AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Calendar No. 128

106TH CONGRESS, *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 106–58

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 2000

JUNE 2, 1999.—Ordered to be printed

Filed under authority of the order of the Senate of May 27, 1999

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1186]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1186) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2000

Budget estimates considered by Senate	$21,996,026,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	21,717,280,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Below the budget estimate, 2000	−278,746,000
Below enacted bill, 1999	−439,545,000

CONTENTS

TITLE I

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Page
General investigations ... 8
Construction, general ... 25
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries ... 43
Operation and maintenance, general ... 48
Regulatory program ... 68
Flood control and coastal emergencies ... 68
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program ... 68
General expenses ... 69

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:
Central Utah project completion account ... 71
Bureau of Reclamation: Water and related resources ... 71
California bay-delta ecosystem restoration ... 84
Bureau of Reclamation loan program account ... 85
Central Valley project restoration fund ... 87
Policy and administrative expenses ... 87

TITLE III

Department of Energy:
Energy Supply Programs ... 89
Solar and renewable energy ... 89
Nuclear energy programs ... 92
Environment, safety, and health ... 93
Energy support activities ... 93
Environmental management (nondefense) ... 95
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund ... 95
Nuclear waste fund ... 95
Science ... 96
High energy physics ... 96
Nuclear physics ... 96
Biological and environmental research ... 96
Basic energy sciences ... 97
Other energy research programs ... 97
Fusion energy sciences ... 97
Departmental administration ... 97
Miscellaneous revenues ... 97
Office of Inspector General ... 98
Atomic energy defense activities ... 98
Weapon activities ... 98
Defense environmental restoration and waste management ... 105
Site and project completion ... 106
Defense facility closure projects ... 109
Defense environmental management privatization ... 109
Other defense activities ... 110
Defense nuclear waste disposal ... 114
Power marketing administrations:
Operations and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration ... 115
Operations and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration ... 116

Page

Department of Energy—Continued
Power marketing administrations—Continued
Construction, rehabilitation, operations and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration 116
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 117
Salaries and expenses—revenues applied 117

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:
Appalachian Regional Commission 128
Denali Commission 128
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 128
Nuclear Regulatory Commission 129
Office of Inspector General 130
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board 130
Tennessee Valley Authority 130

TITLE V

Rescissions 131
Compliance with paragraph 7(c), rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate 132
Compliance with paragraph 12, rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate 133
Budgetary impact statement 136

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2000 beginning October 1, 1999, and ending September 30, 2000, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian regional development programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 2000 budget estimates for the bill total $21,996,026,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $21,717,280,000. This is $278,746,000 below the budget estimates and $439,545,000 under the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGET ALLOCATION

The Energy and Water Development Subcommittee allocation under section 302(b)(1) of the Budget Act totals $21,280,000,000 in budget authority and $20,868,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000. The bill as recommended by the Committee is within the subcommittee allocation for fiscal year 2000 in budget authority and outlays.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $12,443,500,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Stockpile stewardship	$2,351,800,000
Stockpile management	2,025,300,000
Nonproliferation and national security	822,300,000
Other defense programs	1,872,000,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	4,551,676,000
Defense facilities closure projects	1,069,492,000
Defense environmental privatization	228,000,000

ENERGY SUPPLY

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $715,412,000 for energy research programs including:

Solar and renewable energy	$353,900,000
Nuclear fission R&D	287,700,000

NONDEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

An appropriation of $327,922,000 is recommended for nondefense environmental management activities of the Department of Energy.

SCIENCE

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $2,725,069,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$691,090,000
Nuclear physics	330,000,000
Basic energy sciences	854,545,000
Biological and environmental R&D	429,700,000
Magnetic fusion	220,614,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $300,050,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission	$71,400,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	170,000,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	465,400,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Corps of Engineers:	
General investigations	$125,459,000
Construction	1,113,227,000
Flood control Mississippi River and tributaries	315,630,000
Operations and maintenance	1,790,043,000
Corps of Engineers, regulatory activities	115,000,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
California Bay-Delta restoration	50,000,000
Central Valley project restoration fund	37,346,000
Water and related resource	612,451,000
Central Utah project completion	39,370,000

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $4,560,951,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Water is our Nation's most precious and valuable resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy. There is only so much water available.

Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

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

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

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

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

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development. In 1998, flood control projects prevented $13,700,000,000 in damages, and U.S. ports and harbors annually handle about $600,000,000,000 in international cargo generating over $150,000,000,000 in tax revenues, nearly $515,000,000,000 in personal income, contributing $783,000,000,000 to the Nation's gross domestic product, and $1,600,000,000,000 in business sales.

The Department of Energy, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Army Corps of Engineers shall each report in detail on the specific use of Year 2000 conversion emergency funds provided by the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1999 and any other act. Each report shall demonstrate how all of the funds obligated as of January 1, 2000 were directly applied to the Year 2000 conversion of federal information technology systems. For any funds which were used for purposes other than the Year 2000 conversion, the report shall explain the use of such funds and specify the provision which gave the agency the authority to spend the funds for other purposes. The report shall also estimate what portion of the emergency funds were used for technology upgrades which would have occurred in 1999 or 2000 even without the Year 2000 crisis. The report shall be delivered to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senate Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem, the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, and the Senate Committee on the Budget by May 15, 2000.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held three sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2000 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

In addition, the subcommittee received numerous statements and letters from Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life throughout the United States. Testimony, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 2000, therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of 27 to 1 the Committee on May 27, 1999, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1999	$161,747,000
Budget estimate, 2000	135,000,000
Committee recommendation	125,459,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	ALABAMA						
(N)	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL	2,622	616	150		150	
(FDP)	BALDWIN COUNTY WATERSHEDS, AL	1,100	100	100		100	
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	600	100	100		100	
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL	15,035	310	170		170	
(FDP)	BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL	1,100	100	100		100	
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL	1,668	618	350		200	
(SPE)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	1,370	556	250		250	
	ALASKA						
(N)	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	9,600			75		75
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK	400	84	150		150	
(FDP)	ANIAK, AK	637	365	100		100	
(SP)	BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	100				100	
(N)	BREVIG MISSION, AK	340	168	100		100	
(FDP)	CHANDALRR RIVER WATERSHED, AK	100				100	
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	777	577	115		115	
(N)	COASTAL STUDIES NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT, AK	2,000	994	220		220	
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	500	226	140		140	
(N)	FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK	300		150		100	
(N)	GASTINEAU CHANNEL, JUNEAU, AK	100				100	
(E)	KENAI RIVER WATERSHED, AK	900	100	128		128	
(E)	MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, AK	900	100	235		150	
(E)	NAKNEK RIVER WATERSHED, AK	500	84	120		120	
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	19,300	197		253		253
(N)	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	400	184	150		150	
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK	3,316	189		58		58
(E)	SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK	650	150	230		230	
(N)	SKAGWAY HARBOR, AK	100				100	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(N)	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	471	283	150		150	
(N)	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	8,700	50		284		284
	AMERICAN SAMOA						
(N)	WESTERN DISTRICT HARBOR, AS	1,100	100	125		125	
	ARIZONA						
(SPE)	COLONIAS ALONG U.S.—MEXICO BORDER, AZ AND TX	1,675	1,365	200		200	
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, NORTHEAST PHOENIX DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	1,985	1,403	342		342	
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN, AZ	1,375	1,175	200		200	
(SPE)	LITTLE COLORADO RIVER, AZ	250	100	50		50	
(E)	RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	1,100	100	250		150	
(FDP)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	1,933	1,670	263		263	150
(E)	RIO SALADO, PHOENIX REACH, AZ	53,300	1,830		1,545		1,000
(E)	RIO SALADO, TEMPE REACH, AZ	4,485	349		100		100
(E)	SANTA CRUZ RIVER (PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS), AZ	1,350	100	200		200	
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ	13,000			50		50
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ	1,985	1,499	486		486	
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	19,000	296		420		420
	ARKANSAS						
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER, FORT SMITH, AR	840	84	100		100	
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	840	421	200		200	
(FDP)	NORTH LITTLE ROCK, DARK HOLLOW, AR	1,350	462			250	
(N)	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR	27,600	1,293		307		307
	CALIFORNIA						
(E)	ALISO CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	897	736	161		161	
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	28,510	16,672		5,000		3,000
(FC)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	54,290			150		150
(E)	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	967	635	200		100	

(FC)	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	.....	320	.....	480	.....	380
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	21,465	2,418	.....	582	.....	582
(E)	LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	1,100	150	200	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	LLAGAS CREEK, CA	350	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
(FC)	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	15,000	.....	.....	250	.....	250
(E)	MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	850	100	100	.....	.....	.....
(N)	MARE ISLAND STRAIT DREDGING EXPANSION, CA	1,100	100	50	.....	50	.....
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	1,350	1,250	25	.....	25	.....
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	7,500	.....	.....	50	.....	50
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	1,825	1,725	100	.....	100	.....
(SPE)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	1,300	290	300	.....	100	.....
(E)	MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	600	105	100	.....	.....	.....
(E)	MUGU LAGOON, CA	600	120	150	.....	100	.....
(FC)	MURRIETA CREEK, CA	19,500	.....	.....	100	.....	100
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	400	134	150	.....	150	.....
(E)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	1,970	949	200	.....	200	.....
(E)	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	1,095	625	150	.....	100	.....
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	1,806	908	275	.....	175	.....
(E)	NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	1,100	100	50	.....	50	.....
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	4,160	.....	.....	200	.....	100
(E)	NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA	1,170	120	140	.....	140	.....
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	77,300	725	.....	400	.....	400
(E)	ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	850	100	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	PINE FLAT DAM, FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION,	5,000	.....	.....	100	.....	.....
(N)	PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	1,350	126	150	.....	150	.....
(FC)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	16,250	10	.....	200	.....	200
(N)	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	1,600	150	200	.....	100	.....
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	1,850	400	125	.....	125	.....
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO—SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	5,940	5,354	200	.....	200	.....
(E)	SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY,	12,750	6,033	2,000	.....	2,000	.....
(FDP)	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA	850	100	100	.....	100	.....
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR (DEEPENING), CA	22,500	.....	.....	50	.....	50
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR (DEEPENING), CA	730	614	116	.....	116	.....
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, NATIONAL CITY, CA	2,250	105	50	.....	50	.....
(E)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	1,100	150	200	.....	100	.....
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	1,585	1,460	125	.....	75	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(RCP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	706	240	150		150	
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES AND MOKELUMNE RIVERS,	850	100	50		50	
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	1,611	1,231	200		200	
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA	1,600	125	150		150	
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	750	314	250		250	
(E)	SAN JUAN CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	1,470	1,056	414		414	
(E)	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	2,800	450	50		50	
(FDP)	SANTA MARGARITA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	1,189	957	232		232	
(E)	SANTA ROSA CREEK WATERSHED, CA	1,152	392	200		150	
(E)	SANTA YNEZ RIVER, CA	1,100		100			
(FC)	SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	40,700	711		500		500
(N)	SOUTHAMPTON SHOAL CHANNEL AND EXTENSION, CA	1,110	260	70		70	
(RCP)	STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	800	84	500		250	
(FDP)	SUTTER BASIN, CA	1,100	84	60		60	
(E)	TAHOE BASIN, CA AND NV	1,200	225	150		500	
(SPE)	TIJUANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	1,100	110	250		250	
(FC)	TULE RIVER, CA	10,660			150		600
(FC)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	60,000	533		300		300
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	1,845	512	250		150	
(E)	UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	1,100	100	100		100	
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	1,000	205	100		100	
(FDP)	WHITE RIVER, POSO AND DEER CREEKS, CA	1,100	84	60		60	
(FC)	YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	18,300	36		150		600
	COLORADO						
(RCP)	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO	1,100	240	340		340	
	CONNECTICUT						
(E)	COASTAL CONNECTICUT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT	600	250	200		150	

	DELAWARE						
(SP)	BETHANY BEACH, SOUTH BETHANY, DE	469	45	.....	.....	.....	250
(N)	C&D CANAL, BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE AND MD (DEEPE ..	69,800	3,150	.....	500	.....	500
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	2,845	2,766	79	.....	79	.....
	FLORIDA						
(FDP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL	3,270	1,243	400	.....	200	.....
(N)	LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	100	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
	MILE POINT, JACKSONVILLE, FL	100	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	6,500	220	.....	105	.....	105
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	18,400	932	.....	188	.....	188
	GEORGIA						
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, GA	800	268	189	.....	189	.....
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	32,966	1,857	.....	469	.....	469
(E)	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	2,230	1,318	480	.....	650	.....
(RCP)	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA AND SC	840	398	442	.....	442	.....
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	141,482	516	.....	100	.....	100
(COM)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA AND SC	3,100	527	500	.....	350	.....
	HAWAII						
(E)	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	700	100	40	.....	40	.....
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	30,000	.....	.....	380	.....	380
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI	650	225	225	.....	225	.....
(N)	KAHULUI HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, MAUI, HI	900	100	125	.....	125	.....
(N)	KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR, HI (MODIFICATIONS)	100	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
	IDAHO						
(FDP)	KOOTENAI RIVER AT BONNERS FERRY, ID	100	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	LITTLE WOOD RIVER, ID	100	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
	ILLINOIS						
(FC)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	9,750	.....	.....	375	.....	150
(FC)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	25,000	392	.....	247	.....	247
(RCP)	ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	2,195	100	350	.....	150	.....
(FDP)	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL AND IN	1,700	750	295	.....	295	.....
(SPE)	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	1,060	569	300	.....	300	.....
(E)	ROCK RIVER, IL AND WI	1,835	84	200	.....	200	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(SPE)	UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	5,900	3,245	2,100		2,100	
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	59,980	51,294	6,700		6,700	
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	4,950			450		450
(FDP)	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	600	166	201		201	
	INDIANA						
(N)	JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN AND KY	230,000			1,000		800
(FDP)	MISSISSINEWA RIVER, MARION, IN	100				100	
	IOWA						
(FDP)	DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	1,430	265	400		300	
(FDP)	INDIAN CREEK, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IA	350	84	90		90	
	KANSAS						
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	1,287	718	211		211	
(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	25,600	425		266		266
	KENTUCKY						
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, KY	700	217	150		150	
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS NAVIGATION DISPOSITION, KY	830	760	70		70	
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY	600	200	150		150	
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	850	351	304		304	
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	1,784	1,179	400		300	
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	45,300	32,352	7,157		6,457	
	LOUISIANA						
(FDP)	CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	100				100	
(N)	CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	3,900	100	691		691	
(N)	CAMERON LOOP, CALCASIEU PASS, LA	1,100		300		300	
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	85,400	1,966		134		134
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	5,380	4,213	700		700	

(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	3,044	2,844	200	.....	200	.....
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	2,857	2,442	415	.....	415	.....
(SP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LA	17,500	.....	.....	.....	500	.....
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	2,700	2,475	225	.....	225	.....
	ST. BERNARD PARISH, LA	100	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	1,805	1,138	500	.....	500	.....
	MARYLAND						
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	3,000	1,405	700	.....	400	.....
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, NORTHWEST BRANCH, MD AND DC	6,500	.....	.....	300	.....	150
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD AND DC	1,453	304	600	.....	400	.....
(FC)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, DEEP RUN/TIBER HUDSON, MD	7,340	42	.....	400	.....	200
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, GWYNNS FALLS, MD	1,232	992	200	.....	200	.....
(E)	EASTERN SHORE, MD	1,200	100	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, MATTAWOMAN, MD	700	175	150	.....	150	.....
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD	1,650	1,497	153	.....	153	.....
(FC)	PATUXENT RIVER, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD	9,750	.....	.....	50	.....	.....
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	1,103	917	156	.....	156	.....
	MASSACHUSETTS						
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA AND RI	1,631	805	300	.....	300	.....
	MICHIGAN						
	DETROIT RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI	100	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
	SAULT STE MARIE, MI	15,300	816	.....	.....	.....	400
	MISSOURI						
(FDP)	BALLWIN, ST LOUIS COUNTY, MO	580	166	150	.....	150	.....
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	12,000	1,305	.....	377	.....	377
(FC)	CHESTERFIELD, MO	19,825	.....	.....	320	.....	100
(FDP)	CHESTERFIELD, MO	1,079	879	200	.....	200	.....
(FC)	FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO	6,700	25	.....	325	.....	325
(RCP)	KANSAS CITY, MO AND KS	2,460	750	315	.....	315	.....
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 AND R460-471, MO	1,570	1,070	275	.....	275	.....
(RCP)	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	800	230	285	.....	285	.....
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO AND IL	15,508	2,797	.....	322	.....	322
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	709	651	58	.....	58	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	NEBRASKA						
(FC)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	16,250	.....	.....	153	.....	100
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	910	838	72	.....	72	.....
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	2,056	1,186	350	.....	350	.....
	NEVADA						
(FDP)	CARSON RIVER, NV	1,100	84	16	.....	16	.....
(FDP)	FALLON, NV	1,000	84	16	.....	16	.....
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	1,300	640	100	.....	500	.....
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION,	13,000	.....	.....	103	.....	.....
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION,	1,223	1,136	87	.....	87	.....
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	11,250	5,375	.....	550	.....	625
	NEW JERSEY						
(N)	ARTHUR KILL EXTENSION TO PERTH AMBOY, NJ AND NY	800	100	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	1,350	842	400	.....	400	.....
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNENDE INLET, NJ	1,026	600	.....	.....	226	.....
(E)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ	1,540	803	519	.....	419	.....
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ	415	100	225	.....	225	.....
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ	1,775	1,209	320	.....	320	.....
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	2,800	1,791	569	.....	569	.....
(FDP)	UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBS, LONG HILL, MORRIS COUNT	800	184	200	.....	200	.....
(FDP)	UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, MORRIS COUNTY, NJ	800	184	200	.....	200	.....
(FDP)	WOODBRIDGE AND RAHWAY, NJ	1,500	100	100	.....	100	.....
	NEW MEXICO						
(FDP)	ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	870	796	50	.....	50	.....
(FDP)	NORTH LAS CRUCES, NM	500	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
(E)	RIO GRANDE WATER MANAGEMENT, NM, CO AND TX	650	50	50	.....	50	.....
(E)	SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, ALBUQUERQUE, N	1,200	230	250	.....	250	.....

	NEW YORK						
(RCP)	ADDISON, NY	1,105	384	150	.....	150	.....
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	45,400	5,145	.....	1,312	.....	1,312
(FDP)	AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY	800	184	100	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	BOQUET RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY	800	184	100	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	BRONX RIVER BASIN,NY	800	100	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	CHEMUNG RIVER BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NY AND PA	1,500	450	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	1,590	436	600	.....	400	.....
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	6,000	.....	.....	100	.....	.....
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	2,399	1,213	100	.....	100	.....
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY	1,000	.....	50	.....	.....	.....
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	1,850	1,411	166	.....	166	.....
(FDP)	LINDENHURST,NY	800	184	100	.....	100	.....
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ	400,000	.....	.....	2,534	.....	2,534
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ	9,100	8,216	884	.....	884	.....
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	1,200	591	300	.....	300	.....
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	1,750	762	50	.....	50	.....
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	1,140	852	130	.....	130	.....
(E)	OTSEGO LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NY	1,050	218	150	.....	150	.....
(E)	SAWMILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	800	100	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	2,100	182	50	.....	50	.....
(SP)	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	2,100	965	350	.....	350	.....
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA AND MD	3,900	.....	.....	60	.....	.....
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA AND MD	1,450	1,349	101	.....	101	.....
(E)	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	1,300	539	300	.....	200	.....
	NORTH CAROLINA						
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	.....	4,100	.....	850	.....	850
	JOHN KERR, NC AND VA (SEC. 216) (LOWER ROANOKE RIVER)	100	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(E)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	1,100	184	400	.....	200	.....
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	88,557	9,250	.....	350	.....	100
(E)	NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	1,100	100	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBS, EASTERN BAND CHEROKEE NATIO	712	314	398	.....	398	.....
(E)	TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBS, FRANKLIN, MACON COUNTY, NC	518	319	199	.....	199	.....
	NORTH DAKOTA						
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	3,733	2,775	300	.....	300	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	OHIO						
(E)	ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH	.....	.....	.....	600	.....	600
(FDP)	COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	1,600	100	400	.....	300	.....
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH	750	225	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH	650	50	200	.....	.....	.....
(N)	MAUMEE RIVER, OH	2,100	.....	.....	116	.....	116
	OREGON						
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR AND WA	112,500	172	.....	892	.....	892
(E)	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR	1,004	909	95	.....	95	.....
(E)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR	1,100	110	200	.....	100	.....
(E)	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR AND WA	1,116	523	90	.....	90	.....
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	2,284	1,993	291	.....	291	.....
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	1,515	150	300	.....	100	.....
	PENNSYLVANIA						
(FDP)	BLOOMSBURG, PA	800	276	184	.....	184	.....
(E)	CONEMAUGH RVR BASIN, NANTY GLO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATI	1,875	160	.....	140	.....	140
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, BRUSH CREEK ENV RESTORATION, PA	432	82	191	.....	.....	.....
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, LYONS RUN ENV RESTORATION, PA	450	100	223	.....	.....	.....
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, UPPER TURTLE CREEK ENV RESTORATION	432	177	255	.....	255	.....
	PUERTO RICO						
(FC)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR	21,200	1,091	.....	403	.....	403
(FC)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	8,900	625	.....	463	.....	463
	RHODE ISLAND						
(E)	RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	1,200	168	177	.....	177	.....
(E)	RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST AND SRTM DMG REDU	540	383	157	.....	157	.....

	SOUTH CAROLINA						
(RCP)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	3,100	838	400		400	
(E)	CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC	1,600	243	150		150	
(SP)	PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	800	226	150		150	
(E)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS—GOOSE CREEK RESERVOI	1,034			68		68
(E)	YADKIN—PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC AND NC	9,750			50		
(E)	YADKIN—PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC AND NC	707	525	182			
	SOUTH DAKOTA						
(FDP)	JAMES RIVER, SD AND ND	900		100			
(FC)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	10,790	288		95		95
	TENNESSEE						
(E)	DUCK RIVER WATERSHED, TN	855	152	394		100	
(E)	NOLICHUCKY WATERSHED, TN	700	184	200		200	
(E)	NORTH CHICKAMAUGA CREEK, TN	650	246	288		188	
	TEXAS						
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	2,100	450	300		300	
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,931	762	672		672	
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, LAQUINTA CHANNEL, TX	3,000				300	
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX	9,848	2,310		300		300
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	96,000	6,567		1,553		1,553
(RCP)	GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	4,180	1,133	830		830	
(N)	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	5,330	4,259	770		770	
(RCP)	GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	4,110	478	840		840	
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY MODIFICATION, TX	200				200	
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	163,735	5,040		560		560
(FC)	HUNTING BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	82,200	1,000		328		328
(E)	MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	1,490	599	300		300	
(E)	NORTH PADRE ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI, TX	2,370	515	100		50	
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	1,026	200	250		250	
(E)	ONION CREEK, TX	500	84	220		150	
(FC)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	4,318			62		62
(FC)	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	72,307	178		100		100
(N)	SABINE—NECHES WATERWAY, TX	3,370	472	700		700	
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	144,310	5,630		600		600

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(E)	SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX	560	84	245		145	
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	8,235	7,109	720		720	
	VIRGIN ISLANDS						
(N)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI	1,410	109		241		241
	VIRGINIA						
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	1,168	525	370		370	
(E)	ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENVIR RESTORATION, HAMPTON ROAD	1,301	750	339		339	
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	9,795			195		195
(FC)	JOHN H. KERR, VA AND NC	100				100	
	LOWER RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER BASIN, VA	100				100	
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	3,050	350	1,050		750	
(FDP)	POQUOSON, VA	625	475	100		100	
(E)	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	1,477	700	240		240	
(E)	POWELL RIVER, ELY/PUCKETTS CREEK, VA				250		
(E)	PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY WATERSHED, VA	775	310	200		200	
(E)	RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, EMBREY DAM, VA	600	300	200		200	
	WASHINGTON						
(FC)	CENTRALIA, WA (1986 WRDA)	9,000	193		250		250
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	983	831	152		152	
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	50,825			20		
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	11,250	524		888		888
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	889	491	100		100	
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	2,124	1,433	300		300	
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	2,547	1,556	313		313	
(E)	SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	600	84	66		66	
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	1,115	618	201		150	
(E)	TRI-CITIES AREA RIVERSHORE ENHANCEMENT, WA	800	100	200		150	

	WEST VIRGINIA						
	LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	1,950	94				500
	ISLAND CREEK, LOGAN, WV	2,500	1,525				400
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	12,992	12,342	650		650	
(FDP)	MERCER COUNTY, WV	800	332	403		403	
(E)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRON RESTORATION, WV, MD	7,800	202		50		50
	WHEELING WATERFRONT, WV	100				100	
	WYOMING						
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	8,000			340		
	MISCELLANEOUS						
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION			1,500		1,100	
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES			100		100	
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA			400		400	
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES			9,000		8,500	
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES			500		500	
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES			1,900		1,000	
	OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS			8,100		7,500	
	PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES			6,500		6,300	
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)			400		400	
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT			300		300	
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			27,000		25,000	
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS			100		100	
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)			700		700	
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS			700		700	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	.....	.....	650	.....	650	.....
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	−23,496	.....	−23,846	.....
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	.....	.....	102,362	32,638	95,262	30,197
				135,000		125,459	

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(N) NAVIGATION
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(SP) SHORELINE PROTECTION
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(RCP) REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT
(RDP) REVIEW OF DEFERRED PROJECT
(COMP) COMPREHENSIVE
(SPEC) SPECIAL

PROPOSED FUNDING REDUCTIONS

In order to comply with constraints on non-Defense domestic discretionary spending put forth in the Congressional Budget Resolution, it is necessary that the committee recommend numerous reductions to budgeted new and ongoing studies and planning projects for fiscal year 2000. The Committee has tried to limit the impact of these reductions primarily by reducing the increases proposed in the fiscal year 2000 budget over the funding levels for fiscal year 1999, and by reducing the numbers of projects with lower priority benefits from proceeding into the next phase of the Corps' planning process. This action will cause delays in addressing the water resource needs around the country, but will allow most activities to proceed in fiscal year 2000 although at a slower rate.

Akutan Harbor, Breakwater, AK.—The Committee understands that feasibility studies for improvements at Akutan Harbor, AK will continue with available funds. The Corps is to provide a status report of the progress, expected completion date, and possible recommendations not later than March 31, 2000.

North Little Rock, Dark Hollow, AR.—The Committee has been made aware of the possible failure of the Redwood Tunnel, which is a major drainage outlet for the City of North Little Rock, AR. The Committee has included $250,000 for the Corps to prepare a limited reevaluation report which is needed for possible project authorization.

Rio de Flag, AZ.—The Committee has provided an additional $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design on the Rio de Flag project in Arizona. This is in addition to the $263,000 contained in the budget request for the Corps to complete feasibility studies for the project.

Llagas Creek, CA.—The Committee has included $250,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete a limited reevaluation report on the Llagas Creek, CA project. A favorable limited reevaluation will support legislation transferring project construction authority from the Nation Resources and Conservation Service to Corps of Engineers.

Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach County, FL.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study to address the water resource problems related to Palm Beach Harbor in Florida.

Mile Point, Jacksonville, FL.—An amount of $100,000 is included for a reconnaissance study to determine the source of erosion and possible causes of sinkholes along the Mile Point shoreline near Jacksonville, Florida.

Metro Atlanta Watershed, GA.—The Committee recommendation for the Metro Atlanta Watershed study has been increased by $170,000 for the Corps to prepare section 905(b) studies for the Utoy, Sandy, and Proctor Creek watershed in metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia area.

Kawaihae Deepdraft Harbor, HI.—The Committee has been informed that a surge problem at the Kawaihae Deepdraft Harbor in Hawaii is rendering the harbor unusable during many times of the year. Therefore, the Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps to undertake a section 905(b) reconnaissance analysis of the

problem and to determine the Federal interest in navigation improvements.

Mississinewa River, Marion, IN.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of persistent flooding problems along the Mississinewa River in the vicinity of Marion, Indiana.

Little Wood River, ID.—Included within the committee recommendation is $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of flooding problems at Gooding, Idaho. The Committee understands that the existing flood protection works was constructed by the WPA during the 1930's, is severely outdated and in need of repair.

Calcasieu River Basin, LA.—An appropriation of $100,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance level study of providing flood control and environmental enhancement measures along the Calcasieu River Basin in several parishes in southwestern Louisiana.

Louisiana Coastal Area, LA.—The Committee has recommended $500,000 for the Corps to initiate feasibility level analysis to address Louisiana's critical loss of coastal landscape.

St. Bernard Parish, LA.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of flood control measures in St. Bernard Parish in Louisiana. Frequent heavy rains have caused significant flooding and damages over the past nearly 20 years. The funding recommended will begin the process to analyze needed improvements to reduce these repetitive damages to developed areas.

Detroit River Environmental Dredging, MI.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Corps to undertake a section 905(b) study to evaluate the Federal interest in environmental dredging of contaminated sediments in the Detroit River outside of the Federal navigation channel.

Sault Ste Marie, Lock Replacement, MI.—The Committee recommendation includes $400,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of a replacement lock Sault Ste Marie in Michigan.

Las Vegas Wash Wetlands, NV.—An amount of $400,000 is provided for the Corps to advance the completion of the Las Vegas Wash Wetlands feasibility report. The Committee expects the Corps to make every effort to complete the feasibility phase as soon as practicable.

Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, NJ.—An appropriation of $200,000 is recommended for the Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Towsends Inlet New Jersey project for the Corps to complete the feasibility study report on the project.

North Las Cruces, NM.—The Committee has included $200,000 for the Corps to undertake a Limited Reevaluation Report and, if favorable, initiate the feasibility phase of a flood control project at North Las Cruces in New Mexico. The Committee understands that the City has committed to the project financially and has been working with the Corps of Engineers to develop a project. The Corps is also requested to evaluate the advisability of including recreation into the project plan.

Corpus Christi Ship Channel, La Quinta Channel, TX.—The Committee has recommended $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to develop a project study plan, and initiate feasibility studies to

determine the economic and environmental viability of extending the authorized La Quinta, Texas navigation channel by approximately two miles.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway Modifications, TX.—The Committee understands that the Brazos River Floodgates and the Colorado River Locks could be contributing to increased navigation traffic accidents and associated delays on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. Therefore, an appropriation of $200,000, $100,000 each for the Brazos Floodgates and Colorado Locks, is recommended for the Corps to initiate studies to evaluate the existing facilities and determine what operational or other modifications may be needed, and to address associated environmental issues.

Lower Rappahannock River Basin, VA.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study which will focus on wetland protection and environmental restoration for fish and wildlife purposes.

Island Creek at Logan, WV.—An appropriation of $500,000 is recommended for the Island Creek at Logan, West Virginia project. The funding is provided for the Corps to develop a project management plan, complete a General Reevaluation Report and initiate plans and specifications. The Committee understands that the Logan County Commission has received a commitment of financial support from the State of West Virginia and has indicated a willingness to act as the non-Federal sponsor for the project, which now allows the project to move forward.

Lower Mud River, Milton, WV.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia project for the Corps of Engineers to complete a Limited Reevaluation Report (LRR) and, upon approval of the LRR and a National Resources Conservation Service report as the decision document, to proceed with detailed design.

Wheeling Waterfront, WV.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study of waterfront development along the Ohio River at its confluence with Wheeling Creek at Wheeling, West Virginia. The study is to be conducted in conjunction with the Wheeling Area National Heritage Corporation to determine future Corps involvement in the Wheeling National Heritage Port project.

Planning assistance to States.—The Committee has provided $6,300,000 for the Corps of Engineers' planning assistance to States program. The Corps is to work with the city of Laurel, MT to provide appropriate assistance to ensure reliability in the city's Yellowstone River water source.

Other coordination programs.—The Committee recommendation includes $7,500,000 for other coordination programs of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee has not included funding for "Presidential Initiatives" proposed in the Corps' fiscal year 2000 budget request.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1999	$1,429,885,000
Budget estimate, 2000	1,239,900,000
Committee recommendation	1,113,227,000

An appropriation of $1,113,227,000 is recommended for ongoing construction activities.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	ALABAMA				
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	18,900	2,581	3,000	3,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	305,568	29,134	700	700
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL AND GA (MAJOR REH	37,000	.....	750	750
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL AND GA (MAJOR REHAB)	30,800	6,072	3,600	3,600
	ALASKA				
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	5,589	485	4,357	4,357
(N)	COOK INLET, AK	9,450	7,272	500	1,700
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK	18,000	11,810	2,568	2,568
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	14,349	5,687	500	1,400
	ARIZONA				
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	16,100	15,455	645	645
	ARKANSAS				
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	29,700	17,736	11,964	10,464
(N)	MCCLELLAN—KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	632,500	604,750	3,080	3,080
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	242,000	107,349	20,000	33,000
	CALIFORNIA				
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (NATOMAS), CA	34,210	19,522	4,000	4,000
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	47,600	17,919	17,000	15,000
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	43,800	23,231	500	500
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	78,500	69,128	5,000	4,500
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	12,300	9,100	3,200	3,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	150,000	93,050	30,000	38,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA	116,200	106,415	9,785	4,785
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	4,660	2,343	2,317	2,317
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	32,260	31,960	300	300
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	91,800	18,758	500	500

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	14,900	9,716	4,000	4,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	91,000	15,000	4,500	3,000
	NORCO BLUFFS, CA	8,025	5,580	.....	2,200
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	179,900	107,581	7,000	6,300
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	16,550	5,176	3,000	3,000
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	13,230	5,304	4,800	4,300
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	896,000	634,774	20,000	20,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	5,360	400	4,960	4,500
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	36,000	19,805	14,800	14,800
(FC)	SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	30,900	1,140	1,250	1,250
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	5,640	2,585	3,055	2,750
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	24,700	16,087	7,700	7,000
	DELAWARE				
(BE)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	11,800	5,121	259	259
	FLORIDA				
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR DEEPENING, FL	6,600	5,770	830	830
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	124,470	33,634	2,750	2,750
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	2,586,300	476,045	52,300	45,300
(BE)	DADE COUNTY, FL	163,300	62,897	2,000	2,000
(E)	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	75,000	10,518	21,100	16,100
	FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL	28,000	4,778	.....	500
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL AND GA (MAJOR R	35,600	10,370	6,000	6,000
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	243,500	46,627	39,800	33,800
	LAKE WORTH SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL	4,500	282	.....	500
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	19,885	6,099	4,700	4,700
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	47,566	20,999	15,000	13,000
(N)	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	18,700	3,227	3,000	3,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	144,600	41,083	2,000	2,000

	GEORGIA				
(MP)	BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,900	1,816	3,650	3,350
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	20,800	19,300	1,500	1,500
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	619,521	597,819	8,500	8,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700	18,475	8,000	7,500
	HAWAII				
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	14,297	835	219	219
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	4,997	1,205	75	75
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	11,329	3,266	272	272
	ILLINOIS				
(N)	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	24,500	965	1,600	1,600
(E)	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	2,000	749	100	100
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	169,600	26,690	7,629	9,629
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	32,335	26,791	2,000	2,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24 PART 1, MISS RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	25,000	15,920	3,844	3,444
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24 PART 2, MISS RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	38,400	.....	1,200	1,200
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	25,900	21,444	4,456	4,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	22,500	11,802	3,888	3,588
(FC)	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	489,000	25,396	2,500	2,500
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL AND MO	740,700	727,281	2,900	2,900
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL AND KY	1,020,000	372,148	28,634	38,634
(E)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MO, MN	242,862	181,685	18,955	16,055
	INDIANA				
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	37,021	32,804	4,000	3,600
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	131,000	63,330	3,900	3,900
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION (INDIANA SHORELINE), IN	4,378	3,060	.....	1,000
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	7,200	.....	2,000	2,000
	WHITE RIVER, INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	39,975	24,753	.....	3,000
	IOWA				
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 12, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	15,500	.....	2,600	2,300
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	20,000	15,908	4,092	3,792
(E)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	81,400	43,268	5,000	5,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS AND MO	139,193	97,821	3,000	2,800
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA	6,820	4,040	2,500	2,300

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	42,580	22,937	9,500	9,000
	KANSAS				
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	27,400	6,232	4,300	4,100
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	6,600	6,446	154	154
	KENTUCKY				
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN	159,799	156,181	1,450	1,450
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	13,700	2,858	2,500	2,500
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	533,000	24,948	7,750	9,750
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY AND IN	268,000	28,006	2,800	2,800
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	12,115	2,227	3,251	3,000
	LOUISIANA				
(FC)	ALOHA—RIGOLETTE, LA	7,078	6,497	581	581
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	82,700	7,201	4,000	4,000
(N)	INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	533,000	30,519	13,000	15,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	520,000	385,442	11,887	16,887
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	80,000	72,219	2,000	2,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	171,000	24,780	1,500	1,500
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	171,000	143,078	1,400	1,400
(N)	PORT FOURCHON, LA	2,557	373	2,184	2,184
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,895,691	1,694,408	21,113	21,113
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	374,000	127,980	47,066	47,066
(FC)	WEST BANK VICINITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LA	192,000	44,779	7,000	8,000
	MARYLAND				
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD AND DC	12,000	5,849	4,031	3,600
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	270,300	34,624	200	200
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (BREWERTON CHANNEL), MD	44,521	34,943	9,578	8,800
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD	2,500	1,941	559	559

(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	320,000	38,394	9,502	12,002
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	12,150	11,150	1,000	1,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	30,500	.....	5,000	4,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	18,600	15,343	3,257	3,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	30,600	29,000	1,500	1,500
	MICHIGAN				
	CLINTON RIVER, MI SPILLWAY (DEFICIENCY CORRECTION)	2,650	2,150	.....	250
	LAKE MICHIGAN CENTER, MI (SEC. 14)	100	.....	.....	100
	MINNESOTA				
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	15,400	1,938	3,200	3,200
(FC)	MARSHALL, MN	7,850	4,397	2,275	2,275
(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	9,820	3,396	3,390	3,190
(FDP)	ST. CROIX RIVER, STILLWATER, MN	8,700	25,512	.....	1,100
	MISSISSIPPI				
	JACKSON COUNTY, MS	10,000	9,200	.....	800
	NATCHEZ BLUFF, MS	19,549	12,500	.....	2,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	39,041	23,038	7,792	7,000
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	211,000	149,643	13,700	18,700
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU, JACKSON, MO	36,293	28,458	1,900	1,900
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	28,030	12,668	3,500	3,200
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	274,000	189,157	3,000	3,000
(FC)	STE GENEVIEVE, MO	36,100	14,334	7,000	7,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO AND AR (DAM SAFETY)	60,200	5,095	13,000	13,000
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD	21,000	2,615	300	1,300
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	10,000	1,850	100	100
	NEVADA				
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	208,500	68,198	20,100	29,000
	NEW JERSEY				
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	87,700	14,692	1,700	1,700

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA AND DE	214,000	11,525	16,500	12,000
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	358,800	31,971	419	419
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	72,100	7,589	2,000	2,000
	PASSAIC RIVER, MINISH WATERFRONT PARK, NJ	33,705	9,100	.....	250
(E)	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	18,300	1,480	1,800	1,800
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	11,240	5,483	1,300	1,300
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	286,000	36,117	1,000	1,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	979,000	104,509	9,000	8,000
	NEW MEXICO				
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	66,000	11,945	1,500	1,500
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	41,400	4,955	700	700
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, NM	6,600	4,200	2,400	2,400
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	46,800	9,141	600	600
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	62,300	4,644	600	600
	NEW YORK				
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	91,000	14,685	300	300
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	63,000	42,097	3,320	3,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	532,000	32,346	3,000	2,700
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	571,400	50,279	3,250	3,250
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY AND NJ	823,300	227,576	60,000	40,000
	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY&NJ	136,000	45,541	.....	750
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(N)	AIWW, REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	70,700	62,167	7,000	6,300
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	247,100	15,866	18,300	17,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION, N	40,000	4,160	5,000	5,000
(FC)	DEVILS LAKE EMERGENCY OUTLET, ND	29,000	15,000	10,000	.....

(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	37,100	5,932	6,500	6,000
(FC)	GRAND FORKS, ND—EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	175,900	6,442	10,000	9,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	16,000	1,908	3,000	2,800
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	7,800	6,265	500	500
	OHIO				
(FC)	BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	3,500	640	1,400	1,400
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	13,035	3,739	2,266	2,266
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH	163,000	99,953	915	915
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	91,700	61,884	8,000	12,000
	OKLAHOMA				
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	9,800	465	500	500
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	37,900	4,746	6,800	6,400
	OREGON				
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR AND WA (MAJOR REHAB)	104,600	37,340	10,800	10,800
(E)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR AND WA	73,966	24,463	6,368	5,510
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	174,000	109,401	500	500
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR AND WA	28,000	21,203	262	352
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	70,600	4,083	1,700	1,700
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,664	13,905	6,800	6,800
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	705,000	76,996	21,600	31,600
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	58,085	16,753	520	520
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	10,575	2,694	3,500	3,200
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	108,300	40,338	20,000	18,500
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	12,500	1,828	2,500	2,500
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	430,300	379,390	5,434	5,434
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	63,300	7,705	1,000	1,000
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	321,000	50,575	9,566	8,800
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	24,100	12,197	8,000	7,300
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING AND WIDENING)	98,444	22,775	37,284	31,600

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(E)	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	108,000	.....	2,000	3,000
(FDP)	JAMES RIVER RESTORATION, SD	1,000	.....	.....	1,000
(MP)	PIERRE, SD	100,000	340	10,000	6,500
	TENNESSEE				
	BLACK FOX, MURFREE SPRINGS, AND OAKLAND WETLANDS, TN	5,845	2,950	.....	1,000
	TENNESSEE				
	RIVER, HAMILTON COUNTY, TN	6,669	2,804	.....	1,000
	TEXAS				
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	293,010	10,505	9,800	9,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	26,820	13,640	8,700	7,900
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	75,830	22,736	3,200	2,900
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	116,300	102,526	6,200	5,600
(N)	GIWW, ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	20,660	7,643	9,000	7,650
(N)	HOUSTON—GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	415,543	84,607	60,000	54,000
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	41,895	5,000	2,000	2,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	153,100	151,596	610	610
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	214,320	73,104	18,300	16,500
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	23,100	7,194	3,000	3,000
	DICKENSON COUNTY, SEC 202 PROJECT, VA	700	.....	.....	200
(MP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (MAJOR REHAB)	59,600	.....	1,400	1,400
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	137,496	22,941	550	550
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	28,800	5,839	1,197	1,197
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA HURRICANE PROTECTION	247,300	66,607	.....	17,000
	WASHINGTON				
(E)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR AND ID	1,376,330	553,975	100,000	70,000

(E)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	232,000	228,659	1,300	1,300
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	195,800	114,577	540	540
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA AND OR (MAJOR REH	94,000	10,890	2,300	2,300
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	107,300		750	750
(FDP)	GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	12,000	2,254		800
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,837,841	702,645	5,400	9,800
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB)	20,300	1,060	600	600
(N)	MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	294,000	20,003	9,800	9,800
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV AND OH	363,474	341,834	7,150	7,150
(FC)	TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	7,500	2,534	2,900	2,900
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	226,900	218,532	1,400	1,400
	WISCONSIN				
	LAFARGE LAKE, KICKAPOO RIVER, WI	17,000	3,368		1,000
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM			3,000	5,000
	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)			4,500	6,260
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)			2,500	2,500
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)			1,000	1,000
	DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM			20,000	10,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)			8,500	8,500
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION			19,554	19,554
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)			26,900	32,575
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE			45	45
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE			185	185
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)			500	500
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)			4,500	5,460
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME			8,500	10,000
	RIVERINE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AND FLOOD HAZARD MITIGA			25,000	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECT (SECTION 208)	.....	.....	100	100
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SIPPAGE, AND CARRYOVER BALANCES	.....	.....	−211,789	−291,789
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL	.....	.....	1,239,900	1,113,227

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

BUDGET CONSTRAINTS AND REDUCTIONS

Severely constrained spending limits required under the discretionary budget caps imposed by the Congressional Budget Resolution have made it most difficult for the Committee to formulate a balanced Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. In order the adhere to the subcommittee's allocations, address the critical ongoing activities, correct program imbalances contained in the President's fiscal year 2000 budget, and respond to the numerous requests of the Members, the Committee finds it necessary to recommend numerous reductions and adjustments to funding levels proposed in the budget. The constrained budget will result in continued delayed completion schedules. Project benefits will be deferred. Finally, the Committee regrets that many worthwhile projects could not be recommended for funding because of the lack of authorization and the shortfall in resources.

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

Cook Inlet, AK.—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $1,700,000 for the Cook Inlet navigation project in Alaska. The budget request of $500,000 would have resulted in unacceptable delays in project construction and, therefore, an additional $1,200,000 is recommended in order to mitigate the potential delays.

Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, AR.—An appropriation of $33,000,000 is recommended for the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, Arkansas project. This is an increase of $13,000,000 over the budget request and, while a significant increase, is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

Los Angeles County Drainage Area, CA.—The Committee recommendation for the Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California project is $38,000,000, an increase of $8,000,000 over the budget request. The additional funding will advance the project and help mitigate the funding shortfall proposed in the Administration's fiscal year 2000 budget.

Los Angeles Harbor, CA.—The Committee has reduced the funding for the Los Angeles Harbor project from $9,785,000 to $4,785,000. The recommendation is made possible as the result of the Corps of Engineers reprogramming additional funding into the project during the current fiscal year, which reduced the fiscal year 2000 funding requirements.

Norco Bluffs, CA.—An amount of $2,200,000 is recommended for the Norco Bluffs, California project. The Committee expects the Corps to complete construction of the projects during fiscal year 2000.

Central and Southern, Everglades, and Kissimmee River Projects, FL.—In light of the severe budget constraints, the Committee has had to make many difficult recommendations in developing the funding levels for fiscal year 2000. Confronted with a highly constrained budget environment and program imbalances put forth in

the President's budget request, the Committee has recommended reductions to many important water resource projects and programs, including the Everglades, Kissimmee River and the Central and Southern projects.

Jackson Harbor, Mill Cove, FL.—The Committee will interpose no objection to the Corps of Engineers negotiating an agreement with the St. Johns River Water Management District to accept contributed funds to undertake the Jacksonville Harbor, Mill Cove, Florida project put forth in the April 23, 1999 letter of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works. This action is taken with the understanding and under the condition that there will be no reimbursement for the Federal portion of the project as stated in the January 4, 1999 letter of the St. Johns River Water Management District to the Jacksonville District of the Corps of Engineers.

Chicago Shoreline, IL.—The Committee has provided $9,629,000 for the Chicago Shoreline project in Illinois. The additional funding is recommended for acceleration of the Irving to Belmont section of the project.

Olmstead Locks and Dam, Ohio River, IL and KY.—An appropriation of $38,634,000 is provided for the Olmstead Lock and Dam, Illinois project. The Administration's budget request for fiscal year 2000 significantly under funded the construction needs and the Committee has, therefore, recommended an additional $10,000,000 in an effort to mitigate delays on this important facility on the Nation's inland waterway system.

Ohio River Flood Protection, Indiana Shoreline, IN.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 for the Ohio River Flood Protection, Indiana Shoreline project in Indiana. No funding was included in the budget request for fiscal year 2000 to continue this project, but the amount recommended by the Committee should be sufficient to complete project construction.

White River, Indianapolis Central Waterfront, IN.—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $3,000,000 for the Corps to finalize plans and specifications on the remaining project features, and continue construction on the White River, Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana project.

Kentucky Lock and Dam, KY.—An appropriation of $9,750,000 is provided for the Kentucky Lock and Dam project in Kentucky to help mitigate delays as the result of the less than optimum funding level contained in the Administration's budget request.

Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, LA.—Funding in the amount of $15,000,000 is recommended for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock project in Louisiana. The recommended appropriation provides the full budget request of $2,900,000 for community impact activities; and an additional $2,000,000 for engineering and design, and construction work.

West Bank Vicinity of New Orleans, LA.—The Committee has provided $8,000,000 for the West Bank Vicinity of New Orleans, Louisiana project to continue construction activities and to initiate two additional contracts in the Westwego to Harvey Canal.

St. Croix River, Stillwater, MN.—An amount of $1,100,000 is recommended for the St. Croix River, Stillwater, Minnesota project. No funds were requested in the Administration's budget request to continue this important flood control project. The Committee,

therefore, has included the recommended funding to complete construction of the Stage 2 wall extension.

Blue River Channel, Kansas City, MO.—The Committee has provided $18,700,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request, for the Corps to expedite work on the Blue River Channel, Kansas City, Missouri flood control project. The Committee believes the Administration's budget request for fiscal year 2000 significantly underfunded this critical flood control project causing additional delays in project completion, and also delaying the repair of other facilities in the area.

Missouri National Recreation River, NE and SD.—The Committee has provided $1,300,000 for the Missouri National Recreational River, NE and SD project. This is $1,000,000 over the budget request for fiscal year 2000. The additional funding is provided to allow the Corps to resume efforts to develop a cost sharing partner for the Ponca Research and Education Center and undertake preconstruction activities related to the Center, as appropriate, once a non-Federal sponsor is identified and a cost sharing agreement is finalized.

Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, NV.—The Committee has provided $29,000,000 for the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes project in Nevada to advance completion of this important flood control project. The Committee urges the Corps to use available funds or propose a reprogramming in order to keep this project on schedule. The Committee has no objection to the February 24, 1999 proposal to execute an agreement with the local sponsor regarding project financing. The Committee expects the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works to make every effort to even out reimbursement payments to lessen future budgetary impacts.

Devils Lake Emergency Outlet, ND.—The Committee recommendation includes no additional funding for the Devils Lake Emergency Outlet, North Dakota project as requested in the budget. This action is recommended without prejudice in recognition that Corps has authority to use up to $10,000,000 of previously appropriated funds to initiate construction of an outlet once certain conditions mandated by Congress are met.

West Columbus, OH.—The Committee has provided an additional $4,000,000 over the budget request for the West Columbus, Ohio flood control project to allow the Corps to continue construction on a more optimum schedule and to mitigate delays due to the inadequate funding request proposed in the Administration's budget for fiscal year 2000.

Locks and Dams 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River, PA.—The Committee has recommended $31,600,000 to continue construction of the Locks and Dams 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River navigation project in Pennsylvania. While providing an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request, budget constraints do not allow the Committee to reach the capability level of the Corps which is significantly higher than the $31,600,000 recommended herein.

Black Fox, Murfree Springs, and Oaklands Wetland, Murfreesboro, TN.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 for the Black Fox, Murfree Springs, and Oaklands Wetland, Murfreesboro, Tennessee project. No funding was included in the Administration's

fiscal year 2000 budget request and the recommended funding will be used to continue construction of three wetland restoration sites.

Tennessee River, Hamilton County, TN.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 in its recommendation in order to continue construction of the Tennessee River, Hamilton County, Tennessee project.

Dickenson County, VA Element, Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, VA, WV, and KY.—The Committee has included $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a Detailed Project Report for the Dickenson County, Virginia, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks project. The Committee understands that flooding is a continuing problem in Dickenson County, and the recommended funding will allow the Corps to begin detailed studies on how to address the flooding problems.

Virginia Beach, Hurricane Protection, VA.—An appropriation of $17,000,000 is recommended to continue construction activities on the Virginia Beach, Hurricane Protection project in Virginia.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, WA and OR.—The Committee recommends $70,000,000 to continue the Columbia River Fish Mitigation project. The recommended level of funding is necessary due to the severe budget constraints. In addition, no part of any appropriation contained herein shall be used to begin Phase II of the John Day drawdown study or to start a study of the drawdown at McNary Dam.

In last year's Conference Report, the conferees requested the Northwest Power Planning Council, with the assistance from the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP), to conduct an annual review of the Bonneville Power Administration's reimbursable fish and wildlife programs. The Council's first report to the Appropriations Committee, submitted earlier this month, noted that the Panel's future reviews might be improved if the Panel could conduct some or all of its review of the reimbursable programs in the Fall, prior to release of the Administration's annual budget. This would allow more time for the preparation of the Council's report that is due each year on May 15. The Committee understands that the Council is exploring changes in the timing of the ISRP's reviews with the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies. The Committee expects the Corps to cooperate with the Council and the independent scientists in providing information on the Corps' reimbursable programs that will be useful in the Council's annual report to the Appropriations Committee.

Lower Columbia River Basin Bank Protection, Barlow Point, WA.—The Committee has recommended $352,000 for the Lower Columbia River Basin Bank Protection project in Oregon and Washington, including $90,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Barlow Point, WA element of the project.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, WV-KY-VA.—The Committee has provided a total of $9,800,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project.

The Committee recommendation also includes $600,000 for the Upper Mingo County, including Mingo County tributaries, West Virginia, element; $1,300,000 for the Kermit, Lower Mingo County

(Kermit), WV, element; $300,000 for the Wayne County, WV, element; and $2,200,000 for the McDowell County, WV, element.

Finally, $4,600,000 is provided for the Grundy, VA, element.

Aquatic plant control program.—The Committee has included $5,000,000 to continue the aquatic plant control program. In light of severe budget constraints and the fact that this is a nationwide program, the Committee believes it inappropriate to earmark the small amount of funding available for fiscal year 2000. The appropriations are to undertake the highest priority activities. The Committee recognizes that there is a shortage of funding to harvest nuisance aquatic plants, while there are other programs to aid aquatic plant control research. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps to place a higher priority on actual plant harvesting and eradication through funding provided in this account. Finally, in an effort to maximize the use of the limited Federal funding, the Committee recommends that harvesting and eradication be undertaken only where a local sponsor agrees to provide 50 percent of the cost of the work.

The Committee recommendation includes $400,000 for aquatic weed control at Lake Champlain in Vermont.

Emergency streambank and shoreline protection, (sec. 14).—The Committee has included $8,500,000 for the section 14, emergency streambank and shoreline erosion protection program.

Small navigation projects (sec. 107).—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $5,460,000 for small navigation projects under the section 107 program. The recommendation includes $200,000 for feasibility phase work on the Haines Harbor, AK project; $140,000 for feasibility activities on the Ketchikan Harbor, AK project; $400,000 for the Corps to prepare a decision document and recommendations regarding the unforseen conditions and cost increases on the Ouzinkie Harbor, AK project; $200,000 for feasibility phase activities on the Unalaska Harbor, AK project; and $20,000 to initiate studies to determine the feasibility of providing navigation improvements along the Blackwater River in New Hampshire.

Small flood control projects (sec. 205).—The Committee recommendation for section 205 small flood control projects is $32,175,000.

The Committee recommendation includes $400,000 to initiate plans and specifications on the Ledgewood Creek, CA project; $175,000 to complete the feasibility phase and initiate plans and specifications for the St. Joe River at St. Maries, ID project; $100,000 to initiate studies for flooding problems in the vicinity of Cataldo, ID; $100,000 to initiate work on the Frankfort, Jones Rum Pump Station, KY project; $2,000,000 to initiate construction on the Ft. Fairfield, ME project; $150,000 to initiate studies to address severe flooding conditions at Livingston, MT; $300,000 to formulate and evaluate flood control alternatives and to prepare draft feasibility reports for the Upper Little Sugar Creek, Briar Creek, Irwin Creek and McMullen Creek in Meckleburg County, NC; $250,000 to initiate studies and the feasibility phase for the Hernandez, NM project; $100,000 to continue feasibility studies and execute a PCA in the Chagrin River, Eastlake, OH project; $75,000 to perform a preliminary assessment of flood reduction alternatives and nego-

tiate a PCA for the Tawney Run Creek, Springdale, PA project; $175,000 to complete feasibility studies to identify and evaluate flood damage alternatives along Town Creek, Lenoir County, TN; $150,000 to complete feasibility studies to identify and evaluate flood damage alternatives in the vicinity of Mountain City, Johnson County, TN; $100,000 to initiate studies to determine the economic and environmental feasibility of flood control measures at Gates, TN; $100,000 to initiate and complete a section 905(b) study and if approved negotiate a feasibility cost sharing agreement for the Jamestown Island Seawall, VA project; and $770,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Snoqualmie River at Snoqualmie, WA project.

Aquatic ecosystem restoration (sec. 206).—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $6,260,000 for section 206 aquatic ecosystem restoration projects for fiscal year 2000.

The recommended funding level includes $160,000 to complete the feasibility study, complete design, and prepare plans and specifications, and initiate construction of the Little Sugar Creek, NC project; $400,000 to prepare a preliminary restoration plan, ecosystem restoration report, and initiate plans and specifications for the Edgewood Creek, NV project; $400,000 to initiate and complete the ecosystem restoration report, and initiate plans and specifications on the Incline Creek, NV project; and $800,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications and initiate construction on the Upper Jordan River Restoration, UT project.

The Committee is aware of a shoreline restoration project at the Chicago Botanic Garden in Cook County, Illinois and recognizes the importance of protecting the garden lagoon system. The Committee encourages the Corps to carry out the work necessary to stabilize the Garden's embankment and the roadways, including all studies necessary to evaluate the feasibility of this project, and to initiate preconstruction engineering and design activities.

Projects modifications for improvement of the environment (sec. 1135).—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for section 1135 Project Modification for the Improvement of the Environment Program.

The recommendation includes $200,000 for planning and design upon successful completion and approval of the Preliminary Restoration Plan for the Great Lakes, Sea Lamprey Control program, and the submission of a formal study request by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission; $100,000 to prepare a preliminary restoration plan and initiate the ecosystem restoration report on the Rio Grande, NM, Habitat Conservation project; $200,000 to prepare plans and specifications for habitat restoration at Rochester Harbor, NY; $1,730,000 to initiate construction of the Ballard, Chittinden Locks, WA project; and $100,000 to complete the preliminary restoration plan for 5 sites along the Green/Duwamish River, WA.

Funding Adjustments.—The Committee has recommended an additional reduction over that proposed in the budget request for anticipated carryover balances from fiscal year 1999 into fiscal year 2000. This action is required in order to bring the bill into compliance with the allocations required by Congressional budget caps, and to correct programmatic imbalances proposed in the Presi-

dent's fiscal year 2000 request. In allocating the amount assigned to savings and slippage, which is recommended at the budget request level, and the additional reduction, it is the Committee's intent that these reductions be applied proportionally. Nevertheless, the Committee is aware of considerable savings due to favorable bids, and where circumstances have significantly slowed projects work, substantially affecting the amount of funding which can be used on such project in fiscal year 2000. Therefore, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to use its reprogramming authority to the fullest extent possible to meet funding needs on these projects that may arise during fiscal year 2000.

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

Appropriations, 1999	$321,149,000
Budget estimate, 2000	280,000,000
Committee recommendation	315,630,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Current year allocation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS					
	SURVEYS:					
	GENERAL STUDIES:					
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALEXANDER COUNTY, IL AND SCOTT	350	100	100	30	30
(FDP)	ALEXANDRIA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	3,150	362	268	700	700
(FDP)	DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA	3,500	250	250	250	250
(COM)	MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN AND MS	2,075	768	768	675	675
(FC)	BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	125,000	5,151	4,001	1,767	1,767
(FC)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	88,400	.....	.....	700	700
(FC)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN AND KY	21,450	432	432	318	318
(FC)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	11,765	.....	.....	525	525
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	.....	.....	.....	365	365
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	5,330	5,330			
	CONSTRUCTION					
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	3,667,000	2,525,845	35,830	37,685	37,685
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	9,000	3,952	1,435	700	700
(FC)	GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	245,350	19,267	7,683	21,900	13,900
(FC)	HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	8,370	3,624	1,274	2,190	2,190
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	1,995,000	852,009	28,980	23,250	35,750
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO	387,000	363,445	5,660	4,350	4,850
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	185,000	72,620	7,203	7,500	7,500
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,720,000	849,026	26,577	19,750	19,750
(FC)	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA	19,500	5,758	4,322	3,000	5,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA AND MS	66,900	8,074	240	100	100
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	99,200	78,654	14,717	10,400	10,400
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	166,900	116,610	9,699	8,930	8,930
	YAZOO BASIN	(1,513,837)	(708,083)	(29,302)	(24,279)	(24,279)

(FC)	BACKWATER LESS ROCKY BAYOU, MS	254,491	59,144	20	20	20
(FC)	BACKWATER PUMP, MS	97,840	11,098	410	500	1,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	109,383	90,387	4,322	3,915	4,500
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	244,284	237,990	12,964	6,294	11,294
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	194,431	34,586	24	20	20
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	32,408	26,781	1,767	1,570	1,570
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	243,000	107,040	192	340	340
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	338,000	141,057	9,603	11,620	11,620
(FC)	ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	58,800	12,592	5,762	7,800	9,800
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN AND MS	17,941	10,454	235	2,500	2,500
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	143,000	53,776	1,601	2,398	2,398
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	176,732	191,817			
	MAINTENANCE					
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN				55,876	55,876
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR				284	284
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR				443	443
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR				66	66
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR				108	108
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN				3,736	6,500
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO				6,300	7,800
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR AND LA				2,344	2,344
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR				964	964
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL				45	45
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY				25	25
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA				644	644
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA				10,560	12,810
(N)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA				157	157
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA				101	101
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA				1,068	1,068
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA				373	373
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA				84	84
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA				436	436
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA				4,027	4,027

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Current year allocation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA				2,927	2,927
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS				333	333
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS				193	193
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS				199	199
	YAZOO BASIN:				(20,475)	(20,475)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS				3,265	4,265
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS				209	209
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS				3,214	4,214
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS				946	946
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS				4,280	5,280
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS				1,059	1,059
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS				4,334	5,334
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS				1,269	1,300
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS				493	493
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS				560	560
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS				846	846
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO				202	202
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO				3,500	3,500
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN				113	113
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN				800	800
(FC)	MAPPING				1,117	1,117
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE				−19,562	−9,562
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE				97,938	118,483
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES				280,000	315,630

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

The Committee rejects the totally inadequate budget request proposed by the administration and again expresses concern over the continued, severe budget reductions for the Mississippi River and tributaries [MR&T] project. The Mississippi River has the third largest drainage basin in the world, exceeded in size only by the Amazon and Congo River watersheds. It drains a total of 1,245,00 square miles, covering all or part of 31 States and two Canadian Provinces. Water from as far east as New York and as far west as Wyoming contribute to floods in the lower Mississippi River Valley, flowing through the basin roughly resembling a funnel which has its spout at the Gulf of Mexico.

Therefore, flood control and protection along the Mississippi River and its tributaries is not an option, it is mandatory. The floods of 1993 demonstrated this importance by averting $8,100,000,000 in damages. Over the years, the MR&T project has saved and estimated $150,000,000,000 in flood damages based on a Federal investment of $8,121,000,000. Another outcome of the recent floods is the need to raise and strengthen numerous section of levees. The proposed $41,149,000 reduction below the appropriation for 1999 severely impacts this effort and increases the likelihood of higher disaster payments as the result of major flooding.

The Committee again directs the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers to continue ongoing construction and expedite award of contracts, using continuing contracts, in fiscal year 2000 to alleviate continued flooding and suffering affected areas.

The Committee believes that it is essential to provide adequate resources and funding to the Mississippi River and Tributaries program in order to protect the large investment in flood control facilities. Although much progress has been made, considerable work remains to be done for the protection and economic development of the rich national resources in the Valley. The Committee expects the additional funds to be used to advance ongoing studies, initiate new studies, and advance important construction and maintenance work. In conjunction with efforts to optimize use of the additional funding provided, the Committee expects adjustments in lower priority activities and non-critical work in order to maximize the public benefit within the Mississippi River and Tributaries program.

Yazoo basin, Big Sunflower River, MR&T.—The Committee has provided $4,500,000 for the Corps to expedite construction of various features of the Big Sunflower River, MS, project.

Yazoo basin, demonstration erosion control, MR&T.—An additional $5,000,000, over the budget request, is recommended for the demonstration erosion control project, to continue a joint effort by the Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service in the Yazoo basin of the Mississippi. The funds provided will permit the Corps to undertake construction of additional flood water retarding structures, pipe and culvert grade control structures, channel improvements, and bank stabilization items in various watersheds. Design of future work, acquisition of real estate and monitoring of results will be accomplished for all watersheds in order to facilitate work in fiscal year 2000 and for all future work as required for completion of the total program. The Com-

mittee expects the administration to continue to request funds for this important project.

Mississippi River Levees.—The Committee recommendation includes $35,750,000 to advance completion of construction of critical levee and other flood control facilities within the Mississippi River and Tributaries program, including up to an additional $2,000,000 for the Commerce-Birds Point, MO levee grade raise.

St. Francis Basin and Tributaries, MO and AR.—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $4,500,000 for construction activities on the St. Francis Basin and Tributaries feature, including an additional $500,000 to advance completion of channel improvements on Main and Ditch # 2, Item 2 in Missouri.

St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, MO.—The Committee has included $9,800,000 for construction activities on the St. Johns and New Madrid Floodway in Missouri, including additional funding to advance completion construction of the New Madrid pumping station by 1 year.

Yazoo Basin, Big Sunflower River, MS.—An appropriation of $209,000 is recommended for the Big Sunflower River maintenance portion of the Yazoo Basin feature, including additional funds for the purchase of mitigation lands as appropriate.

The Committee understands the urgency of restoring channel capacity on the Big Sunflower River in the Yazoo Basin of Mississippi. The Committee understands that litigation has delayed the award of contracts on this project during fiscal year 1999 and pending resolution of this litigation, may effect contract awards in fiscal year 2000. However, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to redirect available funds within project if the litigation is resolved during fiscal year 2000.

Yazoo Basin, MS.—The Committee is informed of bank slides on the Mississippi River and the impacts on the ability of Adams County, Mississippi to maintain road surfaces. The Committee expects the Corps to work with the County to address the problem.

Yazoo basin maintenance.—The Committee has been informed of inadequate maintenance of road surfaces and slides on Mississippi levees in the Yazoo basin. Additional levee maintenance funding has been provided for the Corps to address this and other problems.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1999	$1,653,252,000
Budget estimate, 2000	1,835,900,000
Committee recommendation	1,790,043,000

The Committee recommendation for Operation and Maintenance activities of the Corps of Engineers totals $1,790,043,000 for fiscal year 2000.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA—COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	3,000	3,000
ALABAMA—COOSA RIVER, AL	5,185	5,185
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	10	10
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	15,917	15,917
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	4,000	4,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	40	40
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM ''BILL'' DANNELLY LA	5,560	5,560
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	17,562	19,562
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	300	300
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	6,183	6,183
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	95	95
TENNESSEE—TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL AND MS	19,999	19,999
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA	7,910	7,910
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,794	1,794
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,552	1,552
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	401	401
HOMER HARBOR, AK	188	188
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	35	35
LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL (SEWARD), AK		1,000
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	180	180
NOME HARBOR, AK	460	460
PETERSBURG HARBOR, AK	88	88
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	502	502
ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	384	384
WRANGELL NARROWS, AK	1,024	1,024
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,180	1,180
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	75	75
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,118	1,118
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	27	27
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	155	155
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,702	3,702
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	5,585	5,585
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,117	1,117
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	5,536	5,536
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,673	5,673
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,167	4,167
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,285	1,285
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,054	1,054
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,002	1,002
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,946	4,946
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	295	295
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	283	283
MCCLELLAN—KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	25,086	25,086
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,816	1,816
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	3,498	3,498
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,367	1,367
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,803	3,803
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	523	523
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR AND LA	6,538	6,538

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
OZARK—JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,515	5,515
WHITE RIVER, AR	2,363	2,363
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	171	171
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,844	1,844
BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	2,055	2,055
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	170	170
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,877	3,877
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,272	4,272
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	332	332
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	2,069	2,069
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,189	4,189
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,021	1,021
ISABELLA LAKE MITIGATION, CA	3,700	3,700
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,456	1,456
LOS ANGELES—LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	165	165
LOS ANGELES—LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	100	100
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,940	3,940
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	277	277
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	246	246
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	2,818	2,818
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,894	1,894
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,081	1,081
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	40	40
NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR, CA	758	758
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	8,149	8,149
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,170	1,170
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,301	2,301
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,138	1,138
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	5,546	5,546
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	1,656	1,656
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,149	1,149
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	153	153
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,289	2,289
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,473	2,473
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,441	2,441
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,662	1,662
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,007	3,007
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,646	1,646
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,516	1,516
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,880	1,880
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	2,995	2,995
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,684	1,684
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,875	2,875
YUBA RIVER, CA	36	36
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	454	454
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	778	778
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	530	530
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	129	129
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,051	2,051
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	300	300
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	702	702

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	328	328
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	412	412
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	232	232
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	797	797
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	512	512
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	290	290
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	340	340
THOMASTON DAM, CT	556	556
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	418	418
DELAWARE		
CEDAR CREEK, DE	265	265
CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL, ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REPL	4,000	4,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	19,518	19,518
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	456	456
MISPILLION RIVER, DE	305	305
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	430	430
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,395	3,395
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	880	880
POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	985	985
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	37	37
FLORIDA		
AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC &	30	30
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	7,332	7,332
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	8,470	8,470
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	2,652	2,652
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	1,023	1,023
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	100	100
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	50	50
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	3,286	3,286
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	7,193	7,193
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL AND GA	5,699	5,699
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	2,620	2,620
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	4,200	4,200
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	4,680	4,680
OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	10	10
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,101	2,101
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	1,300	1,300
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	7,696	7,696
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	2,900	2,900
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	400	400
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,130	3,130
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	70	70
ST LUCIE INLET, FL	2,242	2,242
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	7,041	7,041
WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	34	34
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	6,328	6,328
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	5,830	5,830
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	2,310	2,310
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	6,231	6,231

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,000	7,000
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	8,150	8,150
HARTWELL LAKE, GA AND SC	9,500	9,500
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	41	41
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA AND SC	8,750	8,750
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	8,000	8,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	13,757	13,757
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	2,340	2,340
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL	6,200	6,200
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	121	121
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	279	279
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	750	750
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	2,759	2,759
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,304	2,304
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	82	82
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,238	1,238
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	176	176
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ID	63	63
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL AND IN	2,539	2,539
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,879	4,879
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	5,146	5,146
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362	362
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	185	185
ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL	405	405
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL AND IN	25,368	25,368
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	432	432
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,588	1,588
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	837	837
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,558	5,558
MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &	103,547	105,047
NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL	150	150
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	43	43
REND LAKE, IL	3,881	3,881
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	97	97
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	736	736
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	844	844
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,829	1,829
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	266	266
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	709	709
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	837	837
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	1,064	1,064
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	92	92
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	802	802
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	213	213
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	825	825
MONROE LAKE, IN	803	803
PATOKA LAKE, IN	730	730
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	42	42
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	741	741

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	154	154
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,755	2,755
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	109	109
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	211	211
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS AND MO	7,182	7,182
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,147	2,147
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,577	3,577
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,905	3,905
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,582	1,582
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,130	1,130
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	560	560
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	716	716
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,184	1,184
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	938	938
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	275	275
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	975	1,500
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,370	1,370
MARION LAKE, KS	1,331	1,331
MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,016	2,016
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,856	1,856
PEARSON—SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	900	900
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,089	2,089
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,752	1,752
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	347	347
TORONTO LAKE, KS	468	468
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	1,767	1,767
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,731	1,731
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN	7,382	7,382
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,057	2,057
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,170	1,170
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,209	1,209
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,364	1,364
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	819	819
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,293	1,293
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	340	340
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,609	1,609
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,113	1,113
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,142	1,142
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,826	1,826
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	112	112
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,084	1,084
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,780	1,780
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	17	17
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	662	662
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	76	76
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,907	1,907
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA AND WV	83,884	83,884
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA AND WV	5,789	5,789
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	932	932
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,625	1,625

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,043	1,043
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	5,345	5,345
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,071	1,071
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	12,631	12,631
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	2,119	2,119
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	509	509
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	5	5
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25	25
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	32	32
BAYOU TECHE, LA	212	212
CADDO LAKE, LA	127	127
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	7,560	7,560
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	3,585	3,585
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	12,506	12,506
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,443	3,443
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	260	260
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	579	579
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	93	93
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,445	2,445
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	2,743	2,743
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	64,430	64,430
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	14,989	14,989
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80	80
RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	8,781	10,781
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,270	2,270
WALLACE LAKE, LA	209	209
MAINE		
PORTLAND HARBOR, ME	6,985	6,985
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,030	1,030
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	440	440
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	625	625
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	16,142	16,142
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	140	140
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	324	324
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV	1,616	1,616
KNAPPS NARROWS, MD	770	770
NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD	850	850
NORTHEAST RIVER, MD	770	770
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	380	380
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	450	450
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	143	143
TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD	5,800	5,800
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	895	895
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	494	494
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	423	423
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	443	443
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	10,816	10,816
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	202	202
CHATHAM (STAGE) HARBOR, MA	215	215

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	168	168
CUTTYHUNK HARBOR, MA	118	118
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	375	375
GREEN HARBOR, MA	332	332
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	381	381
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	125	125
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	362	362
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	395	395
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	280	280
NEW BEDFORD HARBOR, MA	230	230
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	3,227	3,227
SALEM HARBOR, MA	175	175
TULLY LAKE, MA	391	391
WEST HILL DAM, MA	550	550
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	414	414
MICHIGAN		
ALPENA HARBOR, MI	441	441
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	68	68
BAY PORT HARBOR, MI	227	227
CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI	333	333
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	512	512
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	133	133
CLINTON RIVER, MI	368	368
DETROIT RIVER, MI	3,235	3,235
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	363	363
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	615	615
GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	345	345
HARRISVILLE HARBOR, MI	142	142
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	379	379
INLAND ROUTE, MI	43	43
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205	205
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	291	291
LAC LA BELLE, MI	156	156
LELAND HARBOR, MI	156	156
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	247	247
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	97	97
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	1,152	1,152
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	52	52
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	1,356	1,356
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI AND WI	28	28
MONROE HARBOR, MI	137	137
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	120	120
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	444	444
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	400	400
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	1,708	1,708
POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR, MI	328	328
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	579	579
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	134	134
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	195	195
ROUGE RIVER, MI	57	57
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,387	1,387
SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	2,042	2,042
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10	10
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	488	488

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,064	1,064
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	667	667
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	21,957	21,957
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,426	2,426
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	324	324
WHITEFISH POINT HARBOR, MI	115	115
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN AND SD	209	209
DULUTH—SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN AND WI	2,480	2,480
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	161	161
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	527	527
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	155	155
ORWELL LAKE, MN	561	561
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	57	57
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	242	242
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,219	3,219
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	64	64
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	15	15
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	108	108
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	150	150
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,216	2,216
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	360	360
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	104	104
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,620	1,620
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	3,417	3,417
PEARL RIVER, MS AND LA	263	263
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	1,034	1,034
YAZOO RIVER, MS	15	15
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	200	200
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,174	5,174
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,248	2,248
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,613	8,613
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	669	669
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	825	825
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	801	801
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	13,544	13,544
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	269	269
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,888	1,888
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	30	30
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,083	1,083
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	421	421
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,247	3,247
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	5,963	5,963
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	20	20
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,842	3,842
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	21	21
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	2,520	2,520
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	48	48
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MT	67	67

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE AND SD	7,184	7,184
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	2,379	2,379
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	150	150
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	900	900
MISSOURI NATIONAL RIVER	.....	250
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING, NE	250	250
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	678	678
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	796	796
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	106	106
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	37	37
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV AND CA	532	532
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	181	181
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	361	361
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	394	394
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	502	502
HOPKINTON—EVERETT LAKES, NH	941	941
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	479	479
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH	.....	20
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	485	485
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,270	1,270
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	545	545
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA AND DE	15,356	16,856
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,280	3,280
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	1,854	1,854
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	165	165
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	700	700
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	1,191	1,191
SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	70	70
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,198	1,198
COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,926	1,926
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,150	1,150
GALISTEO DAM, NM	315	315
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	103	103
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	600	600
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	836	836
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	115	115
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	303	303
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL	.....	800
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	451	451
ARKPORT DAM, NY	228	228
BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	70	70
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,053	1,053
BRONX RIVER, NY	70	70
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,425	1,425
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	700	700
CATTARAUGUS CREEK HARBOR, NY	50	50

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	510	510
EAST RIVER, NY	150	150
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	250	250
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	463	463
EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	2,000	2,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	505	505
FIRE ISLAND INLET, NY	810	810
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	325	325
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	125	125
GREAT SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	200	200
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	40	40
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	200	200
HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,575	2,575
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	808	808
JAMAICA BAY, NY	250	250
JONES INLET, NY	1,200	1,200
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	60	60
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	200	200
MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	220	220
MORICHES INLET, NY	70	70
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	3,975	3,975
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	953	953
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY AND NJ	4,955	4,955
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	740	740
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	6,105	6,105
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	395	395
PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	60	60
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,706	1,706
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	815	815
ROUSES POINT, NY	25	25
SAG HARBOR, NY	800	800
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	100	100
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	728	728
STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	15	15
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	565	565
WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	70	70
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	542	542
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,552	5,552
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,346	1,346
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	550	550
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	707	707
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,346	1,346
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,029	1,029
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22	22
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	380	380
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,998	4,998
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	45	45
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	3,709	3,709
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	825	825
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	210	210
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	139	139
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	59	59
ROANOKE RIVER, NC	100	100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,660	1,660
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	6,431	6,431
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN—HALEY LAKE, ND	204	204
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	7,997	8,097
HOMME LAKE, ND	174	174
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	13	13
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,460	1,460
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	802	802
SOURIS RIVER, ND	368	368
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	667	667
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	845	845
BERLIN LAKE, OH	4,503	4,503
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,228	1,228
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	719	719
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	5,535	5,535
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	1,352	1,352
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	670	670
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	1,917	1,917
DILLON LAKE, OH	746	746
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	481	481
HURON HARBOR, OH	840	840
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	228	228
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	790	790
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25	25
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	1,200	1,200
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,422	1,422
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	7,078	7,078
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	327	327
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	673	673
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	80	80
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	74	74
ROCKY RIVER, OH	340	340
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30	30
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,037	1,037
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	174	174
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,385	3,385
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	279	279
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	574	574
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	856	856
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	403	403
BIRCH LAKE, OK	611	611
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,508	1,508
CANDY LAKE, OK	30	30
CANTON LAKE, OK	2,497	2,497
COPAN LAKE, OK	1,020	1,020
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	7,366	7,366
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	4,034	4,034
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	751	751
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	259	259
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	697	697

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,404	1,404
HULAH LAKE, OK	491	491
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	91	91
KAW LAKE, OK	2,740	2,740
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	6,543	6,543
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,947	3,447
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	74	74
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	32	32
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,414	1,414
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,501	4,501
SARDIS LAKE, OK	1,287	1,287
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	369	369
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,084	1,084
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,400	3,400
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,997	1,997
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,066	3,066
WISTER LAKE, OK	679	679
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	872	872
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	297	297
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	5,747	5,747
CHETCO RIVER, OR	442	442
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA AND PORTLA	15,173	17,473
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA	7,426	7,426
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	356	356
COOS BAY, OR	4,112	4,112
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	434	434
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	913	913
COUGAR LAKE, OR	690	690
DEPOE BAY, OR	178	178
DETROIT LAKE, OR	609	609
DORENA LAKE, OR	556	556
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	433	433
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	997	997
GREEN PETER—FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,001	1,001
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	334	334
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	163	163
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	3,450	3,450
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,692	1,692
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,594	3,594
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	4,501	4,501
PORT ORFORD, OR	737	787
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	137	137
ROGUE RIVER, OR	866	866
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	105	105
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	809	809
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	1,013	1,013
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	7	7
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	14	14
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,254	1,254
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	514	514
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	66	66
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	637	637
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	3,691	3,691

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	9,789	9,789
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	749	749
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	232	232
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	875	875
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,002	2,002
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	940	940
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,824	1,824
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	2,312	2,312
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	669	669
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	884	884
ERIE HARBOR, PA	123	123
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	712	712
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	796	796
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	248	248
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	143	143
JOHNSTOWN, PA	13	13
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,388	1,388
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,086	1,086
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	879	879
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	12,395	12,395
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	86	86
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	935	935
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	13	13
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,042	3,042
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	2,565	2,565
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,121	2,121
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	387	387
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	70	70
TIOGA—HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,968	1,968
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	2,075	2,075
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	259	259
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	796	796
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	542	542
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD	2,184	2,184
RHODE ISLAND		
BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI	675	675
PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	3,906	3,906
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	3,391	3,391
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	5,779	5,779
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,375	3,375
FOLLY RIVER, SC	236	236
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	4,064	4,064
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	26	26
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	1,424	1,424
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	75	75
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	811	811
TOWN CREEK, SC	345	345
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,853	6,853
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	644	644
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	223	223

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,091	8,091
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	13	13
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD AND MN	642	642
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	130	130
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD AND ND	10,812	10,812
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	61	61
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,167	5,167
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,704	5,704
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,220	4,220
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	4,200	4,200
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	4	4
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,396	3,396
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,006	6,006
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	16,123	16,123
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	388	388
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	602	602
ARKANSAS—RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI	1,242	1,242
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	1,000	1,000
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,436	1,436
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,625	1,625
BELTON LAKE, TX	2,542	2,542
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,896	1,896
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,062	1,062
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,034	2,034
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,265	2,265
CEDAR BAYOU, TX	1,131	1,131
CHANNEL TO HARLINGEN, TX	950	950
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,690	4,690
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, BARGE LANES, TX		400
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	6,728	6,728
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	14	14
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,288	2,288
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	5,100	5,100
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	1,985	1,985
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	315	315
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,652	1,652
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,267	2,267
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	23,072	23,072
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,201	1,201
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,416	6,416
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	854	854
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,045	1,045
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	740	740
LAKE KEMP, TX	154	154
LAVON LAKE, TX	2,390	2,390
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,123	3,123
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,780	3,780
MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	2,950	2,950
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,456	1,456
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,934	1,934
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,488	1,488

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,974	1,974
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,490	1,490
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	50	50
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	1,093	1,093
SABINE—NECHES WATERWAY, TX	9,500	9,500
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,572	4,572
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	235	235
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,508	2,508
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	2,006	2,006
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	2,062	2,062
WACO LAKE, TX	2,907	2,907
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,090	1,090
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	5,088	5,088
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,587	2,587
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	63	63
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	414	414
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	703	703
BURLINGTON HARBOR BREAKWATER, VT	160	1,300
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT AND NY	536	536
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	511	511
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	631	631
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	724	724
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	520	520
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	391	391
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	2,364	2,364
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	45	45
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	842	842
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,566	1,566
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK AND NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	920	920
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	59	59
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,983	3,983
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA AND NC	11,190	11,190
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,347	1,347
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	282	282
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	5,815	5,815
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	340	340
PAGAN RIVER, VA	145	145
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	2,252	2,252
POTOMAC RIVER AT ALEXANDRIA, VA	660	660
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	630	630
RUDEE INLET, VA	1,002	1,002
TANGIER CHANNEL, VA	648	648
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	3,347	3,347
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,185	1,185
WASHINGTON		
BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	512	512
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	811	811
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA AND OR	450	450
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	6	6
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,225	1,225

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
FRIDAY HARBOR, WA	300	300
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	13,150	16,150
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,710	1,710
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,791	2,791
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	177	177
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	8,530	8,530
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,138	1,138
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,920	5,920
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,801	1,801
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	870	870
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	409	409
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	3,157	3,157
OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	927	927
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	308	308
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,041	1,041
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	1,061	1,061
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	453	453
SEATTLE HARBOR, EAST WATERWAY CHANNEL DEEPENING, WA	3,400	3,400
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	727	727
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	195	195
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	59	59
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	72	72
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA AND OR	2,402	2,402
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	727	727
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,076	1,076
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,218	1,218
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,390	1,390
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,585	1,585
ELKINS, WV	16	16
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	84	84
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	7,314	7,314
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,643	1,643
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	937	937
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,505	1,505
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,648	1,648
TYGART LAKE, WV	1,923	1,923
WISCONSIN		
ALGOMA HARBOR, WI	107	107
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	195	195
BIG SUAMICO HARBOR, WI	368	368
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	685	685
FOX RIVER, WI	3,487	3,487
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	996	996
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	494	494
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	69	69
LA FARGE LAKE, WI	52	52
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	226	226
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	832	832
OCONTO HARBOR, WI	168	168
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	93	93
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	230	230
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	507	507

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	707	707
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	117	117
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,126	1,126
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	288	288
MISCELLANEOUS		
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	3,000	2,500
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	2,000	1,500
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	12,450	6,450
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,085	500
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	8,000	5,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	2,500	1,500
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	500	500
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	575	575
MANAGEMENT TOOLS FOR O&M	975	500
MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	2,000	1,000
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	40	40
NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM	20	20
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	6,000	5,000
NATIONAL RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT (NRMS) PROGRAM	1,850	1,000
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,365	750
PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50	50
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675	500
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	500
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	950	750
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,542	4,000
WETLANDS FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	1,000	1,000
ZEBRA MUSSEL CONTROL	1,500	.....
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−19,284	−64,284
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,835,900	1,790,043

The Committee continues to believe that it is essential to provide adequate resources and attention to operation and maintenance requirements in order to protect the large Federal investment. Yet current and projected budgetary constraints require the Committee to limit the amount of work that can be accomplished in the fiscal year. In order to cope with the current situation, the Corps has had to defer or delay scheduled maintenance activities.

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

The Committee is aware of the Corps' efforts to stretch the limited resources to cover all of its projects and to effect savings

through a variety of means. As more and more projects enter the inventory and budgetary constraints continue, it is clear that the Corps will need to find innovated ways to accomplish required maintenance work while reducing operational and other costs. Adjustment in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be made in conjunction with efforts to optimize the use of the limited resources in order to maximize the public benefit.

Mississippi River Between Missouri River and Minneapolis, MN (Sny Island), IL.—The Committee has included an additional $1,500,000 for the Corps to advance the Sny Island levee stabilization work being undertaken as part of the Mississippi River Between Missouri River and Minneapolis, MN project.

John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, KS.—The Committee has included an additional $525,000 for the Corps to study raising the conservation pool at John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, KS.

J. Bennett Johnston (Red River) Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, LA.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 over the budget request for the J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA, project for the Corps to undertake repairs to Locks and Dams 1, 2, 4, and 5, and other maintenance work.

Missouri River Between Fort Peck and Culbertson, MT, Bank Stabilization.—The Corps of Engineers is urged to consider non-traditional means to combat bank erosion along the Missouri River between the communities of Fort Peck and Culbertson, MT.

Upper Rio Grande water operation model, NM.—The Committee has provide $800,000 for the Corps to complete the water operation model, update the water control manual, and begin activities related to preparation of an EIS for the Upper Rio Grande Basin water operations review.

Oologah Lake, OK.—The Committee has included $500,000 over the budget request for the Corps to initiate in-lake water quality and reservoir water quality modeling at Oolagah Lake, OK. The Committee expects the Corps to coordinate and consult with the Bureau of Reclamation and the State of New Mexico.

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

Little River Harbor, NH.—The Committee recommendation includes $35,000 to complete an environmental assessment, prepare plans and specifications and coordinate with State and Federal agencies for the purpose of proceeding with maintenance dredging.

Portsmouth Harbor, Piscataqua River, NH.—The Committee has included $20,000 over the budget request for the Corps to coordinate with State and Federal agencies, seek State approvals and prepare plans and specifications for maintenance dredging at Portsmouth Harbor, Piscataqua River, NH.

Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea (Pea Patch Island), NJ and DE.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,500,000 for the Corps to continue construction of facilities to control erosion of the shoreline in the vicinity of Pea Patch Island located in the Delaware River east of Delaware City, DE.

Columbia and Lower Willamette River Below Vancouver, OR and WA.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional

$2,300,000 to repair approximately 200 feet of deteriorated breakwater at Astoria East Boat Basin.

Port Orford, OR.—An additional $50,000 over the budget request is recommended for the Corps to initiate studies and data collection required for ocean disposal of dredge material at Port Orford, OR.

Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Barge Lanes, TX.—The Committee has included $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a study to determine solutions and/or alternatives to traffic and safety issues related to barge traffic in the Corpus Christi Ship Channel, TX.

Burlington Harbor Breakwater, VT.—The Committee has provided $1,300,000 over the budget request for the Corps to initiate reconstruction of the bulkhead at Burlington Harbor, VT.

Columbia River navigation channel, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee is aware that the authorized 40-foot Columbia River navigation channel is subject to shoaling at a number of locations in the river, causing restrictions in channel draft. The Committee directs the Corps to use its existing authorities to dredge a 5-foot overdraft; and, when appropriate, to conduct advance maintenance dredging to assure that project depth of 40 feet is maintained to the maximum extent possible.

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, WA.—The Committee has included $16,150,000 for the Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, WA project, including $3,000,000 for the Corps to initiate reconstruction of the North Jetty at Grays Harbor.

In addition, the attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance or review and for which the Committee has received requests: the need for additional maintenance dredging at Humboldt Harbor, CA; additional maintenance dredging of Bayou Segnette, LA; for additional maintenance dredging of the Intracoastal Waterway in South Carolina from Georgetown to Little River, and from Port Royal to Little River; dredging at the entrance channel at Murrells Inlet, SC; additional dredging for the Lower Winyah Bay and Gorge in Georgetown Harbor, SC as appropriate.

Funding Adjustments.—The Committee has recommended additional reductions over that proposed in the budget request in order to bring the bill in compliance with the allocations required by Congressional budget caps and to correct programmatic imbalances proposed in the President's fiscal year 2000 request. It is the Committee's intent that the General Provision requiring proportional reductions shall not apply to the additional amount. To the extent feasible, it is the Committee's intent that this amount be applied to deepdraft harbor and navigation projects.

The Committee notes that maintaining the hopper dredge Wheeler in ready reserve status, in accordance with section 237 of Public Law 104–303, to ensure the vessel's ability to perform emergency work, involves costs estimated at $12,450,000 per year. While the Committee supports measures to increase the use of private sector hopper dredges, budget constraints do not allow the appropriation of the full amount needed for maintaining the dredge in ready reserve. The Committee also believes, based on dredging requirements experienced in recent years, that it is likely for some or all of the Dredge *Wheeler's* capacity to be required for project mainte-

nance. Accordingly, the Committee has reduced the amount requested for ready reserve status to $6,450,000 and expects the Dredge *Wheeler* to perform work to make up the difference in expected allocations. If during the year, the need for the Dredge *Wheeler* does not materialize so that the amount appropriated for ready reserve is insufficient to pay all ready reserve costs, the Corps is directed to reduce hopper dredging work proportionately based on capacity in order to keep the Dredge *Wheeler* in ready reserve.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1999	$106,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	117,000,000
Committee recommendation	115,000,000

An appropriation of $115,000,000 is recommended for regulatory programs of the Corps of Engineers.

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

The Committee is disappointed with the Administration's total disregard to the directions of the Congress to implement an administrative appeal process for which funding was provided. This has forced the Committee to recommend language in the bill to require the establishment of an appeals process for a single-level appeal of jurisdictional determinations as directed in prior years.

The Committee recommendation also includes $3,000,000 as proposed in the budget for personnel and other labor costs to help mitigate the delays and other impacts being experienced by the public from a workload which is at an all-time high.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1999	.....
Budget estimate, 2000	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

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

There was no additional funding request for fiscal year 2000 and the Committee understands that, based on the average yearly funding requirement, additional appropriations are not required for fiscal year 2000.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1999	$140,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	150,000,000
Committee recommendation	150,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $150,000,000 to continue activities related to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial

Action Program [FUSRAP] in fiscal year 1999. This is the same as the amount requested.

The responsibility for the cleanup of contaminated sites under the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] was transferred to the Army Corps of Engineers in the Fiscal Year 1998 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Public Law 105–62. The Committee is pleased that the Department of Energy and the Corps of Engineers have finally entered into an agreement on the functions of the program assumed by the Corps. This should help eliminate any uncertainties as the program moves forward.

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

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

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1999	$148,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	148,000,000
Committee recommendation	151,000,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $151,000,000.

The Committee recommendation is based on a concern about the ability of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to provide adequate and effective executive direction and management of its civil works program given the requested level of General Expenses funding. The Corps has reorganized, reducing the number of division offices and assigning increased responsibilities to district offices. It has reduced its headquarters staffing and has made great strides in refining the headquarters mission to eliminate overlaps and redundant review layers. These changes have been beneficial, resulting in a more efficient and cost effective Corps. However, the General Expenses appropriation request for fiscal year 2000 is over $4,000,000 less than the amount actually appropriated in fiscal year 1995. Because the Corps has had to absorb inflation, annual salary adjustments, increased rents and other cost increases, the decline in general expense funding in real terms has been even more significant, over $20,000,000 in constant dollars just during

this period. Therefore, in order to sustain the leadership within the Corps of Engineers, to preserve the quality and effectiveness of this national asset, and to prevent further erosion of its oversight and management capabilities, the Committee has recommended an adjustment in the General Expenses account for fiscal year 2000.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 1999	$42,500,000
Budget estimate, 2000	39,370,000
Committee recommendation	39,370,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2000 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act is $39,370,000. An appropriation of $21,002,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction; $12,047,000 for fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation; and $5,000,000 for the Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account. Finally, the Committee recommendation provides $1,321,000 for program administration and oversight.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 1999	$617,045,000
Budget estimate, 2000	652,838,000
Committee recommendation	612,451,000

An appropriation of $612,451,000 is recommended by the Committee for general investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
ARIZONA						
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	6,996	.....	6,996
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT (LCRBDF)	4,091,767	3,137,516	27,326	.....	24,326	.....
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I	450,051	409,136	1,036	12,056	1,036	9,056
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	102,373	95,592	3,564	.....	3,564	.....
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT	5,000	.....	.....	.....	5,000	.....
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	580	.....	300	.....
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSE MESA DAM	16,767	4,500	.....	1,590	.....	1,590
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	850	.....	850	.....
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	57,458	14,343	5,873	.....	5,873	.....
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	8,000	4,300	400	.....	400	.....
TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY	1,000	450	150	.....	150	.....
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	.....	.....	109	15,423	109	15,423
CALIFORNIA						
CACHUMA PROJECT	32,659	32,289	639	723	639	723
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	500	.....	400	.....
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJECT	20,000	.....	1,500	.....	.....	.....
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:						
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	2,736,703	531,514	8,800	10,103	6,800	8,103
DELTA DIVISION	364,312	216,379	14,362	4,651	13,612	4,651
EAST SIDE DIVISION	.....	.....	575	3,781	575	3,781
FRIANT DIVISION	522	108	3,614	2,498	3,614	2,498
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	672,061	334,121	11,099	1,734	11,099	1,734
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, EXTRAORDINARY MAINTENANCE	.....	.....	.....	8,500	.....	8,500
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	517,360	393,814	7,032	1,649	8,532	1,649

SAN FELIPE DIVISION	362,604	309,600	1,163	.....	1,163	.....
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	277,012	73,265	1,443	.....	1,443	.....
SHASTA DIVISION	295,132	277,589	3,480	7,139	3,480	7,139
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	356,506	322,286	8,006	4,807	5,506	4,807
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	.....	.....	635	5,750	635	5,750
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	1,515,191	575,839	5,912	6,302	5,912	6,302
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	.....	.....	2,000	.....	2,000	.....
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	13,970	.....	1,500	.....	.....	.....
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE PROJECT	69,970	61,730	7,500	.....	7,500	.....
NORTH SAN DIEGO CNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	20,000	.....	1,500	.....	.....	.....
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	20,000	.....	1,500	.....	.....	.....
ORLAND PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	570	.....	570
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	.....	.....	1,000	.....	600	.....
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	172,590	41,788	10,600	.....	10,600	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	38,090	23,941	2,000	.....	2,000	.....
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	109,959	16,579	3,000	.....	3,000	.....
SOLANO PROJECT	.....	.....	995	1,005	995	1,005
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	625	.....	425	.....
COLORADO						
ANIMAS–LAPLATA PROJECT, SECTIONS 5 AND 8	.....	76,579	3,000	.....	2,000	.....
COLLBRAN PROJECT	.....	.....	813	798	813	798
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	.....	.....	304	7,506	304	7,506
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	435	.....	435	.....
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	.....	.....	94	16	94	16
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	.....	.....	339	4,927	339	4,927
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, PUEBLO DAM	23,000	16,300	.....	6,700	.....	6,700
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP	.....	.....	403	506	403	506
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	.....	.....	763	1,010	763	1,010
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	50	.....	50	.....
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, CRBSCP	.....	.....	.....	319	.....	319
MANCOS PROJECT	.....	.....	44	22	44	22
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP	.....	.....	.....	2,058	.....	2,058
PINE RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	362	58	362	58
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN/CONEJOS DIV	.....	.....	316	3,591	316	3,591
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	.....	.....	293	23	293	23

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN SELENIUM STUDY	540	440	100		100	
IDAHO						
BOISE AREA PROJECTS			2,385	2,726	2,385	2,726
COLUMBIA–SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	98,052	44,983	13,122		9,500	
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT	850	50	200		200	
FORT HALL INDIAN RESERVATION	600	300			250	
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			363		363	
LEWISTON ORCHARDS, RESERVOIR 'A' DAM	2,959	2,809		150		150
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS			4,030	1,809	4,030	1,809
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAINWATER MANAGEMENT PROJECT	1,830	790	315		200	
KANSAS						
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			400		400	
WICHITA PROJECT				219		219
MONTANA						
FORT PECK RURAL WATER SYSTEM, MT	5,800	1,800			4,000	
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT			69	177	69	177
MILK RIVER PROJECT			145	353	145	353
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			446		250	
ROCKY BOYS INDIAN WTR RIGHTS SETTLEMENT STUDY			1,000		500	
NEBRASKA						
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT			30	28	30	28
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			150		150	
NEVADA						
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT			6,352	1,098	5,552	1,098
LAKE MEAD AND LAS VEGAS WASH	2,000				2,000	

NEWLANDS WATER RIGHTS FUND	7,000				1,500	
TRUCKEE RIVER OPERATION AGREEMENT	800				800	
WALKER RIVER BASIN PROJECT	1,200	900			400	
NEW MEXICO						
CARLSBAD PROJECT			1,012	576	1,012	576
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT			2,010	9,766	4,010	9,766
NAVAJO–GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	1,234	934			300	
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT				268		268
RIO GRANDE PROJECT			769	2,564	769	2,564
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			124		124	
SANTA FE WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	1,250	500			750	
SO. NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			254		254	
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			213		213	
UTE RESERVOIR PIPELINE PROJECT	1,250	500			250	
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT	29,464	23,074	2,313		2,313	
NORTH DAKOTA						
DAKOTA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			200		200	
DAKOTA TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			150		150	
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P–SMBP	1,526,499	631,598	26,849	180	28,849	180
OKLAHOMA						
ARBUCKLE PROJECT				161		161
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT				530		530
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT				225		225
NORMAN PROJECT				156		156
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			275		275	
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT				255		255
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT				640		640
OREGON						
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT			105	297	105	297
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	2,500	500	1,000		500	
DESCHUTES PROJECT			165	122	165	122
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY			50		50	
KLAMATH PROJECT			12,390	292	9,390	292
MALHEUR/OWYHEE/POWDER/BURNT RIVER BASINS	250		50			

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	810	.....	610	.....
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	.....	.....	165	626	165	626
TUALATIN PROJECT	.....	.....	91	97	91	97
TUMALO IRRIGATION DIST., BEND FEED CANAL, OR	2,000	.....	.....	.....	400	.....
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT (PHASE III)	740	340	250	.....	250	.....
UMATILLA PROJECT	.....	.....	336	1,270	336	1,270
SOUTH DAKOTA						
MID–DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	134,574	56,517	5,000	10	7,000	10
MNI WICONI PROJECT	370,947	132,454	23,873	5,527	21,873	5,527
RAPID CITY WASTEWATER REUSE STUDY	225	175	50	.....	50	.....
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	23	.....	23
TEXAS						
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	124	.....	124
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	387	.....	387
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	541	.....	541
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	255	.....	255
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	390	.....	390	.....
UTAH						
HYRUM PROJECT	.....	.....	49	12	49	12
MOON LAKE PROJECT	.....	.....	14	11	14	11
NAVAJO SANDSTONE AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY	875	100	150	.....	150	.....
NEWTON PROJECT	.....	.....	35	12	35	12
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	400	.....	400	.....
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	67	18	67	18
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	335	293	335	293
SCOFIELD PROJECT	.....	.....	49	3	49	3

SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	400	.....	250	.....
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	.....	.....	84	3	84	3
TOOELE WASTEWATER REUSE PROJECT	3,900	3,300	.....	.....	600	.....
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	19,639	18,217	1,845	140	1,845	140
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	281	7	281	7
WASHINGTON						
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	.....	.....	5,030	8,984	5,030	8,984
LOWER ELWHA KLALLAM RURAL WATER SUPPLY FEAS. STUDY	200	.....	100	.....	.....	.....
TULALIP TRIBES WATER QUALITY FEASIBILITY STUDY	200	.....	50	.....	.....	.....
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	410	.....	200	.....
YAKIMA PROJECT	.....	.....	491	7,535	491	7,535
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WTR ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	175,541	16,249	11,734	.....	10,480	.....
WYOMING						
KENDRICK PROJECT	.....	.....	4	4,642	4	4,642
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	.....	.....	18	1,164	18	1,164
SHOSHONE PROJECT	.....	.....	38	859	38	859
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	20	.....	15	.....
VARIOUS						
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II	75,000	22,995	12,300	.....	12,300	.....
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5	.....	.....	4,222	1,014	4,222	1,014
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECTION 8, RF&W	96,855	49,835	10,650	.....	7,650	.....
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	70,465	48,011	75	.....	75	.....
DEPARTMENT IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	.....	.....	3,600	.....	2,000	.....
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE	.....	.....	500	.....	5,000	.....
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	.....	.....	5,250	.....	3,000	.....
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	306	.....	306
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENT. PROGRAM	37,500	4,099	15,118	.....	15,118	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION	.....	.....	1,677	.....	677	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	.....	.....	2,083	.....	1,500	.....
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	.....	.....	.....	3,892	.....	3,892
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	1,375	.....	1,375
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES	.....	.....	2,135	.....	1,900	.....
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	.....	.....	6,232	.....	5,232	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	13,540	.....	9,540	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	.....	.....	.....	910	.....	910
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	.....	.....	1,300	.....	1,300	.....
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	.....	.....	9,250	.....	8,250	.....
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	.....	.....	1,048	.....	1,048	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	.....	.....	98	538	98	538
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM—OTHER PROJECT	.....	.....	3,174	24,593	3,174	24,593
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	.....	.....	1,031	642	1,031	642
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	.....	436	.....	436	.....
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	.....	.....	5,235	.....	4,696	.....
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT—TITLE XXVIII	.....	.....	4,222	.....	4,222	.....
RECREATION, FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	.....	.....	2,053	.....	1,891	.....
SAFETY OF DAMS:						
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	1,600	.....	1,600
SAFETY OF DAMS EVALUATION AND MODIFICATION	.....	.....	.....	60,869	.....	54,983
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:						
APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	77,347	45,144	4,503	.....	4,503	.....
DESALINATION RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	18,939	12,439	1,300	.....	1,300	.....
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	24,929	24,876	50	.....	50	.....
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION/ENHANCE	3,715	700	215	.....	215	.....
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	2,616	1,116	300	.....	300	.....
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	11,329	4,329	1,000	.....	1,000	.....
SITE SECURITY	.....	.....	.....	754	.....	754
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION	.....	.....	257	.....	257	.....
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	.....	.....	1,911	.....	1,211	.....
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY	.....	.....	2,214	.....	1,000	.....
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECH SUPPORT	.....	.....	100	.....	100	.....
WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM	.....	.....	8,836	.....	6,600	.....

WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	.....	.....	5,595	.....	3,595	.....
ADJUST FOR FY 1999 ITEMS NOT REQUESTED IN FY 2000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	.....	.....	.....	−30,800	.....	−38,050
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	.....	.....	409,199 652,838	243,639	386,948 612,451	225,503

BUDGET LIMITATIONS AND REDUCTIONS

Severely constrained spending limits required under the Discretionary budget caps imposed by the Congressional Budget Resolution have made it most difficult for the Committee to formulate a balanced Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. In order to adhere to the subcommittee's allocations, address the critical ongoing activities, correct program imbalances contained in the President's fiscal year 2000 budget, and respond to the numerous requests of the Members, the Committee finds it necessary to recommend numerous reductions and adjustments to funding levels proposed in the budget. The constrained budget will result in continued delayed completion schedules and project benefits being realized. Finally, the Committee regrets that many worthwhile projects could not be recommended for funding because of the lack of authorization and the shortfall in resources.

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

Headgate Rock Hydroelectric Project, AZ.—The Committee is aware that the Headgate Rock hydroelectric powerplant was severely damaged when a turbine shaft failed and the facility was flooded. While the Bureau of Reclamation has initiated repair work, the Committee understands that additional funding is needed to complete the repair work. Therefore, the Committee has included $5,000,000 for completion of this essential repair work.

Central Arizona project, Arizona.—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $24,326,000 for the central Arizona project. The Committee recommendation reduces the proposed increase over fiscal year 1999 for native fish protection and recreation development.

Colorado River Basin Salinity Control, Title I.—The Committee has included a total of $10,092,000 for the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control, Title I program. Budget constraints have forced the Committee to recommend that initiation of replacement of membrane elements at the Yuma Desalting Plant be deferred for fiscal year 2000. In addition, the Committee remains concerned about the high cost of keeping the Plant in a standby status. The Department is to provide a report to the Committee on alternatives to meeting Treaty requirements without the Desalting Plant, and actions the Bureau of Reclamation can take to reduce the high annual operation and maintenance costs.

Central Valley project, American River Division, California.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $14,903,000 for the American River Division of the Central Valley Project. The Committee recommendation includes $2,400,000 for the Folsom Temperature Control Device. No funding is provided for the Bureau to begin implementation of the Water Forum agreement or efforts in support to the Nimbus Fish Hatchery Interpretative Facility. The Committee believes that, in light of the severe budget constraints, these activities can be deferred without adverse impacts.

Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, CA.—The Committee recommendation for the Sacramento River Division includes $3,750,000, an increase of $1,500,000 over the budget request, for continued work on the Glenn Colusa Irrigation District fish screen project; and $520,000 for the captive broodstock program.

Central Valley Project, Trinity River Division, CA.—Due to budget constraints, the Committee has recommended a reduction in the proposed increase over the fiscal year 1999 funding level for Trinity River Division, fish and wildlife activities. The Committee has provided $5,050,000 for these activities in fiscal year 2000.

Central Valley project, miscellaneous project programs, California.—An appropriation of $12,833,000 is provided for Central Valley project, miscellaneous project programs in California. This is the same as the amount requested in the budget

Animas-La Plata Project, CO and NM.—In providing an amount less than the Administration's request for the Animas-La Plata Project, the Committee does not intend that the Department of the Interior's efforts or obligation to fulfill the objectives of the 1988 Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act are any less of a priority. Severe budget constraints have limited the amount of funding available for continued activities on this project. The Committee remains concerned that the provision of water for the two Ute Tribes has not occurred since passage of the Act. Timelines in the Act are approaching which are critical to the Tribes, who remain committed to obtaining water for their future needs instead of a cash settlement. The Committee encourages the Department to promptly complete the current activities required under the National Environmental Policy Act, on or before the projected date of completion established by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Department will provide the Committee with written status reports on the NEPA process on a regular basis. Should the funds provided in this bill be insufficient to complete the NEPA process by that date or before, the Department will immediately notify the Committee. The Department is directed to make available carryover funds previously provided for the Animas-La Plata Project so that the Bureau's deadline will be met and additional delays are in complying with the Settlement Act do not occur.

Fort Hall Indian Reservation, ID.—The Committee has included $250,000 to continue the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, ID study. No funding was included in the fiscal year 2000 budget request to continue this important project which is addressing groundwater supply and quality issues on the reservation. It should be pointed out that the Fort Hall Reservation drinking water resource has already been contaminated with ethylene dibromide, and EPA has issued an emergency administrative order to correct the problem. In light of these facts, the Committee cannot understand why the Administration has not requested funding to continue these critical studies.

Fort Peck Rural Water System, MT.—The Committee has recommended $4,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue construction of the Fort Peck Rural Water System, MT project. The Committee understands that these additional funds will allow completion of the project within the sunset provision of the Fort Peck

Rural County Water Supply System Act. The Bureau is to take appropriate actions to insure that the project is completed within the timeframe of the Act, and to notify the Committee in advance of any potential problems in this regard.

Garrison Diversion Project, ND.—The Committee has included $29,029,000, an increase of $2,000,000, for the Garrison Diversion, ND project. The additional funds will allow the Bureau of Reclamation to continue development of municipal, rural, and the industrial Indian water system.

Middle Rio Grande Project, NM.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 over the budget request for the Middle Rio Grande Project in New Mexico for habitat conservation and restoration activities along the middle Rio Grande River valley from below Cochiti Dam to the headwaters of Elephant Butte Lake. The Bureau is to work with interested parties to evaluate and define the scope of the habitat and restoration measures to be undertaken in order to ensure that proposed work compliments, rather than duplicates, other ongoing activities. The Committee is supportive of the efforts of interested groups along the middle Rio Grande to find ways to address the endangered species issue, and expects the Bureau of Reclamation to work cooperatively to undertake measures as appropriate.

Navajo-Gallup Water Supply Project, NM.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to finalize the feasibility studies for the Navajo-Gallup Water Supply project in New Mexico. The feasibility report is needed for ultimate project authorization. The Committee understands that the Navajo Tribe and the City of Gallup have agreed to a plan to complete this work over about a 2-year period, and to support construction what ever project may be supported at the conclusion of the feasibility phase.

Santa Fe Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, NM.—The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue to update and complete the feasibility study and NEPA compliance documents for the Santa Fe Water Reclamation and Reuse, NM project.

Upper Colorado River Endangered Species Program.—The Committee recommendation for the Upper Colorado River Endangered Species Program includes the full budget request for habitat conservation and restoration activities in the San Juan River Basin proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Battle Mountain, Land Transfer, NV.—Any discussions regarding the transfer of the Battle Mountain Pasture from the Bureau of Reclamation to Pershing County Water Conservation District should involve representatives from all interested and affected parties.

Lake Mead and Las Vegas Wash, NV.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to develop, in consultation with interested parties, a comprehensive project plan for the restoration of wetlands and associated water resource issues at Lake Mead and Las Vegas Wash in Nevada. The Plan is to include the scope of work, defined costs, identification of project sponsors and responsibility of maintenance of constructed wetlands.

Las Vegas Shallow Aquifer Desalination Project, NV.—The Committee has not provided additional funding for the Las Vegas Shallow Aquifer Desalination because the project has funds still available from past appropriations. The Committee encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to continue working with the non-Federal entities in developing the project.

Newlands Project Water Rights Fund, NV.—The Committee has included $1,500,000 for the Newlands Water Rights Fund authorized by the Truckee-Carson-Pyramid Lake Water Rights Settlement Act to be utilized to pay for purchasing and retiring water rights in the Carson Division of the Newlands Reclamation Project.

Truckee River Operating Agreement, NV.—The Committee has provided $800,000 for completion of a supplemental draft EIS/EIR, negotiation and placement of storage contracts, re-licensing of existing storage contracts, and administrative and technical tasks associated with rulemaking in order to implement the Truckee River Operating Agreement.

Tumalo Irrigation District, Bend Feed Canal, OR.—The Committee has included $400,000 to begin the final design of the Tumalo Irrigation District, Bend Feed Canal project in Oregon, which has significant potential for water conservation, and fish and wildlife benefits.

Tooele Wastewater Reuse Project, UT.—The Committee recommendation includes $600,000 for the Tooele Wastewater Reuse, UT project. The Committee understands that project construction will be completed in fiscal year 1999, and that these additional funds are needed to meet the Federal commitment to the project under Title XVI of Public Law 102–575.

Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project, WA.—The Committee is aware of a proposal to enhance instream flows by reducing or eliminating the need to divert water to operate hydraulic turbines which pump water to the Kennewick Irrigation District in the State of Washington. While the Committee believes that this proposal has the potential to provide significant flow improvements and resultant fish mitigation benefits, the Committee understands that the Bureau of Reclamation does not currently have authority to begin the studies needed to determine feasibility and environmental impacts, and define the scope and costs of the project. The Committee urges the authorizing committee to address this project at the earliest possible time in order that the Committee may recommend funds to initiate work.

Dam Safety Program.—The Committee is aware of and supports the funding allocation method used by the Bureau of Reclamation which is based on a priority system that considers the structural condition and potential impacts in determining where to allocate available resources. However, the Committee has been informed that the dam safety program in Montana may need a more current appraisal and urges the Bureau to review the situation and dam safety needs.

Drought Emergency Assistance.—The Committee has included $5,000,000 for Drought Emergency Assistance. The additional funding over the budget request is required due to severe drought conditions that currently exist in New Mexico and several other west-

ern States. The funding is provided for leasing of water to minimize the impacts of the drought in affected areas.

The severe drought in many parts of the western United States has helped to focus attention on the conflicts and competition over a limited amount of available water to satisfy municipal and industrial, endangered species, irrigation, and international water needs. The result of the dwindling amounts of water has served to increased competition and conflict among the various interests, including irrigation districts, municipalities and States, and international interests such as Mexico. The Committee is aware of and recognizes that the work of the Utton Transboundary Resources Center, an nationally and internationally recognized resource center, has a history of assisting in providing valuable information regarding international rivers in various areas of the world, and interstate rivers throughout the United States.

The methods of resolving water conflicts are often inadequate because they are limited in scope and function, and, more often than not, dissolve into a war between competing experts. There is now no place for competing interests to turn for impartial guidance on critical issues. In the past, Federal agencies such as the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Geologic Service, have attempted to provide this service, but the perception of impartiality is suspect due the agency involvement in water resource matters.

Given the growing problems of water allocation in the West, particularly during periods of drought, and the demonstrated ability of the Center to provide impartial information and analysis, the Committee encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to use the capability of the Center, as appropriate, in addressing the current water and future water shortages.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

Appropriations, 1999	$75,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	95,000,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000

An appropriation of $50,000,000 is recommended for the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration [CALFED] Program.

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

The fiscal year 2000 budget proposes funding of $95,000,000, an increase of $20,000,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999. While the Committee is unable to provide the full budget request due to severe budget constraints, progress has been made over the past year to strengthen the program. While CALFED is an important initiative, it must compete with other important programs under severely constrained domestic budget caps, reduced budget allocations and program imbalances proposed in the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request. In addition, the funding recommendation of the Committee reflects the low expendi-

ture of the funds appropriated over the past two years, and realization that this is the final year of program authority for the CALFED if authorizing legislation is not enacted. The recommended appropriation for ecosystem restoration; and water supply reliability, water quality, and levee system integrity is to be allocated in accordance with the 60–40 consensus recommendation.

Finally, language proposed in the President's budget request to extend the authority for the program, through the appropriations process, is not recommended. The Committee has expressed concern in the past regarding the duplication and overlap of CALFED activities with Central Valley Improvement Act programs, and other activities funded under various other programs within the Bureau of Reclamation. It should be pointed out that the original CALFED program authority was not reviewed or recommended by the appropriate authorizing committees of the Congress. The Committee believes that it is essential the committees of jurisdiction in these complicated matters have the opportunity to develop legislation to address these issues.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 1999	$8,421,000
Budget estimate, 2000	12,425,000
Committee recommendation	12,425,000

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

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

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

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—LOAN PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
CALIFORNIA						
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	14,307	9,266	2,600	.....	2,600	.....
CHINO BASIN DESALINATION PROJECT	10,249	10,132	117	.....	117	.....
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION	9,293	6,500	1,700	.....	1,700	.....
SAN SEVAINE CREEK WATER PROJECT	28,100	8,012	6,408	.....	6,408	.....
TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT	5,327	4,152	1,175	.....	1,175	.....
VARIOUS						
LOAN ADMINISTRATION	.....	.....	425	.....	425	.....
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM	.....	.....	12,425	.....	12,425	.....

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 1999	$33,130,000
Budget estimate, 2000	47,346,000
Committee recommendation	37,346,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $37,346,000 for the Central Valley project restoration fund. Budget constraints have required the Committee to limit the activities to be funded through the Central Valley project restoration funds for fiscal year 2000. However, the amount recommended represents an increase of $4,216,000 over the current year level. The Committee intends, to the greatest extent possible, that the Bureau of Reclamation take such steps as are necessary to ensure that amounts appropriated from the Restoration Fund equal funds assessed and collected. It is not the desire or intent of the Committee to allow unappropriated balances to accrue in the CVP Restoration Fund.

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

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1999	$47,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	49,000,000
Committee recommendation	49,000,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is $49,000,000. This is the same as the budget request.

The general administrative expenses program provides for the executive direction and management of all reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, DC, Denver, CO, and five regional offices. The Denver office and regional offices charge individual projects or activities for direct beneficial services and related administrative and technical costs. These charges are covered under other appropriations.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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

PERSONNEL SECURITY

The Department needs to improve its personnel security practices. The Committee has provided an increase from the request for security investigations and recommends that, for employees of the Department and its contractors with access to sensitive nuclear weapons information or special nuclear materials, the Department contract with the Federal Bureau of Investigation for that service.

The Committee recommends the Department implement a graded clearance system. Those with access to sensitive nuclear weapons information or the means to access that information should be required, as a condition of clearance, to submit upon request with causal basis by the Director of Counter-Intelligence to a counter-intelligence polygraph and may be required to provide access to financial and other information as the Department warrants.

In the past, the Department and its contractors have given great deference to the investigative techniques and requirements of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in counter-intelligence matters. However, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's primary interest in criminal prosecution in these matters is not always consistent with the Department of Energy's responsibility to protect sensitive information. In its efforts to protect sensitive information, the Department should not necessarily defer to the interests of the Federal Bureau of Investigations. The Department should be pro-active in any such investigation and may, on occasion, determine that its ability and right to conduct an investigation regarding, or take actions to halt or prevent espionage, outweigh the Federal Bureau of Investigations' interest in a criminal prosecution.

EXTERNAL REGULATION

In previous years, the Committee directed a review of the benefits of external regulation of the Department's facilities and funded pilot programs to explore such arrangements in detail. The Committee has determined that the Department's unique responsibilities and facilities too rarely have non-federal analogs with existing, appropriate regulatory schemes. As a result, the Committee no longer contemplates external regulation of the Department's facilities.

INAPPROPRIATE USE OF APPROPRIATIONS

In the previous Energy and Water Development Act, the Committee was critical of the use of appropriations to: pay for members

of industry associations and associated entities to attend national and international conferences, publish magazines, purchase association membership information, conduct surveys of association membership, place op-ed style articles in publications, write talking points in support of the Department's programs, and underwrite industry conferences.

The Department has significantly improved its practices in these areas by selecting its outreach and information dissemination contractors through competitive processes. While competition may improve the quality of the products and services procured through these contracts, the Committee continues to insist that, as a general rule, appropriated funds should not be used, directly or indirectly, to underwrite the expenses of industry associations or associated entities.

Certain Department of Energy contractors are being reimbursed for exhorbitant travel expenses. In fiscal year 1998, Department of Energy contractors incurred $249,000,000 in travel costs for which they sought reimbursement. Sandia National Laboratories alone reported taking over 4,500 trips to Washington, DC, in fiscal year 1998 or the equivalent of 87 trips each week. Those sort of practices are absolutely unacceptable. The Committee has included in its recommendation both a statutory cap on the total amount of funds available for contractor travel costs and required that each contractor's travel costs in fiscal year 2000 be limited to not more than 80 percent of the amount incurred in fiscal year 1998. The Committee considers this a measured response and will take substantially more forceful action in the future if this situation is not remedied.

ENERGY SUPPLY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1999	$727,091,000
Budget estimate, 2000	836,067,000
Committee recommendation	715,412,000

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Appropriations, 1999	$365,905,000
Budget estimate, 2000	446,021,000
Committee recommendation	353,900,000

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

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

When considered in those terms, the commitments made in Kyoto will have a negligible effect on the concentration of CO_2 and

other pollutants in the atmosphere. If prudence merits the development of new energy production technologies, it also requires a recognition that existing technology does not provide a means to meet increasing global energy requirements while stabilizing the production of atmospheric pollutants and certainly does not provide a means to reduce atmospheric pollution concentrations.

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

Solar building technology research.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for solar building technology research. The Committee recommendation does not provide funds for quality assurance or precompetitive field validation.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The Committee recommends $64,000,000 for photovoltaic energy systems. Within that amount, $17,000,000 is provided for fundamental research including: $5,500,000 for measurement and characterization, $5,500,000 for basic research/university programs, $2,000,000 for non-conventional breakthrough R&D, and $4,000,000 for high-performance advanced research. $25,000,000 is provided for advanced materials and devices. $26,000,000 is provided for collector research and systems development including: $10,000,000 for manufacturing R&D only to complete existing contracts, $11,000,000 for systems engineering and reliability, and, $1,000,000 for partnerships for technology introduction only to complete existing contracts.

Concentrating solar power.—The Committee recommends $15,000,000 for concentrating solar power and includes no funds for strategic alliances and market awareness.

Biomass/biofuels—power systems.—The Committee recommends $34,950,000 for biomass/bio-fuels—power systems. $700,000 is provided for thermochemical conversion including; $500,000 for co-firing/ash deposition, and $200,000 for capital equipment. $26,150,000 is provided for systems development; a $6,000,000 reduction to the request due to delays in the Minnesota Valley Alfalfa Producers project. Within the amount provided for systems development, $1,000,000 is for the continuation of biomass research at the Energy and Environmental Research Center on key barrier issues impeding the technical feasibility, cost-effectiveness, and environmental acceptability of biomass utilization processes. The funding is intended to advance the Center's work in integration of biomass with fossil fuels to increase baseload renewable electricity generation, development of practical methods for using biomass in advanced power systems, and improvement of efficiency and envi-

ronmental performance in agricultural processing and forest-based product industries. The switchgrass project is fully funded. Also, $3,100,000 is provided for feedstock development, and no funds are provided for the regional biomass energy program.

The recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the McNeil biomass plant in Burlington, Vermont, $300,000 for the Vermont Agriculture Methane project, $2,000,000 for continued research in environmental and renewable resource technologies by the Michigan Biotechnology Institute, and $500,000 for the University of Louisville to research the commercial viability of refinery construction for the production of P–series fuels, as defined by the Department of Energy's Final Rule on P-series Fuels on May 17, 1999

Biomass/biofuels—transportation.—The Committee recommendation includes $38,000,000 for biomass/biofuels transportation. The Committee is aware of a public-private endeavor to construct and operate a national ethanol pilot plant at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. This facility would help lower the cost of converting corn into ethanol fuel while enhancing the role of this domestic energy source and its environmental benefits. The Committee recognizes that corn is one of the most commercially viable and economically feasible feedstocks. The Committee directs the Department of Energy to provide no less than $3,000,000 under the Biomass/Biofuels Energy Systems—Transportation for this project.

Wind.—The Committee recommendation includes $34,000,000 for wind energy systems, an increase of $800,000 over the current year. Within that amount, $13,500,000 is provided for applied research consistent with the request. $18,200,000 is provided for turbine research including: $5,000,000 for the next generation turbine project, $400,000 to conduct near term research and testing, $1,000,000 to conduct small wind turbine projects, $800,000 for the cold weather turbine project, and $8,000,000 for turbine research and turbine verification program activities. Due to severe budget constraints the recommendation provides only $2,300,000 for cooperative research and testing.

Renewable energy production incentive.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000, the same amount as the request for the renewable energy production incentive.

Solar program support.—Due to budget pressures, the Committee recommendation includes only the $2,000,000 requested for technical analysis and assistance within solar program support.

International solar programs.—The Committee strongly supports the U.S. international joint implementation program funded in this account but due to severe budget constrants recommends only $3,000,000 for that purpose.

National Renewable Energy Laboratory construction.—The Committee recommendation includes the amount of the request for construction at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory.

Geothermal.—The Committee commends the Department of Energy's decision to allow market forces to determine the extent to which geothermal heat pump technology succeeds. Due to the termination of that $6,500,000 per year program, the Committee recommendation of $24,000,000 provides a $2,000,000 increase over the fiscal year 1999 base geothermal program.

Hydrogen research.—The Committee strongly supports research and development of technologies related to the use of hydrogen and recommends $27,000,000, a $6,000,000 increase over the current year, for that purpose. The recommendation includes $250,000 for investigation of simultaneous production of carbon dioxide and hydrogen at the natural gas reforming facility in Nevada, $350,000 for the Montana Trade Port Authority in Billings, MT to continue the ongoing resource inventory, feasibility study, and development of a Solid Waste Hydrogen Fuel Cell manufacturing capability, and $250,000 for the gasification of Iowa switchgrass and its use in fuel cells.

Hydropower.—The Committee commends the Department of Energy for recognizing the benefits of and developing advanced "fish-friendly" turbines for hydro-electric generation. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for that effort.

Renewable Indian energy resources.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for renewable Indian energy resource development including: $1,000,000 to complete the 4 megawatt Sitka, Alaska project, $1,700,000 for the Power Creek hydroelectric project, $1,000,000 for the Kotzebue wind project, and $300,000 for the Old Harbor hydroelectric project.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The Committee recommendation includes $33,500,000 for electric energy systems and storage including $3,500,000 for transmission reliability and $30,000,000 for high-temperature superconducting research and development. Within the amount provided for transmission reliability, the recommendation includes $1,000,000 for a demonstration associated with the planned upgrade of the Nevada Test Site power substations of distributed power generation technologies (microturbines, fuel cells, and photovoltaics), energy-efficient utilization technologies, transmission and distribution systems, and grid stabilization technologies.

Solar and renewable energy program direction.—The Committee recommendation includes $17,750,000 for program direction within this account; an increase of $650,000 over the current year.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1999	$283,966,000
Budget estimate, 2000	269,305,000
Committee recommendation	287,700,000

Nuclear fission currently provides 20 percent of domestic electricity production and emits no atmospheric pollutants. The United States has not yet determined how it will dispose of spent nuclear fuel, and the Committee does not underestimate the technical and social challenges entailed in the disposal of spent nuclear fuel. However, unlike the emissions of coal, gas, and fuel oil plants, the byproducts of fission can be contained. Until even more advanced, base-load energy technologies are developed, nuclear fission provides the best credible means of reducing the concentration of atmospheric pollutants in the foreseeable future.

Nuclear energy plant optimization.—The recommendation includes $5,000,000 the same amount as the request for the Nuclear Energy Plant Optimization program.

Nuclear energy research initiative.—The Committee recommends $25,000,000 for the Nuclear Energy Research Initiative. In making its recommendations for low emission energy technologies, the Committee seeks to achieve a prudent balance among technologies that may assist in the future reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The Administration's request in that regard; a total of $440,697,000 in energy production technologies and $646,515,000 in energy conservation measures, includes only $5,000,000 for nuclear energy related technology or one percent of the total.

Civilian research and development.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to continue the assessment of accelerator transmutation of waste technology that may be able to significantly reduce the radioactivity and radio-toxicity of certain isotopes.

Fast flux test facility.—Without prejudice, the Committee has provided $28,000,000 to keep the FFTF in hot standby until the Department of Energy determines whether the facility should be decommissioned or restarted.

Isotopes support.—The Committee recommendation includes $15,500,000, the same as the current year but an increase of $2,500,000 over the amount of the request, for isotope support. The increase will enable to Department to complete the M0–99 program in fiscal year 2000.

The Committee is aware of the continued acute shortage of production sources for short-lived isotopes. As a result, there is a critical need for a facility that can supply short-lived, reactor-produced radioisotopes for experimental treatment of cancer and other diseases. Because of the unique power and capacity of the University of Missouri Research Reactor (MURR) to produce such cutting-edge radionuclides, the Committee encourages the Department of Energy to provide funds to enable the MURR to serve as a continued production source for the foreseeable future. The Committee encourages the Department to work with the MURR and the Institute of Medicine to fully utilize this facility once MURR's capital improvement program is completed.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

Appropriations, 1999	$50,398,000
Budget estimate, 2000	50,750,000
Committee recommendation	48,998,000

The Committee recommendation includes $48,998,000 for non-defense environment, safety, and health which includes $18,998,000, the same amount as the request, for program direction. The Committee does not support the external regulation of the Department of Energy's facilities and has not provided the $1,200,000 requested for external regulation transition.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1999	$124,727,000
Budget estimate, 2000	122,912,000
Committee recommendation	119,600,000

Technical information management.—The Committee recommendation for the technical information management program is $8,600,000, the same amount as the current year.

Field operations.—The Committee recommendation for field offices and management is $100,000,000 a $2,000,000 reduction from the request due to servere budget constraints.

Oak Ridge landlord.—The Committee recommendation for the Department of Energy's Oak Ridge landlord responsibilities is $11,000,000, the same amount as the current year.

USE OF PRIOR YEAR BALANCES

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $31,589,000 in unobligated carryover balances previously appropriated in the energy supply account or the energy supply research and development account that existed until the Committee restructured accounts in 1998. In accordance with the authority provided in Section 305 of this Act, those balances are to be transferred to the energy supply account and become available in fiscal year 2000 in accordance with the Committee recommendation. The $31,589,000 is composed of the following amounts: $821,000 from the geothermal resources development fund, $10,000 from high energy physics, $15,000 from nuclear physics, $7,739,000 from the Superconducting Supercollider, $790,000 from biological and environmental research, $75,000 from materials sciences, $12,000 from chemical sciences, $34,000 from engineering and geosciences, $4,000 from engineering biosciences, $62,000 from computational and technical research, $2,000 from energy research analysis, $2,506,000 from energy research program direction, $386,000 from the energy research small business innovative research program, $1,000 from the small business technology transfer pilot research program, $26,000 from unapplied energy research balances, $101,000 from unobligated energy research construction balances, $182,000 from solar building technology research, $625,000 from photovoltaic energy systems, $265,000 from solar thermal energy systems, $825,000 from biomass and bio-fuels power systems, $2,451,000 from biomass and bio-fuels transportation, $67,000 from wind energy systems, $16,000 from the international solar energy program, $21,000 from solar technology transfer, $148,000 from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, $238,000 from geothermal technology development, $6,000 from hydrogen research, $111,000 from electro-magnetic field studies, $5,000 from high-temperature superconducting research and development, $8,000 from energy storage systems, $174,000 from renewable energy program direction, $1,000 from advanced light-water reactors, $247,000 from advanced reactor research and development, $84,000 from space power systems, $188,000 from advanced radioisotope power systems, $136,000 from university fuel assistance, $4,000 from nuclear energy termination costs, $594,000 from nuclear energy program direction, $41,000 from nuclear energy spent fuel storage research and development, $852,000 from non-defense environment, safety and health, $54,000 from environment, safety and health program direction, $652,000 from magnetic fusion research and development, $82,000 from non-defense environmental management program direction, $5,000 from in-house energy management, $5,000

from strategic facilities utilization, $62,000 from atomic vapor laser isotope separation technology development, $4,701,000 from isotope production and distribution, and $6,155,000 from non-defense environmental management.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

(NONDEFENSE)

Appropriations, 1999	$431,200,000
Budget estimate, 2000	330,934,000
Committee recommendation	327,922,000

The Committee recommendation provides $327,922,000 for nondefense environmental management, a reduction of $3,012,000 from the request. The reduction is recommended without prejudice due to severe budget constraints.

The Committee recognizes the importance to the local community of the Grand Junction office and is aware the site needs remediation. The Committee further notes that the Grand Junction community is attempting to privatize the Grand Junction Office Site. Accordingly, the Committee has increased funding for the Albuquerque operations account by $5,800,000 to provide for accelerated cleanup in anticipation of privatization.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriations, 1999	$220,200,000
Budget estimate, 2000	240,198,000
Committee recommendation	200,000,000

The uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund was established in accordance with title XI of Public Law 102–486, the National Energy Policy Act of 1992. The funds provided for the environmental cleanup of the Department's uranium enrichment plants, two of which are currently leased to the USEC, and the cleanup of uranium mill tailings and thorium piles resulting from production and sales to the Federal Government for the Manhattan project and other national security purposes.

Due to budget constraints, the Committee recommendation includes a reduction of $20,200,000 from the current level of $220,200,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE FUND

Appropriations, 1999	$169,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	258,000,000
Committee recommendation	242,500,000

The Committee recommendation includes $355,000,000 for nuclear waste disposal. Of that amount, $242,500,000 is derived from the nuclear waste fund, an additional $112,500,000 shall be available from the "Defense nuclear waste disposal" account, and $5,000,000 shall be available from the General Fund for the development of accelerator transmutation of waste technology.

The Committee has provided $4,727,000 for the State of Nevada and $5,432,000 for affected units of local government in accordance with the statutory restrictions contained in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

Seismic evaluation.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for the University of Nevada at Reno Earthquake Engineering Facility to conduct experiments involving multiple support excitation problems at large scale.

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 1999	$2,682,860,000
Budget estimate, 2000	2,835,393,000
Committee recommendation	2,725,069,000

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

Appropriations, 1999	$696,500,000
Budget estimate, 2000	697,090,000
Committee recommendation	691,090,000

The Committee recommendation includes $691,090,000 for high energy physics, a reduction of $6,000,000 from the request. The reduction is taken from the $12,000,000 proposed for research and development for a TeV scale center of mass accelerator. The estimated cost of such a facility prohibits its serious consideration in the foreseeable future.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

Appropriations, 1999	$335,100,000
Budget estimate, 2000	342,940,000
Committee recommendation	330,000,000

Due to severe budget restraints, the Committee recommendation for nuclear physics is $330,000,000, a reduction of $5,100,000 from the current level and $12,940,000 from the request. That reduction is offset by the completion of the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider at the Brookhaven National Laboratory for which the Committee provided from this account $16,620,000 in the current year.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 1999	$443,600,000
Budget estimate, 2000	411,170,000
Committee recommendation	429,700,000

The Committee recommendation includes $429,700,000 for biological and environmental research. The recommendation does not include the proposed $4,467,000 increase in radio-pharmaceuticals.

Low dose effects program.—The Committee recommendation includes $22,500,000, of which $17,500,000 is within biological and environmental research and $5,000,000 is within defense environmental restoration and waste management environmental sciences, for the low dose effects program. The funding is provided consistent with the level and program proposed by the Low Dose Radiation Research Program Plan Subcommittee of the Biological and Environmental Research Advisory Committee.

Radiation effects on avian populations.—The Committee recommendation also includes $270,000 to study the effects of radiation on avian populations at the Nevada Test Site.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 1999	$809,100,000
Budget estimate, 2000	888,084,000
Committee recommendation	854,545,000

Spallation neutron source.—The Committee recommendation includes $186,900,000, including $169,000,000 for construction, related to the spallation neutron source. Project delays in the current year have reduced the funding requirements for fiscal year 2000 and resulted in the commensurate reduction from the request of $214,000,000.

EPSCoR.—The Committee recommendation includes the amount of the request, $6,815,000, for the Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research program.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1999	$165,260,000
Budget estimate, 2000	221,135,000
Committee recommendation	151,260,000

Computational and technology research.—The Committee recommendation does not include the $70,000,000 requested for the Department's participation in the Scientific Simulation Initiative.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 1999	$223,300,000
Budget estimate, 2000	222,614,000
Committee recommendation	220,614,000

The Committee recommendation for Fusion Energy Sciences is $220,614,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 from the request. While, in the past, the Committee has supported increases above the level of the request for this program, severe budget constraints and shortfalls elsewhere in the Department's request, necessitate the reduction at this time.

The Committee recommendation includes $19,000,000 for inertial fusion energy research to improve heavy ion accelerator efficiency, heavy ion and laser chamber designs, and the design of fusion energy target pellets.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 1999	$200,475,000
Budget estimate, 2000	247,515,000
Committee recommendation	219,415,000

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 1999	−$136,530,000
Budget estimate, 2000	−116,887,000
Committee recommendation	−116,887,000

Office of Field Management.—Consistent with the recommendation of the Commission on Maintaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise to establish direct reporting chains for the Department's sites, laboratories, and facilities, the Committee rec-

ommendation eliminates funding for the Office of Field Management.

USE OF PRIOR YEAR BALANCES

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $3,000,000 in unobligated carryover balances previously appropriated in the departmental administration account. In accordance with the authority provided in Section 306 of this Act, those balances are to be available in fiscal year 2000 in accordance with the Committee recommendation. The $3,000,000 is composed of the following amounts: $31,000 from the Board of Contract Appeals, $53,340 from the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, $122,238 from the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, $149,225 from the Office of Field Management program direction, $203,835 from the Office of General Counsel program direction, $136,525 from the Office of Policy program direction, $131,128 from the Office of Public Affairs, $94,615 from departmental administration program support, $424,180 from the Office of the Secretary, $1,103,313 from the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, $571,500 from management and administration.

INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 1999	$29,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	30,000,000
Committee recommendation	29,000,000

The Committee has provided $29,000,000, the current level, for the Office of the Inspector General.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

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

Atomic Energy Defense Activities

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

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1999	$4,400,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	4,531,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,609,832,000

Weapons activities support the Nation's national security mission of nuclear deterrence by preserving nuclear weapons technology and competence in the laboratories and maintaining the reliability and safety of the weapons in the enduring nuclear stockpile. The United States continues to retain strategic nuclear forces sufficient to deter future hostile countries from seeking a nuclear advantage. In the past, confidence in the nuclear weapons stockpile was assured through a combination of underground nuclear and labora-

tory testing. Since October 1992 the United States has maintained a moratorium on underground nuclear testing and has explored other means to assure confidence in the safety, reliability, and performance of nuclear weapons.

The mission of defense programs is to maintain the safety, security, and reliability of the Nation's enduring nuclear weapons stockpile within the constraints of a comprehensive test ban, utilizing a science-based approach to stockpile stewardship and management in a smaller, more efficient weapons complex infrastructure. The future weapons complex will rely on scientific understanding and expert judgment, rather than on underground nuclear testing and the development of new weapons, to predict, identify, and correct problems affecting the safety and reliability of the stockpile. Enhanced experimental capabilities and new tools in computation, surveillance, and advanced manufacturing will become necessary to certify weapon safety, performance, and reliability without underground nuclear testing. Weapons will be maintained, modified, or retired and dismantled as needed to meet arms control objectives or remediate potential safety and reliability issues. As new tools are developed and validated, they will be incorporated into a smaller, more flexible and agile weapons complex infrastructure for the future.

The Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program is a single, highly integrated technical program for maintaining the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile in an era without underground nuclear testing and without new nuclear weapons development and production. Traditionally, the activities of the three weapons laboratories and the Nevada test site have been regarded separately from those of the weapons production plants. However, although there remain separate budget items within defense programs, all stockpile stewardship and management activities have achieved a new, closer linkage to each other.

There are three primary goals of the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program: (1) provide high confidence in the safety, security, and reliability of the U.S. stockpile to ensure the continuing effectiveness of the U.S. nuclear deterrent while simultaneously supporting U.S. arms control and nonproliferation policy; (2) provide a small, affordable, and effective production complex to provide component and weapon replacements when needed, including limited lifetime components and tritium; and (3) provide the ability to reconstitute U.S. nuclear testing and weapon production capacities, consistent with Presidential directives and the "Nuclear Posture Review," should national security so demand in the future.

The policy framework which guides the Department of Energy's stockpile stewardship and management activities is the "Nuclear Posture Review" which is approved by the President. The requirements for DOE stated in terms of infrastructure to support U.S. nuclear forces are: (1) maintain nuclear weapons capability (without underground nuclear testing); (2) demonstrate the capability to design, fabricate, and certify weapon types in the enduring stockpile; (3) maintain the capability to design, fabricate, and certify new warheads; and (4) ensure tritium availability. In addition, the President has also requested a new annual certification process to certify that the stockpile is safe and reliable in the absence of un-

derground nuclear testing, and to produce a statement about the future confidence in the safety and reliability of the stockpile.

The Committee has serious concerns that projected budget profiles for Defense missions of the Nation are sufficient to sustain the important stockpile stewardship and management initiatives of DOE. The Committee believes that the issue of sufficient resources for the Department of Energy to ensure the certification of the weapons stockpile safety and reliability is of such importance it requires the ongoing attention of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy. With programs constrained by budget ceilings, aggressive management at all levels is mandatory. The Committee is aware of instances at DOE laboratories where projects have not been well defined and there has been a lack of management attention. This situation has resulted in scope creep, extended project completion schedules, and cost growth far in excess of what is acceptable. If the capability of the national laboratories to provide the certification, required by the President, is to be maintained under a severely restricted budget environment, it is mandatory that DOE and the national laboratories take whatever steps are necessary to assure the proper focus. It is essential that critical, centerpiece missions not be impacted because of poor management attention.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP

An appropriation of $2,351,800,000 is recommended for the stockpile stewardship activities of the Department of Energy.

The stockpile stewardship program addresses issues of maintaining confidence in weapons stockpile safety and reliability without underground nuclear testing through a technically challenging science-based stockpile stewardship program utilizing upgraded or new experimental and computational capabilities.

The Committee continues to view laboratory directed research and development [LDRD] as an integral, essential component of the Department's ability to respond to changing needs and requirements, and maintaining the preeminence of the national laboratories in the areas of science and engineering. The Committee directs DOE to continue current guidelines for managing laboratory directed research and development.

Core stockpile stewardship.—The Core Stockpile Stewardship Program provides the physical, technical, and intellectual infrastructure necessary to support a reliable, safe, and secure nuclear weapons stockpile. The Committee has recommended a total of $1,696,455,000 for core stockpile stewardship programs.

The Committee is concerned that the funding level proposed for fiscal year 1999 and future budget planning projections of the Department of Energy are not sufficient to address the critical needs of an aging stockpile. The Committee believes that preservation of core intellectual, scientific, and technical competencies and the continued ability of the weapons complex to respond to changing world situations is critically important. Further, the Committee is not convinced that engineering and surveillance approaches of yesterday will be adequate to maintain the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile in the absence of underground testing.

An appropriation of $341,000,000 is recommended for the accelerated strategic computing initiative [ASCI]. The ASCI program will provide the computing software, computer platforms and an operating environment to allow the national laboratories to make critical decisions about the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapon stockpile without underground nuclear testing. The Committee is concerned with the rate of growth of the ASCI program when considered in the context of constrained DOE defense programs budgets. The Department has embarked on a high-risk, aggressive program to significantly upgrade the computing capabilities of the weapons labs. This computing capability is the glue or common element which ties the entire stockpile stewardship and management effort together, thereby enable certification of the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile.

The Committee commends the Department of Energy for the achievement of the ASCI program and recommends the acceleration of the program to reach the 100 TeraFlop goal.

Direct Stockpile Activities.—An appropriation of $250,452,000 is recommended for Direct Stockpile Activities. This funding provides for pre-production design and engineering activities, design and development of weapon modifications, technical aspects of laboratory surveillance, and analysis of stockpile behind safety studies and assessments. In addition, this program support studies and research to apply basic science to weapon stockpile problems producing new technologies, products and processes in the vital surety areas (safety, security, and use control) technology development and implementation.

The Department of Energy's Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), the Los Alamos National Laboratory, (LANL), Sandia National Laboratory (SNL), and Nevada Test Site (NTS) are major national resources for science and research. These resources not only maintain and ensure the safety and reliability of our nation's nuclear weapons stockpile, but also keep America strong by staying on the cutting edge of technology development, scientific advancements and experimental methods. As with all viable programs, we must continually assess the mission, purpose, and focus of crucial resources to ensure that they are being engaged efficiently, effectively and in the best interest of our nation.

With this in mind, the Committee is aware that the Department of Energy is considering several strategic actions needed to address emerging requirements and assure the national security, and the scientific and research capability of these institutions. While the detailed plan is still under development, the broad outline is now evident.

First, is to re-balance the directed weapons work between LANL and LLNL by moving the responsibility for the W80 system from LANL to LLNL. Second, the hydrodynamic test infrastructure and support throughout the complex should be consolidated at LANL, both x-ray-based and proton-based radiography. This eliminates duplication and creates a more effective and efficient structure to respond to mission requirements. Third, is to establish a major effort in applied microsystems at SNL. This will provide for design options and prototype manufacturing process development needed for certification of weapon systems consistent with planned refur-

bishment schedules of the stockpile. The final element is an enhancement of the capability of the NTS in the areas of subcritical experiments and advanced diagnostics. This insures a credible capability at the NTS to resume underground testing of nuclear weapons should it be in the nation's best interest to do so.

The Committee has recommended an additional $35,000,000 to initiate this new strategy, including $5,000,000 for activities at LLNL, $10,000,000 for LANL, and $20,000,000 for work at SNL.

Testing capabilities and readiness.—An appropriation of $182,126,000 is recommended for testing capabilities and readiness activities. Current Presidential direction is to maintain a readiness capability to conduct an underground nuclear test at the Nevada test site. Therefore, infrastructure and other measures are to be maintained to support this requirement. Presidential direction also indicates that resources should be included that are necessary to conduct experimental activities planned by the nuclear weapons design laboratories and appropriate to the national nuclear testing policy.

The Committee has recommended an additional $15,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 for the Nevada Test Site to begin to field an increased number of subcritical experiments, including more classified geometries at the U1a complex and work with the other national laboratories to develop appropriate advanced diagnostics. As part of efforts to reshape and better integrate the capabilities of the Test Site and the national laboratories, $5,000,000 is provided to begin the process of moving the Atlas pulsed power experimental facility from Los Alamos to the Nevada Test Site to support code modeling and validation and diagnostics development. Also, as part of this refocused and integrated concept, Pegasus, the existing pulse power experimental facility at Los Alamos, is to be relocated to the University of Nevada at Las Vegas to enhance the existing joint work among the NTS, the national labs and the university on physics and diagnostics development.

The Department is encouraged to complete construction of the dual-stage gas gun at the Nevada Test site as soon as possible.

Construction projects.—An appropriation of $133,145,000 is recommended for construction projects under core stockpile stewardship activities for fiscal year 2000. The Committee recommendation is the same as the budget request.

Inertial confinement fusion [ICF].—An appropriation of $475,700,000 is recommended for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Program. The ICF Program continues to be a major contributor to the science and technology base supporting the nuclear deterrent through improved understanding of the underlying physics of nuclear weapons and computational modeling that will provide the future basis for ensuring safety, reliability, and performance on nuclear components.

The Committee recommendation includes $248,100,000 to continue construction of the National Ignition Facility and $15,900,000 for operating expenses to support research activities related to NIF. The President's fiscal year 2000 budget request significantly underfunded several areas of NIF research which would place at risk the success of scientific and stewardship objectives of the National Ignition Facility. With a capital investment of over $1,000,000,000,

the Committee believes the Department's budget request is unwise and jeopardizes a key element of the Stockpile Stewardship effort and; therefore, our national security, and the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The additional $10,000,000 recommended by the Committee provides an additional $3,600,000 for core NIF diagnostics, $1,000,000 for direct drive laser beam smoothing development, and $5,400,000 to initiate critical cryogenic activities. Without this additional funding, the operational schedule, established by the Department of Energy, would be delayed by 1 year at a minimum.

Project 96–D–111, national ignition facility [NIF].—The NIF is a key facility in maintaining nuclear weapons science expertise required for the stockpile stewardship program, and in supporting weapons effects testing. An appropriation of $248,100,000, the full amount needed in fiscal year 2000 to keep this important project on schedule, is recommended for the NIF project. Fiscal year 1999 was the peak year for construction funding, and with the appropriation recommended for fiscal year 2000, the project will be 75 percent complete on an appropriations basis. The project remains on schedule and within the projected construction cost of $1,046,000,000. The Committee is pleased with the management and oversight attention provided by LLNL on the project.

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $46,500,000 for these activities for fiscal year 2000 to support ongoing cooperative research and development agreements and education activities.

The Committee recommendation includes funding as requested in the budget to continue activities at the Amarillo Plutonium Research facility. No funding is provided for a new or relocated National Atomic Museum.

STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,025,300,000 for stockpile management activities.

The stockpile management mission is to provide for maintenance, evaluation, dismantlement, transportation, and disposal of nuclear weapons in accordance with quality, quantity, and schedule requirements approved by the President in the nuclear weapons stockpile plan. The program addresses issues of near-term and long-range support for the enduring stockpile, and for ensuring an adequate supply of tritium. Along with routine stockpile surveillance, this includes corrective maintenance and system replacement, as well as weapon dismantlement. The goal is to support the national security of the United States by maintaining a safe and reliable nuclear deterrent.

Of the additional funds recommended for stockpile management, the Committee has provided an increase of $27,000,000 for the weapons production plants, including, $15,000,000 for future requirements at the Kansas City Plant compatible with the Advanced Development and Production Technologies [ADAPT] program and the Enhanced Surveillance program. Without additional funding,

the Department and the Kansas City Plant will be unable to integrate new technologies required to meet new, future production requirements, and will delay the incorporation of advanced, critical electronic components into the nuclear weapon refurbishment and upgrade program. The additional funding also supports current workload requirements and efficiency needs.

The Committee recommendation also includes an additional $10,000,000 for core stockpile management weapon activities to support work load requirements at the Pantex plant in Amarillo, Texas; and $2,000,000 to plan modifications of the nuclear materials vault area at Los Alamos, TA–55 so that it can be used to handle materials used in research and technology development.

The Committee's is concerned that the budget request for the Pantex Plant is $32,700,000 less than in fiscal year 1999. The Committee's recommendation restores part of this funding. Given the significance of Pantex in evaluating and maintaining the viability of our weapons in an era of no testing and its significant dismantlement responsibilities pursuant to Arms Control treaties, the Committee directs the Department to address the facilities infrastructure, and take steps to prevent the loss of skilled technicians and other staff.

Project 97–D–122 Nuclear Materials and Storage Facility, LANL.—The Committee understands that recently completed Title I design activities for Project 97–D–122, the Nuclear Materials Storage Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory, have indicated that continuing with this project is not warranted. The Committee also understands that sufficient uncosted prior year obligations remain against the project to allow the expeditious closeout of the project. The Committee expects the Department to proceed promptly with this closeout. Uncosted obligations remaining against this project after closeout may be directed toward nuclear material storage activities including the provision of interim storage capacity at Los Alamos. The Department is requested to provide the Congress with a definitive plan for meeting long term nuclear material storage needs at Los Alamos before proceeding further. The Committee is also interested in alternative uses for the existing facility, if any, in lieu of its intended nuclear material storage mission.

Construction projects.—An appropriation of $158,679,000 is recommended for line item construction projects under core stockpile management for fiscal year 2000. The Committee recommendation is the same as the budget request.

95–D–102 Chemical and Metallurgical Research (CMR) Building Upgrades, Los Alamos.—The Committee recommends that no further funding be used to upgrade the CMR facility at Los Alamos. The Committee believes that, given the age of the existing building (45 years old) further investment is not justified in light of a 10-year life extension of the facility after the upgrades are completed. Instead, the Committee directs the Department to use the budget request of $18,000,000 to initiate the process of planning, designing and construction of a replacement facility. The long term weapons mission support requirements and the need for specialized laboratory space highlight the urgency for the Department of Energy to expedite the definition of programmatic needs, and begin those activities necessary to provide a new replacement facility as quickly

as possible. The Committee expects to kept informed of the Department's progress on a regular basis.

Tritium Source.—The Committee recommendation provides $64,000,000, the full budget request, for Tritium Production projects for fiscal year 2000. The Department has selected the Civilian Light Water Reactor (CLWR) to serve as the primary source of tritium, and decided that the Accelerator Production of Tritium (APT) option is to be developed as the backup capacity. Therefore, the Committee has included $33,000,000 to proceed with the Project 98–D–125, the Tritium Extraction Facility at the Savannah River Site which is needed to process target assemblies irradiated in a CLWR to remove the tritium gas. An amount of $31,000,000 is recommended for Project 98–D–126, the Accelerator Production of Tritium project to complete engineering development, demonstration and preliminary design for an accelerator-based plant to be available if needed in the future.

Funding Adjustments.—The Committee has recommended funding adjustments totaling $13,768,000 made up of $7,668,000 of prior year balances, and $6,100,000 in contractor travel savings. The Committee is aware that after several years of savings, travel costs are beginning to increase. Therefore, the reduction is proposed to keep these costs in line with prior year levels.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

An appropriation of $246,500,000 is recommended for program direction activities. This is the same as the budget request.

Program Direction provides funds for all Federal personnel-related expenses for Defense Programs offices at the Department of Energy headquarters and the field operations offices. It also provides technical support throughout the Defense Programs complex in the areas of environment, safety and health; safeguards and security; NEPA compliance, and compliance with Federal and state laws, and recommendations of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 1999	$4,310,227,000
Budget estimate, 2000	4,505,676,000
Committee recommendation	4,551,676,000

The Department's environmental management program is responsible for identifying and reducing health and safety risks, and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out nuclear energy or weapons research and production activities which resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination. The environmental management program goals are to eliminate and manage the urgent risk in the system; emphasize health and safety for workers and the public; establish a system that increases managerial and financial control; and establish a stronger partnership between DOE and its stakeholders. The "Defense environ-

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

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

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

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

While it is imperative that the Department's cleanup costs be brought down, there are instances where relative small amounts of additional funding invested in the near-term offer the potential for significant reductions in long-term budgetary requirements. The Committee continues to be concerned with growing landlord costs required to maintain buildings and facilities that are ready for demolition, and the high costs associated with temporarily storing and monitoring wastes that are ready for permanent disposal. In order to reduce these costs in the future, it is important that the Department expedite demolition work, waste shipments, and permanent storage whenever possible.

SITE AND PROJECT COMPLETION

An appropriation of $993,292,000 is recommended for site/project completion activities. This is the same as the budget request.

This account will provide funding for projects that will be completed by fiscal year 2006 at sites or facilities where a DOE mission (for example, environmental management, nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship, or scientific research) will continue beyond 2006. These activities are focused on completing projects by 2006 and distinguishes these projects from the long-term projects or activities at the sites, such as high level waste vitrification or the Department's

other enduring missions. The largest amount of funding requested is for activities at the Hanford, WA, Savannah River, SC, and Idaho sites. A significant amount of work is expected to be completed at these sites by 2006, although environmental management and other stewardship activities will continue beyond 2006.

The Committee recommendation provides an additional $10,000,000 to address funding shortfalls in meeting environmental restoration Tri-Party Agreement compliance deadlines, and to accelerate interim safe storage of reactors along the Columbia River. In providing additional resources, the Committee does not want to minimize the challenge goals for savings and efficiencies to be realized at the site. This, in combination with the additional funding, will help maintain mandates milestones and augment deactivation and decommissioning activities.

The Committee has also recommended an additional $6,000,000 in operating funds to support research and development associated with resolving technology issues related to the processing wastes at the Savannah River Site.

POST-2006 COMPLETION

The Committee recommendation for Post-2006 completion activities is $3,009,548,000, which includes $2,524,997,000 in operating expenses.

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

Of the amounts recommended, the Committee has included an increase of $5,000,000 for the National Spent Fuel Program to address regulatory and repository issues associated with Department of Energy owned spent nuclear fuel, and an additional $10,000,000 for spent fuel activities related to the Idaho Settlement Agreement with the Department of Energy.

The appropriation also includes an additional $30,000,000 for tank cleanup activities at the Hanford Site. The Committee understands that additional funding will help to maintain schedules required by revised compliance agreement with the State of Washington.

Project 00–D–401, Spent Nuclear Fuel Treatment and Storage Facility, SRS.—The Committee understands technical issues concerning the generation of larger than anticipated amounts of benzene gas have suspended all activities for pre-treatment of the salt feed for the Defense Waste Processing Facility at Savannah River, and that the fiscal year 2000 budget request includes funding for processing system engineering, and research and development necessary to evaluate all salt processing options prior to selecting the best option in fiscal year 2000. Further, the budget request includes $7,000,000 for design only of a new treatment and storage facility.

Even though there are significant technical, regulatory and design risks, the Committee believes that the Department's approach

should minimize the uncertainty, and understands that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has concluded that melt and dilute would be an acceptable concept for geologic disposal of aluminum-based spent nuclear fuel. Therefore, the Committee has provided an additional $10,000,000 for detailed design of the project. The additional funding will help alleviate the delays based on the level of the budget request and to help mitigate the resultant increased costs associated with a projected 2-year delay.

The Committee has included a $3,000,000 increase over the current year funding level for DOE-funded studies or other activities associated with the health effects of radiation and other hazardous substances on DOE workers and communities. The Committee directs that these studies be managed by the Office of Environmental, Safety, and Health.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

An appropriation of $230,500,000 is recommended for science and technology activities related to the environmental waste cleanup program.

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

The Committee finds that the independent review provided through the consortium for risk evaluation and stakeholder participation to be important in providing balance and credibility to work performed for the Department. The recommendation continues support for the program at the level requested in the budget.

The Committee recommendation supports the Department's efforts to complete the previously agreed privatization of the Western Environmental Technology Office.

The Committee recognizes the work carried out by the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory [DIAL] for the Department of Energy's Environmental Management Program. This work has led to the development of instrumentation and technology of value to the Department's cleanup effort. The Committee recommendation supports DIAL at $6,000,000.

Funding Adjustments.—The Committee has recommended funding adjustments totaling $22,373,000 made up of $20,000,000 of prior year balances, and $2,373,000 in contractor travel savings.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation for program direction totals $349,409,000, which is the same as the budget request.

Program direction provides the overall direction and administrative support for the environmental management programs of the Department of Energy.

The amount recommended by the Committee supports the establishment of an Office of River Protection at the Hanford Site in accordance with the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1999. The Office will be responsible for all

aspects of the Tank Waste Remediation system with the critical mission to immobilize Hanford's high-level waste and protect the Columbia River.

DEFENSE FACILITY CLOSURE PROJECTS

Appropriations, 1999	$1,038,240,000
Budget estimate, 2000	1,054,492,000
Committee recommendation	1,069,492,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,069,492,000 for the site closure program. This is an increase of $15,000,000 over the budget request.

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

The Committee continues to believe that a closure fund, which targets funding at specific facilities whose accelerated closure in the near-term results in significantly reduced out-year costs, is important in freeing up budgetary resources in the longer term. The Committee has included an additional $20,000,000 to mitigate the funding shortfall proposed in the budget for the Rocky Flats site. The Committee understands that early closure of the Rocky Flats site could result in over $1,000,000,000 in saving.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

Appropriations, 1999	$228,357,000
Budget estimate, 2000	228,000,000
Committee recommendation	228,000,000

An appropriation of $228,000,000 is recommended for the environmental management privatization initiative. This is the same as the budget request.

The Department of Energy continues to rely upon the private sector to accomplish it's mission of environmental cleanup. Privatization is just one tool used by DOE to implement alternative business strategies for the procurement of goods and services required to fulfill their cleanup responsibilities. The term "privatization" as used by DOE refers to a method of financing, contracting and risk-sharing between the Department and firms in the private sector for good or services, and involves the use of fixed price contracts under which contractors use private funding to design, construct, operate, and deactivate equipment and facilities required in the cleanup mission. The vendor then receives payment for producing products that meet DOE performance specifications. Budget authority is set aside to cover future contractual obligations, as well as to provide an incentive for private sector investment.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1999	$1,696,676,000
Budget estimate, 2000	1,792,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,872,000,000

An appropriation of $1,872,000,000 is recommended by the Committee for other defense activities.

This account includes the following programs: verification and control technology, nuclear safeguards and security, security investigations, security evaluations, the Office of Nuclear Safety, Worker, and Community Transition Assistance, fissile materials control and disposition, emergency management, international nuclear safety and security activities, and naval reactors. Descriptions of each account are provided below.

NONPROLIFERATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The Nonproliferation and National Security Program includes activities related to nonproliferation and verification research and development, arms control, and intelligence. The Department is engaged in an active nuclear nonproliferation program through research and development activities performed at the national laboratories, by providing technical and analytical support to treaty development and implementation, and by providing intelligence support to these efforts. The Committee recommendation totals $822,300,000. The Committee continues to strongly support these important national security programs.

Verification and control technology/arms control.—The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology research and development, and arms control totals $547,000,000. The funding level recommended by the Committee provides significant increases over the current year level for DOE to continue important activities related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and biological weapons; and increased initiatives to reduce the danger of nuclear smuggling and the associated potential of nuclear terrorism.

The Committee recommendation also includes $84,000,000 for Deterrence and Detection Technologies, including $41,152,000 for Chemical and Biological non-proliferation activities. This funding level supports an enhanced program of critical research to develop and test fast and selective detection technologies, predictive plume transport models suitable for urban areas, new recovery and restoration concepts, and advanced biological forensic methods for proliferation detection.

The recommendation provides $165,000,000 for material protection, control, and accounting [MPC&A] activities. The Committee continues to consider these activities important to reducing the threat created by the breakup of the former Soviet Union. The increased funding will allow additional material protection, control and security upgrade work at defense-related and important civilian and regulatory sites in Russia. The recommendation also supports an enhanced program of material control, protection and accounting upgrades at several Russian Navy sites. The Committee continues to believe that these activities are critical elements of the United States non-proliferation efforts.

The Committee action supports the budget request for both the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention and the Nuclear Cities program of the Department of Energy. These programs contribute to the international non-proliferation effort by engaging highly qualified and knowledgeable scientists, engineers, and technicians from Russia and the former States of the Soviet Union in cooperative commercial and other high technology non-military activities.

Nuclear Safeguards and Security.—The Committee has provided $69,100,000 for Nuclear Safeguards and Security programs of the Department of Energy. These activities provide policy, programmatic direction and training for the protection of the Department's nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, classified information and facilities. An additional $10,000,000 is recommended to enhance and strengthen physical protection of critical facilities and infrastructure against physical and cyber attack.

Security Investigations.—The Security Investigations Program funds background investigations for all DOE Federal staff and all Headquarters contractors, who, in the performance of their official duties, require access authorizations to Restricted Data, National Security Information or special material. Given the heightened awareness and sensitivity, the Committee expects the numbers of security background investigations to increase significantly. The Committee has recommended $45,000,000, an increase of $15,000,000 over the budget request, to respond to this increased requirement.

The Committee understands that the cost of security clearances is to be offset by program organizations in the amount of $20,000,000.

HEU (Highly Enriched Uranium) Transparency Implementation.—The Committee recommendation includes $15,750,000 for the HEU Transparency Implementation program of the Department of Energy. This program is responsible for ensuring that the non-proliferation aspects of the February 1993 agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation are met. This Agreement covers the purchase over 20 years of low enriched uranium [LEU] derived from at least 500 metric tons of HEU removed from dismantled Russian nuclear weapons. Under the Agreement, conversion of the HEU components into LEU is performed in Russian facilities. The purpose of this program is to put into place those measures agreed to by both sides, that permits the U.S. to have confidence that the Russian side is abiding by the Agreement.

International Nuclear Safety.—The Committee recommendation is $34,000,000, the full budget request for the International Nuclear Safety program.

This program supports international nuclear safety cooperation through project activities in host countries and through participation with international nuclear safety organizations. Project activities are focused to address the most significant safety issues in selected countries, including primarily those with Soviet-designed reactors.

Intelligence.—The Committee recommendation totals $36,059,000.

The Office of Intelligence provides information and technical analysis on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear pro-

grams, and other energy-related matters to policymakers in the Department and other U.S. Government agencies. The focus of the Department's intelligence analysis and reporting is on emerging proliferant nations, nuclear technology transfers, foreign nuclear materials production, and proliferation implications of the breakup of the former Soviet Union.

Counterintelligence.—An appropriation of $39,200,000 is provided for the counterintelligence activities of the Department of Energy. This is an increase of $22,559,000 over the current years appropriation. The funding recommendation recognizes that the $12,559,000 of the amount recommended is to be provided by the national laboratories.

Recent security issues has revealed the need to strengthen and enhance the counterintelligence activities of the Department. The recommended increase in funding supports the efforts of the Department and further enhances the program in the area of cyber security and early warning and intrusion analysis. It is critical that the Department of Energy cyber security be brought into line with other U.S. intelligence community partners who are advancing a national CI-Cyber strategy.

Emergency management.—The Committee has provided $21,000,000 for emergency management activities. The Office of Emergency Management serves as the single point of contact and control for all DOE emergency and threat assessment-related activities, and ensures an integrated response to emergencies affecting departmental operations and activities or requiring departmental assistance.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Office of Environment, Safety, and Health is the departmental resource that provides oversight in the areas of environment, safety, health, and safeguards and security performance. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $94,000,000.

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

The Committee has included within the recommended funding of $15,500,000 to support ongoing studies of the health effects of radiation on the survivors of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bombings. The Committee directs the Department to undertake a review of the current dosimetry system, DS86, used to estimate the neutron dose at Hiroshima to determine if, based on the available activation measurements from Hiroshima, a corrective factor should be used in the system to account for distance from the hypocenter. The Department should report to the Committee within 60 days of enactment of this Act on its plans for such a review.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

In accordance with section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1993 and as a result of a change in the work force at defense nuclear facilities, defense employees of the Department

may be provided various options to minimize impacts of these work force structure changes. These options include retraining, early retirement incentives, preference in hiring, outplacement assistance, and relocation assistance. In addition, this program funds contractor employment reduction requirements for severance and separation payments.

The Committee recommendation is $30,000,000 for this program. The recommendation supports the Department's commitment to the State of Idaho at the amount contained in the budget request.

The Committee supports efforts to diversify technical activities at the Nevada Test Site. The Committee believes that appropriate activities will share the infrastructure burden that is necessary to maintain test readiness. The Department is encouraged to provide assistance for implementation of such appropriate activities at the Nevada Test Site.

FISSILE MATERIALS CONTROL AND DISPOSITION

The Fissile Materials Control and Disposition Program is responsible for the technical and management activities to assess, plan, and direct efforts to provide for the safe, secure, environmentally sound long-term storage of all weapons-usable fissile materials and the disposition of fissile materials declared surplus to national defense needs. The Committee recommendation is $205,000,000 the same as the budget request.

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

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

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

Funding Adjustments.—The Committee has recommended a $2,600,000 reduction in contractor travel savings for Other Defense Activities, excluding the Naval Reactor program.

NAVAL REACTORS

The Naval Reactors Program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores having long fuel life, high reliability, improved performances, and simplified operating and maintenance requirements. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships. The Committee recommendation is $677,600,000.

The Committee has provided an additional $12,600,000 to optimize the program to shutdown prototype reactors and conduct remediation work. The Committee supports this effort and urges the Department to review the need for additional funding in future years, and to take appropriate action to request additional resources as may be needed in future budgets.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 1999	$189,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	112,000,000
Committee recommendation	112,500,000

The Committee recommends $112,500,000 for defense nuclear waste disposal.

Since passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, the nuclear waste fund has incurred costs for activities related to disposal of high-level waste generated from the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy. At the end of fiscal year 1998, the balance owed by the Federal Government to the nuclear waste fund was $1,191,000,000 (including principal and interest). The "Defense nuclear waste disposal" appropriation was established to ensure payment of the Federal Government's contribution to the nuclear waste repository program. Through fiscal year 1998, a total of $987,830,000 has been appropriated to support nuclear waste repository activities attributable to atomic energy defense activities.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

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

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

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000-square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent Western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets

hydroelectric power from 29 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also markets and exchanges surplus electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

Bonneville constructs, operates, and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system, consisting of over 15,000 circuit-miles of transmission line and 360 substations with an installed capacity of 21,500 megawatts.

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

Borrowing authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to Bonneville as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts Bonneville plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation on these borrowing requirements. For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $352,000,000 in new borrowing authority, the same as the budget request, for transmission system construction, system replacement, energy resources, fish and wildlife, and capitol equipment programs.

Repayment.—During fiscal year 1999, Bonneville will pay the Treasury $607,000,000, of which $164,000,000 is to repay principal on the Federal investment in these facilities.

Limitation on direct loans.—The Committee recommends that no new direct loans be made in fiscal year 2000.

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1999	$7,500,000
Budget estimate, 2000	.....
Committee recommendation	39,594,000

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

ment, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

The Committee disagrees with the Department's proposal to eliminate funding for power purchases and wheeling and includes $28,000,000 for that purpose.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1999	$26,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	27,940,000
Committee recommendation	28,000,000

The Southwestern Power Administration is the marketing agent for the power generated at Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana with a total installed capacity of 2,158 megawatts. It operates and maintains some 1,380 miles of transmission lines, 24 generating projects, and 24 substations, and sells its power at wholesale primarily to publicly and cooperatively owned electric distribution utilities.

The Committee disagrees with the Department's proposal to eliminate funding for power purchases and wheeling and includes $833,000 for that purpose.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1999	$203,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	171,471,000
Committee recommendation	223,555,000

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

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

The Committee disagrees with the Department's proposal to eliminate funding for power purchases and wheeling and includes $53,886,000 for that purpose.

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

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Creation of the Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund was directed by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994–95. This legislation also directed that the fund be administered by the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission to defray operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams in Texas.

The Committee recommendation is $1,309,000, the same as the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1999	$167,500,000
Budget estimate, 2000	179,900,000
Committee recommendation	170,000,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 1999	−$167,500,000
Budget estimate, 2000	−179,900,000
Committee recommendation	−170,000,000

The Committee recommendation provides $170,000,000 for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The Committee recommendation includes a Department of Energy general provision not included in the current year Energy and Water Development Act.

Contractor travel expenses.—Department of Energy contractor travel costs are limited to not more than $200,000,000 in fiscal year 2000, and each contractor is limited to not more than 80 percent of the amount that contractor spent on travel in fiscal year 1998.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ENERGY SUPPLY			
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES TECHNOLOGIES			
Solar energy:			
Solar building technology research	2,900	5,500	2,000
Photovoltaic energy systems	66,800	93,309	64,000
Photovoltaic energy research	2,883	2,847	2,847
Subtotal, Photovoltaic	69,683	96,156	66,847
Concentrating solar power	17,000	18,850	15,000
Biomass/biofuels energy systems:			
Power systems	31,000	38,950	34,950
Transportation	41,750	53,441	38,000
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems	72,750	92,391	72,950
Biomass/biofuels energy research	27,199	26,740	26,740
Subtotal, Biomass	99,949	119,131	99,690
Wind energy systems	33,200	45,600	34,000
Wind energy research	283	283	283
Subtotal, Wind	33,483	45,883	34,283
Renewable energy production incentive program	4,000	1,500	1,500
Solar program support	.....	10,000	2,000
International solar energy program	3,750	6,000	3,000
National renewable energy laboratory	2,000	1,100	1,100
Construction: 96–E–100 FTLB renovation and expansion	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, National renewable energy laboratory	2,000	1,100	1,100
Solar photoconversion	14,532	14,260	14,260
Total, Solar Energy	247,297	318,380	239,680
Geothermal: Geothermal technology development	28,500	29,500	24,000
Hydrogen research	21,000	28,000	27,000
Hydrogen energy research	3,008	2,970	2,970
Total, Hydrogen	24,008	30,970	29,970
Hydropower	2,000	7,000	5,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	3,500	.....	4,000
Electric energy systems and storage:			
Transmission reliability	2,500	4,000	3,500
High temperature superconducting R&D	32,500	31,000	30,000
Energy storage systems	4,500	6,000	.....
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	39,500	41,000	33,500
Federal building/Remote power initiative	4,000	.....	.....
Program direction	17,100	19,171	17,750
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES TECHNOLOGIES	365,905	446,021	353,900
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
Nuclear energy R&D:			
Advanced radioisotope power system	37,000	37,000	37,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Test reactor area landlord	4,000	6,070	6,070
Construction:			
99–E–200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	341	1,430	1,430
95–E–201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	2,425	1,500	1,500
Subtotal, Construction	2,766	2,930	2,930
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	6,766	9,000	9,000
University reactor fuel assistance and support	11,000	11,345	12,000
Nuclear energy plant optimization		5,000	5,000
Nuclear energy research initiative	19,000	25,000	25,000
Civilian research and development			5,000
Total, Nuclear energy R&D	93,766	87,345	93,000
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	30,000	30,000	28,000
Termination costs	85,000	65,000	80,000
Uranium programs	49,000	41,000	39,000
Construction:			
98–U–200 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, KY			
96–U–201 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, KY			
Subtotal, Construction			
Total, Uranium programs	49,000	41,000	39,000
Isotope support	15,500	13,000	15,500
Construction: 99–E–201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	6,000	8,000	7,500
Total, Isotope support	21,500	21,000	23,000
Program direction	24,700	24,960	24,700
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	283,966	269,305	287,700
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Environment, safety and health	32,000	31,752	30,000
Program direction	18,398	18,998	18,998
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	50,398	50,750	48,998
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
Technical information management program	1,600	1,600	1,600
Program direction	7,000	7,500	7,000
Total, Technical information management program	8,600	9,100	8,600
Transfer to OSHA for external regulation pilot projects	1,000		
Field operations	104,127	102,000	100,000
Oak Ridge Landlord	11,000	11,812	11,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	124,727	122,912	119,600

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Subtotal, Energy supply	824,996	888,988	810,198
Renewable energy research program	−47,905	−47,100	−47,100
Use of prior year balances	−50,000	.....	−31,589
Transfer from Geothermal and USEC	.....	−5,821	−5,821
Contractor travel savings	.....	.....	−10,276
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	727,091	836,067	715,412
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT			
Site closure	254,344	211,146	210,000
Site/project completion	102,948	98,366	98,000
Construction: 93–E–900 Long-term storage of TMI–2 fuel, INEL	.....	2,500	2,500
Subtotal, Site/project completion	102,948	100,866	100,500
Post 2006 completion	83,908	18,922	17,422
Use of prior year balances	−10,000	.....	.....
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	431,200	330,934	327,922
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and decommissioning	190,200	210,198	175,000
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	30,000	30,000	25,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING	220,200	240,198	200,000
SCIENCE			
High energy physics:			
Research and technology	215,865	227,190	221,190
Facility operations	459,635	441,200	441,200
Construction:			
00–G–307 SLAC office building	.....	2,000	2,000
99–G–306 Wilson hall safety improvements, Fermilab	6,700	4,700	4,700
98–G–304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	14,300	22,000	22,000
Subtotal, Construction	21,000	28,700	28,700
Subtotal, Facility operations	480,635	469,900	469,900
Total, High energy physics	696,500	697,090	691,090
Nuclear physics	318,480	342,940	330,000
Construction: 91–G–300 Relativistic heavy ion collider (BNL)	16,620	.....	.....
Total, Nuclear physics	335,100	342,940	330,000
Biological and environmental research	443,600	411,170	429,700
Basic energy sciences:			
Materials sciences	417,216	407,636	405,000
Chemical sciences	209,582	215,577	212,000
Engineering and geosciences	44,413	37,545	37,545
Energy biosciences	32,489	31,226	31,000
Construction:			
99–E–334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	101,400	196,100	169,000
96–E–300 Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	4,000	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Subtotal, Construction	105,400	196,100	169,000
Total, Basic energy sciences	809,100	888,084	854,545
Other energy research:			
Computational and technology research	143,000	198,875	129,000
Energy research analyses	1,000	1,000	1,000
Multiprogram energy labs—facility support.			
Infrastructure support	1,160	1,160	1,160
Construction: MEL–001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	14,924	18,351	18,351
Multiprogram general purpose facilities:			
Construction:94–E–363 Roofing improvements (ORNL)	4,908	1,749	1,749
Subtotal, Multiprogram gen. purpose facilities	4,908	1,749	1,749
Environment, safety and health:			
Construction: 96–E–333 Multiprogram energy laboratories upgrades, various locations	268	.....	.....
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	268	.....	.....
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs—fac. suppor	21,260	21,260	21,260
Total, Other energy research	165,260	221,135	151,260
Fusion energy sciences program	223,300	222,614	220,614
Program direction	49,800	52,360	52,360
Subtotal, Science	2,722,660	2,835,393	2,729,569
Use of prior year SSC balances	−7,600	.....	.....
Use of other prior year balances	−13,000	.....	.....
Contractor travel savings	.....	.....	−4,500
General reduction	−5,700	.....	.....
General reduction for policy papers for CCTI	−13,500	.....	.....
TOTAL, SCIENCE	2,682,860	2,835,393	2,725,069
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Office of the Secretary	4,175	4,940	4,940
Board of contract appeals	715	838	838
Chief financial officer	22,350	23,792	23,000
Contract reform	3,200	3,200	3,000
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,900	4,910	4,910
Economic impact and diversity	4,700	5,046	4,700
Field management	7,500	8,080	.....
General counsel	19,250	21,434	20,000
Management and administration	97,000	101,273	98,000
Policy office	14,000	17,430	15,500
Public affairs	3,500	3,963	3,963
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	181,290	194,906	178,851
Program support:			
Minority economic impact	1,700	1,700	1,700
Policy analysis and system studies	350	1,000	500
Environmental policy studies	2,000	2,432	2,000
Scientific and technical training	450	450	450
Corporate management information program	8,000	13,000	12,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Subtotal, Program support	12,500	18,582	16,650
Total, Administrative operations	193,790	213,488	195,501
Cost of work for others	44,312	34,027	34,027
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	238,102	247,515	229,528
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....	−3,000
Work for others prior year balances	.....	.....	−7,113
Transfer from other defense activities	−37,627	.....	.....
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	200,475	247,515	219,415
Miscellaneous revenues	−136,530	−116,887	−116,887
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	63,945	130,628	102,528
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	29,000	30,000	29,000
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Stockpile stewardship:			
Core stockpile stewardship	1,482,632	1,635,355	1,696,455
Construction:			
00–D–103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	.....	8,000	8,000
00–D–105 Strategic computing complex, LANL Los Alamos, NM	.....	26,000	26,000
00–D–107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	.....	1,800	1,800
99–D–102 Rehabilitation of maintenance facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	4,000	3,900	3,900
99–D–103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	2,000	2,000
99–D–104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,500	2,400	2,400
99–D–105 Central health physics cailbration facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	2,900	1,000	1,000
99–D–106 Model validation & system certication center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	1,600	6,500	6,500
99–D–108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	2,000	7,005	7,005
97–D–102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	36,000	61,000	61,000
96–D–102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations	20,423	2,640	2,640
96–D–103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory	6,400	.....	.....
96–D–104 Processing and environmental technology laboratory (SNL)	18,920	10,900	10,900
96–D–105 Contained firing facility addition (LLNL)	6,700	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	103,443	133,145	133,145
Subtotal, Core stockpile stewardship	1,586,075	1,768,500	1,829,600
Inertial fusion	223,800	217,600	227,600
Construction: 96–D–111 National ignition facility, LLNL	284,200	248,100	248,100
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	508,000	465,700	475,700
Technology transfer/education:			
Technology transfer	45,000	22,200	22,200

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Education	9,000	29,800	24,300
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education	54,000	52,000	46,500
Total, Stockpile stewardship	2,148,075	2,286,200	2,351,800
Stockpile management	1,986,803	1,839,621	1,866,621
Construction:			
99–D–122 Rapid reactivation, various locations	11,200	11,700	11,700
99–D–123 Replace mechanical utility systems, Y–12, Oak Ridge, TN	1,900	.....	.....
99–D–125 Replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	1,000	.....	.....
99–D–127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	13,700	17,000	17,000
99–D–128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	1,108	3,429	3,429
99–D–132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	9,700	11,300	11,300
98–D–123 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring initiative Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	27,500	21,800	21,800
98–D–124 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring initiative Y–12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	10,700	3,150	3,150
98–D–125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	6,000	33,000	33,000
98–D–126 Accelerator production of Tritium, various locations	20,000	31,000	31,000
97–D–122 Nuclear materials storage facility renovation (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	2,500	.....	.....
97–D–123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	6,400	4,800	4,800
96–D–122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU), Pantex plant	3,700	.....	.....
95–D–102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project (LANL)	5,000	18,000	18,000
93–D–122 Life safety upgrades, Y–12 plant	3,250	.....	.....
88–D–123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	.....	3,500	3,500
Subtotal, Construction	123,658	158,679	158,679
Total, Stockpile management	2,110,461	1,998,300	2,025,300
Program direction	250,000	246,500	246,500
Subtotal, Weapons activities	4,508,536	4,531,000	4,623,600
Use of prior year balances	−82,536	.....	−7,668
Contractor travel savings	.....	.....	−6,100
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,426,000	4,531,000	4,609,832
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Site/project completion:			
Operation and maintenance	858,090	892,629	905,002
Construction:			
99–D–402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	2,745	3,100	3,100
99–D–404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID	950	7,200	7,200

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
98–D–401 H–tank farm storm water systems upgrade, Savannah River, SC	3,120	2,977	2,977
98–D–453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	26,814	16,860	16,860
98–D–700 Road rehabilitation (INEL), ID	7,710	2,590	2,590
97–D–450 Savannah River nuclear material storage, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	79,184	4,000	4,000
97–D–470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	7,000	12,220	12,220
96–D–406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	38,680	24,441	24,441
96–D–464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho chemical processing plant (INEL), ID	11,544	11,971	11,971
96–D–471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	8,000	931	931
95–D–456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho chemical processing plant (INEL), ID	485	.....	.....
92–D–140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades Savannah River, SC	3,667	.....	.....
86–D–103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility (LLNL), Livermore, CA	4,752	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Construction	194,651	88,290	88,290
Total, Site/project completion	1,052,741	980,919	993,292
Post 2006 completion:			
Operation and maintenance	2,261,107	2,478,997	2,524,997
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	398,088	420,000	420,000
Construction:			
00–D–401 Spent Nuclear Fuel treatment and storage facility Title I & II, Savannah River, SC	.....	7,000	17,000
99–D–403 Privatization Phase I infrastructure support, Richland, WA	14,800	13,988	13,988
97–D–402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	22,723	20,516	20,516
96–D–408 Waste management upgrades, Richland, WA	171	.....	.....
94–D–407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	32,860	4,060	4,060
93–D–187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	15,214	8,987	8,987
Subtotal, Construction	85,768	54,551	64,551
Total, Post 2006 completion	2,744,963	2,953,548	3,009,548
Science and technology	247,000	230,500	230,500
Program direction	337,073	349,409	349,409
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	4,381,777	4,514,376	4,582,749
Use of prior year balances/general reduction	−71,550	.....	−20,000
Contractor travel savings	.....	.....	−2,373
Offsetting collections	.....	−8,700	−8,700
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,310,227	4,505,676	4,551,676
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS			
Closure projects	1,038,240	1,054,492	1,069,492
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	228,357	253,000	253,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Use of prior year balances	.....	−25,000	−25,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION	228,357	228,000	228,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	5,576,824	5,788,168	5,849,168
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Other national security programs:			
Nonproliferation and national security:			
Verification and control technology:			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	210,000	215,000	225,000
Construction: 00–D–192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	.....	6,000	6,000
Subtotal, Nonproliferation & verification	210,000	221,000	231,000
Arms control	256,900	296,000	316,000
Intelligence	41,600	.....	.....
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	508,500	517,000	547,000
Emergency management	21,000	21,000	21,000
Nuclear safeguards and security	55,200	59,100	69,100
Security investigations	30,000	30,000	45,000
HEU transparency implementation	.....	15,750	15,750
International nuclear safety	.....	34,000	34,000
Program direction—NN	86,900	90,450	90,450
Subtotal, Nonproliferation and national security	701,600	767,300	822,300
Intelligence	.....	36,059	36,059
Counterintelligence	.....	31,200	39,200
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	66,731	67,231	69,231
Program direction—EH	24,769	24,769	24,769
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	91,500	92,000	94,000
Worker and community transition	26,000	26,500	26,500
Program direction—WT	3,900	3,500	3,500
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	29,900	30,000	30,000
Fissile materials disposition	116,372	129,766	134,766
Program direction—MD	4,588	7,343	7,343
Construction:			
00–D–142 Immobilization and associated processing facility, various locations	.....	21,765	21,765
99–D–141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, various locations	20,000	28,751	28,751
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, various locations	28,000	12,375	12,375
Subtotal, Construction	48,000	62,891	62,891
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	168,960	200,000	205,000
Nuclear energy (Defense):			
International nuclear safety: Soviet designed reactors	30,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Nuclear energy (Defense)	30,000	.....	.....
National Security programs administrative support	37,627	.....	.....
Office of hearings and appeals	2,400	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Other national security programs	1,061,987	1,159,559	1,229,559
Contractor travel savings	.....	.....	−2,600
Total, Other national security programs	1,061,987	1,159,559	1,226,959

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Independent assessment of DOE projects	.....	.....	.....
Naval reactors:			
Naval reactors development	628,289	620,400	633,000
Construction:			
GPN–101 General plant projects, various locations	9,000	9,000	9,000
98–D–200 Site laboratory/facility upgrade, various locations	7,000	3,000	3,000
90–N–102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	5,800	12,000	12,000
Subtotal, Construction	21,800	24,000	24,000
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	650,089	644,400	657,000
Program direction	20,100	20,600	20,600
Total, Naval reactors	670,189	665,000	677,600
Subtotal, Other defense activities	1,732,176	1,824,559	1,904,559
Use of prior year balances	−15,500	.....	.....
Offset to user organizations	−20,000	−20,000	−20,000
Contribution from labs	.....	−12,559	−12,559
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,696,676	1,792,000	1,872,000
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	189,000	112,000	112,500
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	11,888,500	12,223,168	12,443,500
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	4,370	.....	11,594
Purchase power and wheeling	6,130	.....	28,000
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	10,500	.....	39,594
Use of prior year balances	−3,000	.....	.....
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	7,500	.....	39,594
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Operating expenses	2,722	3,625	3,625
Purchase power and wheeling	59	.....	833
Program direction	16,402	17,631	16,858
Construction	6,817	6,684	6,684
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	26,000	27,167	28,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Construction and rehabilitation	20,802	26,802	25,000
System operation and maintenance	36,469	35,096	35,096
Purchase power and wheeling	53,886	.....	53,886
Program direction	107,383	104,537	104,537
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,036	5,036	5,036
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	223,576	171,471	223,555

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Use of prior year balances	−20,576		
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	203,000	171,471	223,555
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	1,010	1,309	1,309
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	237,510	199,947	292,458
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	167,500	179,900	170,000
FERC revenues	−167,500	−179,900	−170,000
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Repository program	112,000	186,397	172,897
Program direction	53,000	71,603	69,603
Subtotal from Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	165,000	258,000	242,500
Transfer from defense nuclear waste disposal		(39,000)	
Civilian research and development	4,000		
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	169,000	258,000	242,500
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	16,449,306	17,084,335	17,078,389

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1999	$66,400,000
Budget estimate, 2000	66,400,000
Committee recommendation	71,400,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is composed of the Governors of the 13 Appalachian States and a Federal cochairman who is appointed by the President.

The Committee recommendation for the Appalachian Regional Commission totals $71,400,000.

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

The Committee understands the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit ruled in January of this year that the revised EIS for the Richie County Dam was sufficient, thereby, clearing the way for construction of the facility. The Committee further understands that the long delay caused by the litigation has resulted in increased project costs. Therefore, the Committee has provided $5,000,000 to cover a portion of the increased costs, which with $4,000,000 to be provided by the State of West Virginia, will provide sufficient funding to complete the project.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1999	$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	.....
Committee recommendation	25,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes $25,000,000 for the Denali Commission and recommends that the Commission contract for a state-wide infrastructure development plan. The plan should address energy, water and sewer, solid waste, access and other infrastructure issues and provide particular consideration to efficiency, reliability, and maintenance requirements.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1999	$16,500,000
Budget estimate, 2000	17,500,000
Committee recommendation	17,500,000

An appropriation of $17,500,000 is recommended for fiscal year 2000. This is the same as the budget request.

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

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1999	$465,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	465,400,000
Committee recommendation	465,400,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1999	−$444,800,000
Budget estimate, 2000	−442,400,000
Committee recommendation	−442,400,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1999	$20,200,00
Budget estimate, 2000	23,000,000
Committee recommendation	23,000,000

In the report accompanying the Fiscal Year 1999 Energy and Water Development Act, the Committee was critical of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, listed a series of specific concerns regarding the Commission, and directed the Commission to report monthly to the Committee on the status of the Commission's licensing and regulatory duties.

The Commission as a whole, the five Commissioners individually, and the Commission staff deserve a great deal of credit for the Commission's accomplishments in the last year.

There are certainly areas that continue to need attention. However, it is the Committee's view that the Commission is actively identifying and considering those issues and taking steps to address them including the recent submission to Congress of a number of legislative proposals. The Committee strongly endorses that effort and will work with the appropriate authorizing Committees in that regard.

The Commission's monthly reports to the Committee have been informative and useful in tracking progress at the Commission, and the Commission should continue to provide them.

The Committee recommendation includes $465,400,000, the same amount as the request, for the Commission and includes a single year extension of the NRC's user fee collection authority. The Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, requires that the Commission recover 100 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the nuclear waste fund, by assessing licenses and annual fees. That authority expires in 1999, and unless

additional fee collection authority is enacted prior to or concurrent to enactment of this Act, the Commission's authority to collect user fees would be limited to 33 percent of its budget. The Committee is aware that the Environment and Public Works Committee may soon consider legislation in this regard and intends that the 1-year extension included in this measure serve as a safeguard should that legislation not be enacted by October 1, 1999.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1999	$4,800,000
Budget estimate, 2000	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,000,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1999	−$4,800,000
Budget estimate, 2000	−6,000,000
Committee recommendation	−5,000,000

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 1999	$2,600,000
Budget estimate, 2000	3,150,000
Committee recommendation	3,150,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,150,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 1999	.....
Budget estimate, 2000	$7,000,000
Committee recommendation	7,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the same as the budget request. The funding is provided for the operation and maintenance of the Land Between the Lakes recreation area.

TITLE V—RESCISSIONS

Severely constrained spending limits required under the Discretionary budget caps imposed by the Congressional Budget Resolution have made it most difficult for the Committee to formulate a balanced Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. In order the adhere to the subcommittee's allocations and address the critical ongoing programs and activities, and respond to the numerous requests of the Members, the Committee finds it necessary to recommend a series of rescissions in the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Energy. A good portion of the funding recommended for rescission is not needed in fiscal year 2000 or future years due to project completion or program termination. However, the Committee has included rescissions of several projects that will require completion funding in future years. In those cases, while recommending a rescission, sufficient funding remains to continue those projects in fiscal year 2000.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The recommended appropriations in title III, Department of Energy, generally are subject to annual authorization. However, the Congress has not enacted an annual Department of Energy authorization bill for several years, with the exception of the programs funded within the atomic energy defense activities which are authorized in annual defense authorization acts. The authorization for the atomic energy defense activities, contained in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1998, is currently being considered by the Senate.

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

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, the Committee ordered reported en bloc, S. 1186, an original fiscal year 2000 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill, and S. 1143, an original fiscal year 2000 Transportation Appropriations bill, both subject to amendment and subject to the section 302 budget allocation, by a recorded vote of 27–1, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Stevens	Mrs. Feinstein
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. Gorton	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Burns	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Campbell	
Mr. Craig	
Mrs. Hutchison	

Mr. Kyl
Mr. Byrd
Mr. Inouye
Mr. Hollings
Mr. Leahy
Mr. Lautenberg
Mr. Harkin
Ms. Mikulski
Mr. Reid
Mr. Kohl
Mrs. Murray
Mr. Dorgan
Mr. Durbin

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

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

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

TITLE 16—CONSERVATION

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 12H—PACIFIC NORTHWEST ELECTRIC POWER PLANNING AND CONSERVATION

* * * * * * *

§ 839b. Regional planning and participation

(a) Pacific Northwest Electric Power and Conservation Planning Council; establishment and operation as regional agency

* * * * * * *

(h) Fish and wildlife

(1)(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(10)(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(D) INDEPENDENT SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL.—(i) The Northwest Power Planning Council (Council) shall appoint an Inde-

pendent Scientific Review Panel (Panel), which shall be comprised of eleven members, to review projects proposed to be funded through that portion of the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) annual fish and wildlife budget that implements the Council's fish and wildlife program. Members shall be appointed from a list of no fewer than 20 scientists submitted by the National Academy of Sciences (Academy), provided that Pacific Northwest scientists with expertise in Columbia River anadromous and non-anadromous fish and wildlife and ocean experts shall be among those represented on the Panel. The Academy shall provide such nominations within 90 days of September 30, 1996, and in any case not later than December 31, 1996. If appointments are required in subsequent years, the Council shall request nominations from the Academy and the Academy shall provide nominations not later than 90 days after the date of this request. If the Academy does not provide nominations within these time requirements, the Council may appoint such members as the Council deems appropriate.

(ii) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(vii) COST LIMITATION.—The cost of this provision shall not exceed $2,000,000 in 1997 dollars.

[(viii) EXPIRATION.—This paragraph shall expire on September 30, 2000.]

(vii) COST LIMITATION.—The annual cost of this provision shall not exceed $500,000 in 1997 dollars.

* * * * * * *

TITLE 42—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 23—DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

* * * * * * *

Division A—Atomic Energy

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER XIII—GENERAL AUTHORITY OF COMMISSION

* * * * * * *

§ Sec. 2214. NRC user fees and annual charges

(a) Annual assessment

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) Last assessment of annual charges

The last assessment of annual charges under subsection (c) of this section shall be made not later than [September 30, 1999] *September 30, 2000*.

* * * * * * *

Division B—United States Enrichment Corporation

SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

§ 2297b–7. Accounts

(a) Establishment of United States Enrichment Corporation Fund

[There is established] *(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established* in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund, to be known as the "United States Enrichment Corporation Fund"[, which] *(referred to in this section as the 'Fund'), which* shall be available to the Corporation, without need for further appropriation and without fiscal year limitation, for carrying out its purposes, functions, and powers, and which shall not be subject to apportionment under subchapter II of chapter 15 of title 31.

(2) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest such portion of the Fund as is not, in the judgment of the Secretary, required to meet current withdrawals. Investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States.

(B) ACQUISITION OF OBLIGATIONS.—For the purpose of investments under subparagraph (A), obligations may be acquired—

(i) on original issue at the issue price; or

(ii) by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price.

(C) SALE OF OBLIGATIONS.—Any obligation acquired by the Fund may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price.

(D) CREDITS TO FUND.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Fund shall be credited to and form a part of the Fund.

(b) Transfer of unexpended balances

On the transfer date, the Secretary shall, without need of further appropriation, transfer to the Corporation the unexpended balance of appropriations and other monies available to the Department (inclusive of funds set aside for accounts payable), and accounts receivable which are related to functions and activities acquired by the Corporation from the Department pursuant to this division, including all advance payments.

* * * * * * *

PUBLIC LAW 105–204

SECTION 1. UNITED STATES ENRICHMENT CORPORATION.

(a) PLAN.—The Secretary of Energy shall prepare, and the President shall include in the budget request for [fiscal year 2000] *fiscal year 2001*, a plan and proposed legislation to ensure that all amounts accrued on the books of the United States Enrichment Corporation for the disposition of depleted uranium hexafluoride

will be used to commence construction of, not later than January 31, 2004, and to operate, an onsite facility at each of the gaseous diffusion plants at Paducah, Kentucky, and Portsmouth, Ohio, to treat and recycle depleted uranium hexafluoride consistent with the National Environmental Policy Act.

(b) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding the privatization of the United States Enrichment Corporation and notwithstanding any other provision of law (including the repeal of chapters 22 through 26 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297 et seq.) made by section 3116(a)(1) of the United States Enrichment Corporation Privatization Act (104 Stat. 1321–349), no amounts described in subsection (a) shall be withdrawn from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund established by section 1308 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297b–7) or the Working Capital Account established under section 1316 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297b–15) until the date that is 1 year after the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget request for **[**fiscal year 2000**]** *fiscal year 2001*.

(c) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should authorize appropriations during **[**fiscal year 2000**]** *fiscal year 2001* in an amount sufficient to fully fund the plan described in subsection (a).

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

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

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 2000: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
General purpose discretionary	21,280	21,277	20,868	[1] 20,868
Violent crime reduction fund	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2000	.....	.....	.....	[2] 13,326
2001	.....	.....	.....	6,366
2002	.....	.....	.....	1,240
2003	.....	.....	.....	28
2004 and future year	.....	.....	.....	222
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2000	NA	104	NA	150

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1999 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1999 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
General investigations	161,747	135,000	125,459	−36,288	−9,541
Construction, general	1,429,885	1,239,900	1,113,227	−316,658	−126,673
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 105–277)	35,000	.....	.....	−35,000	.....
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	321,149	280,000	315,630	−5,519	+35,630
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 105–277)	2,500	.....	.....	−2,500	.....
Operation and maintenance, general	1,653,252	1,835,900	1,790,043	+136,791	−45,857
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 105–277)	99,700	.....	.....	−99,700	.....
Regulatory program	106,000	117,000	115,000	+9,000	−2,000
Defense function	140,000	150,000	150,000	+10,000	.....
General expenses	148,000	148,000	151,000	+3,000	+3,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	4,097,233	3,905,800	3,760,359	−336,874	−145,441
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	25,741	21,002	21,002	−4,739	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	10,476	12,047	12,047	+1,571	.....
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	41,217	38,049	38,049	−3,168	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1999 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1999 appropriation	Budget estimate
Program oversight and administration	1,283	1,321	1,321	+38	
Total, Central Utah project completion account	42,500	39,370	39,370	−3,130	
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	617,045	652,838	612,451	−4,594	−40,387
(By transfer)	(25,800)			(−25,800)	
Loan program	8,421	12,425	12,425	+4,004	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(38,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)	(+5,000)	
Central Valley project restoration fund	33,130	47,346	37,346	+4,216	−10,000
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	75,000	95,000	50,000	−25,000	−45,000
Policy and administration	47,000	49,000	49,000	+2,000	
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	780,596	856,609	761,222	−19,374	−95,387
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	823,096	895,979	800,592	−22,504	−95,387
(By transfer)	(25,800)			(−25,800)	
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	727,091	836,067	715,412	−11,679	−120,655
(By transfer)		(5,821)	(5,821)	(+5,821)	
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 105–277)	60,000			−60,000	
Non-defense environmental management	431,200	330,934	327,922	−103,278	−3,012
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	220,200	240,198	200,000	−20,200	−40,198
Science	2,682,860	2,835,393	2,725,069	+42,209	−110,324
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 105–277)	15,000			−15,000	

Nuclear Waste Disposal	169,000	258,000	242,500	+73,500	−15,500
(By transfer)	.....	(39,000)	.....	.....	(−39,000)
Departmental administration	200,475	247,515	219,415	+18,940	−28,100
Miscellaneous revenues	−136,530	−116,887	−116,887	+19,643	.....
Net appropriation	63,945	130,628	102,528	+38,583	−28,100
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	10,000	.....	.....	−10,000	.....
Office of the Inspector General	29,000	30,000	29,000	.....	−1,000
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function	(5,576,824)	.....	.....	(−5,576,824)	.....
Non-defense function	(651,400)	.....	.....	(−651,400)	.....
Total	(6,228,224)	.....	.....	(−6,228,224)	.....
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Weapons activities	4,400,000	4,531,000	4,609,832	+209,832	+78,832
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	4,310,227	4,505,676	4,551,676	+241,449	+46,000
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	10,340	.....	.....	−10,340	.....
Defense facilities closure projects	1,038,240	1,054,492	1,069,492	+31,252	+15,000
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	3,500	.....	.....	−3,500	.....
Defense environmental management privatization	228,357	228,000	228,000	−357	.....
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,590,664	5,788,168	5,849,168	+258,504	+61,000
Other defense activities	1,696,676	1,792,000	1,872,000	+175,324	+80,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 105–277)	525,000	.....	.....	−525,000	.....
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	13,650	.....	.....	−13,650	.....
Defense nuclear waste disposal	189,000	112,000	112,500	−76,500	+500
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	12,414,990	12,223,168	12,443,500	+28,510	+220,332
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	7,500	.....	39,549	+32,049	+39,549
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	26,000	27,167	28,000	+2,000	+833
(By transfer)	.....	(773)	.....	.....	(−773)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1999 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1999 appropriation	Budget estimate
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	203,000	171,471	223,555	+20,555	+52,084
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	1,010	1,309	1,309	+299	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	237,510	199,947	292,413	+54,903	+92,466
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	167,500	179,900	170,000	+2,500	−9,900
Revenues applied	−167,500	−179,900	−170,000	−2,500	+9,900
Total, title III, Department of Energy	17,060,796	17,084,335	17,078,344	+17,548	−5,991
Appropriations	(16,423,306)	(17,084,335)	(17,078,344)	(+655,038)	(−5,991)
Supplemental appropriations	(75,000)	.....	.....	(−75,000)	.....
Emergency appropriations	(525,000)	.....	.....	(−525,000)	.....
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	(37,490)	.....	.....	(−37,490)	.....
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	66,400	66,400	71,400	+5,000	+5,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	16,500	17,500	17,500	+1,000	.....
Denali Commission	20,000	.....	25,000	+5,000	+25,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	465,000	465,400	465,400	+400	.....
Revenues	−444,800	−442,400	−442,400	+2,400	.....
Subtotal	20,200	23,000	23,000	+2,800	.....

Office of Inspector General	4,800	6,000	5,000	+200	−1,000
Revenues	−4,800	−6,000	−5,000	−200	+1,000
Subtotal					
Total	20,200	23,000	23,000	+2,800	
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,600	3,150	3,150	+550	
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund		7,000	7,000	+7,000	
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 105–277)	50,000			−50,000	
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	175,700	117,050	147,050	−28,650	+30,000
TITLE V—RESCISSIONS					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
General investigations (rescissions)			−1,512	−1,512	−1,512
Construction, general (rescission)			−62,053	−62,053	−62,053
Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil			−63,565	−63,565	−63,565
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Purchase power and wheeling (rescissions)			−5,500	−5,500	−5,500
Total, South Eastern Power Administration			−5,500	−5,500	−5,500
Total, title V, Rescissions			−69,065	−69,065	−69,065
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	22,156,825	22,003,164	21,717,280	−439,545	−285,884
Appropriations	(21,492,135)	(22,003,164)	(21,786,345)	(+294,210)	(−216,819)
Rescissions			(−69,065)	(−69,065)	(−69,065)
Emergency appropriations	(664,690)			(−664,690)	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1999 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1999 appropriation	Budget estimate
(By transfer)	(25,800)	(45,594)	(5,821)	(−19,979)	(−39,773)

○