many large employer plan sponsors have been forced to take contribution holidays, and thus have been prevented from funding toward projected actuarial liabilities—a more accurate measure of long-term pension plan costs than current liability. I believe it is time to reconsider the suitability of this artificial maximum contribution limit and ensure a more sound funding target—it is not the time to adopt a definition of excess assets based on the inadequate standard of current liabilities.

It may, indeed, be time to reconsider the suitability of this artificial maximum contribution limit and ensure a more sound funding target of at least ''plan termination liability'' which is the level of plan assets needed to pay all benefits upon the actual termination of a plan. Clearly, it could not have been intended that a large employer in or facing bankruptcy be enabled to extract assets from a pension plan and to then terminate the employer's plan or plans, leaving other employers who pay PBGC premiums or taxpayers to pay for the pensions of the employer's underfunded plan or plans. This can be avoided by listening to the voice of pension experts in the American Academy of Actuaries who suggest the withdrawal threshold be based on at least termination liability.

It also may well be that a more refined pension policy allowing for the reversion of pension assets that are truly excess could help restore employer interest in defined benefit plans and, thus, expand pension coverage. However, the provision should be crafted carefully, should amount to more than a temporary revenue raising measure, and should take into consideration the protections of that title I of Employer Retirement Income Security Act [ERISA] presently provides to plan participants and retirees. Without a permanent provision employers will have no incentive to create or remain in defined benefit plans—and that purported benefit of section 13607 will never be realized. Care must also be taken to recognize the complexity of individual plans, including the fact that so-called excess assets can arise from contributions made by employees as well as those made by employers.

Moreover, the reversion provisions of section 13607 may not even generate the revenue projected. Corporations with a tax loss carry-forward will look to acquire companies with excess assets, so that they can take a reversion tax free. Alternatively, companies may wait to take reversions until they have a tax-loss year. Thus, we may be encouraging the removal of an estimated $27 billion of excess assets without gaining the sought-after revenue.

The success of ERISA private pension plans in America has been immense—$3.5 trillion of assets invested in America. In addition, unlike Social Security and many public pension plans, the assets are real. So far, ERISA's ''prudent man rule'' has protected the sanctity of those trust funds. We have been successful in the House in fighting off the administration's efforts to hawk economically targeted investments [ETI's] to private pension plan fiduciaries. That effort could rightly be described as an attempt by the administration to force private pension assets to be used for socially correct investments. We want to allow employers the right to take true excess funds from their pension trusts, but the words ''excess funds'' are, at best, actuarial indefinite and vague. It is therefore essential that the formula for allowing employers to remove funds from pension trusts be unquestionably based on the most conservative of actuarial principles. I believe that this is the essence of what Republicans stand for. I fear, however, that section 13607 is not fully consistent with these principles.

Finally, I remain concerned that the reversion provisions in section 13607 do not include the ERISA amendments necessary to enable pension plan asset reversions to be legally consummated.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, although I have these concerns about the pension reversion provisions, this reconciliation bill has many more positives than negatives. And there still is opportunity—in conference—for salutary changes. What is most important is that the constant failure of Congress to reach a balanced budget is leading us to an unforgivable consequence: passing on trillions of dollars in Federal debt to future generations of Americans. The best time to begin putting matters in order is today; when it comes to making tough decisions to rein in total Federal spending, tomorrow never comes.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] is recognized for 40 seconds.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am a freshman. I have not been here before, but I do recognize the fact that the citizens of the United States want to get their fair share for their dollar spent.

The colleagues to my left keep pointing out about Medicare. My seniors are saying, why pay more than twice the rate of inflation? Any good consumer would not only encourage that, they would demand that. That is all we are saying.

Let me leave you with this: I keep hearing my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who controlled this body for 40 years, saying that they support a balanced budget. As a freshman who has come here this year, my question to them is, why again and again ever since the 1960's have they not been able to present that balanced budget to the people?

So all I ask them to do is quit finding excuses not to vote for a balanced budget. The American people want it. They are tired of the excuses from Washington, and they want us to prove that we can balance the budget just like they do every day of their lives.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, all time for general debate, has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 2517, as modified by the amendments printed in House Report 104–292, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment and is considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1905, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. BUNN of Oregon submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 104–293)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1905) ''making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes,'' having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26, 32, 36, 44, 45, 46, 47, 57, and 58.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 13, 14, 25, 33, 38, 39, 40, 43, and 54; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$121,767,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

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

Norco Bluffs, California, $375,000;

Ohio River Greenway, Indiana, $500,000;

Kentucky Lock and Dam, Kentucky, $2,000,000;

Mussers Dam, Middle Creek, Snyder County, Pennsylvania, $300,000; and

West Virginia Port Development, West Virginia, $300,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to undertake a study of water supply and associated needs in the vicinity of Hazard, Kentucky, using $500,000 of the funds

appropriated under this heading in Public Law 103–316 for Hazard, Kentucky.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$804,573,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

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

Homer Spit, Alaska, repair and extend project, $3,800,000;

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas, $6,000,000: Provided, That $4,900,000 of such amount shall be used for activities relating to Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, Arkansas;

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas and Louisiana, $6,600,000;

Sacramento River Flood Control Project (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), California, $300,000;

San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California, $5,000,000;

Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana, $1,500,000;

Arkansas City flood control project, Kansas, $700,000, except that for the purposes of the project, section 902 of Public Law 99–662 is waived;

Winfield, Kansas, $670,000;

Harlan (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, $12,000,000;

Williamsburg (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, $4,100,000;

Middlesboro (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), Kentucky, $1,600,000;

Salyersville, Kentucky, $500,000;

Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana, $13,348,000;

Ouachita River Levees, Louisiana, $2,300,000;

Red River below Denison Dam Levee and Bank Stabilization, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, $2,500,000;

Roughans Point, Massachusetts, $710,000;

Marshall, Minnesota, $850,000;

Ste. Genevieve, Missouri, $1,000,000;

Broad Top Region, Pennsylvania, $4,100,000;

Glen Foerd, Pennsylvania, $200,000;

South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Restoration, Pennsylvania, $3,500,000;

Wallisville Lake, Texas, $5,000,000;

Virginia Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection, Virginia, $1,100,000;

Hatfield Bottom (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, $200,000; and

Upper Mingo (Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River), West Virginia, $2,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall transfer $1,120,000 of the Construction, General funds appropriated in this Act to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Interior shall accept and expend such funds for performing operation and maintenance activities at the Columbia River Fishing Access Sites to be constructed by the Department of the Army at Cascade Locks, Oregon; Lone Pine, Oregon; Underwood, Washington; and the Bonneville Treaty Fishing Access Site, Washington: Provided further, That using funds appropriated in Public Law 103–316 for the Sacramento River Flood Control Project (Deficiency Correction), California, project and funds appropriated herein for the Sacramento Urban Area Levee Reconstruction, California, project, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to acquire all or part of the Little Holland tract, with any and all appurtenant water rights, for wetland and fish and wildlife activities pursuant to the authority of section 906 of Public Law 99–662 and conditioned on a determination made by the Secretary, pursuant to Section 906, that acquisition is in the Federal interest.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,703,697,000*; and the Senate agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: *$151,500,000*; and the Senate agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: *$62,000,000*; and the Senate agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Retain the matter proposed by said amendment, and on page 7, line 18, of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 1905, strike ''the'', and insert in lieu thereof, ''any civil''.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Delete the matter stricken by said amendment and insert the matter proposed by said amendment, amended as follows:

Strike subsection (d) and insert in lieu thereof the following: *(d) If any of the four Corps of Engineers hopper dredges is removed from normal service for repair or rehabilitation and such repair prevents the dredge from accomplishing its volume of work regularly carried out in each of the past three years, the Secretary shall not significantly alter the operating schedules of the remaining Federal hopper dredges established in accordance with the requirements of subsection (a) above.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

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

SEC. 103. With the exception of the use of funds to process any required Department of the Army permits, none of the funds appropriated herein or otherwise available to the Army Corps of Engineers may be used to assist, guide, coordinate, administer, prepare for occupancy of, or acquire furnishings for or in preparation of a movement to the Southeast Federal Center.

And, on page 9, line 12, of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 1905, strike ''(b) PROJECT DEPTH.—'' and all that follows through ''harbor or refuge.'', on page 10, line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) PROJECT DEPTH.—The project described in subsection (a) is modified to provide for an authorized depth of 12.5 feet.

(c) NAVIGATION CHANNEL (MODIFIED).—The reauthorized project navigation channel shall be defined by the following coordinates: 2911N–2239E, 3240N–2504E, 3964N–2874E, 4182N–2891E, 4469N–2808E, 4692N–2720E, 4879N–2615E, 4952N–2778E, 4438N–2980E, 4227N–3097E, 3720N–3068E, 3076N–2798E, 2996N–2706E, 2783N–2450E.

(d) HARBOR OF REFUGE.—The project described in subsection (a), including the breakwalls, pier and authorized depth of the project (as modified by subsection (b)), shall continue to be maintained as a harbor of refuge.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 106. Using $2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to undertake the Indianapolis, Indiana, project, authorized in section 5 of Public Law 74–738, as amended, and as modified to include certain riverfront alterations as described in the Central Indianapolis Waterfront Concept Master Plan, dated February, 1994, at a total cost of $65,975,000 with an estimated first Federal cost of $39,975,000 and an estimated first non-Federal cost of $26,000,000.

SEC. 107. SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 313 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4845–4847) is amended—

(1) in the heading to subsection (c) by striking ''WITH SARCD COUNCIL'';

(2) in subsection (c) by inserting ''with State, regional, and local officials, including, where applicable,'' after ''consult'';

(3) in subsection (d)(2)(A) by inserting ''where applicable,'' after ''Council'';

(4) in subsection (g)(1) by striking ''$17,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''; and

(5) in subsection (h)(2) by striking ''Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Fulton, Huntingdon, and Somerset'' and inserting ''Armstrong, Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Clearfield, Fayette, Franklin, Fulton, Huntingdon, Indiana, Juniata, Mifflin, Somerset, Snyder, and Westmoreland''.

(b) COST SHARING.—Section 313(d)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4846) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) Cost sharing.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Total project costs under each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall be shared at 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal. The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of design work completed by such interest prior to entering into a local cooperation agreement with the Secretary for a project. The Federal share may in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

''(B) INTEREST.—In the event of delays in reimbursement of the non-Federal share of a project, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest to provide the non-Federal share of a project's cost.

''(C) LANDS, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward its share of project costs, including direct costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the placement of such project on public owned or controlled lands, but not to exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

''(D) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE CREDIT.—Operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent non-Federal.''.

SEC. 108. Using $2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to proceed with engineering, design, and construction of projects to provide

for flood control and improvements to rainfall drainage systems in Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Tammany Parishes, Louisiana, in accordance with the following reports of the New Orleans District Engineer: Jefferson and Orleans Parishes, Louisiana, Urban Flood Control and Water Quality Management, July 1992; Tangipahoa, Techefuncte and Tickfaw Rivers, Louisiana, June 1991; and Schneider Canal, Slidell, Louisiana, Hurricane Protection, May 1990. There is authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of projects described in these reports. The cost of any work performed by the non-Federal interests subsequent to the above cited reports, as determined by the Secretary of the Army to be a compatible and integral part of the projects, shall be credited toward the non-Federal share of the projects.

SEC. 109. (a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary of the Army shall convey to the City of Prestonburg, Kentucky, all right, title, and interest of the United States, in and to the land described in the Supplemental Agreement—Modification No. 2 to the Department of the Army lease #DACW69–1–76–0186, executed by and between the Department of the Army and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, together with any improvements thereon.

(b) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance authorized by this section is subject to the following conditions:

(1) The City shall ensure that the land conveyed by this section will be used for public use recreational purposes and to further the regional economic development.

(2) The City shall use all proceeds derived from the sale or lease of any mineral rights conveyed pursuant to this section for the development, operation, and maintenance of recreational facilities on the lands conveyed in accordance with this section.

(3) The City shall accept the property in its condition at the time of the conveyance. The Secretary shall not be required to make any improvements in the property's condition, and the City shall hold and save the United States free from any claims or damages arising from any activities on the conveyed land either on the date of the conveyance or any subsequent date.

(4) If the City uses the land conveyed under this section for any purpose other than those specified in this paragraph, the Secretary shall notify the City of such failure. If the City does not correct such nonconforming use during the 1-year period beginning on the date of such notification, the Secretary shall have a right of reverter to reclaim possession and title to the land conveyed under this section.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert: *110*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$12,684,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$411,046,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$273,076,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert: *$2,727,407,000, to remain available until expended*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$981,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert: *For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97–425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, $151,600,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$3,460,314,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$5,557,532,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,373,212,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: *: Provided, That of the amount herein appropriated, $85,000,000 shall be available for obligation and expenditure only for an interim storage facility and only upon the enactment of specific statutory authority.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$366,697,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$244,391,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$170,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), $343,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), $428,000.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission as authorized by law (84 Stat. 1541), $318,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (84 Stat. 1530, 1531), $250,000.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$109,169,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: *The Tennessee Valley Authority shall, not later than March 30, 1996, submit to Congress a preliminary plan for funding the environmental research center from sources other than direct appropriations to the Tennessee Valley Authority after fiscal year 1996; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 51:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

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

SEC. 501. Section 510 of Public Law 101–514, the Fiscal Year 1991 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, is repealed.

SEC. 502. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the report referred to in Title 30 of Public Law 102–575 shall be submitted within five years from the date of enactment of that Act.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

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

SEC. 504. Section 4(a) of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the restoration of the fish and wildlife in the Trinity River Basin, California, and for other purposes'', approved October 24, 1984 (98 Stat. 2723), is amended—

(a) in paragraph (1), by striking ''October 1, 1995'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''October 1, 1996''; and

(b) in paragraph (2), by striking ''ten-year'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''eleven-year''.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

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

SEC. 507. In order to ensure the timely implementation of the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to proceed without delay with construction of those facilities in conformance with the final Biological Opinion for the Animas-La Plata project, Colorado and New Mexico, dated October 25, 1991.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 508.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration.

(2) COUNCIL.—The term ''Council'' means the Northwest Power and Conservation Planning Council.

(3) EXCESS FEDERAL POWER.—The term ''excess Federal power'' means such electric power that has become surplus to the firm contractual obligations of the Administrator under section 5(f) of the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 839c(f)) due to either—

(A) any reduction in the quantity of electric power that the Administrator is contractually required to supply under subsections (b) and (d) of section 5 of the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 839c), due to the election by customers of the Bonneville Power Administration to purchase electric power from other suppliers, as compared to the quantity of electric power that the Administrator was contractually required to supply as of January 1, 1995; or

(B) those operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System that are primarily for the benefit of fish and wildlife affected by the development, operation, or management of the System.

(b) SALE OF EXCESS FEDERAL POWER.—Notwithstanding section 2, subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 3, and section 7 of Public Law 88–552 (16 U.S.C. 837a, 837b, and 837f), and section 9(c) of the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 839f(c)), the Administrator may, as permitted by otherwise applicable law, sell or otherwise dispose of excess Federal power—

(1) outside the Pacific Northwest on a firm basis for a contract term of not to exceed 7 years, if the excess Federal power is first offered for a reasonable period of time and under the same essential rate, terms and conditions to those Pacific Northwest public body, cooperative and investor-owned utilities and those direct service industrial customers identified in subsection (b) or (d)(1)(A) of section 5 of the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 839c); and,

(2) in any region without the prohibition on resale established by the second sentence of section 5(a) of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize the completion, maintenance, and operation of Bonneville project for navigation, and for other purposes'', approved August 20, 1937 (commonly known as the ''Bonneville Project Act of 1937'') (16 U.S.C. 832d(a)).

(c) STUDY BY COUNCIL.—(1) Within 180 days of enactment of this Act, the Council shall review and report to Congress regarding the most appropriate governance structure to allow more effective regional control over efforts to conserve and enhance anadromous and resident fish and wildlife within the Federal Columbia River Power System.

(d) CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROCUREMENT.—The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, acting through the North Pacific Division of the Corps of Engineers, is authorized to place orders for goods and services related to facilities for electric power generation and fish and wildlife mitigation associated with the Federal Columbia River Power System with and through the Administrator using the authorities available to the Administrator.

(e) RESIDENTIAL EXCHANGE.—Notwithstanding the establishment, confirmation and approval of rates pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 839e, and notwithstanding the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 839c(c), the cost benefits of eligible utilities' total purchase and exchange sales under 16 U.S.C. 839c(c)(1) shall be $145,000,000 for Fiscal Year 1997, and the net benefits paid to each eligible electric utility shall be $145,000,000 multiplied by the percentage of the total of such net benefits paid by the Administrator to such utility for Fiscal Year 1995.

(f) PERSONNEL FLEXIBILITY.—The Administrator may offer employees voluntary separation incentives as deemed necessary which shall not exceed $25,000. Recipients who accept employment with the United States within five years after separation shall repay the entire amount to the Bonneville Power Administration.

(g) SAVINGS.—Unless superseded by an Act of Congress, the authority provided by this section is expressly intended to extend beyond the fiscal year.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 509. Section 7 of the Magnetic Fusion Energy Engineering Act (42 U.S.C. 9396) is repealed.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert: *510*; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN T. MYERS,
HAROLD ROGERS,
JOE KNOLLENBERG,
FRANK RIGGS,
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN,
JIM BUNN,
BOB LIVINGSTON,
TOM BEVILL,
VIC FAZIO,
JIM CHAPMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
THAD COCHRAN,
SLADE GORTON,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
ROBERT F. BENNETT,
CONRAD BURNS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
FRITZ HOLLINGS,
HARRY REID,
BOB KERREY,
PATTY MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effects of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The language and allocations set forth in House Report 104–149 and Senate Report 104–120 should be complied with unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the conference report and statement of the managers. Report language included by the House which is not changed by the report of the Senate or the conference, and Senate report language which is not changed by the conference is approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein. In cases in which the House or Senate have directed the submission of a report, such report is to be submitted to both House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activates of the Corps of Engineers. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $121,767,000 for General Investigations instead of $129,906,000 as proposed by the House and $126,323,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are aware that there is existing authority for the Corps of Engineers to maintain the Dog River in Alabama from the Mobile Harbor Ship Channel to 2,600 feet west of the Alabama Highway 163 bridge. The river has severe siltation west of that point and is not navigable during low tide. From within available funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to use $200,000 to initiate a reconnaissance study of that portion of the Dog River.

The conference agreement includes $150,000 for the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Palm Beach County, Florida, project, Using these funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to perform a reevaluation study of the authorized navigation improvements along the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway in Palm Beach County.

The conference agreement includes $6,205,000 for the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway study, the same as the budget request. The purpose of this study is to address the need for navigation capacity expansion on the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway. The conferees believe that the environmental component of the study should be limited to any impacts associated with expanding the capacity of the two systems. Therefore, the conferees direct

the Corps of Engineers to not expand the scope of the study such that its total cost exceeds that presented in the current Project Management Plan. In addition, because of the need for a timely review of future navigation needs on the upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway, the conferees direct the Corps to expedite work on the study and ensure that the Division Engineer's public notice on the feasibility report is issued no later than December of 1999.

The Secretary of the Army is directed to initiate a general reevaluation report for the Truckee Meadows Flood Control project, Nevada, authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1988. Of the $400,000 provided in the conference agreement for the Lower Truckee River, Nevada, project, $50,000 is appropriated for this investigation. The report will consider additional flood protection at and below Reno, Nevada, through levee/channel improvements, local impoundments, and potential reoperation of existing reservoirs in the watershed. The report will also consider the potential for environmental restoration along the Truckee River and tributaries in the Reno-Sparks area.

The conference agreement includes $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, to continue the feasibility study for lake stabilization in the Devils Lake Basin of North Dakota as described in Public Law 102–377. The conferees expect the Corps of Engineers to expedite planning for emergency mitigation measures including emergency outlet options to the Sheyenne River, upper basin storage, and enhanced diking. The Corps of Engineers shall make its recommendations to the Congress for upper basin storage and enhanced diking by March 1, 1996, and shall report on the status of the lake stabilization study by September 30, 1996.

The conference agreement includes $559,000 for the Army Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Noyo Harbor Breakwater, California, project. The conferees are aware of a proposal to utilize prefabricated steel structures in lieu of a stone breakwater, at considerably less cost than the $22,900,000 now projected. Furthermore, the structures can be fitted to generate electricity. The potential for reduced construction costs, together with the ancillary benefit of wave power generation, would facilitate local cost sharing. The conferees, therefore, direct that the funds be utilized for efforts to validate the viability of using these structures to serve as breakwaters, including modeling.

The conference agreement includes the following amounts for Coordination Studies With Other Agencies: Cooperation With Other Agencies, $480,000; Section 22 Planning Assistance to States, $2,000,000; Special Investigations, $3,400,000; Gulf of Mexico Program, $300,000; Interagency Water Resources Development, $1,000,000; National Estuary Program, $180,000; North American Waterfowl Management Plan, $180,000; and $380,000 for the Pacific Northwest Forest Case Study as described in the Senate Report.

Within the funds available for the Flood Plain Management Services Program, the conferees have provided $100,000 for a study along the Jacks Defeat Creek watershed in Monroe County, Indiana.

The conference agreement includes $30,432,000 for Corps of Engineers research and development activities. Included in this total is $23,732,000 for the Corps' base research and development program; $1,900,000 for evaluation of environmental investments; $2,000,000 for earthquake engineering; $1,000,000 for zebra mussel control; $1,500,000 for the characterization and restoration of wetlands; and $300,000 for the continuation of the Construction Technology Transfer Project between the Corps of Engineers' research institutions and Indiana State University.

Amendment No. 2: The conference agreement includes language providing $375,000 for the Norco Bluffs, California, project, as provided for in the House and Senate bills; restores House language stricken by the Senate for the Ohio River Greenway, Indiana, project amended to provide $500,000 instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House; includes language proposed by the Senate for the Kentucky Lock and Dam, Kentucky, project amended to provide $2,000,000 instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; restores House language stricken by the Senate providing $300,000 for the Mussers Dam, Pennsylvania, project; and includes language proposed by the Senate providing $300,000 for the West Virginia Port Development, West Virginia, project. The conference agreement also deletes language contained in the House and Senate bills providing funds for the Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana, project. Funding for this project has been included under Construction, General.

The conference agreement also includes language for a watershed study in the vicinity of Hazard, Kentucky, using previously appropriated funds. The Corps of Engineers is directed to prepare a reconnaissance level study addressing flood control, water supply and water quality needs as well as opportunities for environmental restoration in the Upper Kentucky River basin. In particular, the Corps is directed to evaluate the potential to reallocate excess storage in existing Corps lakes and alternatives thereto, for the purpose of providing additional water supply capability to meet expanding regional needs.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $804,573,000 for Construction, General instead of $807,846,000 as proposed by the House and $778,456,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees understand that the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works determined on September 1, 1995, that the Army Corps of Engineers will cost share the project for design deficiency correction of the Klamath-Glen Levee in Del Norte County, California, under the same financial terms as the original construction. This is in accordance with the technical conclusions of the Initial Appraisal Report of the San Francisco District Engineer, entitled ''Terwer Creek Erosion, Klamath-Glen Levee, Klamath River, Del Norte County, California'', March 1994. In view of this determination, and so that the necessary repairs can begin as quickly as possible, the Secretary of the Army is directed to utilize funds appropriated in this or prior appropriations Acts for the project.

The Corps of Engineers may allocate up to $150,000 of the funds provided for the Central and Southern Florida Project Review Study or from other sources, for the purpose of initiating a study to determine whether the construction of a wastewater reuse facility in Dade County, Florida, should be incorporated within the overall project authorization upon receipt of necessary approval. Such reuse facility would be intended to increase the supply of surface water to the Everglades system and Everglades National Park, in turn benefiting recreation and enhancing fish and wildlife.

The conference agreement includes $78,800,000 for the Columbia River Juvenile Fish Mitigation, Washington and Oregon, program as proposed by the Senate instead of $68,800,000 as proposed by the House. Of the funds provided, $1,000,000 is available for advanced planning and design for public and private facilities affected by the operation of the John Day project at minimum pool levels. The conferees share the concern of both the Senate and the House regarding the costs and justification for the John Day drawdown as an effective method for salmon recovery. To date, the conferees have not been provided with any scientific evidence supporting the drawdown; therefore, the Administration is directed to provide scientific justification of the project as an effective means of salmon recovery along with any further requests for funding. Considering the extraordinary cost of completing this project, if the Administration does not find significant benefits, the proposal should be abandoned altogether. The conferees also note that the mitigation necessary to lower John Day Reservoir to minimum operating pool will require specific authorization from Congress.

The conferees understand that rapid and substantial improvement in fish passage in the Federal Columbia River power system is a high priority. Accordingly, the conferees direct the Secretary of the Army to independently evaluate annually the performance of the Corps of Engineers in achieving improvements in fish passage and to provide these evaluations to the Committees on Appropriations. The conferees further direct the Corps and the Bonneville Power Administration, in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, to develop a set of recommendations for improving the system by which fish passage improvements are designed, tested and implemented at the Federal projects. These improvements should seek to shorten the time requirements, reduce the costs, and improve the biological success of fish passage projects. The Corps and BPA should submit these recommendations to the Committees on Appropriations within six months of enactment of this Act and should proceed to implement immediately reforms for which they have the authority.

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to design and construct a Regional Visitors Center in the vicinity of Shreveport, Louisiana, to provide information to the public on the Red River Basin, national and local water resources development of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Red River Waterway Project. The Regional Visitors Center is to be constructed using funds appropriated for construction of the Red River Waterway Project, and will be operated and maintained using funds appropriated for operation and maintenance of the waterway.

The conferees wish to emphasize their continued support for the Corps of Engineers Continuing Authorities Programs. These programs, which require only modest amounts of budgetary resources, have proven to be of great value and are particularly important to many small communities throughout the Nation. Therefore, the conferees direct the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to continue the planning, engineering, and design of projects under all of the continuing authorities programs whether or not they will be approved for construction by the end of fiscal year 1996, initiate new projects under normal procedures for the continuing authorities programs, and continue budgeting these programs in fiscal year 1997 and beyond.

For the Emergency Streambank and Erosion Control (Section 14) program, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to undertake the projects identified in the House Report. In addition, the conference agreement includes $242,000 for the project to provide erosion protection for the Russell-Allison Levee along the Wabash River in Lawrence County, Illinois, and $325,000 for repair of the Ohio River levee in Marietta, Ohio. For the Small Flood Control Projects (Section 205)

program, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to undertake the projects identified in the House and Senate Reports. In addition, the conference agreement including $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a feasibility study to control flooding at the town of Sumava Resorts, Indiana, and $65,000 for a feasibility study of the Bellepoint floodwall, Frankfort, Kentucky, project. For the Small Beach Erosion Control (Section 103) program, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to undertake the Aqua Hedionda Lagoon project in Carlsbad, California, as described in the House Report. For the Project Modifications for the Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135) program, the conference agreement includes funds for the projects identified in the House Report and also includes $100,000 for the St. Paul Harbor, Alaska, project and $370,000 for the Valdez Harbor, Alaska, project. For the Small Navigation Projects (Section 107) program, the conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for the Ouizinkie Harbor, Alaska, project, $500,000 for the Larsen Bay Harbor, Alaska, project, $200,000 for the Williamsburg, Alaska project, and $250,000 for the Tatitlik Harbor, Alaska, project.

Amendment No. 4: The conference agreement includes language in the bill for the following projects, which were funded at the same level in the House and Senate bills: Sacramento River Flood Control Project (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), California ($300,000); Harlan, Kentucky ($12,000,000); Williamsburg, Kentucky ($4,100,000); Middlesboro, Kentucky ($1,600,000); Salyersville, Kentucky ($500,000); Glen Foerd, Pennsylvania ($200,000); Wallisville, Texas ($5,000,000); and Red River Emergency Bank. Protection, Arkansas and Louisiana ($6,600,000).

The conference agreement restores House language stricken by the Senate providing funds for the San Timoteo Creek feature of the Santa Ana River Mainstem, California, project ($5,000,000), and the Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana, project, ($1,500,000).

The conference agreement provides $13,348,000 for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana, project instead of $11,848,000 as proposed by the House and $11,838,000 as proposed by the Senate, provides $2,500,000 for the Red River below Denison Dam, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, project instead of $3,800,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provides $4,100,000 for the Broad Top Region, Pennsylvania, project as proposed by the House instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides $3,800,000 for repair and extension of the Homer Spit, Alaska, project; provides $6,000,000 for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas, project, of which $4,900,000 is for the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam; provides $700,000 for the Arkansas City, Kansas project and waives section 902 of Public Law 99–662; provides $670,000 for the Winfield, Kansas, project; provides $2,300,000 for the Ouachita River Levees, Louisiana, project; provides $710,000 for the Roughans Point, Massachusetts, project; provides $850,000 for the Marshall, Minnesota, project; provides $1,000,000 for the Ste. Genevieve, Missouri, project, provides; $1,100,000 for the Virginia Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection, Virginia, project; provides $2,000,000 for the Hatfield Bottom, West Virginia, project; provides $2,000,000 for the Upper Mingo, West Virginia, project; and provides that $1,120,000 shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for performing operation and maintenance activities at the Columbia River Fishing Access Sites to be constructed in Oregon and Washington.

The conferees have also included language in the bill that directs the Secretary of the Army to acquire all or part of the Little Holland Tract in California for wetlands restoration and waterfowl and fishery habitat enhancement and/or mitigation purposes conditioned on a determination made by the Secretary that acquisition is in the Federal interest; and language that provides $3,500,000 for the South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Restoration project.

The conferees are aware of the need for continued emergency construction on the Red River between Index, Arkansas, and Shreveport, Louisiana. However, due to bank caving problems that may be induced by the previously funded Sulfur Revetment now under construction, the conference agreement includes $6,600,000 to initiate and complete design and construction of the Canale Revetment in lieu of the Dickson Revetment.

The conferees direct the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to extend the levee identified in Plan B of the approved draft specific project report for Williamsburg, Kentucky, dated April 1993, by approximately 2,000 feet upstream using funds provided for this project.

For the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection) project, the conference agreement includes an additional $4,000,000 to continue construction of parallel protection along the Orleans and London Avenue outfall canals, and an additional $1,500,000 for the project to intercept and convey landside runoff from Jefferson Parish lakefront levees. The conferees agree that the landside runoff project is not a separable element of the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection) project and direct that future budget requests for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection) project include funding for landside runnoff.

The amount provided for the Red River below Denison Dam project includes $500,000 to continue the Bowie County Levee, Texas, portion of the project. The conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to continue to prepare plans and specifications for restoration or replacement of the Bowie County Levee as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946 for incorporation into the Federal levee system to provide the same level of protection as the adjoining Miller County Levee in Arkansas under the terms and conditions of section 3 of the Flood Control Act of 1936, Public Law 74–738.

The funds to be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for Columbia River Fishing Access Sites provide for the capitalized operation and maintenance costs for phase I sites. In addition, the conference agreement includes $600,000 for engineering and design of an additional six Bonneville pool sites planned under phase II.

On September 22, 1995, the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works advised the House and Senate Committees of a proposal to enter into a Section 215 agreement with the city of Arkansas City, Kansas, to provide for a credit toward the local contribution for certain work to be performed by the city in connection with the authorized Arkansas City flood control project. The conferees have no objection to that proposal and the Secretary may immediately execute the agreement with the understanding that the credit will not exceed the statutory limit of Section 215 of Public Law 90–483, as amended.

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

Due to the severe budgetary situation, the conference agreement includes; $307,885,000 for the Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, project, which is the same as the amount provided by the House and the Senate and $11,365,000 below the budget request. At the same time, the conferees recognize the importance of this project to the Nation. The conferees agree that the reductions made to the individual features within the Mississippi River and Tributaries project were made without prejudice and expect the Corps of Engineers to manage the project, including the reprogramming of funds where necessary, to derive the maximum benefit from the funds provided.

The conferees are aware that the Corps of Engineers no longer requires the use of lands in the Vidalia, Louisiana, area previously used for casting and storage of articulated concrete mats used for construction of the Mississippi River and Tributaries project. In the interest of public safety and environmental restoration, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to use up to $900,000 of the funds available for the Mississippi River and Tributaries project to return lands to acceptable environmental condition now that the casting operations have ceased.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $1,703,697,000 for Operation and Maintenance, General instead of $1,712,123,000 as proposed by the House and $1,696,998,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees recognize that flooding in the wake of Typhoon Oscar, which resulted in a Presidential disaster declaration in Southcentral Alaska, devastated the harbor at Seward, Alaska, just as the winter season was approaching. The Corps of Engineers is, therefore, encouraged to expedite work using available funds, including such contractual economies of effort with the City of Seward and the State of Alaska as are necessary in the judgment of the District Engineer, to restore full use to the port and port facilities impacted by the flooding.

The conference agreement includes $280,000 for the Pearl River, Mississippi and Louisiana, project, the same as the budget request. These funds are to be used to maintain the project in caretaker status and correct any safety problems, including lighting and boat trolley system improvements, at Pool's Bluff Sill and other lock locations.

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

Amendment No. 6: Provides $5,926,000 for the Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania, project as proposed by the House instead of $3,426,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Inserts language proposed by the Senate which directs the Secretary of the Army to maintain a minimum conservation pool of 475.5 feet at the Wister Lake, Oklahoma, project.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

The conferees agree wit the language contained in the House and Senate Reports for the Regulatory Program of the Corps of Engineers. In addition, the conferees understand that the Corps of Engineers has under review an application by the City of East Chicago, Indiana, for the construction of a breakwater in Lake Michigan. The conferees expect the Corps to work with the city toward an expeditious resolution to the permitting process.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $151,500,000 for General Expenses instead of $150,000,000 as proposed by the House and $153,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and provides that the funds shall remain available until expended as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate limiting the funds available for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers with an amendment providing that not to exceed $62,000,000 shall be available for that purpose instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10: Inserts language proposed by the Senate which provides that the plan for reducing the number of division offices which the Secretary of the Army is directed to develop and submit to the Congress shall be submitted to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and amends language contained in the House and Senate bills which provides that the division office plan shall not change the function of any district office by adding the words ''any civil'' before ''function''. This amendment is necessary to clarify that it is not the intent of the conferees to prohibit the Corps of Engineers from making necessary adjustments in mission and function of districts handling military construction to accommodate the shrinking military workload.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Amendment No. 11: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which provides that the Corps of Engineers shall advertise for competitive bid at least 7,500,000 cubic yards of the hopper dredge volume accomplished with Government-owned dredges in fiscal year 1992 and which further provides that none of the funds available to the Corps of Engineers may be used to undertake improvements or major repair of the hopper dredge McFARLAND and inserts similar language proposed by the Senate. The Senate language differs from the House language in that it permits the Corps of Engineers to expend funds to maintain the McFARLAND's current operational condition and in that it includes an additional subsection relating to the use of the four Corps of Engineers hopper dredges, which has been amended by the conference agreement to provide that if any of the Corps' hopper dredges is removed from normal service for repair or rehabilitation, the Secretary of the Army shall not significantly alter the operating schedules of the remaining dredges.

Amendment No. 12: Inserts language proposed by the Senate which provides that none of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise available to the Corps of Engineers may be used for activities associated with moving the Corps' headquarters office to the Southeast Federal Center with an amendment which clarifies that this limitation on the use of funds does not apply to the use of funds required to process any Department of the Army permits, and makes technical corrections to Section 102, which modifies the authorization for the Manistique Harbor, Michigan, project.

Amendment No. 13: Inserts language proposed by the Senate which modifies the authorization for the Petersburg, West Virginia, project by increasing the total estimated cost to $26,600,000, with an estimated first Federal cost of $19,195,000 and an estimated first non-Federal cost of $7,405,000.

Amendment No. 14: Inserts language proposed by the Senate which authorizes the Secretary of the Army to accept from a non-Federal sponsor additional lands, not to exceed 300 acres, at the Cooper Lake and Channels, Texas, project and further authorizes the Secretary, upon acceptance of those lands, to redesignate an amount of mitigation lands, not to exceed 300 acres, to recreation purposes. The amendment also provides that the lands accepted from the non-Federal sponsor shall provide habitat value at least equal to that provided by the lands redesignated to recreation purposes and that all costs of work to be undertaken pursuant to the amendment shall be borne by the donating sponsor.

Amendment No. 15: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which directs the Secretary of the Army to take such actions as are necessary to obtain and maintain an elevation of 977 feet above sea level at the Lake Traverse, South Dakota and Minnesota, project and inserts the new sections described below.

Section 106 authorizes the Secretary of the Army to undertake the Indianapolis, Indiana, project authorized by Section 5 of Public Law 74–738 as modified to include certain riverfront alterations as described in the Corps of Engineers Central Indianapolis Waterfront Concept Master Plan, dated February, 1994. Non-Federal funds expended on or after the date of the Corps of Engineers report on items and outlined for construction in the Corps' document shall be applied to the non-Federal cost-sharing requirements.

Section 107 modifies section 313 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, the South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Restoration Infrastructure and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program. The modification includes changes to the consultation requirements to reflect a revised geographic scope, an increase in the authorized funding level, and several technical changes. The conferees have also included $3,500,000 under the Construction, General account to accomplish high priority work under the section 313 authority.

Section 108 authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Army to proceed with engineering, design, and construction of projects to provide for flood control and improvements to rainfall drainage systems in Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Tammany Parishes in Louisiana. The conferees are aware of the disastrous floods due to torrential rainfalls that occurred in southeast Louisiana in May of 1995, which resulted in the loss of seven lives, inundation of over 35,000 homes, and estimated property and infrastructure losses exceeding $3,000,000,000. This event produced the second highest number of flood insurance claims ever for a flood event. In addition, between 1978 and 1989, flood insurance claims for this area totaled $227,000,000. Therefore, because of the urgent need to prevent such disasters from recurring, the conferees have directed the Secretary of the Army to proceed immediately with economically justified flood control improvements that have been identified in reports of the Corps of Engineers' New Orleans District Engineer. No further feasibility studies are required for the projects authorized in this section. The conferees intend that the cost-sharing requirement. Between the Federal and non-Federal interests be consistent with the provisions for flood control and hurricane protection projects, as appropriate, in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, except that the non-Federal sponsor shall receive credit, as part of the non-Federal share of the cost of these projects, for any work accomplished subsequent to those reports as determined by the Secretary of the Army to be a compatible and integral part of the projects. The projects include, but are not limited to, pumping station and channel improvements in Jefferson and Orleans Parishes, channel improvements along Mile Creek in Covington, hurricane protection along the Lake Pontchartrain shoreline in Mandeville, and hurricane protection and improved drainage in the Schneider Canal area in Slidell. An amount of $25,000,000 has been authorized for the Corps to proceed with work on these projects.

Section 109 directs the Secretary of the Army to convey land at the Dewey Lake, Kentucky, project to the City of Prestonburg, Kentucky, for the development of public use recreational facilities and to further regional economic development.

Amendment No. 16: Inserts language proposed by the Senate which authorizes the Secretary of the Army to undertake the Coos Bay, Oregon, project in accordance with the Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 30, 1994, at a total cost of $14,541,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $10,777,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,764,000, and changes the section number.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ALABAMA				
(N)	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE L&D, AL	238,000	---	238,000	---
	ALASKA				
(N)	ANIAK, AK	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK	208,000	---	208,000	---
(SPE)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, AK	200,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	---	237,000	---	237,000
(N)	COOK INLET, AK	70,000	---	70,000	---
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK	---	186,000	---	186,000
(N)	KUSKOKWIM RIVER, AK	175,000	---	175,000	---
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	200,000	---	280,000	---
(N)	NORTHERN SEA ROUTE, AK	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	100,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	WRANGELL, AK	---	---	175,000	---
	ARIZONA				
(RCP)	ALAMO LAKE, ARIZONA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, N SCOTTSDALE DRAINAGE AREA	400,000	---	450,000	---
	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, GILLESPIE DAM TO YUMA, AZ	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, TORTOLITA DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	200,000	---	300,000	---
	RIO DE FLAG, AZ	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	RIO SALADO, SALT RIVER, AZ	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	180,000	---	180,000	---
	ARKANSAS				
	ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEE, PLUM BAYOU, AR	---	---	300,000	---
	ARKANSAS RIVER, TUCKER CREEK, AR	---	---	280,000	---
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	MCKINNEY BAYOU, AR & TX	450,000	---	450,000	---
	CALIFORNIA				
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000
(SPE)	CENTRAL BASIN GROUNDWATER PROJECT, CA	375,000	---	375,000	---
	CITY OF ARCADIA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE RESTORATION, CA	---	---	300,000	---
(SP)	CITY OF ENCINITAS, CA	169,000	---	169,000	---
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY (DEEPENING), CA	---	410,000	---	410,000
	IMPERIAL COUNTY WATERSHED, CA	---	---	150,000	---
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(HANSEN & LOPEZ DAMS), CA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(WHITTIER NARROWS & SANTA FE DAM	460,000	---	460,000	---
(SP)	MALIBU COASTAL AREA, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	234,000	---	234,000	150,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, C	200,000	---	200,000	---
	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO RIVER FISH MIGRATION, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, WINTERS & VICINITY, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	---	787,000	---	787,000
	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	---	---	200,000	---
(N)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	250,000	---	250,000	---
	NORCO BLUFFS, CA	---	---	375,000	---
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (BREAKWATER), CA	---	559,000	---	559,000
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	---	500,000	---	500,000
	PENINSULA BEACH, CA	---	---	200,000	---
(N)	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	225,000	---	225,000	---
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA	---	750,000	---	750,000
	RUSSIAN RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, LITTLE HOLLAND TRACT,	290,000	---	290,000	---
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, PROSPECT ISLAND, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, WESTERN DELTA TRACT	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA	150,000	---	250,000	---
(SP)	SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CITIES OF OCEANSIDE AND CALSBAD, CA.	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY BAR CHANNEL, CA	240,000	---	---	---
(SP)	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, OCEAN BEACH, CA	125,000	---	125,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, ARROYO PASAJERO (FRESNO CO),	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALIENTE CREEK STREAM GROUP,	171,000	---	171,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FIREBAUGH AND MENDOTA, CA	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER, CA	40,000	---	40,000	200,000
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STRMS	500,000	---	500,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	---	---	400,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	---	---	200,000	---
	SAN JUAN AND ALISO CREEKS, CA	---	---	150,000	---
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	SAN RAFAEL CANAL, CA	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS, CA	81,000	---	81,000	---
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FDP)	SEVEN OAKS AND PRADO DAMS WATER CONSERVATION, CA	265,000	---	265,000	---
(N)	SF BAY, LEONARD RANCH (DISPOSAL), CA	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	SOUTHAMPTON SHOAL CHANNEL, CA	240,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	285,000	---	285,000	---
	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	---	---	300,000	---
	VENTURA AND SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	370,000	---	370,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	CONNECTICUT				
(FDP)	CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING, CT.....	65,000	---	65,000	---
	DELAWARE				
(N)	C&D CANAL - BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEP	57,000	---	57,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ.....	880,000	---	880,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	145,000	---	145,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, DE, NJ, & PA...	---	780,000	---	780,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
(FC)	WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY.....	---	200,000	---	200,000
	FLORIDA				
	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WW, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	---	150,000
(SP)	BREVARD COUNTY, FL.....	107,000	---	107,000	---
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA STUDY, FL.....	750,000	---	650,000	---
(SP)	DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, FL.....	112,000	---	112,000	---
(N)	HILLSBORO INLET, FL.....	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	414,000	---	414,000	---
	LIDO SARASOTA BEACH, FL.....	---	---	100,000	---
(BE)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL.....	---	415,000	---	415,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL.....	---	285,000	---	285,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL.....	233,000	---	233,000	---
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL.....	---	400,000	---	400,000
	GEORGIA				
(SPE)	ATLANTA WATERSHED STUDY, GA.....	350,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC.....	25,000	---	25,000	---
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC.....	---	250,000	---	250,000
(RCP)	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK & DAM, GA.....	130,000	---	---	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXTENSION, GA.....	332,000	---	332,000	---
	HAWAII				
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI.....	---	170,000	---	170,000
(N)	MAUI SECOND HARBOR, MAUI, HI.....	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI.....	200,000	---	200,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ILLINOIS				
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	175,000	---	175,000	---
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	362,000	---	362,000	---
(RDP)	FREEPORT, IL	108,000	---	108,000	---
(FC)	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	---	150,000	---	150,000
(RCP)	SNY ISLAND, IL	248,000	---	248,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTHEAST CHICAGO, IL	200,000	---	200,000	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	6,205,000	---	6,205,000	---
(RDP)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	25,000	---	25,000	---
	INDIANA				
(FDP)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	55,000	---	55,000	200,000
(FDP)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN, CALUMET TOWNSHIP, IN	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN, DYER, IN	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION (INDIANA SHORELINE), IN	275,000	---	---	---
	OHIO RIVER GREENWAY, IN	---	---	---	500,000
(FDP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, IN & IL (MIDDLE REAC	153,000	---	228,000	---
	IOWA				
(FDP)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, IA, IL & MO	50,000	---	50,000	---
	KANSAS				
(FDP)	GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER, KS	---	---	500,000	---
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, KS	475,000	---	475,000	---
(RCP)	SALINA, KS	200,000	---	200,000	---
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	111,000	---	111,000	---
(RCP)	WILSON LAKE, KS	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	---	670,000	---	---
	KENTUCKY				
	GREEN RIVER LOCK AND DAM NO. 6	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM ADDITION, KY	---	---	---	2,000,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, KY & IN	---	1,487,000	---	---
	METROPOLITAN LEXINGTON, FAYETTE COUNTY, KY	---	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	270,000	---	270,000	---
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, NORTHERN KENTUCKY,	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	UNIONTOWN/OHIO RIVER MAINSTEM STUDY, KY, IL & IN	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	LOUISIANA				
	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	BAYOU BARTHOLOMEW, LA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	---	160,000	---	160,000
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	---	900,000	---	900,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	34,000	---	234,000	---
(N)	LAKE CHARLES SHIP CHAN, BY-PASS AND GEN ANCHORAGE AREA	47,000	---	587,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, LA	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET BANK EROSION, LA	25,000	---	25,000	---
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	60,000	---	60,000	---
(N)	PORT FOURCHON, LA	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	WEST BANK - EAST OF HARVEY CANAL, LA	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
	WEST SHORE - LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	---	---	500,000	---
	MARYLAND				
(FC)	ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	450,000	---	450,000	---
(SPE)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESS, MD &.	300,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES & CHANNELS, MD	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD	291,000	---	291,000	---
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES STUDY, MD	500,000	---	500,000	---
(SPE)	CHESAPEAKE BAY TIME VARIABLE MODEL, MD, VA, PA & DC	335,000	---	335,000	---
(RCP)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE - REALLOCATION, MD & VA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SPE)	LOWER EASTERN SHORE, MD & DE	250,000	---	---	---
(N)	OCEAN CITY, MD AND VICINITY	850,000	---	850,000	---
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER WATER RESOURCES, MD	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	300,000	---	150,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(FDP)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI	300,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	---	185,000	---	185,000
	MICHIGAN				
	SAULT STE MARIE, MI	---	---	---	200,000
	MINNESOTA				
(FDP)	CROOKSTON, MN	150,000	---	150,000	---
(SPE)	POMME DE TERRE RIVER - MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY, MN	75,000	---	---	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	MISSISSIPPI				
(FDP)	HANCOCK, HARRISON AND JACKSON COUNTIES, MS	62,000	---	62,000	---
	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS	---	---	---	1,299,000
(N)	LOWNDES COUNTY PORT BARGE FLEETING AREA, MS	100,000	---	100,000	---
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	10,000	---	10,000
	FABIUS RIVER DRAINAGE DISTRICT, MO	---	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	ST LOUIS REGION, MO	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	144,000	---	144,000	---
	NEBRASKA				
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER & TRIBS, NE	441,000	---	441,000	---
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	---	200,000	---	200,000
	NEVADA				
(FDP)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, NV	---	---	400,000	---
	NEW JERSEY				
	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG INLET, NJ	---	---	550,000	---
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	115,000	---	115,000	---
(SP)	GREAT EGG INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ	290,000	---	290,000	---
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS - CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ	---	963,000	---	963,000
(SP)	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	290,000	---	290,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HBR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, CLAREMONT TERMINAL	---	400,000	---	400,000
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY (CLIFFWOOD BEACH), NJ	52,000	---	52,000	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	620,000	---	620,000	---
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	---	3,600,000	---	3,600,000
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	25,000	---	300,000	---
(SPE)	STONY BROOK, PRINCETON TOWNSHIP, NJ	250,000	---	---	---
(SP)	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	80,000	---	80,000	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(FDP)	ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	118,000	---	118,000	---
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, EL PASO AND VICINITY, NM	---	200,000	---	200,000
(SPE)	RIO DE CHAMA, ABIQUIU DAM TO ESPANOLA, NM	232,000	---	232,000	---
(FDP)	ROCKY ARROYO/DARK CANYON, PECOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES,	45,000	---	45,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	NEW YORK				
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL - HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	---	400,000	---	800,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK, NY	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	350,000	---	350,000	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	195,000	---	195,000	---
(BE)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	---	525,000	---	525,000
(N)	MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	250,000	---	---	---
(SP)	MONTAUK POINT, NY	125,000	---	125,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	26,000	---	26,000	---
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	95,000	---	95,000	---
(N)	RARITAN BAY ANCHORAGES, NY AND NJ CHANNELS, NY & NJ	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	REYNOLD'S CHANNEL AND NEW YORK STATE BOAT CHANNEL, NY.	170,000	---	170,000	---
(SP)	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	30,000	---	330,000	---
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD.	290,000	---	290,000	---
(SP)	YONKERS SHORELINE, NY	332,000	---	332,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR - NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC	400,000	---	400,000	---
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	290,000	---	290,000	---
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, CHANNEL WIDENING, NC	---	570,000	---	570,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	125,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND	225,000	---	225,000	---
	OHIO				
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH, KY.	---	300,000	---	300,000
	OKLAHOMA				
(FDP)	CIMARRON RIVER AND TRIBS, OK, NM, CO, & KS	350,000	---	---	---
(RCP)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	100,000	---	---	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	OREGON				
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA..	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FDP)	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR.....	55,000	---	55,000	---
(FDP)	JOHNSON CREEK, OR.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MIDDLE FORK WILLAMETTE FISHERY RESTORATION, OR.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH SANTIAM FISHERY RESTORATION, OR.....	35,000	---	35,000	---
(SPE)	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR.....	500,000	---	500,000	---
(MP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR.....	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FC)	CHARTIERS CREEK, PA.....	---	570,000	---	570,000
(COM)	CONEMAUGH RIVER BASIN, PA.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	JUNIATA RIVER BASIN, PA.....	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	MILTON, PA.....	15,000	---	15,000	---
	MUSSERS DAM, MIDDLE CREEK, SNYDER CO, PA.....	---	---	---	300,000
(RCP)	YOUGHIOGHENY LAKE - SEC 216.....	250,000	---	200,000	---
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR.....	---	281,000	---	281,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR.....	---	453,000	---	453,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING/WIDENING).....	158,000	---	158,000	---
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS, SC.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	WACCAMAW RIVER, SC.....	300,000	---	---	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD.....	---	390,000	---	390,000
(SPE)	JAMES RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL, SD.....	10,000	---	10,000	---
(FC)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD.....	---	20,000	---	20,000
	TENNESSEE				
	BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLAND SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN...	---	---	---	200,000
(FDP)	METRO CENTER LEVEE, DAVIDSON CO, NASHVILLE, TN.....	400,000	---	400,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	TEXAS				
	ALPINE, TX	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	500,000	---	500,000
(RDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES - ADDICKS & BARKER RESERVO	50,000	---	50,000	---
	COLONIAS ALONG U.S. - MEXICO BORDER, TX	---	---	---	300,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX	---	300,000	---	300,000
(SPE)	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	---	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	GIWW - ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	---	750,000	---	750,000
(RDP)	GIWW - HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX (SECTION 216)	300,000	---	300,000	---
(RCP)	GIWW - PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	150,000	---	---	---
(RDP)	GIWW-CC BAY TO PORT ISABEL, TX AA642	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(N)	NECHES RIVER & TRIBS SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX	30,000	---	30,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	900,000	---	900,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	304,000	---	304,000	---
	UTAH				
	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	---	---	450,000	---
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	---	100,000	---	100,000
	VIRGIN ISLANDS				
(RDP)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI	150,000	---	150,000	---
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, POQUOSON, VA	---	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	EASTERN SHORE, ACCOMACK AND NORTHAMPTON COUNTIES, VA	248,000	---	248,000	---
(RCP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	350,000	---	250,000	---
(SPE)	NANSEMOND RIVER BASIN, SUFFOLK, VA	370,000	---	370,000	---
(BE)	SANDBRIDGE, VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	---	470,000	---	470,000
	WASHINGTON				
(SPE)	CHIEF JOSEPH POOL RAISE, WA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(COM)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER, WA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM (ADDITIONAL STORAGE), WA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(RDP)	MOUNT ST HELENS ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, WA	15,000	---	---	---
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	98,000	---	98,000	---
(COM)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	200,000	---	200,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FDP)	CHEAT RIVER BASIN, WV	65,000	---	65,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	703,000	---	703,000	---
(N)	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV	---	5,319,000	---	5,319,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER WATERFRONT, WV	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTOR, WV &.	275,000	---	275,000	---
	TYGART RIVER BASIN, WV	---	---	400,000	---
	TYGART RIVER BASIN (BARBOUR COUNTY), WV	---	---	400,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA PORT DEVELOPMENT, WV	---	---	300,000	---
	WYOMING				
(FDP)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	270,000	---	270,000	---
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	3,605,000	---	2,600,000	---
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	4,000,000	---	3,600,000	---
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	14,790,000	---	7,920,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	160,000	---	---	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE PARTNERSHIPS	615,000	---	---	---
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	500,000	---	---	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	15,000,000	---	8,600,000	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SEC. 401)	---	---	500,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	770,000	---	700,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	500,000	---	500,000	---
	NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF WATER SUPPLY DEMAND AND AVAILAB	3,000,000	---	---	---
	NATIONAL DREDGING NEEDS STUDY OF PORTS AND HARBORS	909,000	---	450,000	---
	NATIONAL SPATIAL DATA INFRASTRUCTURE	2,050,000	---	---	---
	OHIO RIVER BASIN STUDY	---	---	500,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATEHER SERVICE)	550,000	---	400,000	---
	PRESIDENT'S CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN	600,000	---	---	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	400,000	---	300,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	40,574,000	---	30,432,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	350,000	---	175,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	770,000	---	770,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	950,000	---	950,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-26,988,000	---	-41,117,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	117,273,000	38,352,000	79,673,000	42,094,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA		
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	500,000	500,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	12,400,000	12,400,000
	ALASKA		
(N)	HOMER SPIT, REPAIR AND EXTENSION, AK	---	3,800,000
(N)	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	3,000,000	3,000,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	900,000	900,000
(FC)	HOLBROOK, AZ	2,261,000	2,261,000
(FC)	NOGALES WASH, AZ	75,000	75,000
(FC)	RILLITO RIVER, AZ	4,894,000	4,894,000
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	3,500,000	3,500,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR AR RVR NAV SYSTEM, LOCKS AND DAMS, AR	6,000,000	6,000,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR	---	6,600,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	8,100,000	8,100,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	11,367,000	11,367,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA	100,000	250,000
	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA RECONSTRUCTION, CA	---	500,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	700,000	700,000
	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	---	500,000
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	124,000	124,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	3,296,000	3,296,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	100,000	100,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA (DEF CORR)	100,000	100,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT (GCID), CA	---	300,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO URBAN AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	1,870,000	1,870,000
	SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, CA	---	1,900,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	800,000	800,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	70,249,000	70,249,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	300,000	2,300,000
(N)	SONOMA BAYLANDS WETLAND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, CA	500,000	500,000
(BE)	SURFSIDE - SUNSET - NEWPORT BEACH, CA	100,000	100,000
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	7,000,000	7,000,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	1,240,000	1,240,000
(E)	YOLO BASIN WETLANDS, SACRAMENTO RIVER, CA	720,000	720,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO	600,000	600,000
	FLORIDA		
	BROWARD COUNTY, FL	---	450,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	3,726,000	4,026,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, FL	1,300,000	1,300,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	2,590,000	2,590,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	600,000	600,000
(BE)	LEE COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT)	600,000	600,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	1,450,000	1,450,000
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	3,202,000	3,202,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	1,000,000	1,000,000
	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	---	3,000,000
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL	4,400,000	4,400,000
	ST JOHNS COUNTY (ST AUGUSTINE BEACH), FL	---	350,000
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	1,400,000	1,400,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	4,400,000	4,400,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	2,200,000	2,200,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	ILLINOIS		
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	3,700,000	3,700,000
(N)	FOUR LOCKS, ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL (MAJOR REHAB)	3,254,000	3,254,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	4,300,000	4,300,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	750,000	750,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	2,400,000	2,400,000
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL & KY	32,100,000	32,100,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL (DEF CORR)	300,000	300,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROG, IL, IA, MO, MN.	19,455,000	19,455,000
	INDIANA		
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	4,000,000	4,000,000
	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	1,500,000
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	---	2,000,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	5,000,000	5,000,000
	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION, IN	---	1,000,000
	IOWA		
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	700,000	700,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	5,700,000	5,700,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	125,000	125,000
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA	220,000	220,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	168,000	168,000
(FC)	WEST DES MOINES, DES MOINES, IA	4,040,000	4,040,000
	KANSAS		
	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	---	700,000
	WINFIELD, KS	---	670,000
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	FRANKFORT, SOUTH FRANKFORT, KY	2,623,000	2,623,000
	MCALPINE LOCK AND DAM, KY, IN	---	3,487,000
	SALYERSVILLE, KY	---	500,000
	LOUISIANA		
	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN STORM WATER DISCHARGE, LA	---	850,000
(FC)	ALOHA - RIGOLETTE, LA	2,379,000	2,379,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	7,848,000	13,348,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	1,440,000	1,440,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	3,200,000	3,200,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	3,360,000	3,360,000
	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA	---	2,300,000
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LA, AR, TX	---	2,500,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	16,673,000	16,673,000
	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	---	2,000,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	1,000,000	1,000,000
	MARYLAND		
	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD	---	339,000
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD	230,000	230,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
	ROUGHANS PT, REVERE, MA	---	710,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	990,000	990,000
	MICHIGAN		
	CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI	---	82,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	CHASKA, MN	3,740,000	3,740,000
	MARSHALL, MN	---	850,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,812,000	2,812,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	4,686,000	4,686,000
	MISSOURI		
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	9,600,000	9,600,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON, MO	200,000	200,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	5,700,000	4,700,000
	STE GENEVIEVE, MO	---	1,000,000
	NEBRASKA		
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	20,000	20,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	4,000,000	4,000,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	3,750,000	3,750,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	550,000	550,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND,NJ	70,000	70,000
(N)	SALEM RIVER, NJ	3,576,000	3,576,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	15,700,000	15,700,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM EMERGENCY GATES, NM	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	120,000	1,500,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	100,000	100,000
	NEW YORK		
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	6,100,000	6,100,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	10,400,000	10,400,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY &.	100,000	100,000
(FC)	NORTH ELLENVILLE, NY (DEF CORR)	4,015,000	4,015,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	AIWW - REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	6,500,000	5,600,000
(FC)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	3,300,000	3,300,000
(BE)	FORT FISHER, NC	2,094,000	2,094,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	200,000	200,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY)	4,700,000	4,700,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	853,000	853,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	500,000	500,000
	OHIO		
	HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	---	190,000
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	2,800,000	2,800,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK	4,400,000	4,400,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	530,000	530,000
	OREGON		
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE I, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	8,530,000	8,530,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	7,000,000	7,000,000
	COLUMBIA RIVER IN-LIEU INDIAN FISHING SITES, OR & WA	---	1,720,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	500,000	500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	PENNSYLVANIA		
	BROAD TOP REGION, PA	---	4,100,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	1,230,000	1,230,000
	GLEN FOERD, PA	---	200,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA	240,000	240,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	357,000	357,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 & 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	15,000,000	15,000,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	450,000	450,000
	SOUTH CENTRAL PENN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, PA	---	3,500,000
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK, PA	1,964,000	1,964,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	4,300,000	4,300,000
	PUERTO RICO		
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	12,451,000	12,451,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	250,000	250,000
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	7,000,000	7,000,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	17,000,000	17,000,000
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	CENTER HILL DAM, TN (DAM SAFETY)	904,000	904,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	BEALS CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX	1,916,000	1,916,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	3,100,000	3,100,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	400,000	400,000
(N)	GIWW - SARGENT BEACH, TX	20,000,000	20,000,000
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	110,000	110,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	3,500,000	3,500,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX (DAM SAFETY)	9,474,000	9,474,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	7,097,000	7,097,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX (DAM SAFETY)	300,000	300,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	---	5,000,000
	VIRGINIA		
(FC)	JAMES R OLIN FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, VA	7,400,000	7,400,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	600,000	600,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	400,000	400,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	---	1,100,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT)	925,000	925,000
	WASHINGTON		
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER, SOUTH ABERDEEN AND COSMOPOLIS, WA	1,377,000	1,377,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER JUVENILE FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	78,800,000	78,800,000
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	1,587,000	1,587,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	8,000,000	8,000,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	6,300,000	26,200,000
(FC)	MOOREFIELD, WV	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	PETERSBURG, WV	7,900,000	7,900,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	10,000,000	10,000,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV	11,840,000	11,840,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
	WISCONSIN		
	PORTAGE, WI	---	250,000
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	---	4,000,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	3,000,000	1,500,000
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING (SECTION 208)	500,000	300,000
	DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAM	2,000,000	2,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	10,000,000	7,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	18,984,000	18,984,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	22,000,000	17,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES	40,000	40,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES	185,000	185,000
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION (SECTION 111)	500,000	600,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	5,000,000	3,500,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	24,280,000	10,850,000
	WETLAND AND AQUATIC HABITAT CREATION	15,000,000	2,500,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-33,401,000	-62,201,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL	785,125,000	804,573,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
	SURVEYS:		
	GENERAL STUDIES:		
(FDP)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	500,000	500,000
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA, MS	1,800,000	1,800,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN	238,000	238,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	325,000	325,000
	PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:		
(FC)	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY), AR	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	LOWER WHITE RIVER, BIG CREEK & TRIBUTARIES, AR	200,000	200,000
	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA	---	100,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	5,263,000	5,363,000
	CONSTRUCTION		
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	63,090,000	61,000,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	580,000	580,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	32,450,000	30,000,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	11,294,000	11,294,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR	850,000	850,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	5,300,000	5,300,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	27,000,000	27,000,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, MS & LA	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	13,300,000	13,300,000
(FC)	HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBUTARIES (INCL COW PEN CREEK), MS	148,000	148,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(47,928,000)	(47,928,000)
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	8,920,000	8,920,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	22,000,000	22,000,000
(FC)	F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, MS	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	2,810,000	2,810,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	2,948,000	2,948,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	11,200,000	11,200,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	2,900,000	2,900,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	217,940,000	213,400,000
	MAINTENANCE		
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	61,825,000	56,000,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR	146,000	146,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR	115,000	115,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	5,630,000	5,630,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO	9,363,000	9,363,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	2,628,000	2,628,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	1,258,000	1,258,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	206,000	206,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	13,341,000	13,341,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR - DEVIL SWAMP, LA	150,000	150,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	87,000	87,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA	875,000	875,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	77,000	77,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, CAERNARVON, LA	415,000	415,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	4,821,000	4,821,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	2,740,000	2,740,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	258,000	258,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	223,000	223,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(22,638,000)	(22,638,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	2,012,000	2,012,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS	860,000	860,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS	4,329,000	4,329,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	1,390,000	1,390,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	1,135,000	1,135,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	474,000	474,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	529,000	529,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS	709,000	709,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	3,601,000	3,601,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN	1,415,000	1,415,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	1,368,000	1,368,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	MAPPING	1,008,000	1,008,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE	134,188,000	128,363,000
	REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-38,141,000	-39,241,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	319,250,000	307,885,000

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

	ALABAMA		
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	5,668,000	5,668,000
(N)	BAYOU CODEN, AL	231,000	231,000
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	455,000	455,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	16,820,000	16,820,000
(N)	BON SECOUR RIVER, AL	551,000	551,000
(N)	DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	252,000	252,000
(N)	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	505,000	505,000
(N)	FLY CREEK, AL	249,000	249,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	3,172,000	3,172,000
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	5,156,000	5,156,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	17,780,000	17,780,000
(N)	PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	350,000	350,000
(MP)	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	3,688,000	3,688,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	21,090,000	21,090,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	6,434,000	6,434,000
	ALASKA		
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,380,000	1,380,000
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,649,000	1,649,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	599,000	599,000
(N)	HOMER HARBOR, AK	265,000	265,000
(N)	KETCHIKAN, THOMAS BASIN, AK	564,000	564,000
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	182,000	182,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	305,000	305,000
	VALDEZ HARBOR, AK	---	275,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,167,000	1,167,000
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	3,736,000	3,736,000
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	112,000	112,000
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,983,000	3,983,000
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR	4,640,000	4,640,000
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,153,000	1,153,000
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,575,000	4,575,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	6,385,000	6,385,000
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,189,000	4,189,000
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,096,000	1,096,000
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR	997,000	997,000
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,006,000	1,006,000
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,447,000	4,447,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, AR	500,000	500,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	25,248,000	25,248,000
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,789,000	1,789,000
(MP)	NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	3,524,000	3,524,000
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,363,000	1,363,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,582,000	3,582,000
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	453,000	453,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	5,304,000	5,304,000
(MP)	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,175,000	4,175,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR	2,200,000	2,200,000
(N)	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	142,000	142,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,534,000	1,534,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM - H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,529,000	1,529,000
(N)	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	890,000	890,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA	2,410,000	2,410,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	3,172,000	3,172,000
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	158,000	158,000
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,705,000	1,705,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,670,000	4,670,000
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	702,000	702,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	160,000	160,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,413,000	3,413,000
	LOS ANGELES RIVER, CA	---	600,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA	172,000	172,000
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	217,000	217,000
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	2,580,000	2,580,000
(N)	MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	845,000	845,000
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,529,000	1,529,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL), CA	893,000	893,000
	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	---	1,265,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	2,205,000	2,205,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,045,000	1,045,000
	OCEANSIDE HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	---	750,000
(N)	PETALUMA RIVER, CA	1,690,000	1,690,000
	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	---	400,000
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,451,000	2,451,000
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	135,000	135,000
(N)	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	2,600,000	2,600,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	6,481,000	6,481,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	457,000	457,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	872,000	872,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	117,000	117,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	1,085,000	1,085,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	150,000	150,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,195,000	2,195,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,825,000	1,825,000
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,659,000	1,659,000
(N)	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,080,000	1,080,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	2,889,000	2,889,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,038,000	1,038,000
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	2,358,000	2,358,000
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	665,000	665,000
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA	1,474,000	1,474,000
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,288,000	2,288,000
(N)	YUBA RIVER, CA	30,000	30,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	429,000	429,000
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	978,000	978,000
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,475,000	1,475,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	609,000	609,000
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	249,000	249,000
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	375,000	375,000
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	264,000	264,000
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	724,000	724,000
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	349,000	349,000
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	325,000	325,000
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	245,000	245,000
(N)	STONY CREEK, CT	412,000	412,000
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT	471,000	471,000
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	486,000	486,000
	DELAWARE		
(N)	CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL - ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REP	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	16,090,000	16,090,000
(N)	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	40,000	40,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	2,513,000	2,513,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
(N)	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	785,000	785,000
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	35,000	35,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC & VA	75,000	75,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	187,000	187,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	4,736,000	4,736,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	9,846,000	9,846,000
(N)	CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	3,275,000	3,275,000
(N)	EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	886,000	886,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,623,000	1,623,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	712,000	712,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	221,000	221,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	3,293,000	3,293,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	4,119,000	4,119,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,111,000	5,111,000
(N)	JOHNS PASS, PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	400,000	400,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL	295,000	295,000
(N)	NEW PASS, SARASOTA, FL	1,086,000	1,086,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	3,933,000	3,933,000
(N)	OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	127,000	127,000
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	1,459,000	1,459,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	717,000	717,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	2,147,000	2,147,000
(N)	PORT ST JOE HARBOR, FL	72,000	72,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,700,000	3,700,000
(N)	ST AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL	4,000	804,000
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	85,000	85,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	3,744,000	3,744,000
(N)	WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	34,000	34,000
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	5,894,000	5,894,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &.	4,321,000	4,321,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	1,916,000	1,916,000
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,411,000	3,411,000
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,377,000	7,377,000
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	5,218,000	5,218,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	10,364,000	10,364,000
(MP)	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	9,480,000	9,480,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL, GA	7,307,000	7,307,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	8,377,000	8,377,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	2,475,000	2,475,000
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	5,114,000	5,114,000
	HAWAII		
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	143,000	143,000
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI	480,000	480,000
	IDAHO		
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	4,467,000	4,467,000
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	9,144,000	9,144,000
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,054,000	1,054,000
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	ANDALUSIA HARBOR, IL	71,000	71,000
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	600,000	600,000
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	3,715,000	3,715,000
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,545,000	2,545,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	610,000	610,000
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	273,000	273,000
(N)	ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL	465,000	465,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION), IL	1,440,000	1,440,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (NCD PORTION), IL & IN	20,844,000	20,844,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,717,000	1,717,000
(N)	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	645,000	645,000
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	6,399,000	6,399,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD PORTION), IL	12,437,000	12,437,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &.	73,347,000	73,347,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL	3,434,000	3,434,000
(N)	ROCK ISLAND SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IL	123,000	123,000
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	970,000	970,000
	INDIANA		
(FC)	BEVERLY SHORES, IN	35,000	35,000
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	711,000	711,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,545,000	1,545,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	95,000	95,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	625,000	625,000
(FC)	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	762,000	762,000
(FC)	HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	643,000	643,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	320,000	320,000
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	540,000	540,000
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,073,000	1,073,000
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN	680,000	680,000
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN	790,000	790,000
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	807,000	807,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,654,000	2,654,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	61,000	61,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO	6,068,000	6,068,000
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,028,000	2,028,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,539,000	3,539,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,956,000	4,956,000
	KANSAS		
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,014,000	2,014,000
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,038,000	1,038,000
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	498,000	498,000
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	765,000	765,000
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	892,000	892,000
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	1,128,000	1,128,000
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	2,238,000	2,238,000
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,493,000	1,493,000
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS	2,533,000	2,533,000
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,567,000	1,567,000
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,886,000	1,886,000
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	893,000	893,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS	1,919,000	1,919,000
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS	1,939,000	1,939,000
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS	330,000	330,000
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,202,000	2,202,000
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS	1,307,000	1,307,000
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY	7,026,000	7,026,000
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,898,000	1,898,000
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,035,000	1,035,000
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,272,000	1,272,000
(FC)	CARR FORK LAKE, KY	1,593,000	1,593,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	979,000	979,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,092,000	1,092,000
(N)	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	400,000	400,000
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,607,000	1,722,000
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	986,000	986,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,378,000	1,378,000
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,904,000	1,904,000
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,059,000	1,059,000
	KENTUCKY RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS 5-14, KY	---	3,000,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,261,000	1,261,000
(N)	LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	30,000	30,000
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	649,000	649,000
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	65,000	65,000
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,956,000	1,956,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	53,568,000	53,568,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	6,025,000	6,025,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	940,000	940,000
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,780,000	1,780,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	963,000	963,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	6,488,000	6,488,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,033,000	1,033,000
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	12,786,000	12,786,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	921,000	921,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	504,000	504,000
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	10,000	10,000
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25,000	25,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE, LA	727,000	727,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA	159,000	159,000
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	4,095,000	4,095,000
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,659,000	1,659,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX	16,110,000	16,110,000
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,897,000	3,897,000
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	292,000	292,000
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	37,000	37,000
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,081,000	2,081,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA.	51,837,000	51,837,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	12,054,000	12,054,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,645,000	1,645,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT,	9,714,000	10,714,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,865,000	1,865,000
(N)	TANGIPAHOA RIVER, LA	100,000	100,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA	186,000	186,000
	MAINE		
(N)	CRIEHAVEN HARBOR, ME	293,000	293,000
	SCARBOROUGH RIVER, ME	---	960,000
	YORK HARBOR, ME	---	714,000
	MARYLAND		
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD (50 FT)	13,425,000	13,425,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	455,000	455,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	520,000	520,000
(N)	BROAD CREEK, MD	360,000	360,000
(N)	CHESTER RIVER, MD	660,000	660,000
(N)	CRISFIELD HARBOR, MD	65,000	65,000
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	104,000	104,000
(N)	FISHING BAY, MD	70,000	70,000
(N)	HERRING CREEK, TALL TIMBERS, MD	40,000	40,000
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,604,000	1,764,000
(N)	KNAPPS NARROWS, MD	782,000	782,000
(N)	NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD	260,000	260,000
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	125,000	125,000
(N)	TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	150,000	150,000
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	615,000	615,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	342,000	342,000
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	336,000	336,000
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	331,000	331,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,087,000	8,087,000
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	153,000	153,000
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	236,000	236,000
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	385,000	385,000
(N)	GREEN HARBOR, MA	364,000	364,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	339,000	339,000
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	355,000	355,000
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	326,000	326,000
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	241,000	241,000
(N)	NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA	646,000	646,000
(N)	SCITUATE HARBOR, MA	208,000	208,000
(N)	SESUIT HARBOR, MA	217,000	217,000
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA	384,000	384,000
(N)	WELLFLEET HARBOR, MA	1,214,000	1,214,000
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA	479,000	479,000
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	369,000	369,000
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	ALPENA HARBOR, MI	218,000	218,000
(N)	ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	77,000	77,000
(N)	BOLLES HARBOR, MI	29,000	29,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	245,000	245,000
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	118,000	118,000
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI	4,729,000	4,729,000
(N)	EAGLE HARBOR, MI	60,000	60,000
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	372,000	372,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	817,000	817,000
(N)	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI	218,000	218,000
(N)	GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	123,000	123,000
(N)	GRELICKVILLE, MI	63,000	63,000
(N)	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI	77,000	77,000
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	417,000	417,000
(N)	INLAND ROUTE, MI	31,000	31,000
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	1,641,000	1,641,000
(N)	LELAND HARBOR, MI	280,000	280,000
(N)	LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	224,000	224,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	136,000	136,000
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	495,000	495,000
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	440,000	440,000
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	32,000	32,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI	772,000	772,000
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	805,000	805,000
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	455,000	455,000
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	799,000	799,000
(N)	POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR, MI	301,000	301,000
(N)	PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI	188,000	188,000
(N)	PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	260,000	260,000
(N)	PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	103,000	103,000
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI	297,000	297,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,802,000	1,802,000
(N)	SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	918,000	918,000
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10,000	10,000
(N)	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	868,000	868,000
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,080,000	1,080,000
(MP)	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	14,962,000	14,962,000
(N)	WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	434,000	434,000
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	475,000	475,000
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	3,396,000	3,396,000
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	550,000	550,000
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	145,000	145,000
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN	4,077,000	4,077,000
(FC)	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	302,000	302,000
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,515,000	3,515,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS	461,000	461,000
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	153,000	153,000
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	203,000	203,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,876,000	2,876,000
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	113,000	113,000
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,773,000	1,773,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,998,000	2,998,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	280,000	280,000
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	410,000	410,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER, MS	3,000	3,000
	MISSOURI		
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	300,000	300,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,279,000	5,279,000
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,065,000	2,065,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,549,000	8,549,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	1,403,000	1,403,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	731,000	731,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BETWEEN OHIO AND MO RIVERS, MO & IL (REG WO	18,858,000	18,858,000
(N)	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	300,000	300,000
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,668,000	1,668,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,030,000	1,030,000
(N)	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	150,000	150,000
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,528,000	3,528,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	5,565,000	5,565,000
(FC)	UNION LAKE, MO	16,000	16,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	20,000	20,000
	MONTANA		
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,050,000	4,050,000
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	5,009,000	5,009,000
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	6,363,000	6,363,000
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,488,000	1,488,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE , SD	---	200,000
(MP)	MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO	500,000	500,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	742,000	742,000
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	811,000	811,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	378,000	378,000
(FC)	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	163,000	163,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	387,000	387,000
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	346,000	346,000
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	614,000	614,000
(FC)	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	827,000	827,000
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	392,000	392,000
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	401,000	401,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,455,000	1,455,000
(N)	CHEESEQUAKE CREEK, NJ	2,590,000	2,590,000
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	485,000	485,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	850,000	850,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	18,157,000	18,157,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	1,255,000	1,255,000
	MANASQUAN INLET, NJ	---	100,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	3,729,000	3,729,000
(N)	SALEM RIVER, NJ	410,000	410,000
(N)	SHARK RIVER, NJ	1,190,000	1,190,000
(N)	TOMS RIVER, NJ	290,000	290,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,352,000	1,352,000
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM	2,040,000	2,040,000
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,134,000	1,134,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM	244,000	244,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	398,000	398,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	998,000	998,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	356,000	356,000
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY	438,000	438,000
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY	226,000	226,000
(N)	BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	230,000	230,000
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	3,205,000	3,205,000
(N)	BROWNS CREEK, NY	500,000	500,000
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	455,000	455,000
(N)	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	820,000	820,000
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	309,000	309,000
(N)	EAST RIVER, NY	195,000	195,000
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	930,000	930,000
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	483,000	483,000
(N)	FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY	1,668,000	1,668,000
(N)	GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	130,000	130,000
(N)	GREAT SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	1,380,000	1,380,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,520,000	2,520,000
(N)	IRONDEQUOIT BAY HARBOR, NY	160,000	160,000
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY	220,000	220,000
(N)	JONES INLET, NY	3,880,000	3,880,000
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	1,930,000	1,930,000
(N)	LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	1,560,000	1,560,000
(N)	MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	570,000	570,000
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,810,000	1,810,000
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	205,000	205,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	4,886,000	4,886,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	740,000	740,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	6,020,000	6,020,000
(N)	OAK ORCHARD HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000
(N)	OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000
(N)	OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	496,000	496,000
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	200,000	200,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	853,000	853,000
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	515,000	515,000
(N)	WILSON HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,097,000	5,097,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,237,000	1,237,000
(N)	BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	350,000	350,000
(N)	BELHAVEN HARBOR NC	415,000	415,000
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	655,000	655,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	852,000	852,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	1,070,000	1,070,000
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	857,000	857,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	6,506,000	6,506,000
(N)	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	4,650,000	4,650,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	3,108,000	3,108,000
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	1,595,000	1,595,000
(N)	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	840,000	840,000
(N)	PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	125,000	125,000
(N)	ROANOKE RIVER, NC	125,000	125,000
(N)	SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	200,000	200,000
(FC)	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	2,848,000	2,848,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	6,048,000	6,048,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	222,000	222,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	9,154,000	9,154,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND	149,000	149,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,230,000	1,230,000
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	405,000	405,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND	101,000	101,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	861,000	861,000
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,088,000	1,088,000
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,907,000	1,907,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,186,000	1,186,000
(FC)	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	722,000	722,000
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	13,038,000	13,038,000
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	655,000	655,000
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	620,000	620,000
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	623,000	623,000
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH	914,000	914,000
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH	820,000	820,000
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	407,000	407,000
(FC)	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	922,000	922,000
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,026,000	1,026,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	8,287,000	8,287,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	213,000	213,000
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	521,000	521,000
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	75,000	75,000
(N)	ROCKY RIVER, OH	12,000	12,000
(FC)	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30,000	30,000
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,030,000	1,030,000
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,502,000	3,502,000
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	430,000	430,000
(N)	VERMILION HARBOR, OH	10,000	10,000
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	609,000	609,000
(FC)	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	850,000	850,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	292,000	292,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK	749,000	749,000
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	2,059,000	2,059,000
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK	39,000	39,000
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK	1,692,000	1,692,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK	874,000	874,000
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	4,405,000	4,405,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	4,271,000	4,271,000
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	847,000	847,000
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	337,000	337,000
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	754,000	754,000
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK	1,527,000	1,527,000
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK	401,000	401,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK	1,702,000	1,702,000
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	3,819,000	3,819,000
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,373,000	1,373,000
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	511,000	511,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	5,000	5,000
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,168,000	1,168,000
(MP)	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,862,000	4,862,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK	857,000	857,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	789,000	789,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,371,000	3,371,000
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,894,000	1,894,000
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,515,000	3,515,000
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK	947,000	947,000
	OREGON		
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	664,000	664,000
	ASTORIA HARBOR, NORTH BREAKWATER, OR	---	275,000
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	442,000	442,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	18,788,000	18,788,000
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR	500,000	500,000
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	11,017,000	11,017,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	8,013,000	8,013,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	420,000	420,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR	4,349,000	4,349,000
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	454,000	454,000
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	719,000	719,000
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR	1,282,000	1,282,000
(N)	DEPOE BAY, OR	3,000	3,000
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR	2,247,000	2,247,000
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR	552,000	552,000
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	559,000	559,000
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	920,000	920,000
(MP)	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,558,000	2,558,000
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	752,000	752,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	14,988,000	14,988,000
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	5,439,000	5,439,000
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,914,000	3,914,000
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	12,561,000	12,561,000
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR	425,000	425,000
(N)	PORT OF TOLEDO, OR	---	500,000
(N)	ROGUE RIVER, OR	816,000	816,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	864,000	864,000
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	61,000	61,000
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	43,000	43,000
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,094,000	1,094,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	846,000	846,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	70,000	70,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	482,000	482,000
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,565,000	1,565,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	12,736,000	12,736,000
(FC)	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	612,000	612,000
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	205,000	205,000
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,425,000	1,425,000
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,059,000	2,059,000
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	3,112,000	3,112,000
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	2,084,000	2,084,000
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,201,000	1,201,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	669,000	669,000
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,036,000	1,036,000
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA	468,000	468,000
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	683,000	683,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	675,000	675,000
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	331,000	331,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA	1,243,000	1,243,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,559,000	1,559,000
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,155,000	1,155,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,844,000	1,844,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	16,586,000	16,586,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	463,000	463,000
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	37,000	37,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,426,000	5,926,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	1,930,000	1,930,000
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,074,000	2,074,000
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	373,000	373,000
(FC)	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,415,000	2,415,000
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,256,000	1,256,000
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	296,000	296,000
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	1,242,000	1,242,000
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	3,044,000	3,044,000
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA	1,833,000	1,833,000
	PUERTO RICO		
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	10,000	10,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	2,420,000	2,420,000
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	5,426,000	6,626,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	2,469,000	2,469,000
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC	386,000	386,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	3,509,000	3,509,000
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	64,000	64,000
(N)	MURRELLS INLET, SC	65,000	65,000
(N)	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	1,192,000	1,192,000
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	428,000	428,000
(N)	TOWN CREEK, SC	491,000	491,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,079,000	6,079,000
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	190,000	190,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	184,000	184,000
(MP)	FT RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,520,000	8,520,000
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	973,000	973,000
(MP)	OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	9,363,000	9,363,000
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,251,000	5,251,000
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,895,000	5,895,000
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,192,000	4,192,000
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	4,082,000	4,082,000
(MP)	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,410,000	4,410,000
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	7,281,000	7,281,000
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	13,637,000	13,637,000
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	650,000	650,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	623,000	623,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,139,000	1,139,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,210,000	1,210,000
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX	2,249,000	2,249,000
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,610,000	1,610,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,038,000	1,038,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	3,649,000	3,649,000
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX	1,657,000	1,657,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	1,510,000	1,510,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	874,000	874,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,190,000	2,190,000
(MP)	DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX	6,033,000	6,033,000
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS, TX	12,000	12,000
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	2,130,000	2,130,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	2,870,000	2,870,000
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	136,000	136,000
(N)	GIWW - CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	1,595,000	1,595,000
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,459,000	1,459,000
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,956,000	1,956,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	17,805,000	17,805,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,007,000	1,007,000
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,823,000	5,823,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	810,000	810,000
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX	218,000	218,000
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX	2,303,000	2,303,000
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,798,000	2,798,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,145,000	5,145,000
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	1,780,000	1,780,000
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,388,000	1,388,000
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,540,000	1,540,000
(FC)	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,120,000	1,120,000
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	873,000	873,000
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,528,000	1,528,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	783,000	783,000
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	11,946,000	11,946,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,217,000	4,217,000
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,282,000	2,282,000
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,519,000	1,519,000
(N)	TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,525,000	1,525,000
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM - B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,502,000	1,502,000
(N)	TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,270,000	1,270,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX	2,014,000	2,014,000
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	473,000	473,000
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	3,659,000	3,659,000
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,326,000	2,326,000
	VERMONT		
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	548,000	548,000
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	645,000	645,000
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	398,000	398,000
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	483,000	483,000
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	506,000	506,000
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	363,000	363,000
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	3,169,000	3,169,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	590,000	590,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE BAY CHANNEL, VA	42,000	42,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	36,000	36,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	888,000	888,000
(N)	CRANES CREEK, VA	321,000	321,000
(N)	DEEP CREEK, VA	597,000	597,000
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,169,000	2,169,000
(N)	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	647,000	647,000
(N)	HOSKINS CREEK, VA	395,000	395,000
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	1,616,000	1,616,000
(MP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	8,770,000	8,770,000
(FC)	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,551,000	1,551,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	200,000	200,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	5,131,000	5,131,000
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	351,000	351,000
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	2,266,000	2,266,000
(N)	QUEENS CREEK, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	337,000	337,000
(N)	RUDEE INLET, VA	570,000	570,000
(N)	STARLINGS CREEK, VA	389,000	389,000
(N)	TANGIER CHANNEL, VA	467,000	467,000
(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	1,355,000	1,355,000
(N)	TYLERS BEACH, VA	34,000	34,000
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,268,000	1,268,000
	WASHINGTON		
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	12,038,000	12,038,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	26,000	26,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	7,000	7,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER SYSTEM OPERATION REVIEW, WA, ID, MT & O	559,000	559,000
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	870,000	870,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	10,655,000	10,655,000
(FC)	HOWARD A HANSON DAM, WA	1,373,000	1,373,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	14,884,000	14,884,000
(N)	KENMORE NAVIGATION CHANNEL, WA	202,000	202,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,877,000	6,877,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,978,000	4,978,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	10,618,000	10,618,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,318,000	5,318,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, VIRGIL B BENNINGTON LAKE, WA	731,000	731,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS, WA	432,000	432,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	1,922,000	1,922,000
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	12,000	12,000
(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,155,000	1,155,000
(N)	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	2,250,000	2,250,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	678,000	678,000
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	174,000	174,000
(FC)	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	56,000	56,000
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	12,270,000	12,270,000
(N)	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	431,000	431,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	956,000	956,000
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,741,000	1,741,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,187,000	1,187,000
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,296,000	1,296,000
(N)	ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	3,000	3,000
(FC)	ELKINS, WV	10,000	10,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	11,376,000	11,376,000
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,632,000	1,632,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	957,000	957,000
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,310,000	1,310,000
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,753,000	1,753,000
(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV	1,615,000	1,615,000
	WISCONSIN		
(N)	ALGOMA HARBOR, WI	117,000	117,000
(N)	CORNUCOPIA HARBOR, WI	107,000	107,000
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	560,000	560,000
(N)	FOX RIVER, WI	2,215,000	2,215,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,029,000	1,029,000
(N)	KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	130,000	130,000
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	300,000	300,000
(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE, WI	43,000	43,000
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	257,000	257,000
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	3,123,000	3,123,000
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	883,000	883,000
(N)	STURGEON BAY HARBOR & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	2,831,000	2,831,000
(N)	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	760,000	760,000
	WYOMING		
(FC)	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	979,000	979,000
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	CIVIL WORKS ENERGY DATA SYSTEM	60,000	---
	COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	4,000,000	2,000,000
	DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	480,000	480,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	3,000,000	---
	DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)	3,350,000	1,675,000
	EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	1,250,000	800,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW GUIDE FOR OPERATIONS (ERGO)	2,000,000	---
	HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE RESTORATION	3,000,000	---
	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	7,818,000	6,000,000
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN MAINSTEM MODEL DEVELOPMENT	1,000,000	500,000
	MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	2,100,000	1,900,000
	NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	20,000	20,000
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	7,000,000	5,000,000
	NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION	4,000,000	2,000,000
	NATURAL RESOURCES INVENTORY (NRI)	500,000	---
	NATURAL RESOURCES TECHNICAL SUPPORT (NRTS)	1,800,000	---
	PEER REVIEW PROGRAM	400,000	---
	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS FOR O&M	3,500,000	---
	POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAM	4,000,000	---
	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	11,498,000	7,000,000
	PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	50,000
	REAL TIME WATER CONTROL RESEARCH PROGRAM (WCRP)	1,000,000	---
	REINVESTED USER FEES FOR RECREATION IMPROVEMENTS	5,000,000	---
	RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675,000	500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	1,000,000	500,000
	REPAIR EVALUATION MAINTENANCE RESEARCH (REMR II)	6,000,000	1,500,000
	RIVER CONFLUENCE ICE RESEARCH	1,150,000	---
	SCANNING HYDROGRAPHIC OPERATIONAL AIRBORNE LIDAR SURVE	1,750,000	1,750,000
	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	3,058,000	3,000,000
	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	4,108,000	3,000,000
	WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	1,600,000	---
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,200,000	4,200,000
	WETLANDS ACTION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	500,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-55,770,000	-67,770,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,749,875,000	1,703,697,000

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

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $12,684,000 for General Investigations instead of $13,114,000 as proposed by the House and $11,234,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing $300,000 for the completion of the feasibility study of alternatives for meeting drinking water needs on the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation and surrounding communities in South Dakota. Funding for this project ($150,000) is included in the amount appropriated in Amendment No. 17.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $411,046,000 for Construction Program instead of $417,301,000 as proposed by the House and $390,461,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $12,069,000 for Miscellaneous Project Programs of the Central Valley Project, California, which includes $200,000 for the Salmon Stamp Program as described in the House Report, $250,000 for the Colusa Basin Drainage District Management Project, and $5,750,000 for the unscreened diversions program, which is $250,000 less than the budget request.

The conferees have provided $6,540,000 for the Sacramento River Division of the Central Valley Project, California. The amount provided includes: $3,000,000 for the completion of engineering and design and initiation of construction of a new fish screen and fish recovery facilities at the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District's Hamilton City Pumping Plant; $1,000,000 for the continuation of the pilot research pumping facility evaluation; $500,000 for the program to find solutions for passage for endangered and threatened fish at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam; $865,000 for the installation and evaluation of alternative fish guidance systems at Reclamation District 108 and Reclamation District 1004; and $300,000 for the Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program.

The conference agreement includes $5,067,000 for the Trinity River Restoration Program, California, the same as the budget request and the amount provided in the House and Senate bills. Included in this total is $500,000 to carry out the interagency agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Hoopa Valley Tribe regarding the Cooperative for Comprehensive Fisheries Management and funds necessary to complete the Environmental Impact Statement is support of the instream flow decision the Secretary of the Interior is required to render in 1996.

On July 17, 1995, one of the eight spillway gates at Folsom Dam in California failed resulting in an uncontrolled flow of 40,000 cubic feet per second of water from the reservoir. The total loss of water was about 360,000 acre-feet, which is approximately 35% of total reservoir capacity. The conferees are aware that the Bureau of Reclamation has begun work to design a replacement for the damaged gate, with the goal of having the replacement gate installed in 1996. Because of the timing of this event, no funds were included in either the House bill or the Senate bill to accomplish this work. The conferees agree that the Bureau of Reclamation may reprogram up to $6,000,000 of the funds available to it in fiscal year 1996, upon notification of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, for the removal and replacement of the damaged gate and the remediation of the remaining spillway gates at Folsom Dam. If additional funds are required in fiscal year 1996 to complete the work, the Bureau of Reclamation should request those funds following the normal reprogramming procedures.

On August 22, 1995, the Department of the Interior submitted to the House and Senate subcommittees a request to reprogram $5,000,000 to the Los Angeles Area Water Reclamation and Reuse, California, project. Because of the unanticipated funding needs which have arisen, including the need to repair Folsom Dam in California and the need to make additional dam safety repairs at Ochoco Dam in Oregon, the conferees have agreed to defer, without prejudice, action on this reprogramming request.

The conference agreement includes $1,500,000 for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation as proposed by the Senate. The House had deleted the funds requested by the Administration for this program. Within the amounts provided for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, $500,000 shall be made available to support the Spring Run and Coho Salmon Programs approved by the House under the Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs, California, and $100,000 shall be made available to support the Kaweah River Delta Corridor Project. The conferees are concerned about certain grants that have been made by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation to organizations known to be hostile to the interests of private landowners and those engaged in the productive and lawful use of public lands. The conferees have included the funding cited above for the Foundation based upon the understanding that its grant award procedures have been considerably tightened, and that the Foundation will make a concerted effort to avoid making further grants to the types of organizations described above. The Foundation's performance in this regard will be closely monitored by the Committees during the coming year.

The conference agreement includes $5,000,000 for the Wetlands Development Program. From within that amount, the conferees direct that $3,600,000 be utilized to continue the Caddo Lake wetlands project in Texas.

The conferees agree with the language contained in the House Report regarding the Rillito Creek, Arizona, High Plains Groundwater Recharge Demonstration project. In addition, the conference agreement includes $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Equus Beds recharge project in Kansas.

Amendment No. 20: Provides that $94,225,000 of the funds appropriated under the Construction Program shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund for construction of the Central Arizona Project as proposed by the House instead of $92,725,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $273,076,000 for Operation and Maintenance instead of $278,759,000 as proposed by the House and $267,393,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Due to the budgetary situation, the conferees have provided $273,076,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation's operation and maintenance program, which is $15,683,000 below the budget request and $1,224,000 below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1995. The conferees expect the Bureau of Reclamation to use the flexibility available to it in managing the operation and maintenance program to ensure that the most critical maintenance needs are met. In that regard, the conferees agree with the language contained in the House Report regarding the growth in the Associated Operation and Maintenance Program and expect the Bureau of Reclamation to derive a significant share of the reduction below the budget request from the various Associated O&M Programs in order to retain as much money as possible for operation and maintenance of projects.

The conferees note that the backlog in replacements, additions, and extraordinary maintenance items continues to grow for the Central Valley Project in California. In addition, the conferees are concerned that the Bureau of Reclamation has failed to comply with the directive to submit a plan, by February of 1995, for reducing the backlog in replacements, additions, and extraordinary maintenance items in a timely manner and direct that this previously requested plan be submitted as soon as possible. The conference agreement does include $4,625,000 for replacements, additions, and extraordinary maintenance items, the same as the budget request. The conferees urge the Bureau of Reclamation to continue its efforts to reach consensus with the canal authorities on the manner that those funds are allocated. The conference agreement also includes $5,454,000 for operation and maintenance of the Trinity River Division. The amount provided includes sufficient funds to continue to monitoring and tagging tasks, repair of winter damage, and sediment control needed for continued management of the Trinity River fishery.

The conferees have been informed that landowners and farmers suffered flooding and destruction of crops in March 1995 from waters of the Arroyo Pasajaro in Fresno County, California. The waters were diverted from the San Luis Canal, jointly operated by the Bureau of Reclamation and the State of California. The conferees direct the Bureau to evaluate the damage and report back to Congress on whether Federal responsibility is involved and if steps should be taken to provide compensation to those suffering damage.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

The conferees direct that the $1,000,000 requested for the San Joaquin River Basin Resource Management Initiative, and any funds remaining from previous fiscal years, not be expended for that purpose. This action is consistent with action of the Congress during consideration of H.R. 1158. In the reports accompanying that bill, the Bureau of Reclamation was directed not to obligate any additional funds in fiscal year 1995 for the San Joaquin River Basin Resource Management Initiative.

The conference agreement includes $12,281,000 for the Shasta Dam Temperature Control Device, $1,000,000 above the budget request.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
ARIZONA		
TUCSON/PHOENIX WATER CONSERVATION AND EXCHANGE STUDY..	50,000	50,000
VERDE RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	125,000	125,000
CALIFORNIA		
DEL NORTE CNTY/CRESCENT CITY WASTEWATER RECLAMATION ST	---	300,000
FORT BRAGG WATER RECLAMATION STUDY.....	---	500,000
IMPERIAL VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE STUDY.....	175,000	175,000
LOWER OWENS RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY.....	100,000	---
MALIBU CREEK FISHERY ENHANCEMENT STUDY.....	50,000	---
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT.....	---	100,000
SAN FRANCISCO AREA WATER RECLAMATION STUDY.....	700,000	1,000,000
SO CALIF COASTAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	50,000	50,000
SO CALIF COMPREHENSIVE WATER SUPPLY & RECLAMATION STUD	750,000	750,000
COLORADO		
GRAND VALLEY PROJECT WATER CONSERVATION STUDY.....	50,000	50,000
SOUTHWEST COLORADO RURAL WATER SUPPLY.....	75,000	---
YAMPA RIVER WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	50,000	50,000
IDAHO		
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT.....	100,000	100,000
UPPER SALMON RIVER WATER OPTIMIZATION.....	150,000	150,000
KANSAS		
KANSAS COMPREHENSIVE INVESTIGATION.....	100,000	75,000
MONTANA		
WESTERN MONTANA WATER CONSERVATION STUDY.....	200,000	200,000
YELLOWSTONE RIVER BASIN STUDY.....	140,000	120,000
NEBRASKA		
NEBRASKA WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT.....	100,000	75,000
NEVADA		
WALKER RIVER BASIN.....	---	150,000
NEW MEXICO		
RIO GRANDE/LOW FLOW CONVEYANCE CHANNEL.....	100,000	75,000
SAN JUAN RIVER GALLUP - NAVAJO WATER SUPPLY, NM.....	---	100,000
OKLAHOMA		
OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	100,000	75,000
OREGON		
CARLTON LAKE RESTORATION.....	50,000	50,000
CENTRAL OREGON IRRIG SYS CONSERVATION PROJ FEASIBILITY	200,000	200,000
UPPER DESCHUTES PROJECT.....	50,000	50,000
GRANDE RONDE RIVER BASIN	200,000	200,000
NORTHWEST OREGON REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY.....	300,000	300,000
OREGON STREAM RESTORATION PLANNING STUDY.....	150,000	150,000
OREGON SUBBASIN CONSERVATION PLANNING	200,000	200,000
OWYHEE STORAGE OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	50,000	50,000
SOUTHERN OREGON COASTAL RIVER BASINS.....	100,000	100,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX RESERVATION.....	---	150,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BLACK HILLS REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	150,000	150,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
TEXAS		
EDWARDS AQUIFER REGIONAL WATER RESOURCES & MGMT STUDY.	240,000	240,000
RINCON BAYOU-NUECES MARSH WETLANDS RESTOR/ENHANCE PROJ	150,000	150,000
RIO GRANDE/RIO BRAVO INTERNATIONAL BASIN ASSESSMENT...	200,000	150,000
RIO GRANDE CONVEYANCE CANAL/PIPELINE.....	---	150,000
UTAH		
ASHLEY/BRUSH CREEKS OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	75,000	75,000
WEBER BASIN WATER QUALITY/WATERSHED.....	100,000	100,000
WASHINGTON		
WASHINGTON RIVER BASIN PLANNING.....	75,000	75,000
VARIOUS		
BEAR RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY/WATERSHED.....	100,000	100,000
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	375,000	375,000
DROUGHT INVESTIGATIONS.....	40,000	40,000
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES...	1,877,000	1,000,000
FISH & WILDLIFE HABITAT PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT..	50,000	---
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES.....	2,435,000	1,635,000
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS.....	540,000	432,000
LOWER COLORADO INDIAN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	75,000	---
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS.....	150,000	120,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN TRIBES IN NORTH AND SOUTH DAKOTA.	250,000	250,000
PALLID STURGEON RECOVERY DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	140,000	140,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	1,665,000	1,332,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION.....	200,000	200,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN SALMON MIGRATION WATER STUDY..	250,000	250,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....	13,602,000	12,684,000
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS		
CALIFORNIA		
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:		
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.....	1,357,000	1,357,000
DELTA DIVISION.....	6,500,000	6,580,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	11,869,000	12,069,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	875,000	6,540,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION.....	664,000	664,000
SAN LUIS UNIT.....	800,000	800,000
SHASTA DIVISION.....	749,000	19,749,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM.....	5,067,000	5,067,000
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE PROJECT.....	9,300,000	8,300,000
BRACKISH WATER RECLAMATION DEMONSTRATION FACILITY.....	---	1,000,000
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM.....	2,340,000	2,340,000
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT.....	9,750,000	8,000,000
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE-TITLE 16.....	1,750,000	1,750,000
COLORADO		
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	5,799,000	5,799,000
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	1,231,000	1,231,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	300,000	300,000
IDAHO		
MINIDOKA NORTH SIDE DRAINWATER PROJECT.....	60,000	60,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP.....	24,900,000	24,900,000
OREGON		
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT.....	6,700,000	6,875,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	3,802,000	3,802,000
MID-DAKOTA PROJECT	2,500,000	11,500,000
MNI WICONI PROJECT	10,500,000	22,300,000
TEXAS		
NORTHWEST WASTEWATER REUSE PROJECT	---	1,500,000
WASHINGTON		
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	1,698,000	2,573,000
YAKIMA BASIN ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	---	1,500,000
VARIOUS		
COLUMBIA/SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY	15,000,000	13,500,000
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	3,255,000	1,500,000
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROG., UC R	6,373,000	6,373,000
ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION/RECOVERY PROJ., LC REG	2,170,000	2,170,000
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROG., PN R	170,000	170,000
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	4,357,000	4,357,000
TITLE I DIVISION, CRBSCP	2,300,000	2,300,000
TITLE II, NEW FORMAT, CRBSCP	6,000,000	500,000
WATER CONSERVATION CHALLENGE PARTNERSHIPS	9,000,000	---
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION	157,136,000	187,426,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:		
BOISE PROJECT, ID	510,000	510,000
BRANTLEY PROJECT, NM	650,000	650,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM, AZ - CA	1,800,000	1,800,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OR - CA	2,818,000	2,818,000
LAKE MEREDITH SALINITY CONTROL, NM - TX	100,000	570,000
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY, CO	600,000	600,000
MC GEE CREEK PROJECT, OK	125,000	125,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OK	700,000	700,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, CA - NV	7,250,000	7,250,000
NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TX	105,000	105,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TX	25,000	25,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:		
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP, NE	900,000	900,000
OAHE UNIT, P-SMBP, SD	80,000	80,000
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT ACT-TITLE 28, VARI	3,500,000	3,500,000
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION, AZ	500,000	500,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT, NM	---	1,500,000
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT, VARIOUS	2,330,000	5,000,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE/PROTECTIVE FACILITIES, WA	1,210,000	1,210,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION	23,203,000	27,843,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAM:		
CROOKED RIVER, OCHOCO DAM, OR	6,000,000	6,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	1,270,000	1,270,000
INITIATE SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION	38,175,000	35,175,000
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	2,500,000	2,500,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, AZ	8,085,000	8,085,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, AZ	1,103,000	1,103,000
SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION - COOLIDGE DAM, AZ	974,000	974,000
UMATILLA PROJECT, COLD SPRINGS DAM, OR	5,250,000	5,250,000
YAKIMA, BUMPING LAKE DAM, WA	1,825,000	1,825,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS	65,182,000	62,182,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:		
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT, UT	975,000	975,000
SHOSHONE, WY	1,300,000	1,300,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UT	2,474,000	2,474,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT	4,749,000	4,749,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:		
ENERGY/WATER PRODUCT EFFICIENCY STANDARDS	450,000	---
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	771,000	1,271,000
IMPROVED RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT CONTROL	300,000	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	300,000	300,000
WATERSHED MODELING SYSTEMS INITIATIVE	1,000,000	800,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
WATER TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY	1,700,000	1,360,000
WATER TECHNOLOGY/ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	3,800,000	2,800,000
SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	8,321,000	6,531,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS	258,591,000	288,731,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT		
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS		
COLORADO		
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT	4,879,000	10,000,000
DOLORES PARTICIPATING PROJECT	3,470,000	3,470,000
UTAH		
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	13,579,000	13,579,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES, AZ, CO, NM, UT, WY	1,920,000	1,920,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT	23,848,000	28,969,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT		
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT		
ARIZONA		
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF)	92,725,000	94,225,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, SAFETY OF DAMS	29,411,000	29,411,000
CENTAL ARIZONA PROJECT, GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY	---	1,842,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT	122,136,000	125,478,000
ASSOCIATED ITEMS		
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	-28,632,000	-32,132,000
TOTAL, CONTRUCTION PROGRAM	375,943,000	411,046,000
LOAN PROGRAM		
ARIZONA		
TOHONO O'ODHAM NATION - SCHUK TOAK DISTRICT	3,043,000	3,043,000
CALIFORNIA		
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	1,500,000	1,500,000
CHINO BASIN DESALINATION PROJECT	1,100,000	1,100,000
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT NO. 3	2,200,000	2,200,000
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY	1,100,000	1,100,000
TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT-ELSINORE VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATE	700,000	700,000
COLORADO		
UTE MOUNTAIN UTE	1,500,000	1,500,000
OREGON		
DOUGLAS COUNTY - MILLTOWN HILL	100,000	100,000
VARIOUS		
LOAN ADMINISTRATION	425,000	425,000
NEW LOAN PROGRAM ACTIVITY	5,000,000	---
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM	16,668,000	11,668,000

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs, and activities of the Department of Energy. Additional items of conference agreements are discussed below.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT LEVELS

The Department of Energy has announced a strategic alignment initiative which would reduce the number of Federal employees by 27 percent over five years. The Department has provided a summary of recommended employment levels and proposed reductions by organization for fiscal year 1996. The conferees expect the Department to make these proposed employment reductions in those areas where the conference agreement does not reduce employment levels below those requested by the Department. The Department is to report to the Committees on Appropriations the actual employment levels as of March 1996 compared to the fiscal year 1995 baseline and the Department's proposed employment levels.

SUPPORT SERVICE CONTRACTORS

The conferees are aware of the extensive use of support service contractors by the Department of Energy at headquarters and the field offices. In many instances these contractors are performing inherently governmental functions such as assisting in program management and program execution duties, representing program organizations at meetings inside and outside the Department, preparing briefing materials, newsletters, and budget justifications, and providing daily administrative and clerical support.

There are clearly instances where it is cost-effective to use support service contractors to support Federal programs. This would include functions such as custodial services, guard services, operation of emergency communications centers and mail rooms, and facility and grounds maintenance. In addition to these types of commercial services, there are situations where technical expertise is needed to augment Federal efforts. These technical services would include such tasks as automated data processing systems development for the Department's corporate financial, procurement, and personnel systems, systems review and reliability analyses, and economic and environmental analyses. These tasks are characterized by specific project schedules, milestones, and deliverables.

The conferees have no objection to continuing support service contracts which can be documented to be cost-effective and which provide specific technical expertise not available in the Federal work force at the Department. However, the Department has increasingly used support service contractors to augment the Federal work force for nonspecific functions. This may be done to circumvent Federal employment ceilings or funding constraints or because it is easier to hire an outside contractor than to manage properly the existing Federal work force.

After excluding those support service contracts which are documented to reflect the cost benefits of contracting for the service, and those contracts which provide specific technical expertise tied to a schedule and a deliverable, the conferees expect funding for all other support service contracts to decrease by 50 percent in fiscal year 1996. All other categories of support service contracts should be reduced by 15 percent in accordance with the Department's strategic alignment initiative. The Department is directed to submit semi-annual reports on the use of all support services contracts at headquarters and the field. By organization, appropriation, and program, this report should include the name of the contractor, fiscal year 1996 funding, number of employers, and a brief description of the work performed.

DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS

The Department does not budget for Federal employees in a consistent manner throughout the whole organization. Using existing budget justification materials, it is difficult to determine where each Department of energy employee is located and the costs associated with each. To alleviate these discrepancies, in the fiscal year 1997 budget request the Department is directed to include all salaries and related expenses in the program that manages the employee. In addition to salaries and benefits, the personnel cost for each employee should include all related costs such as space rental, utilities, materials and supplies, telecommunications, and building maintenance. The administrative services group will determine the amount of these costs which should be charged to each program organization to ensure consistency in budgeting.

Within each appropriation account, each organization should have one program direction line for all full-time equivalent employees (FTEs), both field and headquarters, and provide object class information for all expenses. No Federal employees are to be funded in program accounts. Any difference between the average cost of the fully loaded FTE between specific programs should be explained in the budget justification.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $2,727,407,000 for Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities instead of $2,576,700,000 (less $1,000,000) as proposed by the House and $2,793,324,000 as proposed by the Senate, and deletes language proposed by the Senate providing no more than $7,500,000 for termination of the Gas Turbine-Modular Helium Reactor program.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

Funding of $2,000,000 for the solar international program is to be allocated to nongovernmental organizations which are active in joint implementation activities to develop specific international energy projects.

Funding of $400,000 is provided to study the feasibility of piping treated effluent from Santa Rosa to the Geysers for injection.

The conferees have provided $55,300,000 for biofuels energy systems. An amount of $27,650,000 is allocated for the categories of biochemical and thermochemical conversion, of which $3,000,000 is for the Federal share of a 50/50 cost-shared biomass ethanol production plant in Gridley, California, and the amount also includes the request for capital equipment. With the remaining funds, the conferees support and fully fund the biomass power projects in Vermont and Hawaii, and have provided from the remainder of available funds $3,940,000 for the regional biomass program.

The conferees have not provided funding for the ocean thermal energy systems program, now technical assistance and other support for the Kotzebue, Alaska, project for a wind energy system.

Within the total funding provided for solar energy, the conferees have included $2,988,000, the same as the budget request, for the renewable energy production incentive (REPI) program. The conferees urge the Department to fully fund both tier 1 and tier 2 projects as outlined in its recently published regulations. REPI program funding shall be available only for so long as the tax credit for electricity produced from certain renewable sources or the energy investment credit for solar and geothermal property (authorized by sections 1914 and 1916 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, respectively) remain in effect.

Within funds available for hydrogen research, $250,000 shall be made available to an institution where expertise in electrochemical (fuel cells), thermochemical and photochemical reactions for hydrogen production may be synergistically studied and the application to gas storage and alternate vehicle technology may be integrated.

The conferees have provided $1,500,000 for the hydropower program which includes funding to support the cost-shared program to develop an advanced energy-efficient turbine which reduces environmental impacts on fish species.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

The conferees realize that sufficient funding has not been provided to complete all tasks as proposed in the Department's budget request for the advanced light water reactor program. Therefore, the conferees urge the Department to apply funds within the light water reactor program to cost-effectively complete essential activities.

Termination funding of $7,500,000, the same as the budget request, has been provided for the orderly close-out of the gas turbine-modular helium reactor program. An orderly close-out shall include only the summary documentation of existing technical data and information. All design, development, and test programs shall be terminated.

The conference agreement provides $25,000,000 for electrometallurgical research and development in the technology development program for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management. As recommended by the National Academy of Sciences' assessment of the electrometallurgical approach for treating spent nuclear fuel, the conferees expect the Department to develop a plan to support the EBR–II demonstration using this technology. If this is successful, the Department should review the program for application to other types of spent fuel and waste management issues.

No funding for the Soviet-designed reactor safety program is included in the Energy Supply, Research and Development appropriation account. Funding for this activity has been included in the Other Defense Activities appropriation account.

ISOTOPES

The conferees agree to provide a total of $3,000,000—$1,000,000 in fiscal year 1996 in addition to $2,000,000 from funds appropriated for this purpose in fiscal year 1995—to continue development of the National Biomedical Tracer Facility (NBTF). This funding should be used to acquire three site specific conceptual designs from among the strongest submissions received during the project definition study. Additionally, the Department should assess all permanent or interim upgrade NBTF proposals, including any from national laboratories, according to a consistent set of evaluation criteria including the capacity to produce a wide range of isotopes for medical and research purposes; research, technology transfer, education and training capabilities; and overall cost effectiveness considering lifetime costs of the facility as well as public-private partnerships and cost-sharing by state and local partners.

The conferees support using up to $750,000 of available funds within this account for completion of the Hanford medical isotopes business planning and program development project.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Radiation Effects Research Foundation (RERF) is a private foundation co-funded by the governments of the United States and Japan to study the effects of radiation on the survivors of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings. Since 1946, the National Academy of Sciences has provided support and oversight of scientific research on the consequences of the acute radiation exposures suffered by the population of these two cities, pursuant to an international agreement that co-funds activities at a 50–50 cost share, but this work has been threatened by the dramatically declining value of the dollar versus the yen. The conferees direct the Administration to continue to work with the National Academy of Sciences to achieve additional cost savings in this program and with the Japanese government to review areas for cost savings to reflect U.S. budgetary constraints. The appropriate committees should be informed of any funding changes before they become effective.

The conferees are also interested in the assessment of the continuing effectiveness and value of this program that is being conducted by a scientific committee jointly appointed by the U.S. and Japanese governments, and expect the Department to review the continued funding for this activity and report to the appropriate Congressional committees prior to hearings on the fiscal year 1997 budget and upon completion of the international scientific committee's review.

ENERGY RESEARCH

Biological and environmental research

The conferees support the important work conducted at the Inhalation Toxicology Research Institute. The conferees further understand that the Institute is reviewing ways to reduce its operating costs to the Department of Energy and to increase access to its facilities by other Federal and non-Federal entities having research needs. The conferees support these efforts to reduce costs and to meet both Federal and non-Federal needs and requirements.

Any general reductions to this account should be allocated equitably across all program elements without terminating any programs unilaterally.

Fusion

The conferees have provided $244,144,000, an increase of $15,000,000 over the House recommendation, for the fusion energy program. This funding is to support a program in plasma science and fusion technology, and continue United States participation in the engineering design activities phase of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor project to which the United States is committed through fiscal year 1998. The conferees do not agree with the Senate language which recommended transferring computer work, termination, severance and separation costs to other activities within the Department, and transferring the heavy ion fusion program to defense activities.

With little prospect for increased funding for the fusion base program over the next several years, it will be necessary for the program to restructure its strategy, content and near-to-medium-term objectives. The restructured program should emphasize continued development of fusion science, increased attention to concept improvement and alternative approaches to fusion, and development and testing of the low-activation structural materials so important for fusion's attractiveness as an energy source.

The Department of Energy, with participation of the fusion community and the Fusion Energy Advisory Committee, is instructed to prepare a strategic plan to implement such a restructured program, to be completed by December 31, 1995. This plan should assume a constant level of effort in the base program for the next several years; as appropriate, it should be integrated with plans of the international fusion program; and it should address the institutional makeup of a domestic program consistent with the funding assumptions.

The conferees believe that, because of the stringent budget realities facing this Nation, the promise of fusion energy can only be realized through international collaboration. The high cost of fusion development points to the increasing importance of international cooperation as a means of designing, building, and financing major magnetic fusion facilities in the future. Because the United States has committed to such an approach, it is crucial that a restructuring of the fusion program maintain a strong domestic base and not undermine our credibility as a reliable international partner.

Basic energy sciences

The conferees make no recommendation with regard to the siting of the new spallation source project. The Department of Energy shall make that determination in a fair and unbiased manner. The conferees direct the Department of Energy to evaluate opportunities to upgrade existing reactors and spallation sources as cost-effective means of providing neutrons in the near term for the scientific community while the next generation source is developed. This evaluation shall be available prior to the Appropriations Committee's hearings on the Department's fiscal year 1997 budget submission.

For purposes for reprogrammings during fiscal year 1996, funding may be reallocated by the Department among all operating accounts in basic energy sciences other than program direction.

Other energy research activities

The conferees agree that to the extent nonprogram specific general plant projects and general plant equipment are required for the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education, they are to be funded within the Basic Energy Science and Biological and Environmental Research programs, respectively.

The conference agreement provides $18,000,000 for the laboratory technology transfer program. Within this funding, up to $1,500,000 is available for severance costs for 17 current employees. The conferees recommend that the Department identify and complete the most promising cooperative research and development agreements during fiscal year 1996.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

University science and education programs

The conferees have provided $20,000,000 for this portion of the Department's science and education activities. None of the funds in this account may be used for salaries and expenses other than up to $1,100,000 which is available for severance costs for the 27 employees currently managing this program.

In addition to this individual program, the Department of Energy spends will over $100,000,000 throughout all programs to support science and education activities. The conferees continue to support science and education activities funded directly by programs and which have a direct correlation to programmatic needs. The conferees do not agree to fund a separate bureaucracy set up to manage only a small portion of the science and education activities of the Department. In fiscal year 1996, these activities are to be managed by the Office of Energy Research as they were from 1977 to 1993. In that way, this science and education program will be closely coupled with the Department's research programs, and the number of employees needed to support the program will be significantly reduced.

The conference agreement does not contain specific funding directions for science and education activities, but urges the Department to consider the views express in the Senate report. The conferees also encourage the Secretary of Energy to enter into an agreement with a qualified minority women's model institution of excellence to support curriculum development, research, training and other activities related to energy research and environmental restoration and waste management.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

(NON–DEFENSE)

The conferees agree with the House report language on the Wayne, New Jersey project.

INDIAN ENERGY RESOURCES

From within available funds for the Energy Supply, Research and Development appropriation account, $8,600,000 is provided for Indian energy resources. The funding should be allocated to provide $6,100,000 for continued preconstruction activities for the Navajo transmission project, and $2,000,000 for the Haida Alaska Native Village Corporation's Reynolds Creek hydroelectric project. The conference agreement includes $500,000 for the Crow Energy Project, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Department is encouraged to work through the Western Area Technology Center In Butte, Montana, to provide any and all assistance in making the Crow energy project a success.

Amendment No. 23: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing that within available funds $56,000,000 may be available to continue operation of the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing that within the amount for Indian Energy Resource projects, $2,000,000 may be made available to fund the Crow energy resources programs.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes language proposed by the House providing $44,772,000 to implement provisions of section 1211 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Amendment No. 26: Deletes language proposed by the Senate allocating additional funds for renewable energy resources and reducing departmental administration funding.

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

The conference agreement adjusts the allocation of funding for implementation of the depleted uranium hexafluoride cylinders and maintenance program. These adjustments will accelerate cleaning and painting of corroded cylinders at the three gaseous diffusion plant sites and construction of a new cylinder storage yard. These activities have been accommodated by reallocating funding provided in the House and Senate recommendations.

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $981,000,000 for General Science and Research Activities instead of $991,000,000 as proposed by the House and $971,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $151,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $226,600,000 as proposed by the House and deletes language proposed by the Senate that authorizes construction of an interim storage facility for spent nuclear fuel.

The conferees agree on the importance of continuing the existing scientific work at Yucca Mountain to determine the ultimate feasibility and licensability of the permanent repository at that site. The conferees

direct the Department to refocus the repository program on completing the core scientific activities at Yucca Mountain. The Department should complete excavation of the necessary portions of the exploratory tunnel and the scientific tests needed to assess the performance of the repository. It should defer preparation and filing of a license application for the repository with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission until a later date. The Department's goal should be to collect the scientific information needed to determine the suitability of the Yucca Mountain site and to complete a conceptual design for the repository and waste package for later submission to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Weapons activities

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $3,460,314,000 for Weapons Activities instead of $3,273,014,000 as proposed by the House and $3,751,719,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $1,078,403,000 for core stockpile stewardship activities which includes and additional $40,000,000 for the accelerated strategic computing initiative (ASCI). The conferees also support the enhanced surveillance and dual revalidation programs.

Funding of $37,400,000, the same as the budget request, is provided for project 96–D–111, the National Ignition Facility. Full funding for all inertial confinement fusion program participants is provided as requested in the Department's budget justification.

The conference agreement provides an increase of $106,000,000 over the House recommendation for stockpile management to provide for enhanced stockpile surveillance, advanced manufacturing, and core stockpile management activities. However, the conferees believe it is premature to initiate long-term capital improvements in advance of the outcome of the stockpile stewardship/management programmatic environmental impact statement process currently underway. The conferees have not provided specific site funding, but support fundamental initiatives in advanced manufacturing, and additional emphasis on advanced computerized manufacturing and dual revalidation techniques.

The conferees have provided $115,000,000 for program direction activities. The conferees support the liquefied gaseous spill test facility and the facility's modeling support center under the Department's emergency management program funded in the Other Defense Activities appropriation account.

The conference agreement includes the use of $209,744,000 in prior year balances, an increase of $123,400,000 over the budget request which included the use of $86,344,000.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $5,557,532,000 for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management instead of $5,265,478,000 a proposed by the House and $5,989,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The tables accompanying this conference agreement reallocate funding for several construction projects as requested by the Department to reflect the most recent programmatic and site assumptions for fiscal year 1996 activities.

Budget reductions should be taken in those areas which will have the least impact on ongoing cleanup activities. The conferees seek to the extent possible to protect funding necessary to meet the cleanup milestones established in compliance agreements with other Federal agencies, states, and local agencies, by directing the cuts against support service contracts, excessive Headquarters and field oversight, large uncosted balances, and by reducing other Department administrative expenses such as travel.

The conferees direct that, to the maximum extent practicable, funding reductions be taken against Headquarters personnel and activities. Headquarters employees should be reviewing and auditing field and contractor activities and holding the contractors responsible for meeting performance goals and milestones, not micromanaging each step of the process from Headquarters through the financial plan process and activity data sheets. A critical review of Headquarters' approval processes for various activities would yield a wealth of non-value added administrative steps which serve primarily to delay, prolong, and diffuse responsibility for direct and timely cleanup activities. Thus, the conferees expect funding for Headquarters' organizations to be severely curtailed during execution of the fiscal year 1996 program.

The conferees also believe that legislative reforms in the Department's cleanup program are long overdue, and will work with the legislative committees to ensure that significant changes are made in the cleanup program.

The Department has indicated that the environmental management organization plans to hire an additional 315 Federal employees in fiscal year 1996. The conferees do not agree with this strategy. Every witness outside of the Department who testified on this program stated that one of the management problems was too many employees. While the conferees are sympathetic that the program may not have the correct mix of technical skills in the current work force, they are not amenable to the concept of hiring 10% more employees for this program in fiscal year 1996. Thus, the Department is directed not to exceed the current Federal employee ceiling and hire new employees only as current employees leave.

The conference agreement provides $1,635,973,000 for environmental restoration. An additional $60,000,000 has been provided to accelerate cleanup activities and reduce current landlord costs and outyear funding requirements. The conferees strongly support efforts at sites such as Fernald, Ohio, and Rocky Flats, Colorado, which have developed detailed plans to expedite cleanup actions and reduce costs to the taxpayer.

The conferees are in agreement with the Senate recommendation to accelerate certain activities at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. Within the waste management account, funding is provided for preconstruction activities such as design and engineering work on additional capacity for dry storage of spent nuclear fuel and an advanced mixed waste treatment facility. The conference agreement also provides funding of $42,000,000 for project 96–D–406, the nuclear fuel canister storage building and stabilization facility in Richland, Washington.

The conferees agree with the concern expressed by the Senate that the Department is not providing sufficient attention and resources to longer term basic science research which needs to be done to ultimately reduce cleanup costs. The current technology development program continues to favor near-term applied research efforts while failing to utilize the existing basic research infrastructure within the Department and the Office of Energy Research. As a result of this, the conferees direct that at least $50,000,000 of the technology development funding provided to the environmental management program in fiscal year 1996 be managed by the Office of Energy Research and used to develop a program that takes advantage of laboratory and university expertise. This funding is to be used to stimulate the required basic research, development and demonstration efforts to seek new and innovative cleanup methods to replace current conventional approaches which are often costly and ineffective.

In the technology development program, $25,000,000 has been provided for electrometallurgical research and development. The conferees have also included sufficient funding for the Department to prepare a report on the potential of using pentaborane for environmental remediation or other uses, the estimated costs of the effort, and potential advantages and disadvantages of the proposal. The Department's activities in this area are to be confined to the preparation of this report.

The conferees expect the Department to direct more resources toward activities surrounding storage, treatment, and disposal of spent nuclear fuel currently stored at Department of Energy sites.

The conferees fully support the mission of the Hazardous Materials Training Center at the Hanford site in Richland, Washington, and direct the Department to adequately fund the requested operating budget from the compliance and coordination account.

The conferees understand the need for economic development funding to support local communities adversely impacted by Department of Energy programs and to transition communities which have lost jobs due to programmatic changes at facilities, but are concerned that cleanup funds are being used for economic development activities. With that understanding, the conferees have provided $82,500,000 in the worker and community transition program under other Defense Activities which was established and authorized to fund such activities, and expect all economic development activities to be funded from that program.

The conference agreement provides not more than $12,000,000 for public accountability activities in the analysis, education and risk management program. The Department is expected to review requests for this funding to reduce duplication of efforts by various groups and excessive costs. None of these funds may be used for reimbursement of travel expenses of individuals traveling to Washington, DC.

The conference agreement includes funding to maintain State health studies in South Carolina, Tennessee, and Colorado at the $7,300,000 level in fiscal year 1996. These funds are in addition to the $9,950,000 for dose reconstruction or other health studies including those conducted under a Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Health and Human Services and DOE's Office of Environment, Safety and Health. Additionally, the conferees direct that all of these studies shall continue to be administered by the Office of Environment, Safety and Health.

The conference agreement supports the Hanford environmental dose reconstruction project and health information network at the budget request level, and continues the Hanford thyroid study at $1,700,000, the same as the fiscal year 1995 level.

The conferees are aware that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the Department of Energy on the Proposed Nuclear Weapons Nonproliferation Policy Concerning Foreign Research Spent Nuclear Fuel includes as an option the importation of foreign spent nuclear fuel through civilian ports. The conferees are concerned that some of these ports may not have the security or the emergency management capabilities needed to safely handle weapons grade or highly irradiated nuclear material and that the designation of some of these ports as a port of entry would necessitate that the spent nuclear fuel be transported through

highly populated metropolitan areas. The Department of Energy should take into consideration a port's willingness to be designated as a port of entry for the foreign spent nuclear fuel as one of the determining factors in the final selection process and to the maximum extent feasible, the conferees direct the Department of Energy to utilize military ports or civilian ports which have expressed an interest in receiving the spent fuel.

The conference agreement includes the use of $667,240,000 of prior year balances, an increase of $390,298,000 over the budget request, which included the use of $276,942,000.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $1,373,212,000 for Other Defense Activities instead of $1,323,841,000 as proposed by the House and $1,439,112,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have provided $30,000,000 for the Soviet-designed reactor safety program, as proposed by the Senate, and $10,000,000 for the Industrial Partnering Program. The conference agreement also provides $3,600,000 to continue the Department's role in the North Korean spent fuel project.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The conferees are deeply concerned about the recent direction in Executive Order 12958 to ''automatically declassify'' and publicly release documents containing National Security Information within five years whether or not the records have been reviewed. Automatic declassification creates a substantial and unnecessary risk that information, including information regarding U.S. nuclear weapons, will be inadvertently disclosed to potential proliferators. Clearly such disclosure fundamentally undermines U.S. nonproliferation efforts, and could effect grave damage to U.S. national security. The conferees believe that the automatic declassification of national security records that could contain Restricted Data constitutes a violation of the legal protections for Restricted Data mandated by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Although the conferees recognize that the Order provides an exemption from automatic declassification for Restricted Data, the conferees do not see how such an exemption can be effectively implemented since the National Security Information records slated for automatic release have a high probability of containing some Restricted Data intermixed within the National Security Information. Thus, short of a Department of Energy review of all National Security Information records believed by the Department to have a probability of containing Restricted Data, there is no way to ensure the protection of Restricted Data materials consistent with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act.

Given the potential impact to national security through the inappropriate release of Restricted Data, the conferees believe the rush to automatically declassify sensitive documents is not in the national interest. Therefore, the conferees strongly urge the President to review and revise Executive Order 12958 regarding Classified National Security Information, and exempt from automatic declassification all National Security Information files, including files of other agencies, earmarked by the Department of Energy as potentially containing Restricted Data.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The conferees direct the use of $70,000,000 of prior year balances from this account, an increase of $57,000,000 from the budget request of $13,000,000. The increase is to be taken against unobligated and uncosted balances remaining in the Materials Support program at the end of fiscal year 1995.

Amendment No. 32: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing $4,952,000 for project 96–D–463, electrical and utility systems upgrade at the Idaho Chemical Processing Plant in Idaho. Funding for this project has been included in the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation account.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $248,400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $198,400,000 as proposed by the House.

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

During fiscal year 1995, the defense contribution to the nuclear waste fund was reestimated to the current amount of $660,000,000. The recommendation of the conferees is to provide $248,400,000 in fiscal year 1996 which will reduce the deficit to $538,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year.

Amendment No. 34: Inserts language providing that $85,000,000 shall be available only for an interim storage facility and only upon the enactment of statutory authority instead of language proposed by the Senate clarifying the use of the funds appropriated in the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriation account.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $366,697,000 for Departmental Administration instead of $362,250,000 as proposed by the House and $377,126,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Applies revenues of $122,306,000 for use in the Departmental Administration account as proposed by the House instead of $137,306,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Provides a net appropriation of $244,391,000 for a final year estimate of Departmental Administration expenditures instead of $239,944,000 as proposed by the House and $239,820,000 as proposed by the Senate.

While the conferees realize that this funding level for the Departmental Administration account will cause reductions in existing personnel at the Department of Energy, it should be noted that the Secretary of Energy has initiated a strategic alignment process which will also lead to downsizing of the Department by 27 percent over the next five years. The conference agreement assumes a 15-percent reduction in the number of employees during fiscal year 1996 from the fiscal year 1995 baseline. To the extent possible the additional reductions should be targeted to correspond with reductions in other programmatic areas in this bill. Solar and renewables, fusion, nuclear energy, technology transfer, and science and education programs are a few of the areas funded below fiscal year 1995. Support and administrative workload and staff focused on these areas should see a corresponding reduction as should offices for activities such as quality management and employee and contractor protection which have grown significantly in the last two years.

Reduced funding for this account was first proposed by the House of Representatives in June of this year, but the Department made no effort to prepare for the possibility that actual funding reductions would be implemented on October 1, 1995. Thus, the impact of these reductions exceeds that which may have occurred had the Department taken them seriously several months ago. Another example of this was the rescission of $20,000,000 of fiscal year 1995 funding which the Department chose to allocate solely to contractual services rather than personnel or programmatic areas. This was ultimately short-sighted and has amplified the impact of the fiscal year 1996 reduction.

SECRETARIAL TRAVEL

In response to concerns about the breadth and scope of Secretarial travel, the conferees issue directions and impose limitations on appropriated funds as follows:

1. Beginning in fiscal year 1997, the Department is instructed to provide sufficient detail in its budget justifications for the Office of the Secretary to provide for identification of resources budgeted for secretarial travel.

2. Costs to support travel of the Secretary, any special assistants funded through the Office of the Secretary, and any security detail accompanying the Secretary are to be absorbed within the line item for the Office of the Secretary.

3. The Department is instructed to notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of any internal reprogrammings which are executed to directly or indirectly support departmental travel, regardless of the amount.

4. No funds provided by this Act may be used to host or subsidize the travel of any non-Federal participants in secretarial missions.

5. The Department is instructed to provide semi-annual reports on secretarial travel to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. In addition to providing a full financial accounting of trips, these reports should identify: travel dates and destinations, all persons accompanying or advancing the Secretary, and the purpose and results of each trip.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $25,000,000 for the Office of the Department of Energy Inspector General as proposed by the Senate instead of $26,000,000 as proposed by the House. From within available funds, the Office of Contractor Employee Protection is to be funded in this account.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Recent actions by the Bonneville Power Administration have led to concerns that the Bonneville Power Administration may not make its Treasury payment in fiscal year 1996. The conferees cannot state more strongly that failure by Bonneville to make the full annual payment to Treasury will seriously jeopardize its credibility with Congress and will lead to more involvement by Congress in the management and decision-making processes of the agency.

The conferees are also concerned that Bonneville's much touted cost cutting measures are more words than action. For example, Bonneville has indicated its intent to downsize, but plans to reduce its Federal work force by little more than eight percent over three years. That is less that annual attrition rates, and less that the Department of Energy has proposed for other program organizations.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $131,290,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $132,290,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement provides $131,290,000 for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for

program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

The conferees recognize that Commission workload with respect to the regulation of natural gas and oil is declining as those industries become more competitive and, therefore, concurs with the House and Senate Committees' recommendations to reduce staff in the natural gas and oil pipelines program. A 20-percent reduction over the next two years is recommended.

The conferees recognize the value in maintaining the current staffing level for the electric power program. This is necessary to respond to a significant increase in workload due to the Commission's efforts to establish a competitive wholesale bulk power market for electricity similar to what has been accomplished in the natural gas area.

To mitigate the impact of the recommended funding reduction, the conferees encourage the Commission to employ additional authority from prior years' unexpended balances, as needed.

The conferees direct the Commission to not approve the transfer of electric generating facilities at Scott Dam at Lake Pillsbury in Lake County, California, or Cape Horn Dam in Mendocino County, California, unless the Commission determines that such transfer will not adversely affect any existing water rights and will not substantially change flow levels in the Russian and Eel Rivers.

Amendment No. 40: Applies revenues of $131,290,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $132,290,000 as proposed by the House.

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT		
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY		
Solar energy		
Solar building technology research	4,657	2,000
Photovoltaic energy systems	88,129	65,000
Solar thermal energy systems	33,943	25,000
Biofuels energy systems	80,380	55,300
Wind energy systems	49,820	32,500
International solar energy program	29,154	4,000
Solar technology transfer	17,758	4,300
National renewable energy laboratory	380	500
Construction		
General plant projects	120	---
96-E-100 FTLB renovation and expansion, Golden, CO	5,500	1,500
Subtotal, Construction	5,620	1,500
Subtotal, National renewable energy laboratory	6,000	2,000
Resource assessment	4,665	2,000
Solar program support	7,345	---
Program direction	9,460	---
Subtotal, Solar Energy	331,311	192,100
Review of uncosted balances	-4,888	-4,888
Total, Solar Energy	326,423	187,212
Geothermal		
Geothermal technology development	36,130	30,447
Program direction	1,000	---
Capital equipment	397	---
Review of uncosted balances	-555	-555
Total, Geothermal	36,972	29,892
Hydrogen research	7,334	14,500
Hydropower		
Small scale hydropower development	904	1,500
Program direction	90	---
Review of uncosted balances	-14	---
Total, Hydropower	980	1,500
Electric energy systems and storage		
Electric energy systems		
Electric field effects research	9,924	9,924
Reliability research	6,153	---
System and materials research	24,712	19,000
Program direction	850	---
Review of uncosted balances	-615	-615
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	41,024	28,309
Energy storage systems		
Battery storage	5,656	2,000
Program direction	350	---
Review of uncosted balances	-88	---
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	5,918	2,000
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	46,942	30,309
Policy and management	4,746	11,800
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	423,397	275,213

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
NUCLEAR ENERGY		
Nuclear energy R&D		
Light water reactor	49,339	40,000
Advanced radioisotope power system	48,512	48,512
Nuclear technology R&D	37,210	---
Program direction	12,093	8,000
Policy and management	9,841	5,000
Test reactor area hot cells	1,400	---
Oak Ridge landlord	15,380	14,400
Construction		
GPN-103 General plant projects	3,255	---
Subtotal, Oak Ridge landlord	18,635	14,400
Test reactor area landlord	1,370	2,000
Construction		
GP-N-102 General plant projects, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	730	---
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,900	1,900
Subtotal, Construction	2,630	1,900
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	4,000	3,900
Advanced test reactor fusion irradiation	2,303	2,303
University reactor fuel assistance and support	6,130	3,500
Total, Nuclear energy R&D	189,463	125,615
Termination costs	78,800	79,000
Construction		
GPN-102 General plant projects	1,000	---
95-E-207 Modifications to reactors, experimental breeder reactor - II sodium processing facility Argonne National Laboratory-West, ID	1,700	1,700
Subtotal, Construction	2,700	1,700
Total, Termination costs	81,500	80,700
Isotope support	25,303	24,658
Soviet designed reactor safety	78,543	---
Russian replacement power initiative	5,000	---
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	379,809	230,973
CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT		
Spent fuel storage R&D	586	---
Program direction	110	---
TOTAL, CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	696	---
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH		
Environment, safety and health	147,443	114,933
Nuclear safety policy	17,180	13,500
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	164,623	128,433

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
ENERGY RESEARCH		
Biological and environmental research		
Biological and environmental research R&D	354,546	349,891
Construction		
GP-E-120 General plant projects	4,450	---
94-E-337 Advanced light source structural biology support facility, LBL	2,600	2,600
94-E-338 Structural biology center, ANL	4,295	4,295
94-E-339 Human genome lab, LBL	5,700	5,700
91-EM-100 Environmental & molecular sciences laboratory, PNL, Richland, WA	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, Construction	67,045	62,595
Subtotal, Biological & environ. research R&D	421,591	412,486
BER program direction	7,060	7,000
Total, Biological and environmental research	428,651	419,486
Fusion energy	309,187	244,144
Construction		
GPE-900 General plant projects, var. locations	1,000	---
96-E-310 Elise project	3,200	---
94-E-200 Tokamak physics experiment, Princeton plasma physics laboratory	49,900	---
Subtotal, Construction	54,100	---
Total, Fusion energy	363,287	244,144
Basic energy sciences		
Materials sciences	345,606	367,400
Chemical sciences	180,161	198,400
Applied mathematical sciences	107,852	116,500
Engineering and geosciences	39,648	41,700
Advanced energy projects	11,915	12,300
Energy biosciences	29,307	30,200
Program direction	9,495	9,500
Capital equipment	56,973	---
Construction		
GPE-400 General plant projects	6,314	---
96-E-305 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	12,883	10,475
89-R-402 6-7 GeV syn. radiation source, ANL	3,186	3,186
96-E-300 Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Construction	24,383	15,661
Total, Basic energy sciences	805,340	791,661
Other energy research		
Energy research analyses	3,463	3,463
Laboratory technology transfer	58,776	18,000
Advisory and oversight	8,720	6,200
Policy and management	2,180	2,200

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support		
Multiprogram general purpose facilities	6,382	---
Construction		
GPE-801 General plant projects	8,740	---
95-E-301 Central heating plant rehabilitation, Phase I (ANL)	2,500	2,500
95-E-302 Applied science center, phase I (BNL)	3,270	3,270
95-E-303 Electrical safety rehab (PNL)	1,500	1,500
95-E-310 Multiprogram laboratory rehabilitation, phase I (PNL)	2,740	2,740
94-E-351 Fuel storage and transfer facility upgrade (BNL)	440	440
94-E-363 Roofing improvements (ORNL)	2,038	2,038
Subtotal, Construction	21,228	12,488
Subtotal, Multiprogram gen. purpose facilities	27,610	12,488
Environment, safety and health	8,657	6,656
Construction		
96-E-330 Building electrical service upgrade Phase I, Argonne National Laboratory Argonne, Illinois	1,200	---
96-E-331 Sanitary sewer restoration, Phase I, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, CA	2,400	---
96-E-332 Building 801, renovations Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York	800	---
96-E-333 Multiprogram energy laboratories upgrades, various locations	---	4,400
95-E-307 Fire Safety imp. III (ANL)	1,000	1,000
95-E-308 Sanitary system mods. II (BNL)	1,540	1,540
95-E-309 Loss prevention upgrades (BNL)	2,480	2,480
93-E-320 Fire and safety improvements, phase II (ANL)	2,411	2,411
93-E-323 Fire and safety systems upgrade phase I (LBL)	1,130	1,130
93-E-324 Hazardous materials safeguards, phase I (LBL)	1,288	1,288
Subtotal, Construction	14,249	14,249
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	22,906	20,905
Inactive and surplus facilities	500	---
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs - fac. suppor	51,016	33,393
Total, Other energy research	124,155	63,256
TOTAL, ENERGY RESEARCH	1,721,433	1,518,547

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES		
University and science education programs		
Laboratory cooperative science centers	29,576	13,000
University programs	17,377	7,000
University research instrumentation	5,647	---
Program direction	2,359	---
Total, University and science education programs	54,959	20,000
Technical information management program	14,220	11,000
Construction	1,500	1,000
Total, Technical information management program	15,720	12,000
Technology partnership	3,139	---
In-house energy management	15,664	---
Construction		
IHE - 500 Modifications for energy mgmt	13,125	---
Total, In-house energy management	28,789	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	102,607	32,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MGMT. (NON-DEFENSE)		
Corrective activities	1,065	---
Construction		
92-E-601 Melton Valley liquid low level waste collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL	339	339
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Construction	4,339	4,339
Total, Corrective activities	5,404	4,339
Environmental restoration	411,532	366,400
Waste management	194,907	171,896
Construction		
GP-E-600 General plant projects	2,212	---
94-E-602 Bethel Valley federal facility agreement upgrades, ORNL	300	300
93-E-900 Long-term storage of TMI-2 fuel, INEL	4,048	4,048
91-E-600 Rehabilitation of waste management building 306, ANL	787	787
88-R-812 Hazardous waste handling facility, LBL	671	671
Subtotal, Construction	8,018	5,806
Total, Waste management	202,925	177,702
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization	82,395	73,100
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	702,256	621,541
Subtotal, Energy supply, research and development	3,494,821	2,806,707

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
Use of prior year balances	-79,300	-79,300
General reduction, ESR&D	-10,000	---
Galvin task force reductions	-50,000	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	3,355,521	2,727,407
URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES		
Uranium program activities	91,944	83,500
Construction		
96-U-200 UF6 cylinders refurbishment facility, Paducah, Kentucky gaseous diffusion plants	5,800	---
96-U-201 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, Kentucky gaseous diffusion plant	---	3,000
93-U-200 UF6 cylinders and storage yards, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH gaseous diffusion plants	3,400	3,400
Subtotal, Construction	9,200	6,400
Subtotal, Uranium supply & enrichment activities	101,144	89,900
Revenues - Sales	-34,903	-34,903
Use of prior year balances	-25,703	-25,703
TOTAL, URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	40,538	29,294
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND		
Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	288,807	278,807
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH		
High energy physics		
Physics research	146,050	141,000
Facility operations	337,352	353,077
Construction		
GP-E-103 General plant projects, various locations	13,845	---
96-G-301 Accelerator improvement projects, various locations	9,800	---
94-G-304 B-Factory, SLAC	52,000	52,000
92-G-302 Fermilab main injector, Fermilab	52,000	52,000
Subtotal, Construction	127,645	104,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	464,997	457,077
High energy technology	66,864	68,923
Other capital equipment	3,925	---
Total, High energy physics	681,836	667,000
Nuclear physics	237,773	236,925
Construction		
GP-E-300 General plant projects, various locations	4,785	---

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
96-G-302 Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations	4,975	2,575
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL	70,000	65,000
Subtotal, Construction	79,760	67,575
Other capital equipment	2,000	---
Total, Nuclear physics	319,533	304,500
General science program direction	10,330	9,500
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	1,011,699	981,000
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES		
Stockpile stewardship		
Core stockpile stewardship	994,208	1,078,403
Construction		
GPD-101 General plant projects, various locations	12,500	---
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	2,520	2,520
96-D-103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National laboratory	8,400	8,400
96-D-104 Process and environmental technology laboratory, SNL	1,800	1,800
96-D-105 Contained firing facility addition, LLNL	6,600	6,600
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL	9,940	9,940
94-D-102 Nuclear Weapons Research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase V, various locations	12,200	12,200
93-D-102 Nevada support facility, NV	15,650	15,650
90-D-102 Nuclear Weapons Research, Development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase III, various locations	6,200	6,200
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, various locations	17,995	17,995
Subtotal, Construction	93,805	81,305
Subtotal, Core stockpile stewardship	1,088,013	1,159,708
Inertial fusion	203,267	203,267
Construction		
96-D-111 National ignition facility, TBD	37,400	37,400
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	240,667	240,667
Technology transfer/education		
Technology transfer	229,405	150,000
Education	20,000	10,000
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education	249,405	160,000
Marshall Island/Dose reconstruction	6,800	6,800
Total, Stockpile stewardship	1,584,885	1,567,175

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
Stockpile management	1,769,090	1,911,458
Construction		
Stockpile support facilities		
GPD-121 General plant projects, various loc.	10,000	---
Production base		
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	8,660	8,660
96-D-126 Tritium loading line modifications, Savannah River Site, SC	---	12,200
Subtotal, Production base	8,660	20,860
Environmental, safety and health		
96-D-122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU) Pantex plant	600	600
96-D-123 Retrofit HVAC and chillers, for Ozone protection Y-12 plant	3,100	3,100
95-D-122 Sanitary sewer upgrade, Y-12 plant	6,300	6,300
94-D-124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y-12 plant	8,700	8,700
94-D-125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City plant	5,500	5,500
94-D-127 Emergency notification system, Pantex plant	2,000	2,000
94-D-128 Environmental safety and health analytical laboratory, Pantex plant	4,000	4,000
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 plant	7,200	7,200
Subtotal, Environmental, safety and health	37,400	37,400
Safeguards and security		
88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex plant	13,400	13,400
Nuclear weapons incident response		
96-D-125 Washington measurement operations facility, Andrews Air Force Base, MD	900	900
Reconfiguration		
93-D-123 Non-nuclear reconfiguration, various locations	41,065	41,065
Subtotal, Construction	111,425	113,625
Total, Stockpile management	1,880,515	2,025,083
Program direction	135,311	115,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities	3,600,711	3,707,258
Use of prior year balances	-86,344	-209,744
Streamline DOE contractors (undistributed)	-25,000	-37,200
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	3,489,367	3,460,314
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.		
Corrective activities		
Construction		
90-D-103 Environment, safety and health improvements, weapons R&D complex, LANL	3,406	3,406
Environmental restoration	1,570,174	1,635,973

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
Waste management	2,280,039	2,295,994
Construction		
GP-D-171 General plant projects,various locations	30,728	---
96-D-400 Replace industrial waste piping, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO	200	---
96-D-401 Comprehensive Treatment & Management Plan immobilization of miscellaneous wastes, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO	1,400	---
96-D-402 Comprehensive Treatment & Management Plan building 374/774 sludge immobilization Golden, CO	1,500	---
96-D-403 Tank farm service upgrades, Savannah River, SC	3,315	---
96-D-405 T-Plant secondary containment & leak detection upgrades, Richland, WA	2,100	---
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	26,000	42,000
96-D-407 Mixed waste low level waste treatment project, Rocky Flats	---	2,900
96-D-408 Waste mgmt upgrades, various locations	---	5,615
95-D-402 Install permanent electrical service WIPP, AL	4,314	4,314
95-D-405 Industrial landfill V and construction/ demolition landfill VII, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge,TN	4,600	4,600
95-D-406 Road 5-01 reconstruction, area 5, NV	1,023	1,023
95-D-407 219-S Secondary containment upgrade, Richland, WA	---	1,000
94-D-400 High explosive wastewater treatment system, LANL	4,445	4,445
94-D-402 Liquid waste treatment system, NTS	282	282
94-D-404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL	11,000	11,000
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	9,400	12,000
94-D-411 Solid waste operation complex Richland, WA	5,500	6,606
94-D-417 Intermediate-level and low-activity waste vaults, Savannah River, SC	2,704	---
93-D-178 Building 374 liquid waste treatment facility, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	3,900	3,900
93-D-181 Radioactive liquid waste line replacement, Richland, WA	---	5,000
93-D-182 Replacement of cross-site transfer system, Richland, WA	19,795	19,795
93-D-183 Multi-function waste remediation facility, Richland, WA	31,000	---
93-D-187 High level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	19,700	19,700
92-D-171 Mixed waste receiving and storage facility, LANL	1,105	1,105
92-D-188 Waste management ES&H, and compliance activities, various locations	1,100	1,100

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA..	2,000	2,000
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste characterization and storage facility, ID.....	1,428	1,428
90-D-178 TSA retrieval enclosure, ID.....	2,606	2,606
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA.....	800	800
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC.....	11,500	11,500
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA.....	8,885	8,885
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC.....	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	213,330	174,604
Total, Waste management.....	2,493,369	2,470,598
Technology development.....	389,327	440,510
Transportation management.....	16,158	13,158
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization.....	1,462,117	1,447,108
Construction		
GP-D-171 General plant projects, various locations.....	34,724	---
96-D-457 Thermal treatment system, Richland, WA...	---	1,000
96-D-458 Site drainage control, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH.....	885	885
96-D-461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID.....	1,539	1,539
96-D-462 Health physics instrument laboratory, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID.....	1,126	---
96-D-463 Central facilities area (CFA) craft shop Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID.....	724	---
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID.....	4,952	4,952
96-D-465 200 Area sanitary sewer system, Richland, WA.....	1,800	---
96-D-468 Residue elimination project, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Co.....	---	33,100
96-D-470 Environmental monitoring laboratory, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC.....	3,500	---
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC.....	1,500	1,500
96-D-472 Plant engineering & Design, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC.....	4,000	---
96-D-473 Health physics site support facility, Savannah River, South Carolina.....	2,000	---
95-D-155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, South Carolina.....	2,900	2,900
95-D-156 Radio trunking system, Savannah River,SC	6,000	6,000
95-D-454 324 Facility compliance/renovation, Richland, WA.....	3,500	3,500

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
95-D-456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, Idaho	8,382	8,382
94-D-122 Underground storage tanks, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	5,000	5,000
94-D-401 Emergency response facility, INEL, ID	5,074	5,074
94-D-412 300 area process sewer piping system upgrade, Richland, WA	1,000	1,000
94-D-415 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory medical facilities, INEL, ID	3,601	3,601
94-D-451 Infrastructure replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	2,940	2,940
93-D-147 Domestic water system upgrade, Phase I & II, Savannah River, South Carolina	7,130	7,130
93-D-172 Idaho national engineering laboratory electrical upgrade, INEL, ID	124	---
92-D-123 Plant fire/security alarm system replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	9,560	9,560
92-D-125 Master safeguards and security agreement/materials surveillance task force security upgrades, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	7,000	7,000
92-D-181 Idaho national engineering laboratory fire and life safety improvements, INEL, ID	6,883	6,883
91-D-127 Criticality alarm & plant annunciation utility replacement, Rocky Flats plant, Golden, CO	2,800	2,800
Subtotal, Construction	128,644	114,746
Total, Nuclear materials & fac. stabilization	1,590,761	1,561,854
Compliance and program coordination	66,053	31,251
Construction		
95-E-600 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, Washington	15,000	15,000
Total, Compliance and program coordination	81,053	46,251
Analysis, education and risk management	156,430	90,022
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	6,300,678	6,261,772
Savannah river pension refund	-37,000	-37,000
Use of prior year balances	-276,942	-667,240
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	5,986,736	5,557,532
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
Other national security programs		
Verification and control technology		
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	224,905	246,142
Arms control	160,933	160,964
Intelligence	42,110	42,336
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	427,948	449,442
Nuclear safeguards and security	86,774	83,395
Security investigations	32,871	20,000
Security evaluations	14,658	14,707
Nuclear safety	24,597	17,679

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
Worker and community transition	100,000	82,500
Fissile materials control and disposition	69,979	70,000
Emergency management	---	23,321
Total, Other national security programs	756,827	761,044
Naval reactors		
Naval reactors development	649,700	652,568
Construction		
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	6,600	6,600
95-D-200 Laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations	11,300	11,300
95-D-201 Advanced test reactor radioactive waste system upgrades, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	4,800	4,800
93-D-200 Engineering services facilities Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Niskayuna, NY	3,900	3,900
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Construction	29,600	29,600
Total, Naval reactors	679,300	682,168
Subtotal, Other defense activities	1,436,127	1,443,212
Use of prior year balances	-13,000	-70,000
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,423,127	1,373,212
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL		
Defense nuclear waste disposal	198,053	248,400
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	11,097,283	10,639,458
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION		
Administrative operations		
Office of the Secretary - salaries and expenses	3,435	2,500
General management - personnel compensation and benefits	208,398	185,000
General management - other expenses	180,630	157,000
Program support		
Minority economic impact	3,415	2,900
Policy analysis and system studies	5,864	2,900
Consumer affairs	46	40
Public affairs	92	50
Environmental policy studies	7,700	4,000
Scientific and technical training	2,248	1,000
Subtotal, Program support	19,365	10,890
Total, Administrative operations	411,828	355,390
Cost of work for others	22,826	22,826
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	434,654	378,216
Use of unobligated balances and other adjustments	-11,519	-11,519
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	423,135	366,697
Miscellaneous revenues	-137,306	-122,306

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL		
Office of Inspector General	32,611	26,915
Use of prior year balances	-1,915	-1,915
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	30,696	25,000
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS		
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance	4,260	4,260
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Operating expenses	3,472	3,472
Purchase power and wheeling	26,416	26,430
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	29,888	29,902
Use of prior year balances	-10,059	-10,059
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	19,829	19,843
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Operating expenses	20,897	20,897
Purchase power and wheeling	1,464	1,464
Construction	7,789	7,931
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	30,150	30,292
Use of prior year balances	-514	-514
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	29,636	29,778
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Construction and rehabilitation	64,816	51,125
System operation and maintenance	123,358	125,255
Purchase power and wheeling	97,322	93,709
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,283	5,283
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	290,779	275,372
Use of prior year balances	-8,020	-17,720
Transfer of authority from Department of Interior	(4,556)	(4,556)
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	282,759	257,652
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND		
Operation and maintenance	1,000	1,000
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	337,484	312,533
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION		
Federal energy regulatory commission	151,567	146,290
Use of prior year balances (FERC)	-15,000	-15,000
FERC revenues	-136,567	-131,290
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	---	---
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND		
Discretionary funding	---	151,600

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Estimate	Conference
ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS		
Energy Supply, Research and Development	3,355,521	2,727,407
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities	75,441	64,197
Revenues	-34,903	-34,903
Total, Uranium supply and enrichment	40,538	29,294
Uranium enrichment D&D fund	288,807	278,807
General Science and Research Activities	1,011,699	981,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	---	151,600
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management		
Defense function	(5,986,736)	(5,557,532)
Non-defense function	(991,063)	(900,348)
Total, Environmental Restoration and Waste Mgmt	(6,977,799)	(6,457,880)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities		
Weapons Activities	3,489,367	3,460,314
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Mgmt	5,986,736	5,557,532
Other Defense Activities	1,423,127	1,373,212
Defense nuclear waste disposal	198,053	248,400
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	11,097,283	10,639,458
Departmental Administration	423,135	366,697
Revenues	-137,306	-122,306
Total, Departmental administration	285,829	244,391
Office of the Inspector General	30,696	25,000
Power Marketing Administrations		
Alaska Power Administration	4,260	4,260
Southeastern Power Administration	19,829	19,843
Southwestern Power Administration	29,636	29,778
Western Area Power Administration	282,759	257,652
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund	1,000	1,000
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	337,484	312,533
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS	16,447,857	15,389,490

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $170,000,000 instead of $142,000,000 as proposed by the House and $182,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Of the total amount appropriated, $57,355,000 is provided for area development, $3,645,000 is provided for salaries and expenses, and $109,000,000 is provided for the highway program.

The conferees direct that the Commission establish new area development allocation criteria which place greater emphasis on assistance to the more severely distressed counties.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $343,000 for Salaries and Expenses instead of $440,000 as proposed by the Senate and appropriates $428,000 as a contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission instead of $478,000 as proposed by the Senate and deletes language related to the compensation of the United States Commissioner as proposed by the Senate. The House included no similar provision.

The conferees agree to provide final year funding for the Delaware River Basin Commission. Funding is provided to facilitate an orderly transition to financial self-sufficiency of the compact states and an orderly termination of the Office of the Federal Commissioner. Committees of authorizing jurisdiction will have an opportunity during fiscal year 1996 to address any new institutional arrangements or revisions to the Delaware River Basin Compact that are necessary or desirable due to the prospective termination of federal funding.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $511,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House included no similar provision.

The conferees agree to provide final year funding for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. Funding is provided to facilitate an orderly transition to financial self-sufficiency of the compact states. Committees of authorizing jurisdiction will have an opportunity during fiscal year 1996 to address any new institutional arrangements or revisions to the compact creating the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin that are necessary or desirable due to the prospective termination of Federal funding.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $468,300,000 as proposed by the House instead of $474,3000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Derives $11,000,000 from the Nuclear Waste Fund as proposed by the House instead of $17,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Provides for a net appropriation of $11,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $17,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $2,531,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,664,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates $318,000 for Salaries and Expenses instead of $280,000 as proposed by the Senate and appropriates $250,000 as a contribution to the Susquehanna River Basin Commission instead of $288,000 as proposed by the Senate and deletes language relating to the compensation of the United States Commissioner as proposed by the Senate. The House included no similar provision.

The conferees agree to provide final year funding for the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. Funding is provided to facilitate an orderly transition to financial self-sufficiency of the compact states and an orderly termination of the Office of the Federal Commissioner. Committees of authorizing jurisdiction will have an opportunity during fiscal year 1996 to address any new institutional arrangements or revisions to the Susquehanna River Basin Compact that are necessary or desirable due to the prospective termination of Federal funding.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $109,169,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority instead of $103,339,000 as proposed by the House and $110,339,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The appropriation is to be distributed among TVA programs as follows: $71,169,000 for stewardship and land and water; $5,000,000 for Land Between the Lakes; $16,000,000 for economic development; and $17,000,000 for the environmental research center.

In conjunction with its efforts to reduce the need for future appropriations at Land Between the Lakes through reductions, savings and efficiencies, TVA may continue to use its flexibility to allocate up to an additional $1,000,000 from its Stewardship funds to LBL. This flexibility will allow TVA, if the need arises due to a lack of funds or other emergency and/or crisis situations, to allocate additional funding to promote the facilitation of LBL's transition to increased financial self-sufficiency.

Amendment No. 50: Includes language proposed by the Senate that requires the Tennessee Valley Authority to submit to Congress a plan for obtaining funding for the Environmental Research Center from other sources amended to extend the deadline for submission of such plan and to delete limitations on expenditures for the TVA Environmental Research Center.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 51: Deletes language proposed by the House repealing Sec. 505 of Public Law 102–377 which prohibits the use of funds to conduct studies relating to changes in pricing hydroelectric power by the six Federal public power authorities and Sec. 208 of Public Law 99–349 which prohibits the use of funds by the executive branch to solicit proposals, prepare studies, or draft proposals to transfer out of Federal ownership the Federal power marketing administrations located within the contiguous 48 states, but accepts House language repealing Sec. 510 of Public Law 101–514 which prohibits the use of funds by the executive branch to change the employment levels determined by the administrators of the Federal power marketing administrations to be necessary to carry out their responsibilities. The conferees agree that the statutory limitations do not prohibit the Legislative Branch from initiating or conducting studies or collecting information regarding the sale or transfer of the power marketing administrations to non-Federal ownership.

The conference agreement also inserts language which extends the due date for the report required to be submitted by Title 30 of Public Law 102–575, the Western Water Policy Review Act of 1992. This extension is required because of the delay by the Administration in establishing the Western Water Policy Review Advisory Commission. The Bureau of Reclamation may use up to $800,000 of available funds in support of the work of the Commission.

Amendment No. 52: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate providing that no funds may be used for programs, projects, or activities not in compliance with applicable Federal law relating to risk assessment, protection of property rights, or unfunded mandates and inserts language which extends the authorization for the Trinity River Restoration Program of the Central Valley Project, California, for one year. The conferees are aware that the House Resources Committee currently has under consideration legislation to extend the authorization for this program. This temporary extension will permit work to continue on this important program pending action by the authorizing committee.

Amendment No. 53: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate reducing the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund by $1,000, and inserts language that directs the Secretary of the Interior to proceed without delay with construction of those facilities of the Animas-La Plata Project, Colorado and New Mexico, identified for construction in the Final Biological Opinion for the project dated October 25, 1991.

Amendment No. 54: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which provides that none of the funds available in the Act for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Upper Mississippi River—Illinios Waterway Navigation Study may be used to study any portion of the Mississippi River above Lock and Dam 14.

The conferees believe that the language contained in the Hospital-passed bill could restrict the ability of the Corps of Engineers to undertake a comprehensive study of the navigation needs on the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway and have, therefore, agreed to delete the language. The conferees do agree, however, with the intent of the language and direct that the Corps of Engineers not study any large-scale improvements on the Upper Mississippi River above Lock and Dam 14.

Amendment No. 55: Deletes language inserted by the Senate pertaining to the amount of fish and wildlife costs that the Bonneville Power Administration could incur, and inserts language amending Public Law 88–552 and the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act to permit the Bonneville Power Administration to sell excess Federal power outside the Pacific Northwest; requiring the Northwest Power and Conservation Planning Council to provide a report to Congress; authorizing the Corps of Engineers to procure goods through Bonneville using the authorities available to the Administrator; maintaining the residential exchange power program through fiscal year 1997; providing Bonneville Power Administration employees with a voluntary separation incentive up to $25,000; and authorizing these authorities to extend beyond the fiscal year.

The conferees are deeply concerned over the escalating and uncoordinated fish and wildlife costs imposed on the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and its customers due to Endangered Species Act compliance. The conferees are concerned that the current inability to control BPA's fish and wildlife costs may result in the shifting of costs—both directly and indirectly—to the Nation's taxpayers and to non-Federal interests on the Columbia and Snake River system. Such non-Federal interests include the region's electric ratepayers, agriculture, non-Federal hydroelectric projects owners, river users, reservoir users, water interests, and others. The conferees strongly urge BPA and the Administration to resist the temptation to shift fish and wildlife costs onto the Nation's taxpayers and these non-Federal interests.

The conferees understand that there is a nearly unanimous call from affected parties—user groups, and ratepayers—in the region of Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana to start the review of the Pacific Northwest Power Planning and Conservation Act. The provisions of the Northwest Power Act that deserve careful consideration include, but are not limited to, containing the region's fish and wildlife costs, coordinating fish and wildlife expenditures, and granting the region the ability to make the decisions with respect to such costs. The conferees, therefore, urge a renewed review of the Northwest Power Act within the authorizing committees in the next session of Congress in an effort to answer these and other important issues confronting the region.

The conferees understand the Administration is taking steps to control fish and wildlife costs as an interim measure. In addition, the conferees direct the agencies involved to enter into a Memorandum of Agreement establishing an overall salmon recovery budget, and detailing the manner in which such budget will be implemented.

Sale of Excess Federal Power.—Excess power may be generated by routine power operations, or fish and wildlife operations, of either the Federal Columbia River Power System or other electric power plants from which Bonneville is contractually obligated to acquire electric power.

This section removes restrictions from power made excess to BPA contractual obligations by: 1) a customer's decision to remove load from Bonneville, 2) hydrosystem operations, or 3) purchases for the benefit of fish and wildlife. This gives BPA greater flexibility in marketing, to increase its revenue and its competitiveness.

The legislation applies the term ''excess power'' to this power. Currently, Bonneville's authorizing legislation severely limits Bonneville's flexibility to market such power, putting the agency at a marketing disadvantage and restricting potential revenues. Bonneville may sell excess power without, among other things, the regional preference call back provisions of 60 days for energy sales and 60 months for capacity sales, and without the Bonneville Project Act prohibition on resale of Federal power by private entities not in the business of selling power in the retail market. Surplus power which is surplus for reasons other than the reasons stated above will continue to be governed by existing marketing restrictions.

Bonneville is allowed greater flexibility to provide Pacific Northwest preference notice to regional customers for out-of-region sales. This flexibility may include shorter notice periods and less detailed information on in-program negotiations. Notice periods may be very short for short-term sales (for example, notice to accommodate hourly sales) and for transactions that must be negotiated quickly. BPA may also provide seasonal notices with price ranges requesting interested parties to contact BPA to purchase power. In all cases, prior to sales outside the Pacific Northwest, Bonneville would continue to offer power first to Northwest utilities and industries purchasing power from Bonneville. Bonneville would offer excess power first to regional customers under the same essential rate, terms and conditions as for the proposed out-of-region sale. The Administrator has discretion in making this determination given that the rate may depend on terms and conditions for one purchaser that would be inapplicable to another purchaser. The rate, as under current law, will continue to be the price that BPA applies to the proposed sale within the parameters of the applicable rate schedule and based on the terms and conditions of the sale.

This legislation poses no significant risk or cost to Bonneville's regional customers because the only power sold outside the region without the restrictions is power abandoned by regional customers and excess power generated or purchased for the benefit of fish and wildlife. No other amount of power can be sold outside the region without such restrictions. Regional customers will continue to receive first right to purchase excess power before it is sold outside the region.

Within 90 days, the Bonneville Power Administration, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Energy, shall deliver a report on the sale of excess Federal Power provision to the House Commerce Committee, House Resources Committee, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and the House and Senate Committies on Appropriations. This report will be one of the factors considered in the comprehensive review of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Residential Exchange.—Establishes the total amount of benefits available for residential and small farm consumers of utilities participating in the residential exchange program under section 5(c) of the Pacific Northwest Power Planning and Conservation Act for fiscal year 1997. All residential exchange benefits will continue to be passed through in their entirety to the eligible residential and small farm consumers of the respective utilities. The conferees recognize the authority of the Bonneville Power Administration to implement in lieu transactions, among other actions, which could effectively terminate the residential exchange after 2001. Consistent with the regional review, Bonneville and its customers should work together to gradually phase out the residential exchange program by October 1, 2001. This should result in total fiscal year 1997 benefits to these consumers being approximately equivalent to the benefits they received in fiscal year 1996.

In order to maintain a sound financial position, the conferees urge, to the extent practicable, BPA to take such actions as are necessary to assure the proposed rate for public utilities and direct services industries are not increased from the initial proposal. In a further effort to prevent load loss, the conferees urge Bonneville to pursue load commitments from its public utility customers at an appropriate level which assures Bonneville's continued financial viability and recognizes customers' desires for load diversification and to capture economies of scale by pooling their resources.

Amendment No. 56: Inserts a provision which would repeal section 7 of the Magnetic Fusion Engineering Act as proposed by the Senate, but does not repeal section 3131(c) of Public Law 101–510, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, as proposed by the Senate because this was an erroneous citation.

Amendment No. 57: Deletes language proposed by the Senate expressing the sense of the Senate on the conference on S. 4, the Line Item Veto Act.

Amendment No. 58: Deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring reductions in energy costs of agency facilities.

Amendment No. 59: Inserts language proposed by the Senate regarding the regulation of water levels in Rainy Lake and Namakan Lake in Minnesota, and changes the section number.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1996 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparison to the fiscal year 1995 amount, the 1996 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1966 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	$20,042,999,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	20,562,044,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	18,682,457,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	20,169,152,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1996	19,336,311,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	−706,688,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	−1,225,733,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	+653,854,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	−832,841,000

JOHN T. MYERS,
HAROLD ROGERS,
JOE KNOLLENBERG,
FRANK RIGGS,
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN,
JIM BUNN,
BOB LIVINGSTON,
TOM BEVILL,
VIC FAZIO,
JIM CHAPMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
THAD COCHRAN,
SLADE GORTON,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
ROBERT F. BENNETT,
CONRAD BURNS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
FRITZ HOLLINGS,
HARRY REID,
BOB KERREY,
PATTY MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1868

Mr. CALLAHAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104–295)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1868) ''making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes,'' having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 6, 15, 21, 23, 25, 29, 30, 33, 36, 37, 39, 54, 59, 61, 71, 85, 88, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 107, 108, 109, 112, 113, 117, 119, 120, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 134, 136, 137, 141, 143, 148, 153, 154, 157, 164, 166, 170, 172, 173, 174, 177, 178, 179, 180, 184, 185, 187, 188, 191, and 193.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 7, 13, 14, 17, 20, 26, 27, 38, 40, 41, 49, 50, 52, 56, 57, 58, 62, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 77, 81, 83, 84, 86, 87, 103, 104, 105, 110, 111, 114, 116, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 131, 133, 138, 139, 146, 149, 150, 151, 160, 161, 162, and 163, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: