

The original documents are located in Box 36, folder “12/26/75 HR8122 Public Works Appropriation Act (2)” of the White House Records Office: Legislation Case Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald R. Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Exact duplicates within this folder were not digitized.

94TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES } REPORT
1st Session } } No. 94-319

PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY RESEARCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1976

JUNE 20, 1975.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

together with
MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 8122]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for Public Works for water and power development and energy research, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian Regional Development Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Energy Research and Development Administration, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976 and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.



BILL SUMMARY BY MAJOR PROGRAM CATEGORIES

	1975 enacted to date	1976 estimates	1976 bill	1976 bill compared with—		Transition quarter	
				1975 enacted	1976 estimates	Budget estimate	1976 bill
(Title I) Energy Research and Develop- ment Admin- istration.....	\$3,234,939,000	\$3,879,679,000	\$3,908,142,000	+\$673,203,000	+\$28,463,000	\$1,100,007,000	\$1,115,225,000
(Titles II and III) Water and power develop- ment: (Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and power agencies of the Depart- ment of the Interior):							
Planning and con- struction.....	1,619,728,000	1,691,666,000	1,795,510,000	+175,782,000	+103,844,000	543,010,000	608,336,000
Investiga- tions.....	85,251,000	83,345,000	85,468,000	+217,000	+2,123,000	22,410,000	24,174,000
Opera- tional main- tenance.....	641,378,000	687,510,000	716,072,500	+74,694,500	+28,562,500	172,908,000	189,449,000
Other.....	61,720,000	66,020,000	64,990,000	+3,270,000	-1,030,000	16,275,000	16,250,000
Total, titles II and III.....	2,408,077,000	2,528,541,000	2,662,040,500	+253,963,500	+133,499,500	754,603,000	838,209,000
(Title IV) Independent Offices:							
Appalach- ian pro- grams.....	295,247,000	295,352,000	295,030,000	-217,000	-322,000	47,980,000	50,480,000
Federal Power Commis- sion.....	33,097,000	35,910,000	35,610,000	+2,513,000	-300,000	8,558,000	8,558,000
Nuclear Regula- tory Commis- sion.....	135,165,000	219,935,000	202,500,000	+67,335,000	-17,435,000	52,000,000	49,230,000
TVA.....	77,400,000	87,800,000	99,754,000	+22,354,000	+11,954,000	27,500,000	27,984,000
Other.....	10,370,000	10,245,000	8,325,000	-2,045,000	-1,920,000	2,512,000	1,542,000
Total, Title IV.....	551,279,000	649,242,000	641,219,000	+89,940,000	-8,023,000	138,550,000	137,794,000
Grand total.....	6,194,295,000	7,057,462,000	7,211,401,500	+1,017,106,500	+153,939,500	1,993,160,000	2,091,228,000

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Bill page	Report page
Energy Research and Development Administration:		
Operating expenses.....	2	11
Plant and capital equipment.....	4	23
Department of Defense—Civil:		
Department of the Army:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
Construction, general.....	6	37
Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	8	56
General expenses.....	9	56
General investigations.....	5	30
Mississippi River and tributaries.....	7	52
Operation and maintenance, general.....	8	53
Special Recreation use fees.....	9	56

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT—Continued

	Bill page	Report page
Department of the Interior:		
Alaska Power Administration:		
General investigations.....	21	68
Operation and maintenance.....	21	69
Bonneville Power Administration Fund.....	21	69
Bureau of Reclamation:		
Colorado River Basin project.....	14	65
Construction and rehabilitation.....	12	59
Emergency fund.....	16	68
General administrative expenses.....	17	68
General investigations.....	16	57
Loan program.....	15	67
Operation and maintenance.....	15	66
Upper Colorado River storage project.....	13	63
Colorado River basin salinity control projects.....	15	65
Southeastern Power Administration.....	22	70
Southwestern Power Administration:		
Construction.....	22	70
Operation and maintenance.....	23	70
Independent Offices:		
Appalachian program.....	25	71
Delaware River Basin Commission.....	26	72
Federal Power Commission.....	26	72
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	27	74
Nuclear Regulatory Commission.....	27	73
Susquehanna River Basin Commission.....	28	74
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	29	75
Water Resources Council.....	29	77

INTRODUCTION

The Public Works for Water and Power Development and Energy Research Appropriation Bill, 1976, is a vital and important bill that provides a substantial investment in the future of our Nation, an investment that will pay rich dividends in services and economic benefits for the American people.

Appropriations are also recommended in the bill for a broad range of energy research and development programs that will assist in solving the energy crisis and attaining a reasonable level of energy self-sufficiency. These programs will also strengthen America by research and development for defense and defense-related missions.

The projects funded in the bill provide for planning or constructing a total of 507 projects under the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. These projects reach broadly across the Nation and affect every state and region and touch the lives of virtually all Americans. Appropriations for these projects will provide for flood control, additional electric power generation, additional and improved waterways for navigation and transportation, reclamation, recreation, abundant and clean water supplies, beach erosion and shore protection, among others.

Included in the total number of projects are 17 new planning starts and 19 new construction starts that were not proposed in the President's budget. Testimony before the Committee by administration officials disclosed that the budget request was prepared several months ago when the Nation's first priority was to fight inflation, but that priority has since changed and shifted to a fight against recession and unemployment. Thus, the Committee has exercised its prerogatives and discretion in setting some priorities. A limited number of projects have been added and increased which will not only provide jobs but also capital assets for the Nation.

The Committee recommends several reductions in the level of appropriations for some projects and programs while increases are recommended for others. The net effect is a recommended appropriation bill slightly over the budget requested by the Administration.

The bill recommended by the Committee provides funding for a number of Federal agencies to carry out their essential functions necessary to serve the people of our Nation, including the Energy Research and Development Administration, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Water Resources Council, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Delaware and Susquehanna River Basin Commission, and several Federal power agencies such as the Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration and Alaska Power Administration, and the programs of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission.

WATER RESOURCE PROGRAMS

Water is one of our Nation's most valuable resources. Its availability is essential to the very existence of communities and the operation of industry, the growth of crops and the provision of power by hydro-power facilities. The question is not "Should we develop our water resources?", but rather, "What is the proper level of funding to develop our water resources?"

Completed projects have made an enormous contribution to America. The Nation is served by the projects in this bill in many ways—communities and businesses receive water supplies, communities are protected from floods, energy is generated from hydro-power facilities, commerce is transported on inland waterways, food is grown on irrigated acreage, widespread recreation benefits are available to millions. Additionally, massive amounts of water will be needed to develop and process future energy supplies.

PROJECT BENEFITS—COMPLETED PROJECTS

The present value of the Nation of all completed projects for water supply, power development, flood control, navigation, reclamation, and recreation is evident from the following table:

PROJECT BENEFITS	
Annual water supply benefits:	
Gallons of water furnished.....	11,646 billion.
Number of people served.....	21 million.
Annual power benefits:	
Installed generating capacity (kilowatts).....	44 million.
Net generation (kilowatt hours).....	225.5 billion.
Gross revenues.....	\$1.03 billion.
Flood control benefits to date:	
Estimated value of flood damage prevented.....	\$41.9 billion.
Expenditures for flood control facilities.....	\$8.4 billion.
Annual navigation benefits:	
Annual traffic tonnage.....	2.1 billion.
Reclamation benefits:	
Acres irrigated.....	9.2 million.
Annual value of crops produced.....	\$3.9 billion.
Recreation benefits:	
Annual visitor days.....	450 million.

BENEFITS FROM PROJECTS PROPOSED IN BILL

These projects are a "capital investment" in America. Indeed the annual Public Works appropriations measure has aptly been called an all American bill. Just as a private company must make capital investments to assure future production, the American Government must make capital investments to assure a foundation for the future growth and prosperity of the Nation.

The committee believes that the jobs created by the construction funds in this bill are more beneficial to the American people than those jobs created by temporary public service programs. The results of the productive jobs created by this bill—electric power on line, flood control facilities constructed, improved harbors and navigation, expanded irrigation—will benefit the American people for decades to come.

The value of the projects included for planning or construction under the programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation upon completion is evidenced by the following breakdown which summarizes the estimated average benefits expected to accrue annually over the life of the projects.

ESTIMATED AVERAGE ANNUAL BENEFITS FOR PROJECTS FUNDED FOR PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION IN THE 1975 BILL

	Average annual amount
Flood control.....	\$2, 983, 822, 000
Water supply.....	422, 800, 000
Power.....	1, 614, 221, 000
Recreation.....	324, 254, 000
Irrigation.....	1, 133, 705, 000
Water quality.....	104, 954, 000
Navigation.....	1, 053, 114, 000
Fish and wildlife.....	50, 138, 000
Erosion control.....	40, 335, 000
Area redevelopment.....	81, 663, 000
Total estimate.....	\$7, 808, 996, 000

ENVIRONMENT

The Committee believes that the programs funded in this bill offer a balanced approach which is proper and which will contribute to an economic development policy which will promote progress in America and which will provide for preserving, promoting, and protecting our environment while developing vital natural resource needs to serve mankind—thus providing a balanced program serving the total public interest.

The programs administered by the agencies funded in this appropriation bill fulfill a dual role of providing both economic growth and enhancing the environment. Flood control and beach erosion projects protect human life, ecology and property. Multipurpose dams generate pollution-free electricity through hydro-power, provide water supply for municipal and industrial use, irrigation for millions of acres, and recreation facilities for millions of Americans.

Funds are provided in the bill for project investigations underway to assure appropriate weight is being given in water resource planning to preserving and enhancing environmental values.

The Committee shares the widespread concern for the environment, and it should be realized and emphasized that the several agencies involved in water resource development are increasingly aware of the

environment and have instituted extensive changes both in the planning process and in actual construction to minimize any adverse impact of their work on the environment.

The major emphasis of the Energy Research and Development Administration and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is to meet the expanding requirements for energy through the development of new technologies which will have minimal environmental effects.

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a balanced program of development and preservation of the environment in the public interest.

ENERGY

The mission of the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) is as important as that of any agency of the government. The cost and availability of energy has a tremendous impact on our standard of living, economic growth and national security.

The era of cheap, abundant energy which played such an important role in enabling America to become the world's most productive and prosperous nation is at an end. However, we must make certain that the scarcity of energy does not become a permanent fact of American life. We must take steps to speed up and increase conventional and new sources of energy. Our goal is to help America to achieve energy self-sufficiency.

The energy crisis with which America is confronted is one of the greatest challenges in history. We must respond to this crisis through the recognition of the severity of the situation, development of sound policies and programs to deal with the crisis and the allocation of necessary resources to solve this problem in the public interest.

CONSERVATION

In response to the energy crisis, the American people must develop an ethic of conservation. The Committee concurs with the words of one witness who testified, "We must think conservation. We must practice conservation. We must teach our children conservation. We must make conservation a way of life."

Conservation of energy can be approached in two ways. First, individuals, businesses, industries and government can reduce their consumption of energy in innumerable ways—lowering of thermostats, using less lighting in the home and office, the use of smaller cars, etc.

The second approach to conservation is to improve the efficiency of producing, transmitting, and consuming energy through technology. ERDA is conducting research in various programs of this nature, such as:

The development of superconducting cables which would significantly lessen the loss of electricity during transmission.

The development of energy storage systems which could store energy generated by solar power or during off-peak hours for transmission and use later when needed.

Research into end-use energy conservation—i.e., the more efficient use of energy in appliances and buildings, among others. However, there are limits to conservation.

NEED FOR ENERGY SUPPLY

A dramatic drop in energy consumption can cause severe economic impact on industries and individuals. Additionally, even with a strin-

gent conservation ethic, an expanding supply of energy is essential.

There is a direct relationship between a Nation's energy consumption and living standard.

Energy is essential to economic growth.

Ample supplies of energy are essential for national security.

Large amounts of energy are needed to clean up the environment—i.e., in the construction and operation of waste treatment plants, for mass transit systems and for the operation of recycling plants.

Millions of low-income Americans must not be denied a better standard of living because of a shortage of energy.

The future employment of millions of Americans is dependent on an adequate supply of energy.

OPTIONS

There is a tendency to equate the energy crisis with the availability of gasoline for cars. The return of plentiful gasoline supplies has lessened the sense of urgency about America's energy situation. This is most unfortunate because the problem is still extremely serious—diminishing supplies of natural gas, a massive drain on our balance of payments to import oil, potential blackouts because of the slow pace of new electrical power plants coming on line, opposition to the construction of power generating facilities, and soaring costs for fuel and power.

Untold billions of words, thousands of articles and speeches have been published and spoken about the energy crisis. If rhetoric would solve the crisis, America would be awash in energy. Despite a governmental reorganization to more effectively deal with the Nation's energy requirements, including the expenditure of large amounts for research, the outlook continues bleak at the present time. This bill is a positive forward step in providing some constructive solutions.

The simple reality that we must all face is that for the immediate future, our Nation's options in energy are limited. America is consuming its oil and natural gas at an extremely rapid rate. Recent articles concerning a study by the National Academy of Sciences have stated that our oil and natural gas reserves are less abundant than many experts had previously calculated. The Geological Survey recently revised downward its estimate of America's potential oil and gas reserves.

Witnesses before the Committee stressed that the two major energy options of America for the intermediate term are coal and uranium. ERDA has extensive and rapidly expanding R&D programs to assure that these two resources can be utilized more efficiently and with minimal environmental impact.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

The Arab oil embargo dramatized the vulnerability of America in acquiring sufficient energy for its needs and led to a consensus that the Nation should work toward the objective of attaining energy independence. The original goal of energy independence by 1980 is no longer considered feasible. However, the present goal, as described to the Committee by witnesses, is to reach a reasonable level of self-sufficiency so that by 1985 we could withstand, for a considerable period of time, any oil embargo. The results of the previous embargo—

unemployment in various industries, the threat to national security, soaring costs for fuel, the potential of a severe economic impact if the embargo was continued for an extensive period of time—make it clear that a reasonable level of energy self-sufficiency is an important goal worthy of accomplishment.

The amount of money that will be required in the development of the technologies to make America reasonably self-sufficient in energy will be quite large. Additionally, large sums of money will be required in the exploration and development of new sources of domestic fuel. However, to put this into perspective, it should be noted that America spent tens of billions of dollars on importing fuel in 1974. The message from that statistic is clear—America must be generous in allocating resources to attain a reasonable level of energy self-sufficiency as soon as possible.

As the many technologies in the research and development stage come to fruition, this Nation will be able to reduce expenditures for fuel from abroad and improve the Nation's balance of payments through both the lessened imports of products from abroad and the sale of these newly developed technologies to foreign countries and companies.

FUSION AND SOLAR POWER

America's and the world's supply of coal, oil, natural gas and uranium are, of course, limited. Worldwide consumption of these resources is extremely high and growing. When one considers the future impact of population growth and rising living standards on energy consumption, the world's future energy needs become staggering. What nature has developed over eons of time, man is now consuming at a rapid rate.

Over the long range, there is simply no alternative to developing new and additional sources of energy. Two of the most important potential sources of infinite energy are solar power and controlled thermonuclear fusion. Fusion would use a derivative of seawater as a fuel source. Research in both of these technologies has expanded rapidly. Based on the level of funding recommended by the Committee, the costs for fusion research, including magnetic confinement and laser fusion, is up by 150% since FY 1974. Costs for solar energy research have increased by almost 1,700% since FY 1974.

The Committee strongly supports these two programs although the payoff, in terms of providing significant amounts of energy relative to America's total needs, is in the distant future. The energies which these technologies can potentially produce are desperately needed. As these technologies become viable, we can lessen our consumption of finite resources such as coal, oil and uranium.

The Administrator of ERDA testified before the Committee: "In my view fusion holds very great promise for the long term. We should not count on its use until after the year 2000. We have a great deal of work to be done to realize this potential. We have not even proved at this time that it is scientifically feasible, much less technologically feasible or economically viable."

The Committee heard further testimony that, while the long range promise of solar energy is very bright, the near term outlook is for this technology to produce a small amount of energy relative to the overall energy demand.

These comments do not detract from the importance and absolute necessity of continuing an aggressive research and development pro-

gram in these areas. The Committee has significantly increased the funding level of these programs.

The point is that these technologies are not going to bring quick results. Because of the complexity of the research and the time needed to proceed from the laboratory to pilot plants and ultimately to usable energy for public consumption, large scale benefits from these technologies are in the long range future.

NUCLEAR POWER

Concerning nuclear power—the Committee reports that today there are 53 nuclear powerplants operating, 73 under construction, and 107 on order or in the planning stage. The present operating nuclear plants represent 7 percent of total installed electrical generating capacity in the United States.

The continued and expanded development of nuclear power is absolutely essential if we are to attain a reasonable level of energy self-sufficiency. A 1,000 megawatt nuclear plant operating for 1 year at 70 percent of capacity would produce 6,130,000 megawatt hours. The equivalent fossil fuel requirements for 1 year are as follows:

Oil	11 million barrels
Natural Gas	62 billion cubic feet
Coal	2 million tons

Intensive research is continuing in many fields, but at this time nuclear technology is the only economic power-producing alternative to fossil-fuel and hydropower plants, that has proved practical. A recent statement signed by 32 prominent scientists, including 10 Nobel Prize winners, stated in part:

The U.S. choice is not coal or uranium, we need both. . . . There are many interesting proposals for alternative energy sources which deserve vigorous research effort, but none of them is likely to contribute significantly to our energy supply in this century. . . .

The safety of civilian nuclear power has been under public surveillance without parallel in the history of technology. As in any new technology, there is a learning period. Contrary to the scare publicity given to some minor mistakes that have occurred, no appreciable amount of radioactive material has escaped from any commercial U.S. reactor.

The separation of the Atomic Energy Commission into the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) provides added reassurance for realistic management of potential risks and benefits.

In 1974 the Atomic Energy Commission commissioned an exhaustive study on nuclear plant safety. The director of the study was Prof. Norman C. Rasmussen of the department of nuclear engineering of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The report put at 300,000,000 to 1 the chances of a resident living near a nuclear power plant being killed from a reactor accident in any one year—and estimated the odds on an injury in any one year are one chance in 150,000,000.

Nuclear power plants are on line and working successfully. Evidence supports their safety—safety in research and development, safety in

construction and safety in operation. Nuclear power is a needed and demonstrated method for producing power during the energy crisis and for the future, in the public interest.

LIQUID METAL FAST BREEDER REACTOR (LMFBR)

As mentioned, a basic fact central to the longer term energy outlook is the simple reality that there is an unlimited demand for energy and a limited supply of fossil resources to provide that energy. The liquid metal fast breeder reactor will utilize uranium up to 70 times more efficiently than the present generation of nuclear reactors. The enormity and importance of that fact must not be underestimated. Witnesses testified that the breeder will require no uranium mining for at least a century since it can utilize the nonfissionable uranium which is now accumulating in Government stockpiles as a byproduct of the fuel cycle of present day nuclear reactors.

The vital role that LMFBR's are expected to fulfill in providing energy needs in the future is evidenced by the fact that literally every industrial nation in the world is aggressively pursuing the development of the LMFBR technology.

Presently, there are three LMFBR's operating in Russia and a fourth, with a capacity of 600 megawatts, is scheduled to begin operation in 1977.

France has two operating LMFBR's. One is a 250 megawatt reactor which had generated over 1 billion megawatt hours of electricity by the end of 1974. France is planning a 1,200 megawatt plant for operation in 1981.

West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg have begun construction of a 300 megawatt LMFBR which is scheduled to begin operation in 1980.

Two LMFBR's are operating in Great Britain. A 1,300 megawatt LMFBR is planned for operation in 1981 in that country.

Japan is planning a 300 megawatt LMFBR for operation in 1981. Funds included in the bill are to continue a "base research program" for the LMFBR and to proceed with the development of one LMFBR demonstration plant. Under the present timetable, this demonstration plant would be complete in 1982. Critics who attack the breeder would foreclose the possibility of developing a demonstration plant which, as witnesses have testified, will prove the safety and workability of a technology which has the potential of making an enormous contribution to the future energy needs of the Nation.

STATUS OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Legislative authorizations for the programs of the Energy Research and Development Administration, and the Appalachian Regional Commission have been considered by the House and are proceeding through the Congress authorizing legislation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has passed the House and Senate. The recommendations of the Committee are within the totals previously approved by the House and the Committee recommends that consideration of appropriations necessary for these programs proceed in order that timely funding may be provided in the new fiscal year. Any required authorizations should certainly be forthcoming before the Congress completes its final consideration of this bill. The authorization required for certain programs of the Water Resources Council has not been con-

sidered by the House and funds, therefore, are not recommended in the accompanying bill.

EFFECT OF COMMITTEE ACTION ON PROJECTED BUDGET EXPENDITURES (OUTLAYS) IN FISCAL YEAR 1976 AND THE TRANSITION PERIOD

It is estimated that the net budget authority addition of \$153,939,500 in fiscal year 1976 and \$98,068,000 in the transition period recommended by the Committee will result in an addition of about \$75,000,000 in fiscal year 1976 and \$80,000,000 in the transition period in the estimates for expenditures (outlays) projected for 1976.

TITLE I—ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

The Energy Research and Development Administration was created by the Congress by P.L. 93-438, the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, enacted October 11, 1974.

The Act brought together, in a single agency, the major Federal activities in energy research and development.

The agency officially came into existence on January 19, 1975. This is the first annual appropriation bill for ERDA.

Funds recommended in the bill provide for all ERDA programs except for the fossil energy research programs and certain conservation programs which are under the jurisdiction of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations.

At the time the Committee was considering the 1976 appropriations for this agency, the Committee was aware that ERDA was undertaking a review and reanalysis of its funding priorities. This was being done because the agency came into existence after the President's budget was submitted to Congress.

The Committee feels that it is essential that funding be provided to speed up vitally needed research programs. Therefore, it was not considered prudent to wait for the agency's reevaluation.

The Committee recommends a total of \$3,908,142,000 in fiscal year 1976 and \$1,115,225,000 in the transition quarter for the appropriations of ERDA. For fiscal year 1976 this is an increase of \$673,203,000 over 1975.

For the nonnuclear and fusion research and development programs the bill provides a total of \$553,700,000 for fiscal year 1976, which is \$141,031,000 above the budget estimate and \$296,755,000 above the appropriations for 1975.

OPERATING EXPENSES

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$2,446,487,000	-----
Budget estimate, 1976	3,005,387,000	\$514,731,000
Recommended, 1976	3,036,120,000	931,939,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1976	+589,633,000	-----
Budget estimate, 1976	+30,733,000	+17,208,000

A summary of the Committee's recommendations in comparison with the budget estimate follows:

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION OPERATING EXPENSES APPROPRIATION

Item	Fiscal year 1976			Bill compared to budget	Transition period		Bill compared to budget
	1975 ¹	Budget estimate	Committee bill		Budget estimate	Committee bill	
OPERATING EXPENSES							
Solar, geothermal, and advanced energy systems development:							
Solar energy development.....	\$8,770,000	\$57,100,000	\$73,000,000	+\$15,900,000	\$14,500,000	\$24,500,000	+\$10,000,000
Geothermal energy development.....	13,800,000	28,370,000	33,370,000	+5,000,000	3,050,000	8,750,000	+5,700,000
Physical research.....	281,600,000	312,500,000	315,500,000	+3,000,000	80,300,000	82,800,000	+2,500,000
Total, solar, geothermal, and advanced energy systems development.....	304,170,000	397,970,000	421,870,000	+23,900,000	97,850,000	116,050,000	+18,200,000
Conservation research and development:							
Electric power transmission.....	6,372,000	11,830,000	11,830,000	-----	2,673,000	2,673,000	-----
Energy storage systems.....	5,800,000	9,100,000	14,000,000	+4,900,000	2,000,000	3,400,000	+1,400,000
Total, conservation research and development.....	12,172,000	20,930,000	25,830,000	+4,900,000	4,673,000	6,073,000	+1,400,000
Nuclear energy development:							
Fusion power research and development.....	85,030,000	120,000,000	140,000,000	+20,000,000	37,000,000	40,500,000	+3,500,000
Fission power reactor development.....	384,088,000	443,675,000	400,675,000	-43,000,000	130,745,000	109,845,000	-20,900,000
Naval reactor development.....	187,000,000	186,200,000	186,200,000	-----	52,900,000	52,900,000	-----
Space nuclear systems.....	26,600,000	30,900,000	28,000,000	-2,900,000	8,000,000	7,500,000	-500,000
Nuclear materials.....	646,083,000	828,940,000	828,940,000	-----	236,494,000	236,494,000	-----
Advanced isotope separation technology.....	11,700,000	24,200,000	24,200,000	-----	7,300,000	7,300,000	-----
Total, nuclear energy development.....	1,320,498,000	1,633,915,000	1,608,015,000	-25,900,000	454,539,000	473,439,000	+17,900,000
National security:							
Wesports.....	819,997,000	873,515,000	849,115,000	-24,400,000	223,925,000	221,925,000	-2,000,000
Laser fusion.....	41,400,000	54,000,000	57,000,000	+3,000,000	15,100,000	16,500,000	+1,400,000
Nuclear materials security.....	5,863,000	10,945,000	12,945,000	+2,000,000	3,006,000	3,606,000	+600,000
Total, national security.....	867,260,000	938,460,000	919,060,000	-19,400,000	242,031,000	242,031,000	-----
Environmental and safety research:							
Biomedical and environmental research.....	132,215,000	156,515,000	160,000,000	+3,485,000	40,500,000	42,845,000	+2,345,000
Waste management.....	29,570,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	-----	10,100,000	10,100,000	-----
Operational safety.....	3,210,000	5,160,000	5,160,000	-----	1,400,000	1,400,000	-----
Total, environmental and safety research.....	164,995,000	197,675,000	201,160,000	+3,485,000	52,000,000	54,345,000	+2,345,000
Program support:							
Program direction.....	148,543,000	168,614,000	175,356,000	+6,742,000	44,547,000	146,947,000	+2,400,000
Community operations.....	8,065,000	7,650,000	9,075,000	+1,425,000	1,914,000	2,204,000	+290,000
Security investigations.....	9,460,000	12,290,000	12,290,000	-----	2,825,000	2,825,000	-----
Information services.....	8,180,000	9,480,000	9,555,000	+75,000	2,686,000	2,704,000	+18,000
EEO assigned facilities.....	1,650,000	1,984,000	1,984,000	-----	516,000	516,000	-----
Total, program support.....	175,898,000	200,018,000	208,260,000	+8,242,000	52,488,000	55,196,000	+2,708,000
Cost of work for others.....	11,690,000	12,660,000	12,660,000	-----	3,095,000	3,095,000	-----
Total program costs.....	2,856,683,000	3,401,628,000	3,396,855,000	-4,773,000	924,576,000	931,329,000	+6,753,000
Change in selected resources.....	211,901,000	279,429,000	326,135,000	+46,706,000	84,855,000	96,010,000	+11,155,000
Gross obligations.....	3,068,584,000	3,681,057,000	3,722,990,000	+41,933,000	1,009,431,000	1,027,339,000	+17,908,000
Revenues applied.....	-622,190,000	-675,670,000	-675,670,000	-----	-94,700,000	-94,700,000	-----
Net obligations.....	2,446,394,000	3,005,387,000	3,047,320,000	+41,933,000	914,731,000	932,639,000	+17,908,000
Change in unobligated balances.....	93,000	-----	-11,200,000	-11,200,000	-----	-700,000	-700,000
Total, operating budget authority.....	2,446,487,000	3,005,387,000	3,036,120,000	+30,733,000	914,731,000	931,939,000	+17,208,000

¹ Includes pay raise supplemental.

² Includes \$3,000,000 in costs for scientific and technical education.

I. SOLAR, GEOTHERMAL, AND ADVANCED ENERGY SYSTEMS

A. Solar Energy, \$73,000,000 Transition Period, \$24,500,000

The Committee recommends a total of \$73,000,000 for the Solar Energy program for 1976. This is an increase of \$64,230,000 over 1975 and \$15,900,000 over the budget request.

Solar energy holds great promise for providing energy for mankind. ERDA is rapidly expanding its research and development into the development of technologies which will utilize solar radiation through direct and indirect conversion into thermal energy, electricity and clean fuels. Some of the research programs will have near term applications and others are for the long term.

Because of the rapidity at which these programs are expanding, it is essential that the ERDA should be especially vigilant in making certain that the funds in this program are wisely spent.

The Committee urges the Energy Research and Development Administration not to preclude the assessment and potential development of any promising solar energy technologies.

The following table outlines the Committee's recommendations:

	Budget	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget
FISCAL YEAR 1976 (COSTS)			
Solar energy buildings and facilities:			
Heating and cooling demonstration.....	\$12,400,000	\$15,250,000	+\$2,850,000
Research and development.....	9,200,000	9,800,000	+600,000
Solar thermal.....	11,000,000	14,275,000	+3,275,000
Photovoltaic.....	10,000,000	12,000,000	+2,000,000
Wind energy conversion.....	9,000,000	10,500,000	+1,500,000
Bioconversion to fuels.....	3,000,000	4,200,000	+1,200,000
Ocean thermal energy conversion.....	2,500,000	3,500,000	+1,000,000
Resource analysis.....	0	900,000	+900,000
Solar storage.....	0	1,000,000	+1,000,000
Solar Institute.....	0	1,575,000	+1,575,000
Total operating expenses.....	57,100,000	73,000,000	+15,900,000
TRANSITION QUARTER (COSTS)			
Solar energy buildings and facilities:			
Heating and cooling demonstration.....	3,300,000	4,500,000	+1,200,000
Research and development.....	1,600,000	2,600,000	+1,000,000
Solar thermal.....	3,200,000	5,100,000	+1,900,000
Photovoltaic.....	2,900,000	4,700,000	+1,800,000
Wind energy conversion.....	2,500,000	3,200,000	+700,000
Bioconversion to fuels.....	400,000	1,000,000	+600,000
Ocean thermal energy conversion.....	600,000	1,600,000	+1,000,000
Resource analysis.....	0	500,000	+500,000
Solar storage.....	0	800,000	+800,000
Solar Institute.....	0	700,000	+700,000
Total operating expenses.....	14,500,000	24,500,000	+10,000,000

A brief description of each of these programs follows:

SOLAR HEATING AND COOLING OF BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES.—Heating and cooling through the utilization of solar technology will be demonstrated on single and multi-family homes, commercial and industrial buildings and schools. ERDA testified that commercialization of solar heating and cooling systems leading to their installation in 10 percent of new building starts by 1985 could provide a savings equivalent to approximately 100,000 to 200,000 barrels of oil per day.

Also, substantial research and development, to develop more advanced technology for this program, is being conducted.

SOLAR THERMAL.—The major goals of the solar thermal program are to provide a full system capability for the widespread production of supplementary electric and thermal power in the 1980's to meet electric utility requirements and to provide a full system capability for total energy systems for Government installations, urban and rural communities, and industrial load centers.

PHOTOVOLTAIC RESEARCH.—The overall objective of the Photovoltaic Research program is to develop economically viable photovoltaic electric power systems suitable for a variety of applications and capable of providing a significant amount of the Nation's energy requirements by the year 2000.

WIND ENERGY CONVERSION.—The primary purpose of this program is to develop the technology base of large-scale economically viable wind energy systems suitable for supplying commercial electric power, and to accelerate their commercial implementation through demonstration of large-scale experimental systems.

OCEAN THERMAL CONVERSION.—Objective of the program is to establish a technically and economically viable technology base leading to the demonstration and commercial implementation of large-scale floating power plants capable of converting ocean thermal energy into significant quantities of electrical energy.

BIOCONVERSION TO FUEL.—The goal of this program is to establish the commercial practicability of producing significant economic quantities of plant biomass and converting this biomass and other products currently considered wastes into clean fuels.

Four major sources of energy feedstock are considered: urban solid wastes, agricultural residues, terrestrial and marine energy crops. Fuels and energy products that may be produced include synthetic natural gas, alcohol fuels, solid fuels, heat, electricity, fertilizer, and petrochemical substitutes.

SOLAR RESOURCE ANALYSIS.—This program will obtain important data necessary for any economic evaluation of solar energy application.

SOLAR STORAGE.—This program will develop economic solar energy storage systems required by the various solar energy conversion technologies.

SOLAR INSTITUTE.—This program would fund the start-up costs of the Solar Energy Research Institute established by P.L. 93-473. This institute would perform research, development, and related functions as necessary in support of the National Solar Energy Program.

The National Academy of Sciences is presently conducting a study on the definition of the roles and missions of a solar institute.

B. Geothermal Energy Development, \$33,370,000 Transition Quarter, \$8,750,000

The Committee recommends a total of \$33,370,000 for geothermal energy development in 1976. This is an increase of \$19,570,000 over 1975 and an increase of \$5,000,000 over the budget request.

The overall goal is to stimulate industry to exploit the Nation's geothermal resources. One objective is to have 20,000 to 30,000 mega-

watts of power, generated by geothermal sources, on line by 1985. Subprograms are:

Program	Budget	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget
FISCAL YEAR 1976 (COSTS)			
Geothermal energy development:			
Pilot plant/demo plant	0	\$2,700,000	+\$2,700,000
Plant operation	0	1,900,000	+1,900,000
Resource utilization	\$17,870,000	18,270,000	+400,000
Supporting R. & D.	10,500,000	11,400,000	+900,000
Total	28,370,000	33,370,000	+5,000,000
TRANSITION PERIOD (COSTS)			
Geothermal energy development:			
Pilot plant/demo plant	0	4,000,000	+4,000,000
Plant operation	0	600,000	+600,000
Resource utilization	1,500,000	1,900,000	+400,000
Supporting R. & D.	1,550,000	2,250,000	+700,000
Total	3,050,000	8,750,000	+5,700,000

(1) The Committee recommends \$2,700,000 for fiscal year 1976 and \$4,000,000 for the transition quarter for pilot demonstration plants.

The Committee strongly supports these plants because of the potential important role geothermal energy may play in expanding the Nation's energy supply. However, the Committee believes that there should be substantial participation, through cost sharing, by private industry since these are to be viable, energy producing plants. The Committee also recommends \$1,000,000 for FY 1976 and \$600,000 for the transition period for plant operation.

(2) The Committee recommends \$18,270,000 for fiscal year 1976 and \$1,900,000 for the transition period for "Resource Utilization and Technology."

This program will focus on those geothermal resource types identified as potentially feasible for commercial development for both near term and long term periods. Experimental test facilities at geothermal fields will operate under actual field conditions. Increased authorization is to help technology keep pace with the accelerated demonstration plant. Research will be conducted in hydrothermal systems, geopressured systems and advanced geothermal concept which would utilize dry hot rock.

(3) The Committee recommends \$11,400,000 for fiscal year 1976 and \$2,250,000 for the transition period for "Supporting R&D." This is an increase of \$900,000 for fiscal year 1976 and \$700,000 for the transition quarter. This program establishes the technical foundation for future growth of the geothermal industry and to accelerate its development. Priority will be given to advanced geothermal drilling techniques, reservoir modeling studies, pumping systems and heat exchanges.

C. Physical Research, \$315,500,000 Transition Quarter, \$82,800,000

The Committee recommends a total of \$315,500,000 for physical research for 1976. This is an increase of \$33,900,000 over 1975 and an increase of \$3,000,000 over the budget estimate.

This program is involved in basic research about the structure and behavior of matter, and its manifestation as and relationship to energy. Numerous experimental and theoretical research programs are carried out within physical research.

The Committee recommends an increase of \$3,000,000 over the budget. \$2,000,000 of the increase is for the Materials and Molecular Sciences programs. These increases support an expanded effort related to energy research and development programs.

\$1,000,000 of the increase is for the LAMPF facility. While the basic purpose of the LAMPF, Los Alamos Meson Physics Facility, is to conduct research in medium energy physics, it has a "spin off role" of producing isotopes used in the examination of heart muscles. The facility also has the capability of performing cancer therapy. The increase is for electricity to increase the amount of time that LAMPF can be utilized.

II. CONSERVATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends a total of \$25,830,000 for conservation research and development for 1976, which is an increase of \$13,658,000 over 1975 and \$4,900,000 over the budget request. That portion of the Conservation Research and Development program under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Subcommittee includes:

A. Electric Power Transmission, \$11,830,000

The objective of the program is to develop more efficient, reliable, economical, and environmentally acceptable ways to transmit electricity. The major thrust of the program is to develop the technology which would reduce the amount of energy lost in transmission. The Committee recommends \$11,830,000, same as the budget estimate, for this program.

B. Energy Storage Systems, \$14,000,000

The goal of the program is the development of energy storage techniques which could be used by electric utilities, in automotive propulsion and by new energy generating systems. Successful development of this technology would bring a more efficient use of electric generation capacity, a need for fewer additional generating plants and improved operating economy of the utility system. The Committee recommends a total of \$14,000,000, an increase over the budget of \$4,900,000 for this program for FY 1976 and an increase of \$1,400,000 for the transition quarter. The development of more efficient energy storage technology is essential to support solar electric power development programs and to reduce peaking requirements of existing electric power plants.

III. NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

A. Fusion Power Research and Development, \$140,000,000 Transition Quarter, \$40,500,000

The essential fuel material which would be used in controlled thermonuclear fusion is a derivative of seawater. It is estimated that the energy that could, in theory, be produced by the fusion of the deuterium nuclei present in a gallon of water is equal to that obtainable from the combustion of about 300 gallons of gasoline. The enormous amounts of water available on Earth thus represents an inexhaustible potential source of energy. The production of energy from the controlled fusion process has certain unique characteristics which make it extremely attractive from the safety and environmental points of view. Thus controlled thermonuclear fusion could well be a key answer to mankind's long-range energy problems.

The Committee recommends \$140,000,000 for FY 1976 and \$40,500,000 for the transition quarter. This is an increase of \$20 million for FY 1976 and \$3,500,000 for the transition quarter. This increase is to accelerate the development of this important program.

B. Fission Power Reactor Development, \$400,875,000
Transition Quarter, \$109,845,000

Research on various advanced reactor concepts are included in this program—LMFBR, High Temperature Gas Reactor, gas cooled thermal reactors, molten salt breeder reactor and reactor safety.

The Committee strongly supports the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor which will utilize uranium up to 70 times more efficiently than the present generation of nuclear reactors. Because of the potentially important role the LMFBR may fulfill in providing energy in the future, almost every industrialized nation in the world is proceeding rapidly with the development of an LMFBR.

It is anticipated that the commercialization of this technology will occur in the 1990's after safety and operability of the reactor is successfully demonstrated. The Committee strongly supports this program and in view of the present energy situation, America's dwindling resource base of oil and natural gas and the need for improved technology to alleviate the energy crisis, it would be extremely shortsighted not to proceed with the development of an LMFBR demonstration plant or any other potential future energy source.

In addition to the LMFBR demonstration plant, ERDA has an extensive R. & D. program conducting support for the LMFBR. The Committee recommends a reduction from the budget request in FY 1976 totalling \$60,500,000 which is comprised of a net of a minus of \$35,200,000 in the base research and development program, a minus of \$10,800,000 in the demonstration plant, on add of \$3,000,000 in LMFBR Safety and a minus of \$17,500,000 in selected resources applicable to this program. For the transition quarter a total reduction of \$10,700,000 from the budget request has been applied to the program and is composed of minus \$9,500,000 in the base research and development program, minus \$13,000,000 in the demonstration plant, plus \$1,600,000 in LMFBR Safety and plus \$10,200,000 in selected resources. The changes to selected resources are reflected elsewhere in this chapter.

The reduction is made to bring into line the pace of funding for the R. & D. support program and the pace at which the demonstration plant is proceeding. The schedule for the initial operation of the plant has slipped from 1980 to 1982 because of slippage in procurement of components for the plant and a lack of the final approval of the environmental impact statement. The Committee feels that it is prudent to adjust the funding level so that it is "in line" with the currently projected time frame for the development of the demonstration plant.

C. Naval Reactor Development, \$186,200,000
Transition Quarter, \$52,900,000

The Naval Reactor Program includes design and development of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores for future submarines and surface ships. Nuclear powered ships are fulfilling an important role in the development and maintenance of a strong and effective Navy.

The Committee recommends no change from the budget estimate for the Naval Reactor Program.

D. Space Nuclear Systems, \$28,000,000
Transition Quarter, \$7,500,000

This program provides fuel sources and generators for space missions of NASA and DOD. Because of the length of these missions, radioisotopic generators (RTG's) are used as an energy source on the flights.

The Committee recommends \$28,000,000 for fiscal year 1976. This is a decrease of \$2,900,000 from budget estimate and an increase of \$1,400,000 over fiscal year 1975. Also, the Committee recommends a decrease of \$500,000 for the transition quarter.

E. Nuclear Materials, \$828,940,000
Transition Quarter, \$236,494,000

Programs within Nuclear Materials produce enriched uranium to fuel civilian reactors, produce special nuclear material for nuclear warheads, produce various products for civilian purposes, conduct research into advanced methods of producing enriched uranium and evaluate the extent of the Nation's uranium reserves.

A major portion of these funds, \$490,770,000, is for the operation of uranium enrichment facilities. Revenues from the sale of enriched uranium are estimated at \$575,010,000 for fiscal year 1976.

The other major subprogram within Nuclear Materials is "Reactor Products Production" which produces a variety of reactor products for the weapons, space and R. & D. programs. A total of \$201,530,000 is included for this program.

There are no funds included in the bill for new uranium enrichment facilities.

ERDA presently has three uranium enrichment facilities producing fuel for the nation's, and many of the world's nuclear powerplants. The replacement value of these enrichment facilities is in excess of \$6,000,000,000. The facilities are presently being upgraded so that their productive capacity can be expanded. However, testimony indicates that as these facilities reach maximum output it will be essential that new and additional capacity be available. In view of the enormous investment of the Federal Government in the existing facilities and the exclusive technology developed by the Government, the Committee strongly believes and urges that the next increment of uranium enrichment capacity be provided through the expansion of existing Government facilities.

The Committee recommends no change from the budget estimate.

F. Advanced Isotope Separation Technology Program, \$24,200,000
Transition Quarter, \$7,300,000

This program provides for the investigation and development of alternative ways of producing enriched uranium. Lasers would be used as opposed to the present methods of utilizing either the gaseous diffusion or gaseous centrifuge technology.

An important potential of this technology is that, if developed, enriched uranium for nuclear plants could be produced at a lower price since the production process would use very little electricity as compared to the gaseous diffusion method.

The Committee recommends no change from the proposed budget for this program.

IV. NATIONAL SECURITY

A. Weapons, \$849,115,000 Transition Quarter, \$221,925,000

This program provides for research, development, testing and production of nuclear weapons.

The Committee's recommended reductions are in the following areas:

Off-continent test readiness	\$4,000,000
Minuteman III warhead	2,400,000
B61 bomb	5,500,000
General reduction for slippage	12,500,000
Total	24,400,000

OFF-CONTINENT TEST READINESS

The budget included \$8,000,000 for the Off-Continent Test Readiness Program. The purpose of the program is to have the capability to quickly resume atmospheric testing. However, if the decision was made to resume atmospheric testing, expenditures significantly above the present level and an extensive period of time would be necessary.

In light of the Limited Test Ban Treaty, the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the increased capability to carry out effective underground testing because of recently acquired, highly sophisticated equipment such as advanced computers, it is highly unlikely that atmospheric testing will be resumed.

The Committee recommends a reduction of \$4,000,000 in this program, for FY 1976 and \$1,000,000 for the transition period.

MINUTEMAN III

The Committee recommends a reduction of \$2,400,000 for the Minuteman III warheads (Mark 12). An improved Minuteman III warhead (Mark 12A) is planned.

B61

The Committee recognizes and supports the need for advanced weapons to replace those in the stockpile which are outmoded in order to provide for a strong defense program in the national interest. However, the Committee is not convinced of the need for all of the new versions of the B61. The new versions are in addition to the B61s presently in the stockpile.

ERDA, in conjunction with the DOD, should reassess the need for all of the new versions of this weapon. This study should include but not necessarily be limited to areas such as potential changes in planned deployment and the impact of such changes on the need for the new versions, the need for and technical problems associated with development of improved protective devices, an analysis of the advantages/disadvantages vs. the cost of producing all of the new versions, and the need for the new high yield version.

The study should also include alternative weapon mixes, as opposed to the present plans, with regard to the B61 production projection. The

alternative weapon mixes should generally satisfy DOD requirements while minimizing costs. The Committee directs that the report be completed 75 days after enactment of this Appropriation Bill.

The Committee recommends a reduction of \$5,500,000 in the B61 program.

The Committee also recommends a general reduction of \$12,500,000 in the Weapons program because of anticipated slippage.

B. Laser Fusion, \$57,000,000 Transition Quarter, \$16,500,000

The laser fusion program has a dual role—research in the weapons area and research into laser fusion being used to generate electricity. Should this technology prove feasible, it would offer an inexhaustible energy source to mankind, since a derivative of seawater is used as the fuel.

This technology utilizes laser beams to produce energy through fusion as opposed to the magnetic confinement method utilized in another ERDA research program.

The Committee recommends an increase of \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 1976 and \$750,000 for the transition quarter. These funds are to be used at non-governmental facilities. Extensive expertise exists and is being developed in laser fusion research in private industry and at universities. Thus, an expansion of Federal funds to support these efforts is justified. This increase would provide a total of about \$11,000,000 to be used at non-governmental facilities.

C. Nuclear Materials Security, \$12,945,000 Transition Quarter, \$3,606,000

The Nuclear Materials Security Program includes R. & D. in improved methods of safeguarding special nuclear material, operation of Safeguards Analytical Laboratory and a Nuclear Materials Reports and Analysis System.

The Committee recommends \$12,945,000 for fiscal year 1976 and \$3,606,000 for the transition quarter. This is an increase of \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 1976 and \$600,000 for the transition quarter.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SAFETY RESEARCH

A. Biomedical and Environmental Research, \$160,000,000 Transition Quarter, \$42,845,000

The Committee recommends a total of \$160,000,000 for biomedical and environmental research for 1976, which is \$27,785,000 over 1975 and \$3,485,000 over the budget request.

This program performs biomedical and environmental research in support of all energy development. Research is conducted in nuclear medicine, the environmental impact of various methods of producing energy, the development of an artificial heart and the biological impact of producing energy. The Committee urges ERDA to place increased emphasis on the environmental impact of non-nuclear energy.

B. Waste Management, \$36,000,000 Transition Quarter, \$10,100,000

This program has the responsibility for the long-term management of ERDA's and eventually private industry's radioactive waste. The Committee recommends no change in the budget estimate.

C. Operational Safety, \$5,160,000
Transition Quarter, \$1,400,000

This program maintains an aerial radiological monitoring system to be used in case of an unanticipated leak of radioactivity. The Committee recommends no change in the budget estimate.

VI. PROGRAM SUPPORT

There are five "subprograms" within Program Support:

A. Program Direction, \$175,356,000
Transition Quarter, \$46,947,000

This program provides salaries for ERDA personnel which provide management direction for the various ERDA programs conducted through ERDA field offices and Washington headquarters. The Committee recommends an increase of \$6,742,000 for this program, including \$3,000,000 for Scientific and Technical Education in non-nuclear energy and \$3,742,000 for additional personnel for an expanded program level. The Committee also recommends an increase of \$2,400,000 for the transition quarter.

B. Community Operations, \$9,075,000
Transition Quarter, \$2,204,000

This program provides Federal payments to communities where large ERDA facilities cause an excessive tax burden on localities. The increases are for the following localities:

Fiscal year 1976:

A. City of Richland (assistance payments)-----	\$372,000
B. Anderson County-----	396,000
Transition quarter-----	100,000
C. Roane County-----	301,000
Transition quarter-----	100,000
D. Los Alamos County-----	212,000
Transition quarter-----	53,000
E. Los Alamos Schools-----	144,000
Transition quarter-----	37,000

C. Security Investigations, \$12,290,000
Transition Quarter, \$2,825,000

Funds are for the investigation of individuals requiring security clearances and for selective reinvestigations of previously cleared personnel. The Committee recommends no change from the budget estimate.

D. Information Services, \$9,555,000
Transition Quarter, \$2,704,000

Program includes operation of museum, nuclear science exhibits, audiovisual services and dissemination of the results of ERDA's research and development programs to the scientific and industrial community. Increase of \$75,000 for FY 1976 and \$18,000 for the transition quarter is to support the National Atomic Museum at Albuquerque, New Mexico.

E. Equal Employment Opportunity Compliance, \$1,984,000
Transition Quarter, \$516,000

Funds are to assure EEO contract compliance in private facilities of contractors of Government agencies.

VII. CHANGE IN SELECTED RESOURCES

The Committee recommends an increase of \$46,706,000 for FY 1976 and \$11,155,000 for the transition quarter for change in selected resources. Selected resources consists of inventories and goods and services on order. The recommended increase is based on increases and decreases made in the above programs.

VIII. ANTICIPATED UNOBLIGATED BALANCES AND OTHER REDUCTIONS

The Committee recommends a reduction of \$11,200,000 for anticipated unobligated balances. Included in this is a reduction for rental payments to the General Services Administration and a reduction in the entertainment fund, to a level of \$15,000. The Committee is concerned about the increased portion of the travel budget being allocated to foreign travel. The Committee feels that foreign travel, not directly related to specific ERDA programs, should be held to a minimum.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975-----	\$788,452,000	
Budget estimate, 1976-----	874,292,000	\$185,276,000
Recommended, 1976-----	872,022,000	183,286,000
Comparison:		
Appropriations, 1975-----	+83,570,000	
Budget estimate, 1976-----	-2,270,000	-1,990,000

The following table reflects the amounts recommended by the Committee for plant and capital equipment, and a comparison with the budget estimate.

Project No.	Project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1976	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget estimate
CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS				
Physical Research				
76-2-a	Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications.....	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	-----
Fusion Power Research and Development				
76-3-a	Tokamak fusion test reactor (A-E and long-lead procurement), Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Plainsboro, N.J.....	7,500,000	15,000,000	+\$7,500,000
76-3-b	14 MeV intense neutron source facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory.....	-----	2,000,000	+2,000,000
76-3-c	14 MeV high intensity neutron facility, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory.....	-----	2,500,000	+2,500,000
Fission Power Reactor Development				
76-4-a	Modifications to reactors.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	-----
76-4-b	Sodium components test installation steam and feedwater system modification, Liquid Metal Engineering Center, Santa Susana, Calif.....	7,700,000	7,700,000	-----
76-5-a	Test reactor area fire main replacement, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	2,200,000	2,200,000	-----
Nuclear Materials Production				
76-6-a	Additional facilities, high level waste storage, Savannah River, S.C.....	25,000,000	25,000,000	-----
76-6-b	Additional high level waste storage facilities, Richland, Wash.....	19,300,000	19,300,000	-----
76-6-c	Supplemental N reactor irradiated fuel storage, Richland, Wash.....	2,500,000	2,500,000	-----
76-6-d	Uprate electrical switchyards for Roane substation, Oak Ridge, Tenn.....	8,100,000	8,100,000	-----
76-6-e	Conversion of existing steam plants to coal capability, gaseous diffusion plants and feed materials production center, Fernald, Ohio.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	-----
76-6-f	Radioactive liquid waste system improvements, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	5,800,000	5,800,000	-----
Weapons				
76-7-a	MK-12A Minuteman III production facilities, various locations.....	3,300,000	3,000,000	-----
76-7-b	Plutonium metallurgy building modifications, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, California.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	-----
76-7-c	Limited life component exchange facility, Charleston, S.C.....	2,700,000	2,700,000	-----
76-8-a	Fire wall construction, Bendix Plant, Kansas City, Mo.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	-----
76-8-b	Fire protection improvements, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico.....	4,450,000	4,450,000	-----
Biomedical and Environmental Research				
76-9-a	Modifications and additions to biomedical and environmental research facilities.....	3,200,000	3,200,000	-----
76-10	General plant projects.....	64,670,000	64,670,000	-----
76-11	Construction planning and design.....	6,000,000	6,000,000	-----
75-10-c	Retrievable surface storage facility.....	5,000,000	-----	-5,000,000
Increases in Prior-year Projects				
75-1-a	Additional facilities, high-level waste handling and storage, Savannah River, S.C.....	18,000,000	18,000,000	-----
75-1-c	New waste calcining facility, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho.....	2,500,000	2,500,000	-----
75-3-e	Additional to building 350 for safeguards analytical laboratory Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois.....	800,000	800,000	-----
75-6-c	Positron-electron joint projects, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory and Stanford Linear Accelerator Center.....	-----	2,900,000	+2,900,000
75-7-c	Intermediate-level waste management facilities, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee.....	5,100,000	5,100,000	-----
74-1-g	Cascade uprating program gaseous diffusion plants.....	119,100,000	119,100,000	-----
74-2-c	High energy laser facility, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, California.....	9,600,000	9,600,000	-----
71-1-f	Process equipment modifications, gaseous diffusion plants.....	160,000,000	160,000,000	-----
71-9	Fire, safety, and adequacy of operating conditions projects, various locations.....	44,600,000	44,600,000	-----
Appropriation requested for projects previously authorized:				
75-6-b	Heavy ion research facilities, various locations.....	11,800,000	11,800,000	-----
75-3-c	Trident production facilities, various facilities.....	6,800,000	6,800,000	-----
74-1-a	Additional facilities, high level waste storage, Savannah River, S.C.....	3,500,000	3,500,000	-----
67-3-a	Fast flux test facility, Richland, Wash.....	80,450,000	80,450,000	-----
Total construction projects.....		642,370,000	652,270,000	+9,900,000
General reduction, waste back construction.....		-----	-4,000,000	-4,000,000
Reduction, anticipated unobligated balance.....		-----	-15,000,000	-15,000,000
Total appropriation.....		-----	633,270,000	-9,100,000

Project No.	Project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1976	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget estimate
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT NOT RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION				
Solar, geothermal, and advanced energy systems development:				
Solar energy development.....		-----	\$2,000,000	+\$2,000,000
Geothermal energy development.....		560,000	1,500,000	+880,000
Physical research.....		32,300,000	34,000,000	+1,700,000
Total solar, geothermal and advanced energy system development.....		32,920,000	37,500,000	+4,580,000
Conservation research and development:				
Electric power transmission.....		1,700,000	1,700,000	-----
Energy storage systems.....		750,000	1,500,000	+750,000
Total conservation research and development.....		2,450,000	3,200,000	+750,000
Nuclear energy development:				
Fusion power research and development.....		16,000,000	18,500,000	+2,500,000
Fission power reactor development.....		51,400,000	49,900,000	-1,500,000
Naval reactor development.....		8,800,000	8,800,000	-----
Space nuclear systems.....		2,600,000	2,600,000	-----
Nuclear materials.....		28,100,000	28,100,000	-----
Advanced isotope separation technology.....		3,200,000	3,200,000	-----
Total nuclear energy development.....		110,100,000	111,100,000	+1,000,000
National security:				
Weapons.....		61,150,000	58,150,000	-3,000,000
Laser fusion.....		4,500,000	8,500,000	+4,000,000
Nuclear materials security.....		2,220,000	2,220,000	-----
Total national security.....		67,870,000	68,870,000	+1,000,000
Environmental and safety research:				
Biomedical and environmental research.....		10,150,000	11,650,000	+1,500,000
Waste management.....		3,350,000	3,350,000	-----
Operational safety.....		880,000	880,000	-----
Total environmental and safety research.....		14,380,000	15,880,000	+1,500,000
Program Support:				
Program direction.....		3,452,000	3,452,000	-----
Information services.....		750,000	750,000	-----
Total program support.....		4,202,000	4,202,000	-----
Total capital equipment obligations.....		231,922,000	240,752,000	+8,830,000
Total equipment budget authority.....		231,922,000	240,752,000	-----
General reduction, capital equipment.....		-----	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
Total, capital equipment.....		231,922,000	238,752,000	+6,830,000
Grand total, plant and capital equipment.....		874,292,000	872,022,000	-2,270,000

TRANSITION QUARTER

Project No.	Project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1976	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget estimate
CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS				
Physical Research				
76-2-a	Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
Fusion Power Research and Development				
76-3-a	Tokamak fusion test reactor (A-E and long-lead procurement), Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Plainsboro, N.J.	3,000,000	5,500,000	+\$2,500,000
76-3-b	14 MeV intense neutron source facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory		700,000	+700,000
Nuclear Materials Production				
76-6-a	Additional facilities, high level waste storage, Savannah River, S.C.	9,000,000	9,000,000	
76-6-b	Additional high level waste storage facilities, Richland, Wash.	3,800,000	3,800,000	
76-6-c	Conversion of existing steam plants to coal capability, gaseous diffusion plants and feed materials production center, Fernald, Ohio	5,000,000	5,000,000	
76-4	General plant projects	15,900,000	15,900,000	
78-	Construction planning and design	1,500,000	1,500,000	
76-10-a	Retrievable surface storage facility	5,000,000		-5,000,000
Increase in Prior Year Projects				
75-1-a	Additional facilities, high-level waste handling and storage, Savannah River, S.C.	5,000,000	5,000,000	
75-1-c	New waste calcining facility, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho	5,000,000	5,000,000	
74-1-a	Cascade uprating program, gaseous diffusion plants	28,500,000	28,500,000	
71-1-f	Process equipment modifications, gaseous diffusion plants	37,900,000	37,900,000	
71-9	Fire, safety, and adequacy of operating conditions projects, various locations	8,200,000	8,200,000	
Total construction projects		128,800,000	127,000,000	-1,800,000
Anticipated slippage			-2,000,000	-2,000,000
Total appropriation, construction projects		128,800,000	125,000,000	-3,800,000

Project No.	Project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1976	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget estimate
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT NOT RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION				
Solar, geothermal, and advanced energy systems development:				
Solar energy development:				
Geothermal energy development		\$200,000	\$200,000	
Physical research		8,000,000	8,600,000	+\$600,000
Total solar, geothermal and advanced energy systems development		8,200,000	8,800,000	+600,000
Conservation research and development:				
Electric power transmission		200,000	200,000	
Energy storage systems		300,000	700,000	+400,000
Total conservation research and development		500,000	900,000	+400,000
Nuclear energy development:				
Fusion power research and development		4,100,000	4,900,000	+800,000
Fission power reactor development		8,600,000	8,600,000	
Naval reactor development		1,325,000	1,325,000	
Space nuclear systems		650,000	650,000	
Nuclear materials		10,850,000	10,850,000	
Advanced isotope separation technology		800,000	800,000	
Total nuclear energy development		26,325,000	27,125,000	+800,000
National security:				
Weapons		14,870,000	14,870,000	
Laser fusion		1,200,000	2,350,000	+1,150,000
Nuclear materials security		611,000	611,000	
Total national security		16,681,000	17,831,000	+1,150,000
Environmental and safety research:				
Biomedical and environmental research		2,640,000	3,000,000	+360,000
Waste management		840,000	840,000	
Operational safety		220,000	220,000	
Total environmental and safety research		3,700,000	4,060,000	+360,000
Program support:				
Program direction		940,000	940,000	
Information services		130,000	130,000	
Total program support		1,070,000	1,070,000	
Total capital equipment obligations		56,476,000	59,786,000	+3,310,000
Total equipment budget authority		56,476,000	59,786,000	+3,310,000
Anticipated unobligated balances			1,500,000	-1,500,000
Total, capital equipment		56,476,000	58,286,000	+1,810,000

Increases above the budget follow:

(1) (Project 75-6-c) Positron-electron joint project. Lawrence Livermore Laboratory and Stanford Linear Accelerator Center.

This facility is the highest priority facility of the high energy physics community. The objective of the facility is to explore basically the structure of matter. This facility will permit the investigation of new phenomena which have so far defied theoretical explanation.

The Committee recommends that \$2,900,000 be appropriated for architect/engineering and for procurement of long-lead time items.

(2) (Project 76-3-a) Tokamak fusion test reactor.

This project is an important element needed by ERDA to meet the goal of a demonstration fusion reactor. It is an intermediate step between the current experimental devices and the first experimental reactor. This facility will demonstrate fusion power densities equal to that expected in a power reactor, provide a vehicle for developing fusion engineering experience and expertise and gain project management experience in a large fusion system.

The Committee recommends an increase of \$7,500,00 for fiscal year 1976 and \$2,500,000 for the transition quarter.

(3) (Project 76-3-b) 14 MEV intense neutron source facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory.

This facility would be used to test the effects of high energy neutrons on materials under consideration for use in fusion reactors.

The development of materials which can be used in fusion reactors is an essential keystone toward the ultimate development of a fusion reactor.

The Committee recommends that \$2,000,000 be appropriated for this facility.

(4) (Project 76-3-c) 14 MEV high intensity neutron facility, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory.

This project is similar to the previous one (76-3-b) but has a different research objective in that it would provide information on materials to be used in fusion reactors but at a lower flux level than the Los Alamos facility.

The Committee recommends that \$2,500,000 be appropriated for this facility.

(5) The Committee recommends an additional \$4,000,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 1976 and \$1,150,000 for the transition quarter for the laser fusion program. These funds are to be used for capital equipment for a glass laser facility at Rochester, New York. However, these funds are not to be obligated until the State of New York and private industry have committed their portion of the funds to proceed with the project. Upon completion, this facility would be a national user facility.

(6) Other capital equipment increases, as outlined in the following table are:

	Fiscal year 1976	Transition quarter
Solar, geothermal and advanced energy systems.....	\$4,580,000	\$800,000
Conservation research and development.....	750,000	400,000
Nuclear energy development.....	2,500,000	800,000
Environmental and safety research.....	1,500,000	360,000

Because of the higher level of funding for the operating expenses of these programs, it is important that appropriate capital equipment be provided to support the programs.

Recommended decreases from the budget estimate follow:

(1) A reduction of \$4,000,000 because of slippage in the waste tank construction program.

(2) A reduction of \$2,000,000 in capital equipment requested for mass storage devices for computer operations at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. The committee is informed that the total cost of the storage system is \$6,000,000. No funds are included in the Bill since the Committee has not had an opportunity to review the need for the total system.

(3) A decrease of \$1,500,000 in capital equipment for the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR). This reduction is appropriate because of the lower level of funding in operating expenses for this program.

(4) A reduction of \$1 million for capital equipment for the weapons program.

(5) A general reduction of \$2 million for fiscal year 1976 and \$1,500,000 for the transition quarter for capital equipment.

(6) The Committee recommends a reduction of \$15,000,000 for anticipated unobligated balances in Plant and Capital Equipment for fiscal year 1976 and \$2 million for the transition quarter.

COST OVERRUNS

The Atomic Energy Commission, one of ERDA's major predecessor agency's encountered tremendous cost overruns in many of its R & D programs. An investigation by the Appropriations Committee into these overruns concluded that among other things:

(1) There has been a lack of effective, long-range planning;

(2) Planning has not included realistic cost estimates;

(3) Cost estimates initially presented to the Congress were not based upon any significant degree of design data and/or the construction packages were not well defined or scoped prior to their presentation for authorization;

(4) Sources of funds used for the procurement of hardware systems varies. Some are in operating expenses and some in construction line appropriations.

Witnesses testified that steps are being taken to improve the capability to accurately estimate costs of its various projects. A review mechanism is being established in which senior management will review, on a monthly basis, the status of the major projects which ERDA has underway. This mechanism will keep track of funds, schedules and performances.

The Committee is hopeful that this will enable ERDA to become realistic in its cost estimates and improve the management of its programs. The Committee should be notified immediately when it appears that significant cost overruns may occur.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$65,284,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	62,200,000	\$15,550,000
Recommended, 1976.....	63,924,000	17,182,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	-1,360,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	+1,724,000	+1,632,000

Funds are provided under this heading to surveys and activities as follows:

Survey	Type of survey	General Investigations	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
Alabama:			
Mobile County.....	BE.....	\$40,000	\$20,000
Mobile Harbor.....	Nav.....	100,000	30,000
Montgomery to Gadsden, Coosa River channel, (detailed economic restudy).....	Nav.....	1,315,000	160,000
Village Creek.....	FC.....	45,000	20,000
Total, Alabama.....		500,000	130,000
Alaska:			
Metropolitan Anchorage.....	FC.....	183,000	75,000
Rivers and harbors in Alaska (hydro interim).....	FC.....	1,300,000	1,100,000
Southeastern railbelt area.....	FC.....	334,000	80,000
Total, Alaska.....		817,000	255,000
Arizona:			
Gila River and tributaries (Gila drain), Arizona and New Mexico.....	FC.....	1,200,000	145,000
Phoenix metropolitan area.....	FC.....	1,815,000	1,200,000
Total, Arizona.....		1,015,000	245,000
Arkansas:			
Little Rock metropolitan area.....	FC.....	1,475,000	1,125,000
Ozark River Basin, Ark. and La.....	FC.....	40,000	75,000
Pine Bluff metropolitan area.....	FC.....	275,000	25,000
White River Basin Reservoir.....	FC.....	1,100,000	1,25,000
White River Bull Shoals and Norfork.....	FC.....	25,000	50,000
White River, Piney Creek.....	FC.....	20,000	5,000
White River, Polk Bayou.....	FC.....	20,000	5,000
Total, Arkansas.....		955,000	310,000
California:			
Alameda Creek upper basin.....	FC.....	75,000	30,000
Antelope Valley.....	FC.....	40,000	10,000
Calleguas Creek.....	FC.....	90,000	25,000
Carmel River and tributaries.....	FC.....	50,000	0
Coast of northern California.....	Nav.....	50,000	10,000
Eel River.....	FC.....	50,000	20,000
Fisherman's Wharf, San Francisco County.....	Nav.....	45,000	0
Guadalupe River.....	FC.....	1,100,000	1,60,000
Humboldt Harbor and Bay.....	Nav.....	150,000	50,000
Los Angeles County drainage area review.....	FC.....	70,000	20,000
Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor (San Pedro Bay model study).....	Nav.....	450,000	60,000
North coast of Los Angeles County.....	Nav.....	25,000	15,000
Northern California streams.....	FC.....	303,000	65,000
Novato Creek and tributaries.....	FC.....	32,000	0

See footnotes at end of table p. 36.

Survey	Type of survey	General investigations	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
California—Continued			
Oceanside Harbor.....	Nav.....	\$50,000	\$25,000
Pajaro River.....	FC.....	58,000	24,000
Point Mugu to San Pedro breakwater.....	BE.....	33,000	25,000
Sacramento River deepwater ship channel.....	Nav.....	120,000	45,000
Sacramento River-San Joaquin Delta.....	FC.....	50,000	15,000
Sacramento Valley navigation.....	Nav.....	45,000	25,000
Salinas River including part of Salinas-Monterey metropolitan area.....	FC.....	325,000	60,000
San Diego County streams flowing into Pacific Ocean.....	FC.....	160,000	130,000
San Diego County, vicinity of Oceanside.....	BE.....	20,000	0
San Diego Harbor-Sweetwater River (2d entrance).....	Nav.....	25,000	15,000
San Francisco Bay and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta water quality and waste disposal.....	FC.....	1,100,000	15,000
San Francisco Bay area (in depth).....	Nav.....	260,000	95,000
San Francisco Bay, collection and disposal of floating debris.....	Nav.....	45,000	15,000
San Joaquin River basin.....	FC.....	1,190,000	155,000
San Luis Obispo County.....	FC.....	60,000	15,000
Santa Ana River basin and Orange County.....	FC.....	350,000	65,000
Santa Clara River.....	FC.....	90,000	20,000
Sunset Harbor.....	Nav.....	30,000	10,000
Upper Putah Creek.....	FC.....	25,000	0
Ventura County.....	BE.....	80,000	20,000
Walnut Creek Basin.....	FC.....	50,000	25,000
Total, California.....		3,696,000	964,000
Colorado: Metropolitan Denver and South Platte River and tributaries, Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming, total.....	FC.....	600,000	121,000
Connecticut:			
Connecticut River basin authorization report, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont.....	Comp.....	50,000	50,000
New Haven Harbor.....	Nav.....	31,000	0
Rippowam River.....	FC.....	30,000	10,000
Total, Connecticut.....		111,000	60,000
Delaware: Christina River Basin, total.....	FC.....	70,000	15,000
District of Columbia: Metropolitan Washington, D.C., water supply, total.....	Spec.....	150,000	160,000
Florida:			
Clearwater Pass.....	Nav.....	39,000	29,000
Cross-Florida barge canal.....	Spec.....	600,000	225,000
Four River basins.....	FC.....	385,000	30,000
Jacksonville Harbor (Mill Cove).....	Nav.....	20,000	11,000
Jacksonville metropolitan area.....	FC.....	320,000	1,100,000
Manatee Harbor.....	Nav.....	40,000	15,000
Miami Harbor.....	Nav.....	49,000	0
Monroe County.....	BE.....	15,000	20,000
Nassau County (Amelia Island).....	BE.....	102,000	0
Okeechobee Waterway.....	Nav.....	75,000	25,000
Pensacola and Tallahassee metropolitan and other urban areas.....	FC.....	1,150,000	55,000
St. Johns County.....	BE.....	80,000	30,000
Shores of northwest Florida.....	BE.....	65,000	20,000
Tampa Harbor, East Bay channels.....	Nav.....	65,000	0
Volusia County shores.....	BE.....	60,000	40,000
Willoughby Creek.....	Nav.....	15,000	0
Total, Florida.....		2,080,000	600,000
Georgia:			
Metropolitan Atlanta area.....	FC.....	585,000	55,000
Satilla River basin.....	FC.....	61,000	20,000
Savannah River basin, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.....	FC.....	83,000	40,000
Total, Georgia.....		729,000	115,000
Guam: Harbors and rivers in territory of Guam, total.....	Nav.....	50,000	22,000
Hawaii:			
Harbors and rivers in Hawaii.....	FC.....	75,000	15,000
Hawaii framework.....	Comp.....	16,000	0
Kaneohe Bay and part of Metropolitan Honolulu.....	Nav.....	1,300,000	180,000
Total, Hawaii.....		391,000	95,000

See footnotes at end of table p. 36.

Survey	Type of survey	General Investigations	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
Idaho:			
Big Wood River and tributaries	FC	\$22,000	\$31,000
Boise metropolitan region and Upper Snake River and tributaries, Idaho and Wyoming	FC	160,000	10,000
Columbia River and tributaries, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana and Wyoming	FC	1,000,000	1,311,000
Pacific Northwest River basin, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington	Comp.	100,000	10,000
Total, Idaho		1,282,000	362,000
Illinois:			
Chicago-south end of Lake Michigan, Illinois and Indiana	FC	192,000	32,000
East Cape Girardeau, Clear Creek, North Alexander, Preston, and Miller Pond Drainage and Levee District	FC	60,000	15,000
Fox River, Ill. and Wis.	FC	1,250,000	50,000
Kaskaskia Island Drainage and Levee District	FC	20,000	10,000
Mississippi River, Cassville, Wis. to mile 300, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and Wisconsin	FC	107,000	25,000
Mississippi River, Coon Rapids Dam to Ohio River, Ill., Iowa, and Mo.	FC	136,000	30,000
Mississippi River old channel mile 111-117, Illinois and Missouri	FC	30,000	5,000
Muscotlen Bay	Nav.	26,000	13,000
Rock River at Rockford	FC	85,000	30,000
Saline River	FC	70,000	20,000
Saline River and tributaries	Nav.	50,000	15,000
Silver Creek	FC	150,000	135,000
Total, Illinois		1,076,000	280,000
Indiana:			
Columbus	FC	35,000	10,000
Fort Wayne metropolitan area	FC	43,000	40,000
Indiana shoreline erosion, Lake Michigan	BE	80,000	20,000
Wabash River Basin authorization report, Indiana and Illinois	Comp.	150,000	135,000
Wabash River navigation, Indiana and Illinois	Nav.	1325,000	175,000
Total, Indiana		633,000	180,000
Iowa:			
Des Moines River erosion	FC	15,000	20,000
Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa and Minn.	FC	92,000	30,000
Upper Big Sioux River, Iowa and S. Dak.	FC	120,000	30,000
Total, Iowa		227,000	80,000
Kansas:			
Arkansas River, Great Bend, Kansas to John Martin Dam, Colo.	FC	1,150,000	140,000
Arkansas River, Great Bend, Kansas to Tulsa, Okla.	FC	140,000	5,000
Grand (Neosho) River, Kans. and Okla.	FC	0	10,000
Kansas River and tributaries	FC	50,000	65,000
Verdigris River, Kans. and Okla.	FC	1,200,000	160,000
Total, Kansas		540,000	180,000
Kentucky:			
Green and Barren Rivers	Nav.	25,000	8,000
Louisville Harbor	Nav.	30,000	10,000
Lower Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers below Barkley Canal, Ky. and Tenn.	Nav.	100,000	30,000
Metropolitan Lexington region	FC	250,000	50,000
Upper Cumberland River basin (resume study)	FC	175,000	125,000
Total, Kentucky		480,000	123,000
Louisiana:			
Barataria Bay Waterway (Dupre Cut)	Nav.	50,000	15,000
Barataria Bay Waterway, entrance channel	Nav.	70,000	15,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway—High level highway crossings	Nav.	70,000	20,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Louisiana-Texas section, Louisiana and Texas	Nav.	50,000	20,000
Louisiana coastal area	FC	160,000	70,000
Ouachita River Basin, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas)			
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge, La., to Natchez, Miss.	Nav.	35,000	10,000
New Orleans—Baton Rouge metropolitan area	FC	635,000	100,000
Total, Louisiana		1,070,000	250,000
Maine:			
St. John River, Maine	FC	60,000	40,000

See footnotes at end of table p. 36.

Survey	Type of survey	General investigations	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
Maryland:			
Atlantic coast of Maryland and Assateague Island, Va.	BE	\$15,000	0
Baltimore Harbor and channels spoil disposal, Maryland and Virginia	Nav.	80,000	0
Baltimore metropolitan streams	FC	90,000	\$20,000
Chesapeake Bay study, Maryland and Virginia	Spec.	2,035,000	395,000
Total, Maryland		2,220,000	415,000
Massachusetts:			
Boston Harbor (debris)	Nav.	45,000	10,000
Boston Harbor (35 ft channel)	Nav.	30,000	10,000
Cape Cod easterly shores	BE	45,000	15,000
Hoosic River, Mass., N.Y., and Vt.	FC	40,000	10,000
Plum Island	BE	25,000	15,000
Quincy, coastal streams	FC	59,000	0
Total, Massachusetts		244,000	60,000
Michigan:			
Grand Haven Harbor	Nav.	60,000	15,000
Great Lakes connecting channels and harbors	Nav.	50,000	15,000
Great Lakes, particularly Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, including Metropolitan Duluth-Superior, Mich., Minn., N.Y., Ohio, Pa., and Wis.	FC	540,000	50,000
Great Lakes—St. Lawrence Seaway navigation season extension, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin	Spec.	1,900,000	275,000
Monroe Harbor	Nav.	20,000	5,000
Water levels of the Great Lakes, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin	Spec.	220,000	75,000
Total, Michigan		2,790,000	435,000
Minnesota:			
Duluth-Superior Harbor Minn. and Wis.	Nav.	85,000	0
Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area	Comp.	63,000	0
Upper Mississippi River small-craft locks, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa and Missouri	Nav.	0	35,000
Total, Minnesota		148,000	35,000
Mississippi:			
Panapaqua River Basin	FC	77,000	28,000
Pearl River	Nav.	45,000	25,000
Total, Mississippi		122,000	53,000
Missouri:			
Cape La Croix Creek, Cape Girardeau	FC	100,000	30,000
Metropolitan region of Kansas City, Mo. and Kans.	FC	600,000	125,000
Plattin Creek	FC	40,000	10,000
St. Genevieve	FC	70,000	20,000
St. Louis Harbor, Mo. and Ill.	Nav.	75,000	20,000
St. Louis metropolitan area, Missouri and Illinois	FC	385,000	85,000
Total, Missouri		1,270,000	290,000
Montana:			
Fiathead and Clark Fork River Basins, total	FC	75,000	20,000
Nebraska:			
Platte River and tributaries, total	FC	50,000	25,000
New Hampshire:			
Connecticut River streambank erosion (Wilder Lake, N.H. and Vt. to Turners Falls Dam, Mass.)	FC	45,000	30,000
North and Pass Beaches	BE	30,000	15,000
Total, New Hampshire		75,000	45,000
New Jersey:			
Camden metropolitan area	FC	234,000	66,000
Delaware Bay, shore of New Jersey	FC	25,000	5,000
Hackensack River, N.J. and N.Y.	FC	50,000	15,000
Kill Van Kull Channel, Newark Bay Channel, N.J. and N.Y.	Nav.	1,100,000	135,000
Rahway River	FC	1,247,000	155,000
Raritan River basin	FC	168,000	52,000
Total, New Jersey		824,000	228,000

See footnotes at end of table p. 36.

Survey	Type of survey	General investigations	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
New Mexico:			
Pecos River and tributaries at Carlsbad	FC	\$140,000	\$40,000
Rio Grande and tributaries, New Mexico and Colorado	FC	375,000	90,000
Total, New Mexico		515,000	130,000
New York:			
Big Sandy Creek, Mexico Point	Nav	\$ 50,000	\$ 10,000
Buffalo metropolitan area	FC	1 275,000	10,000
Delaware River tributaries in New York	FC	40,000	10,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway (Troy lock and dam)	Nav	1 50,000	1 25,000
Gowanus Creek channel	Nav	1 20,000	1 10,000
Irondequoit Creek	FC	1 25,000	1 10,000
Northeastern United States Water Supply, New York, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia	Spec	910,000	165,000
Ogdensburg Harbor	Nav	1 20,000	1 10,000
Oswego River basin	FC	65,000	60,000
St. Lawrence Seaway, additional locks	Nav	202,000	30,000
Saranac River at Morrisonville	FC	1 10,000	1 10,000
Susquehanna River basin authorization report, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland	Comp	569,000	131,000
Wallkill River, N.Y. and N.J.	FC	48,000	12,000
Westchester County streams, New York and Byram River, Conn.	FC	1 150,000	1 50,000
Total, New York		2,434,000	533,000
North Carolina:			
Cape Fear River	FC	40,000	0
Carolina Beach Inlet	Nav	85,000	25,000
Lumber River, N.C. and S.C.	FC	1 40,000	1 20,000
Neuse River	FC	123,000	42,000
Roanoke River (South Boston and vicinity), N.C. and Va.	FC	75,000	35,000
Sugar Creek Basin, N.C. and S.C.	FC	65,000	41,000
Total, North Carolina		428,000	163,000
North Dakota: Red River of the North, N. Dak. and Minn., total	FC	190,000	90,000
Ohio:			
Central Ohio survey	FC	50,000	15,000
Cleveland Harbor	Nav	185,000	0
Cuyahoga River basin	FC	1 160,000	1 100,000
Lake Erie—Wastewater management, Ohio, Michigan, New York, and Pennsylvania (sec. 108a, Public Law 92-500)	Spec	310,000	250,000
Maumee River Basin, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan	Comp	57,000	0
Muskingum River basin	FC	50,000	15,000
Ohio River port development	Nav	1 60,000	1 30,000
Total, Ohio		873,000	410,000
Oklahoma:			
Canadian River and tributaries	FC	1 210,000	1 50,000
Central Oklahoma project	Nav	50,000	0
Tenkiler Ferry Lake	FC	20,000	45,000
Texas river study	FC	1 50,000	1 50,000
Total, Oklahoma		330,000	145,000
Oregon:			
Checco River	Nav	67,000	0
Columbia River at the mouth	Nav	1 25,000	1 5,000
Marys River	FC	90,000	0
Portland metropolitan area	FC	255,000	35,000
Sillies River and tributaries	FC	1 100,000	1 25,000
Tillamook Bay and Bar	Nav	24,000	11,000
Willamette River and basin authorization report	Comp	160,000	20,000
Total, Oregon		721,000	96,000
Pennsylvania:			
Beaver River basin, Pennsylvania and Ohio	FC	275,000	65,000
Chester Creek Basin	FC	105,000	25,000
Potomac River, North Branch (mine drainage), Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia	FC	270,000	53,000
Raystown Dam hydro study	FC	87,000	26,000
Schuylkill River review	Nav	45,000	20,000
Susquehanna River basin, mine drainage	FC	125,000	20,000
Total, Pennsylvania		907,000	209,000

See footnotes at end of table p. 36.

Survey	Type of survey	General investigations	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
Rhode Island:			
Pawcatuck River and Narragansett Bay drainage basins, Rhode Island and Massachusetts	FC	\$660,000	\$153,000
Point Judith Harbor and Fox Providence Harbor (dredging)	Nav	50,000	0
	Nav	55,000	0
Total, Rhode Island		765,000	153,000
South Carolina:			
Georgetown Harbor, total	Nav	60,000	20,000
Lumber River, N.C. and S.C. (see North Carolina).			
South Dakota:			
Eastern South Dakota water supply	FC	1 10,000	1 30,000
Missouri River, S. Dak., Nebr., N. Dak., and Mont.	FC	175,000	30,000
Total, South Dakota		185,000	60,000
Tennessee:			
Metropolitan region of Memphis	FC	50,000	45,000
Metropolitan region of Nashville	FC	150,000	40,000
Total, Tennessee		200,000	85,000
Texas:			
Brazos River and tributaries	FC	1 500,000	1 125,000
Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	FC	75,000	20,000
Colorado River and tributaries	FC	1 250,000	1 50,000
Corpus Christi ship channel, Harbor Island	Nav	1 400,000	1 100,000
Galveston Bay area navigation study	Nav	42,000	0
Johnson Creek	FC	215,000	50,000
Lake Wichita, Holliday Creek	FC	57,000	0
Linville Bayou-Caney Creek, Tres Palacios	FC	42,000	25,000
Lower Sabine River and tributaries	FC	1 25,000	1 20,000
Palo Blanco Creek and Cibolo Creek at and in vicinity of Falfurrias, Tex.	FC	1 65,000	1 25,000
Red River and tributaries, Texas and Oklahoma	FC	96,000	45,000
Sabine-Neches Waterway	Nav	45,000	0
San Diego Creek, Alice	FC	20,000	7,000
San Jacinto River and tributaries (Cypress Creek)	FC	1 50,000	1 25,000
Shores of Gulf of Mexico and Galveston Bay in Galveston County	BE	1 50,000	1 35,000
Texas coast hurricane	Spec	1 445,000	1 100,000
Total, Texas		2,377,000	627,000
Utah:			
Colorado River and tributaries above Lee Ferry, Utah, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming	FC	70,000	15,000
Jordan River basin	FC	35,000	0
Total, Utah		105,000	15,000
Virginia:			
Chowan River, Virginia and North Carolina	FC	170,000	50,000
James River	FC	100,000	25,000
Potomac River streams draining into Alexandria area	FC	50,000	0
Roanoke River, upper basin	FC	50,000	35,000
Total, Virginia		370,000	110,000
Washington:			
Chehalis River and tributaries	FC	100,000	25,000
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Hoquiam River	Nav	100,000	25,000
Metropolitan Spokane and Spokane River and tributaries, Washington and Idaho	FC	146,000	25,000
Okanogan River and tributaries	FC	100,000	25,000
Puget Sound and adjacent waters authorization report	Comp	140,000	20,000
Snohomish River and tributaries	Nav	1 75,000	1 25,000
Yakima Valley, regional water management supply	FC	100,000	25,000
Total, Washington		761,000	170,000
West Virginia:			
Gauley River	FC	100,000	30,000
Kanawha River basin authorization report, West Virginia, North Carolina, and Virginia	Comp	200,000	63,000
Metropolitan region of Charleston	FC	1 400,000	1 90,000
Metropolitan region of Huntington, W. Va., Ashland, Ky., and Portsmouth, Ohio	FC	450,000	105,000
Metropolitan region of Wheeling, W. Va. and Ohio	FC	300,000	65,000
Total, West Virginia		1,450,000	353,000

See footnotes at end of table p. 36.

Survey	Type of survey	General Investigations	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
Wisconsin:			
Chippewa River.....	FC.....	\$80,000	\$40,000
Harbors between Kewaunee and Keweenaw.....	Nav.....	52,000	30,000
Total, Wisconsin.....		132,000	70,000
Total, all States.....		37,153,000	9,632,000
Coordination studies with other agencies.....		1,820,000	450,000
Review of authorized projects:			
Residues of deferred projects.....		250,000	43,000
Review of completed projects (sec. 216, Public Law 91-611).....		1 599,000	1 167,000
Review for deauthorization (sec. 12, Public Law 93-251).....		300,000	50,000
Detailed economic restudies (Montgomery to Gadsden, Ala).....		2 (315,000)	2 (60,000)
Subtotal, review of authorized projects.....		1,149,000	260,000
Collection and study of basic data:			
Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey).....		440,000	110,000
Precipitation studies (National Weather Service).....		260,000	65,000
Fish and Wildlife studies (U.S.F. & W.S.).....		1,500,000	425,000
International water studies.....		340,000	94,000
Flood plain management services.....		11,000,000	2,825,000
Hydrologic studies.....		270,000	68,000
Scientific and technical information centers.....		100,000	25,000
Coastal data collection.....		150,000	38,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data.....		14,060,000	3,650,000
Research and development.....		12,000,000	3,200,000
Subtotal.....		29,029,000	7,560,000
Anticipated additional unobligated carryover balances and other adjustments.....		-2,258,000	-10,000
Grand total.....		63,924,000	17,182,000

¹ Increase in budget.

² Unbudgeted.

³ Listed under Alabama.

Note: Explanation of symbols used under type of project: Nav—navigation; FC—flood control; BE—beach erosion; Comp.—comprehensive basin survey; Spec.—survey under special studies.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Montgomery to Gadsden, Coosa River Channel, Alabama, Economic Restudy. The Committee has included \$375,000 in the bill for this restudy. The Corps should complete this study not later than July, 1976, and apply the resources required to complete this study without further delay.

Chicago-South End of Lake Michigan, Illinois and Indiana. The Committee does not intend for any of the funds provided for this investigation to be used for further study, planning or construction of any land treatment system of waste water management in the state of Indiana.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Navigation Season Extension, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. The Committee supports this demonstration project. The Corps should, however, study the long range aspects of this project to insure that there will be no negative effects on the shoreline and that there will be no increase in water levels which could cause flooding.

Westchester County streams, New York and Byram River, Connecticut. The Committee deplores the length of time the Corps of Engineers has taken on this study. It is understood that the Corps

has been reviewing various aspects of this project for 20 years. This is too long. The Committee expects it to be completed at the earliest possible time.

Cabin Creek, West Virginia. The Committee is not impressed with the Corps' action during the past year on this study. The study has been completed for over a year, but no action has been taken to seek the necessary legislative authority so that the project can proceed. The Corps should expedite this project.

Review of Completed Projects (Sec. 216). Funds provided over the budget request by the Committee for Section 216 projects are allocated as follows:

	Fiscal year 1976	Transition quarter
Cagle's Mill Lake, Ind.....	\$30,000	\$10,000
Barren River Lake, Ky.....	6,000	
Rough River Lake, Ky.....	13,000	

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$974,841,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	1,092,700,000	\$360,000,000
Recommended, 1976.....	1,157,015,000	408,883,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	+182,174,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	+64,315,000	+48,883,000

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended for advance engineering and design (planning), land acquisition, and construction. Immediately following the table, the Committee has outlined special reductions and changes made in the budgeted projects together with selected other Committee actions.

Type, State and projects (1)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1976			House allowance		
	Construction	Planning	Transition quarter	Construction	Planning	Transition quarter
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Alabama:						
(N) John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam (rehabilitation)	\$1,580,000		\$350,000	\$1,580,000		(C)\$350,000
(MP) Jones Bluff lock and dam	2,100,000		1,100,000	3,100,000		(C)1,800,000
(N) Mobile Harbor (Theodore Channel)		80,000		180,000		(C)500,000
(N) Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss.	52,000,000		21,900,000	72,000,000		(C)29,000,000
Tombigbee River and tributaries (see Mississippi)						
West Point Lake (see Georgia)						
Alaska:						
(FC) Chena River Lakes, Fairbanks	13,000,000		10,075,000	13,000,000		(C)10,075,000
(N) Humboldt Harbor	2,980,000		700,000	2,980,000		(C)700,000
(MP) Snettisham power project	4,000,000		2,000,000	4,000,000		(C)2,000,000
Arizona:						
(FC) Indian Bend Wash	1,150,000		500,000	1,150,000		(C)500,000
(FC) Phoenix and vicinity (including New River) stage 1	900,000		200,000	900,000		(C)200,000
(FC) Phoenix and vicinity (including New River) stage 2		\$350,000	15,000		\$350,000	(P)15,000
Arkansas:						
(MP) DeGray Lake	3,500,000		900,000	3,500,000		(C)900,000
(FC) DeQueen Lake	1,300,000		40,000	1,636,000		(C)40,000
(FC) Dierks Lake	905,000			905,000		
(FC) Gilliam Lake	600,000		208,000	600,000		(C)208,000
(N) McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system bank stabilization and channel rectification, Arkansas and Oklahoma	2,779,000			2,779,000		
(N) McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, locks and dams, Arkansas and Oklahoma	3,000,000		700,000	3,800,000		(C)850,000
(MP) Norfolk Lake, highway bridge		300,000	125,000		300,000	(P)125,000
(MP) Norfolk Lake, units 3 and 4		250,000	80,000		250,000	(P)80,000
(N) Ouachita and Black Rivers, Arkansas and Louisiana	2,000,000		2,800,000	4,400,000		(C)2,900,000
(FC) Pine Mountain Lake		148,000	50,000		148,000	(P)50,000
(FC) Posten Bayou					75,000	(P)15,000
(FC) Red River emergency bank protection (See Louisiana.)						
(FC) Red River levees and bank stabilization below denison dam, Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas	3,150,000		2,100,000	4,000,000		(C)2,400,000
(FC) Village Creek, Jackson and Lawrence Counties		180,000	40,000		160,000	(P)40,000
California:						
(FC) Alameda Creek (Del Valle Reservoir)	1,810,000			1,810,000		
(N) Bodega Bay		50,000	10,000			(P)10,000
(FC) Buchanan Dam-H.V. Eastman Lake	2,200,000		1,000,000	2,200,000		(C)1,000,000
(FC) Chester, North Fork of Feather River	1,200,000		1,800,000	1,200,000		(C)1,800,000
(FC) Corte Madera Creek	260,000		1,000,000	260,000		
(FC) Cottonwood Creek					225,000	(P)145,000
(FC) Cucamonga Creek	2,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000		(C)600,000
(FC) Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake and Channel	1,800,000		1,000,000	1,800,000		(C)1,000,000

38

(FC) Fairfield Vicinity Streams		275,000			275,000	
(FC) Hidden Dam-Hensley Lake	2,380,000		600,000	3,100,000		(C)800,000
(N) Humboldt Harbor and Bay		40,000	20,000		40,000	(P)20,000
(BE) Imperial Beach	100,000		50,000	200,000		(C)50,000
(FC) Lytle and Warm Creeks	8,506,000			8,506,000		
(MP) Marysville Lake		840,000			840,000	
(FC) Merced County streams		500,000	280,000		500,000	(P)280,000
(FC) Napa River Basin	500,000		1,200,000	500,000		(C)1,200,000
(MP) New Melones Lake	40,100,000		15,500,000	43,000,000		(C)15,000,000
(FC) Pajaro River		75,000	65,000		75,000	(P)65,000
(FC) Pine Flat Lake and Kings River	905,000			905,000		
(N) Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor		50,000			50,000	
(FC) Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	200,000		50,000	200,000		(C)50,000
(FC) Sacramento River bank protection	2,800,000		1,500,000	3,000,000		(C)1,600,000
(FC) Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	1,660,000		1,660,000	1,660,000		
(N) San Diego Harbor	3,200,000		900,000	5,300,000		(C)1,500,000
(FC) San Diego River (Mission Valley)		75,000	25,000		75,000	(P)25,000
(BE) San Diego (Sunset Cliffs) (seg. A)					30,000	(P)5,000
(N) San Francisco Bay to Stockton (John F. Baldwin and Stockton ship channels)	500,000		200,000	500,000		(C)200,000
(FC) San Luis Rey River					100,000	(P)35,000
(FC) Sweetwater River				250,000		(C)20,000
(FC) Walnut Creek	800,000		600,000	800,000		(C)600,000
Colorado:						
(FC) Arkansas River and tributaries above John Martin Dam		250,000	80,000		250,000	(P)80,000
(FC) Bear Creek Lake	14,800,000		4,000,000	14,800,000		(C)4,000,000
(FC) Chatfield Lake	2,100,000		1,100,000	2,100,000		(C)1,100,000
(FC) Trinidad Lake	4,400,000		300,000	4,460,000		(C)300,000
Connecticut:						
(FC) Danbury	5,800,000		2,000,000	5,800,000		(C)2,000,000
(FC) Park River		308,000		1,500,000		(C)2,000,000
Delaware:						
(FC) Delaware coast protection				910,000		(C)210,000
(N) Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (pt. II)	600,000		446,000	600,000		(C)446,000
District of Columbia:						
(FC) Potomac estuary pilot water treatment plant, District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia		630,000			630,000	
Florida:						
(FC) Central and southern Florida	8,500,000		2,150,000	10,000,000		(C)3,650,000
(FC) Dade County (Bal Harbour) (reimbursement)	2,300,000			2,300,000		
(BE) Duval County				1,000,000		(C)1,000,000
(FC) Four River basins	3,700,000		1,770,000	4,000,000		(C)3,000,000
(N) Jacksonville Harbor (1965 act)	3,500,000		550,000	5,000,000		(C)1,500,000
(N) Panama City Harbor	600,000		70,000	600,000		(C)70,000
(BE) Pinellas County	150,000			150,000		
(N) Port Everglades Harbor		100,000	25,000		100,000	(P)25,000
(N) Tampa Harbor (main channel)	5,500,000		1,575,000	7,200,000		(C)3,050,000

39

Type, State and projects (1)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1976			House allowance		
	Construction	Planning	Transition quarter	Construction	Planning	Transition quarter
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Georgia:						
(MP) Carters Lake	\$2,954,000			\$2,954,000		
(MP) Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake, Ga. and S. Ca.	4,400,000		\$2,200,000	4,400,000		(C)\$2,200,000
(N) Savannah Harbor (widening and deepening)	850,000		850,000	850,000		(C)850,000
(BE) Tybee Island	1,169,000			1,169,000		
(MP) West Point Lake, Ala. and Ga.	2,600,000		548,000	2,600,000		(C)548,000
Hawaii:						
(N) Barbers Point (deep draft) Harbor, Oahu		\$100,000	25,000		\$200,000	(P)50,000
(N) Honolulu Harbor, Oahu		60,000	25,000		60,000	(P)25,000
(FC) Iao Stream, Maui		105,000			105,000	
(FC) Kaneohe-Kailua area	400,000		600,000	800,000		(C)900,000
(N) Lahaina, small boat harbor	700,000		200,000	700,000		(C)200,000
Idaho:						
(MP) Dworshak Dam and reservoir	4,000,000		1,500,000	4,000,000		(C)1,500,000
(FC) Ririe Lake	3,800,000		900,000	3,800,000		(C)900,000
Illinois:						
(FC) Carlyle Lake	2,000,000		450,000	2,000,000		(C)450,000
(FC) Columbia Drainage and Levee District No. 3	400,000		200,000	400,000		(C)200,000
(FC) East Moline		182,000			182,000	
(FC) East St. Louis and vicinity, Cahokia Creek low dam			750,000			(C)750,000
(FC) East St. Louis and vicinity, interior flood control	1,400,000		850,000	1,400,000		(C)850,000
(FC) Eldred and Spankey Drainage and Levee District					50,000	(P)40,000
(FC) Freeport				50,000		(C)25,000
(FC) Fulton				200,000		(C)100,000
(FC) Harrisonville and Ivy Landing Drainage and Levee District No. 2	1,300,000		550,000	1,300,000		(C)550,000
(N) Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	2,800,000		680,000	2,800,000		(C)680,000
(N) Illinois Waterway, Duplicate Locks, Illinois and Indiana		400,000	100,000			(C)100,000
(FC) Kaskaskia Island Drainage and Levee District		200,000	80,000		200,000	(P)80,000
(N) Kaskaskia River navigation	6,300,000		850,000	6,300,000		(C)850,000
(FC) Levee District No. 23 (Dively), Kaskaskia River	400,000			400,000		
(FC) Little Calumet River				150,000		(C)140,000
(N) Lock and Dam 53 (temporary lock), Illinois and Kentucky	21,100,000		2,150,000	21,100,000		(C)2,150,000
(FC) Louisville Lake		175,000	70,000		175,000	(P)70,000
(FC) McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District				250,000		(C)200,000
(FC) Milan		91,000			121,000	(P)20,000
(N) Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers (regulating works), Illinois and Missouri	3,000,000		700,000	3,000,000		(C)700,000
(FC) Moline		180,000	30,000		180,000	(P)30,000
(FC) Rock Island	300,000		80,000	300,000		(C)80,000
(FC) Rockford	200,000		800,000	200,000		(C)800,000
(FC) Saline River and tributaries	380,000			380,000		
(N) Smithland locks and dam, Illinois, Indiana and Kentucky	84,000,000		14,885,000	84,000,000		(C)14,885,000
(FC) South Beloit		30,000	20,000		30,000	(P)20,000
(FC) Wood River Drainage and Levee District					70,000	(P)25,000
Indiana:						
(FC) Big Blue Lake		150,000	50,000		150,000	(P)50,000
(FC) Big Pine Lake	700,000		1,300,000	700,000		(C)1,300,000
(FC) Big Walnut Lake (Land Acquisition)		300,000	105,000		300,000	(LA)400,000
(FC) Brookville Lake	2,635,000		885,000	2,635,000		(C)885,000
(N) Cannelton locks and dams, Indiana and Kentucky	620,000		100,000	620,000		(C)100,000
(FC) Evansville	1,850,000		1,350,000	1,850,000		(C)1,350,000
(FC) Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification pt. I (see Illinois)						
(FC) Illinois Waterway, duplicate locks (see Illinois)						
(FC) Island levee	200,000		580,000	200,000		(C)580,000
(FC) Lafayette Lake				300,000		(C)500,000
(FC) Levee unit No. 5	300,000		100,000	300,000		(C)100,000
(FC) Mason J. Niblack levee (pumping facilities)	1,019,000		573,000	1,273,000		(C)573,000
(N) Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	7,800,000		575,000	7,800,000		(C)575,000
(FC) Patoka Lake	5,000,000		1,885,000	5,000,000		(C)1,885,000
(N) Smithland locks and dam (see Illinois)						
(N) Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	1,810,000		50,000	1,810,000		(C)50,000
Iowa:						
(FC) Bettendorf	100,000		600,000	100,000		(C)600,000
(FC) Big Sioux River at Sioux City, Iowa and S. Dak.				400,000		(C)1,000,000
(FC) Clinton	3,500,000		1,600,000	3,500,000		(C)1,600,000
(FC) Davenport		240,000	60,000		240,000	(P)60,000
(FC) Marshalltown	1,500,000		700,000	1,500,000		(C)700,000
(FC) Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	300,000		200,000	500,000		(C)600,000
(N) Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	3,000,000		1,000,000	4,000,000		(C)2,000,000
(FC) Saylorville Lake	4,730,000		550,000	4,730,000		(C)550,000
(FC) Waterloo	7,550,000		1,450,000	7,550,000		(C)1,450,000
Kansas:						
(FC) Arkansas-Red Basins chloride control (see Oklahoma)						
(FC) Big Hill Lake	400,000		269,000	400,000		(C)269,000
(FC) Cedar Point Lake		200,000	54,000		200,000	(P)54,000
(FC) Clinton Lake	6,900,000		2,500,000	7,500,000		(C)2,600,000
(FC) Dodge City	2,150,000		216,000	2,150,000		(C)216,000
(FC) El Dorado		180,000			180,000	
(FC) El Dorado Lake	9,600,000		5,152,000	9,600,000		(C)5,152,000
(FC) Great Bend		146,000			146,000	
(FC) Hillsdale Lake	1,550,000		800,000	3,000,000		(C)1,900,000
(FC) Indian Lake		200,000	75,000		200,000	(P)75,000
(FC) Kansas City 1962 modification	7,500,000		2,150,000	7,500,000		(C)2,150,000
(N) Kansas River navigation		50,000	50,000		50,000	(P)50,000
(FC) Lawrence	1,100,000		574,000	1,100,000		(C)574,000
(FC) Marion	1,200,000		429,000	1,500,000		(C)440,000
(FC) Missouri River levee system (see Iowa)						
(FC) Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth (see Iowa)						
(FC) Perry Lake area (road improvements)	200,000		400,000	200,000		(C)400,000
(FC) Tomahawk Lake		200,000	75,000		200,000	(P)75,000
(FC) Towanda Lake					50,000	(P)40,000
(FC) Winfield		108,000			108,000	
(FC) Wolf-Coffee Lake		400,000	100,000		400,000	(P)100,000

Type, State and projects (1)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1976			House allowance		
	Construction	Planning	Transition quarter	Construction	Planning	Transition quarter
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Kentucky:						
(FC) Big Sandy River, dam No. 3				\$305,000		
(FC) Big South Fork National River and recreation area, Kentucky and Tennessee		\$350,000			\$350,000	(P)\$15,000
(FC) Boone County					50,000	
(FC) Booneville Lake		209,000			209,000	(P)10,000
(FC) Camp Ground Lake		190,000	\$10,000		190,000	
(FC) Cannelton locks and dams (see Indiana)						
(FC) Carr Fork Lake	\$5,914,000			5,914,000		
(FC) Cave Run Lake	3,900,000		750,000	4,400,000		(C)1,000,000
(FC) Dayton		105,000			105,000	
(FC) Frankfort, North Frankfort area	200,000			200,000		(C)700,000
(FC) Kehoe Lake				750,000		(C)1,144,000
(MP) Laurel River Lake	4,700,000		644,000	5,200,000		
(FC) Lock and dam 53 (temporary lock) (see Illinois)						
(FC) Martin	600,000		350,000	600,000		(C)350,000
(FC) Martins Fork Lake	2,900,000		1,240,000	2,900,000		(C)1,240,000
(FC) Newburg locks and dam (see Indiana)						
(FC) Paintsville Lake	1,800,000		750,000	1,300,000		(C)750,000
(FC) Red River Lake	1,000,000		527,000	1,000,000		(C)527,000
(FC) Smithland locks and dam (see Illinois)						
(FC) Southwestern Jefferson County	1,680,000		1,420,000	1,680,000		(C)1,420,000
(FC) Taylorsville Lake	4,574,000		2,465,000	5,100,000		(C)2,465,000
(FC) Tug Fork Valley (phase 1)		200,000	75,000		200,000	(P)75,000
(MP) Uniontown locks and dam (see Indiana)						
(FC) Wolf Creek Dam, Lake Cumberland (rehabilitation)	6,050,000		3,800,000	6,050,000		(C)3,800,000
(FC) Yatesville Lake	1,400,000		800,000	1,400,000		(C)800,000
Louisiana:						
(N) Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black	1,500,000		2,100,000	4,200,000		(C)2,100,000
(FC) Bayou Bodcau and tributaries	2,000,000		1,000,000	2,000,000		(C)1,000,000
(N) Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche Jump Waterway	400,000		1,000,000	400,000		(C)1,000,000
(N) Calcasieu River at Devil's Elbow	5,022,000			5,022,000		
(FC) Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity	22,000,000		7,350,000	22,000,000		(C)7,350,000
(FC) Larose to Golden Meadow	1,600,000		1,000,000	2,200,000		(C)1,000,000
(N) Mississippi River outlets, Venice, La.	500,000		550,000	1,000,000		(C)750,000
(N) Mississippi River—gulf outlet	1,000,000		475,000	1,600,000		(C)1,350,000
(FC) New Orleans to Venice	6,100,000		2,700,000	6,100,000		(C)2,700,000
(FC) Ouachita and Black Rivers (see Arkansas)						
(FC) Ouachita River levees	2,100,000		320,000	2,100,000		(C)320,000
(N) Overton-Red River Waterway (lower 31 miles only)	1,100,000		50,000	1,500,000		(C)50,000
Maine:						
(N) Red River emergency bank protection, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas	4,000,000		1,475,000	5,000,000		(C)1,700,000
(N) Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam (see Arkansas)						
(N) Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, La.	17,300,000		4,070,000	23,000,000		(C)9,000,000
(N) Vermilion lock (replacement)		133,000			133,000	
Maryland:						
(FC) Bloomington Lake, Md and W. Va.	6,200,000		3,300,000	6,200,000		(C)3,300,000
(FC) Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (pt. II) (see Delaware)						
(FC) Potomac Estuary pilot water treatment plant (see District of Columbia)						
Massachusetts:						
(FC) Charles River Dam	11,000,000		3,500,000	11,000,000		(C)3,500,000
(FC) Charles River natural valley storage areas		200,000	90,000		200,000	(P)90,000
(N) Edgartown Harbor		135,000			135,000	
(FC) North Nashua River		60,000	20,000		60,000	(P)20,000
(FC) Saxonville				500,000		(C)600,000
(N) Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers	2,000,000		400,000	2,000,000		(C)400,000
Michigan:						
(N) Great Lakes Connecting channels	974,000			974,000		
(N) Lexington Harbor	500,000		320,000	500,000		(C)320,000
(N) Ludington Harbor		45,000	15,000		45,000	(P)15,000
(N) New Buffalo Harbor	311,000			311,000		
(N) Ottawa River Harbor, Michigan and Ohio		70,000	10,000		70,000	(P)10,000
(FC) Red Run drain and lower Clinton River		500,000	115,000		500,000	(P)115,000
(FC) River Rouge, 1962 act	2,200,000		300,000	2,200,000		(C)300,000
(FC) Saginaw River, 1958 act	2,300,000		880,000	2,300,000		(C)880,000
(N) Tawas Bay Harbor				50,000		
Minnesota:						
(N) Beaver Bay Harbor		100,000			100,000	
(FC) Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River, Minnesota and S. Dak.	900,000		100,000	900,000		(C)100,000
(N) Knife River Harbor		60,000			60,000	
(N) Lutsen Harbor		85,000			85,000	
(FC) Mankato and North Mankato	2,200,000		1,300,000	2,200,000		(C)1,300,000
(FC) Rochester (phase I)		110,000	30,000		110,000	(P)30,000
(FC) Roseau River				100,000		(C)2,100,000
(FC) Twin Valley Lake	250,000		60,000	250,000		(P)60,000
(FC) Winona	400,000		110,000	400,000		(P)110,000
Mississippi:						
(FC) Edinburg Lake (phase 1)		350,000			350,000	
(FC) Tallahala Creek Lake	1,000,000		1,100,000	1,000,000		(C)1,100,000
(FC) Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway (see Alabama)						
(FC) Tombigbee River and tributaries, Mississippi and Alabama	700,000		800,000	700,000		(C)800,000
(N) Yazoo River, Belzoni Bridge (advance participation)	150,000			150,000		

Type, State and projects (1)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1976			House allowance		
	Construction	Planning	Transition quarter	Construction	Planning	Transition quarter
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Missouri:						
(FC) Blue River Channel, Kansas City.....		\$400,000	\$100,000		\$400,000	(P)\$100,000
(MP) Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir.....	\$24,100,000		5,100,000	\$24,100,000		(C)5,100,000
(MP) Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir.....	45,500,000		14,450,000	45,500,000		(C)14,450,000
(FC) Little Blue River Channel.....	2,100,000		850,000	2,100,000		(C)850,000
(FC) Little Blue River Lakes (LA).....	2,500,000		800,000	2,500,000		(C)800,000
(FC) Long Branch Lake.....	3,500,000		2,000,000	4,300,000		(C)2,400,000
(FC) Meramec Park Lake.....	5,500,000		1,300,000	5,500,000		(C)1,300,000
(FC) Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers (regulating works), (see Illinois).		168,000			168,000	
(FC) Mississippi River Agricultural Area No. 8 (Elsberry Drainage District). Missouri River levee system (see Iowa). Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth (see Iowa).		155,000			155,000	
(FC) Perry County Drainage and Levee District 1, 2, 3.....			5,400,000	14,000,000		(P)150,000
(FC) Pine Ford Lake.....	14,000,000			14,000,000		(C)5,400,000
(FC) Smithville Lake.....	1,080,000			1,080,000		
(FC) Union Lake, State Highway 185 (advance participation).....						
Montana:						
(FC) Billings (western unit).....		110,000			110,000	
(MP) Libby Dam, Lake Kocanusa.....	14,800,000		5,000,000	14,800,000		(C)5,000,000
(MP) Libby reregulating dam power units.....		200,000	75,000		250,000	(P)75,000
(FC) Miles City.....					40,000	(P)15,000
Nebraska:						
(MP) Gavins Point Dam-Lewis and Clark Lake (relocation of Niobrara), Nebr., and S. Dak. Missouri River levee system (see Iowa). Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth (see Iowa).	3,700,000		1,276,000	3,700,000		(C)1,276,000
(FC) Papillion Creek and tributaries lakes.....	3,900,000		3,100,000	6,900,000		(C)3,100,000
Nevada:						
(FC) Humboldt River and tributaries.....		75,000	85,000		75,000	(P)85,000
New Jersey:						
(N) Corson Inlet-Ludlam Beach.....		130,000	50,000		130,000	(P)50,000
(FC) Elizabeth.....	1,560,000		540,000	1,560,000		(C)540,000
(N) Great Egg Harbor and Peck Beach.....		150,000	50,000		150,000	(P)50,000
(N) Newark Bay, Hackensack, and Passaic Rivers.....				1,500,000		(C)700,000
New Mexico:						
(FC) Cochiti Lake.....	3,200,000		318,000	3,200,000		(C)318,000
(FC) Los Esteros Lake.....	3,400,000		944,000	3,400,000		(C)944,000

New York:						
(N) Cattaraugus Harbor.....		110,000			110,000	(P)35,000
(N) Dunkirk Harbor.....		70,000	35,000		70,000	(C)1,250,000
(BE) East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay (pt I).....	1,630,000		100,000	1,730,000		(C)500,000
(BE) Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet.....	2,700,000		500,000	2,700,000		(C)400,000
(FC) Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point.....	1,350,000		400,000	1,350,000		
(BE) Hamlin Beach State Park (reimbursement).....	733,000			733,000		(C)30,000
(N) Irondequoit Bay.....				50,000		(C)56,000
(FC) Ithaca.....	90,000		56,000	90,000		(C)500,000
(N) New York Harbor collection and removal of drift.....	900,000		500,000	900,000		(C)1,100,000
(N) New York Harbor, anchorages.....	1,600,000		1,100,000	2,600,000		(P)40,000
(N) Port Ontario.....					50,000	
(FC) Scajaquada Creek.....		125,000			125,000	
(FC) Staten Island (Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill).....		100,000			100,000	
(FC) Wellsville.....	595,000			595,000		(C)500,000
(FC) Yonkers.....	1,300,000		500,000	1,300,000		
North Carolina:						
(N) Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, highway bridges.....	400,000		130,000	400,000		(C)130,000
(FC) B. Everett Jordan Dam and Lake.....	11,400,000		1,200,000	11,400,000		(C)1,200,000
(FC) Carolina Beach and vicinity.....	433,000		200,000	433,000		(C)200,000
(FC) Falls Lake.....	6,400,000		2,116,000	6,400,000		(C)2,116,000
(FC) Howards Mill Lake.....		100,000	50,000		100,000	(P)50,000
(N) Little River Inlet (see South Carolina).		70,000			70,000	
(N) Manteo (Shallow Bag) Bay.....	700,000		500,000	700,000		(C)500,000
(N) Morehead City Harbor (1970 act).....			60,000		120,000	(P)60,000
(FC) Randleman Lake.....		120,000	60,000		150,000	(P)40,000
(FC) Reddies River Lake.....		150,000	40,000		150,000	(P)50,000
(FC) Roaring River Lake.....		150,000	50,000		150,000	
North Dakota:						
(FC) Burlington Dam.....		300,000	200,000		300,000	(P)200,000
(MP) Garrison Dam-Lake Sakakawea.....	100,000		50,000	100,000		(C)50,000
(FC) Kindred Lake.....					100,000	(P)30,000
(FC) Minot.....	4,100,000		2,974,000	4,100,000		(C)2,974,000
(FC) Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Lake Oahe.....	200,000		50,000	200,000		(C)50,000
Ohio:						
(FC) Alum Creek Lake.....	1,500,000		1,000,000	1,500,000		(C)1,000,000
(FC) Caesar Creek Lake.....	11,200,000		3,310,000	11,800,000		(C)4,100,000
(FC) Chillicothe.....	1,000,000		600,000	1,000,000		(C)600,000
(FC) East Fork Lake.....	7,000,000		1,439,000	7,000,000		(C)1,439,000
(FC) Eastlake-Chagrin River.....		80,000		3,866,000		80,000
(N) Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....	3,866,000			3,866,000		50,000
(BE) Lakeview Park, Lorain.....		50,000				(C)1,260,000
(FC) Mill Creek.....	2,000,000		1,260,000	2,000,000		(C)150,000
(FC) Muskingum River lakes (rehabilitation).....	250,000		150,000	250,000		
(FC) Ottawa River Harbor (see Michigan).						
(FC) Paint Creek Lake.....	709,000			709,000		
(FC) Point Place.....		80,000	10,000		80,000	(P)10,000
(N) Willow Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....	4,100,000		600,000	4,100,000		(C)600,000

Type, State and projects (1)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1976			House allowance		
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Transition quarter (4)	Construction (5)	Planning (6)	Transition quarter (7)
Oklahoma:						
(FC) Arcadia Lake		\$300,000	\$100,000	\$800,000		(C)\$450,000
(FC) Arkansas-Red Basins chloride control, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Texas		1,260,000	446,000		\$1,260,000	(P)446,000
(FC) Arkansas-Red River Basins chloride control, area VIII				200,000		(C)100,000
(FC) Birch Lake	\$3,300,000		605,000	3,300,000		(C)605,000
(FC) Candy Lake				700,000		(C)450,000
(FC) Clayton Lake	2,500,000		2,030,000	2,500,000		(C)2,030,000
(FC) Copan Lake	1,300,000		2,270,000	11,200,000		(C)4,400,000
(MP) Fort Gibson Lake, units 5 and 6		350,000	100,000		350,000	(P)100,000
(FC) Hugo Lake	2,224,000			2,224,000		
(FC) Kaw Lake	7,500,000		1,408,000	8,200,000		(C)1,500,000
(FC) Lukfata Lake				50,000		(C)100,000
(FC) McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system (see Arkansas.)						
(FC) Optima Lake	9,800,000		1,525,000	9,800,000		(C)1,525,000
(FC) Sand Lake					100,000	(P)80,000
(FC) Skiatook Lake	2,000,000		1,770,000	2,000,000		(C)1,770,000
(FC) Waurika Lake	13,800,000		4,109,000	13,800,000		(C)4,109,000
Oregon:						
(FC) Applegate Lake (LA)	300,000		100,000	300,000		(LA)100,000
(FC) Beaver Drainage District	100,000		200,000	100,000		(C)200,000
(MP) Bonneville lock and dam (2d powerhouse) Oregon and Washington	17,500,000		13,000,000	18,000,000		(C)13,000,000
(MP) Bonneville lock and dam (modification for peaking), Oregon and Washington	1,900,000		500,000	1,900,000		(C)500,000
(FC) Cascadia Lake		200,000	200,000		200,000	(P)200,000
(FC) Catherine Creek Lake	400,000		250,000	400,000		(C)250,000
(N) Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers, Oregon and Washington (40 foot channel)	1,000,000		350,000	1,000,000		(C)350,000
(N) Coos Bay				2,000,000		(C)3,500,000
(MP) Cougar Lake	740,000		300,000	740,000		(C)300,000
(FC) Days Creek Lake (phase I)		100,000	25,000		400,000	(P)100,000
(FC) Elk Creek Lake	6,600,000		3,000,000			
(MP) John Day lock and dam, Lake Umatilla, Oreg. and Wash.	5,065,000		1,300,000	5,525,000		(C)1,300,000
(MP) Lost Creek Lake	24,000,000		8,600,000	24,000,000		(C)8,600,000
(FC) Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	450,000		300,000	450,000		(C)300,000
(MP) McNary lock and dam, Lake Wallula, Oreg. and Wash.	4,100,000		1,000,000	4,100,000		(C)1,000,000
(FC) Scappoose Drainage District	100,000		400,000	100,000		(C)400,000
(FC) The Dalles lock and dam (see Washington)						
(FC) Willamette River Basin bank protection	400,000		950,000	400,000		(C)950,000
Pennsylvania:						
(FC) Blue Marsh Lake	10,500,000		2,900,000	10,500,000		(C)2,900,000
(FC) (Relocate Gruber Wagon Works)				431,000		
(FC) Chartiers Creek	1,200,000		1,300,000	1,200,000		(C)1,300,000
(FC) Cowanesque Lake	12,400,000		5,000,000	12,400,000		(C)5,000,000
(FC) DuBols	2,000,000			2,000,000		
(N) Grays Landing lock and dam		300,000	130,000		300,000	(P)130,000
(N) Point Marion lock		200,000	90,000		200,000	(P)90,000
(FC) Pottstown		50,000	20,000		50,000	(P)20,000
(BE) Presque Isle Peninsula	750,000		10,000	750,000		(C)10,000
(FC) Raystown Lake	4,500,000		1,900,000	4,500,000		(C)1,900,000
(FC) Tioga-Hammond Lakes	31,000,000		9,314,000	31,000,000		(C)9,314,000
(MP) Tocks Island Lake (relocation of Route 209 only)				2,500,000		(C)2,100,000
(FC) Tyrone	1,700,000		750,000	1,700,000		(C)750,000
Puerto Rico:						
(FC) Portugues and Bucana Rivers	5,000,000		1,225,000	6,400,000		(C)1,750,000
South Carolina:						
(N) Cooper River, Charleston Harbor	3,000,000		1,273,000	3,000,000		(C)1,273,000
(N) Little River Inlet, S.C. and N.C.		380,000	100,000		380,000	(P)100,000
(N) Murrells Inlet		300,000			300,000	
(N) Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake (see Georgia)						
South Dakota:						
(FC) Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River (see Minnesota)						
(FC) Gavins Point Dam-Lewis and Clark Lake (relocation of Niobrara) (see Nebraska)						
(FC) Sacred Heart Hospital, emergency bank stabilization, Yankton, S. Dak.	125,000			125,000		
Tennessee:						
(MP) Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area (see Kentucky)			420,000	1,300,000		(C)520,000
(FC) Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir	1,000,000					
Texas:						
(FC) Alpine		70,000	20,000		70,000	(P)20,000
(FC) Aquilla Lake				1,500,000		(C)700,000
(FC) Arkansas-Red Basins chloride control (see Oklahoma)						
(FC) Aubrey Lake	2,500,000		3,314,000	2,500,000		(C)3,314,000
(FC) Big Pine Lake		300,000	75,000		300,000	(P)75,000
(FC) Big Spring		65,000	20,000		65,000	(P)20,000
(FC) Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	1,473,000			1,473,000		
(FC) Carl L. Estes Dam and Lake		400,000	135,000		400,000	(P)135,000
(FC) Clear Creek		300,000	75,000		300,000	(P)75,000
(FC) Cloptin Crossing Lake (phase I)			685,000	1,500,000		(C)685,000
(FC) Cooper Lake and channels	1,500,000			100,000		(C)200,000
(BE) Corpus Christi Beach	1,900,000		650,000	1,900,000		(C)650,000
(N) Corpus Christi ship channel (1968 act)	4,000,000		1,332,000	4,000,000		(C)1,332,000
(FC) El Paso	4,300,000		900,000	4,300,000		(C)900,000
(FC) Freeport and vicinity, hurricane flood protection			30,000		100,000	(P)30,000
(N) Freeport Harbor		100,000				
(N) Galveston Channel (1971 authorization)	1,400,000			1,400,000		
(N) Gulf Intercoastal Waterway, Texas section, relocation in Matagorda Bay		35,000	15,000		35,000	(P)15,000
(N) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, harbor of refuge at Seadrift					30,000	(P)12,000
(FC) Highland Bayou	2,085,000		400,000	2,085,000		(C)400,000
(FC) Lake Brownwood modification		238,000			238,000	
(FC) Lakeview Lake	2,500,000		2,398,000	2,500,000		(C)2,398,000
(FC) Lavon Lake modification and East Fork channel improvement	3,680,000		581,000	3,880,000		(C)581,000

Type, State and projects (1)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1976			House allowance		
	Construction	Planning	Transition quarter	Construction	Planning	Transition quarter
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Texas—Continued						
(FC) Lower Rio Grande Basin (phase I).....		\$200,000	\$50,000		\$350,000	(P)\$50,000
(FC) Millican Lake.....		450,000	110,000		450,000	(P)110,000
(N) Mouth of Colorado River.....		70,000			70,000	
(FC) Pecos and vicinity.....		150,000	40,000		150,000	(P)40,000
(FC) Peyton Creek.....		200,000	50,000			
(FC) Plainview.....			120,000		120,000	(P)40,000
(FC) Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection).....	\$7,900,000		1,225,000	\$7,900,000		(C)1,225,000
Red River emergency bank protection (see Louisiana).....						
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam (see Arkansas).....						
(FC) San Antonio Channel Improvement.....	2,200,000		1,100,000	2,200,000		(C)1,100,000
(FC) San Gabriel River.....	6,850,000		2,607,000	7,000,000		(C)3,000,000
(FC) Taylors Bayou.....	650,000		490,000	650,000		(C)490,000
(FC) Texas City and vicinity (hurricane flood protection).....	1,000,000		85,000	1,000,000		(C)85,000
(FC) Three Rivers.....		150,000	50,000		150,000	(P)50,000
(FC) Trinity River project.....		800,000	300,000		800,000	(P)300,000
(FC) Vince and Little Vince Bayous.....	200,000		250,000	200,000		(C)250,000
Virginia:						
(FC) Buena Vista (phase I).....		150,000	60,000		150,000	(P)60,000
(FC) Fourmile Run, city of Alexandria and Arlington County.....	6,265,000		1,900,000	6,265,000		(C)1,900,000
(FC) Gathright Lake.....	8,600,000		2,200,000	8,600,000		(C)2,200,000
Potomac estuary pilot water treatment plant (see District of Columbia).....						
Tug Fork Valley (see Kentucky).....						
(FC) Verona Lake (phase I).....		350,000	160,000		350,000	(P)160,000
(BE) Virginia Beach (reimbursement).....	230,000			230,000		
Washington:						
(MP) Bonneville lock and dam (see Oregon).....						
Chief Joseph Dam-Rufus Woods Lake, additional units.....	52,600,000		14,500,000	55,000,000		(C)17,000,000
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, Oreg. and Wash. (40-foot channel). (See Oregon).....						
(BE) Edis Hook.....		170,000			170,000	
(MP) Ioe Harbor lock and dam, additional units.....	2,300,000		400,000	2,300,000		(C)400,000
John Day lock and dam (see Oregon).....						
(MP) Little Goose lock and dam, Lake Bryan.....	900,000			900,000		
(MP) Little Goose lock and dam, Lake Bryan—Additional units.....	16,000,000		2,800,000	16,000,000		(C)2,800,000
Lower Columbia River basin bank protection (see Oregon).....						
(MP) Lower Granite lock and dam.....	13,100,000		2,000,000	13,100,000		(C)2,000,000
(MP) Lower Granite lock and dam—Additional units.....	14,900,000		2,800,000	14,900,000		(C)2,800,000
(MP) Lower Monumental lock and dam.....	950,000			950,000		
(MP) Lower Monumental Lock and Dam—Additional units.....	4,800,000		2,500,000	4,800,000		(C)2,500,000
McNary Lock and Dam (see Oregon).....						
(MP) The Dalles Lock and Dam—Additional units.....	700,000		300,000	700,000		(C)300,000
(FC) Wahkiakum County consolidated diking district No. 1.....	200,000		300,000	200,000		(C)300,000
(FC) Wenatchee Canyons 1 and 2.....		284,000	130,000		284,000	(P)130,000
(FC) Yakima River at Ellensburg.....					25,000	(P)15,000
West Virginia:						
(FC) Beech Fork Lake.....	6,800,000		1,500,000	6,800,000		(C)1,500,000
Bloomington Lake (see Maryland).....						
(FC) Burnsville Lake.....	6,200,000		2,500,000	6,200,000		(C)2,500,000
(FC) Coal River Basin.....	500,000		400,000	500,000		(C)400,000
(FC) East Lynn Lake.....	4,700,000		300,000	4,700,000		(C)300,000
Hannibal locks and dam (see Ohio).....						
(FC) R.D. Bailey Lake.....	16,800,000		4,750,000	18,000,000		(C)5,300,000
(FC) Rowlesburg Lake.....		100,000	40,000		100,000	(P)40,000
Tug Fork Valley (see Kentucky).....						
Wisconsin:						
(FC) Lafarge Lake and Channel improvement.....	3,000,000		1,400,000	3,000,000		(C)1,400,000
(N) Northport Harbor.....		100,000	25,000		100,000	(P)25,000
(FC) Prairie du Chien.....		50,000	20,000		50,000	(P)20,000
(FC) State road and Ebner coulees.....		127,000	80,000		127,000	(P)80,000
Wyoming:						
(FC) Sheridan.....	600,000			600,000		
MISCELLANEOUS.						
(N) Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$1,000,000 (sec. 107).....	1,500,000		500,000	1,500,000		500,000
(FC) Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$1,000,000 (sec. 205).....	4,000,000		1,000,000	5,300,000		1,615,000
(FC) Emergency Streambank & Shoreline protection (1974 Mod). (Sec. 14).....	1,000,000		250,000	1,250,000		250,000
Recreation facilities at completed projects.....	20,000,000		4,000,000	21,000,000		4,000,000
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).....	1,900,000		500,000	1,900,000		500,000
Mitigation of shore damages attributable to navigation projects (Sec. 111).....	600,000		150,000	600,000		150,000
Streambank Erosion Control Evaluation and Demonstration (Sec. 32 1974 Act).....				3,000,000		1,000,000
Aquatic plant control (1965 Act).....	1,600,000		450,000	1,600,000		450,000
Employees compensation.....	2,190,000		600,000	2,190,000		600,000
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages.....	-62,085,000		-21,165,000	-85,419,000		-24,405,000
	1,063,650,000	24,050,000	360,000,000	1,182,178,000	24,837,000	408,883,000
Grand total, construction, general.....		(1,092,700,000)			(1,157,015,000)	

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Bodega Bay, California, Channel and Harbor Project.—Local interests have requested a delay in preconstruction planning studies pending completion of a local interest's study on economic viability of the harbor complex and determination of a local sponsor. In view of this delay the \$50,000 included in the fiscal year 1976 Budget will not be required. The \$10,000 requested for the 1976 Transition Quarter will be required for continuation of planning in that period.

Corte Madera Flood Control Project, California.—The bill provides \$250,000 for a reevaluation of the Corte Madera Project. No funds are included in the bill for further construction. The two upstream towns, which were part of the original project, no longer wish to participate in the project. Therefore, only 3,000 feet of the project in Ross remains to be completed. It may well be desirable to use other economically and environmentally acceptable methods to accomplish a desirable level of flood protection. The Corps should participate with a local citizens group comprised of (1) representatives of those living along the creek where the project will go; (2) representatives of those living downstream where the project has been completed; and (3) a representative of the College of Marin Board of Trustees; in selecting the firm to accomplish the study.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton (John F. Baldwin and Stockton ship channels) California Funds are included in the Bill for construction of the Point Edith to Stockton channel in the transition quarter.

William L. Springer Lake, Illinois.—The Corps of Engineers is urged to complete the Environmental Impact Statement incident to this project at the earliest possible time.

Hayward Creek, Massachusetts. The Committee has included \$800,000 in FY 1976 and \$500,000 in the transition quarter for the Hayward Creek, Mass. Section 205 project.

Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes, Local Protection Project, Nebraska.—Reformulation studies of this project are now underway. Pending completion of these studies there will be some delays in this project's schedules. Consequently, \$2 million of the budget request of \$8,900,000 for fiscal year 1976 is no longer required.

Saw Mill River, Chappaqua, New York.—The Committee has provided funds in the bill under Sec. 205 projects to complete design and initiate construction of this project.

Elk Creek Lake, Oregon.—The Committee is advised that this project is being reexamined by the State of Oregon. Pending this reevaluation, the Committee has recommended no funds for this project.

Relocation of the Town of North Bonneville, Washington.—This relocation of construction of the second powerhouse at the Bonneville Lock and Dam project, will place great stress on the community and citizens. The Corps should aid the town and the citizens by all means practicable under the available authorities, including Section 83, Public Law 93-251. Thus, it is desirable that the Corps:

(a) Sell lots in the initial town development at prices corresponding to value of unimproved land with provisions to preclude windfall profits to individuals.

(b) Convey to the municipality without cost those open spaces within the initial town development required for common use areas not to exceed 125 acres; provided that such open spaces shall be dedicated to public use and not available for resale.

(c) In the absence of standards required by Federal and State laws as referenced in Section 83, Public Law 93-251, furnish replacement municipal facilities meeting standards and criteria recognized by professional technical groups, custom or good practice and representing wise use of resources in space allocations and design; provided that the size and type of these facilities shall be fully justified by the reasonable requirements for services to the initial town development.

(d) In the event the appropriate school authorities determine that the existing elementary school will not be relocated to the new town site, provide replacement for the community service facilities now available in the existing school.

The above is not intended to change the provisions of law as set out in Section 83, Public Law 93-251 but is intended to convey the committee's belief that the above position is reasonable, authorized and constitute equitable treatment of the people to be displaced by the powerhouse construction.

Tocks Island Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee is advised that the existing Route 209 in Pennsylvania is extremely hazardous. Route 209 has 300 percent more traffic than the national average of traffic on roads of the same class and the accident rate is substantially higher than the national average. Therefore, the Corps is urged to proceed with the land acquisition and the relocation of Route 209. No funds are included for any other aspect of the Tocks Island Lake Project pending the conclusion of the study which is currently underway. The Corps is directed to complete this study in August, 1975, as set forth in the Conference Report No. 93-1274 accompanying the Appropriations Bill for Public Works for Water and Power Development and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriations Act, 1975 (P. L. 93-393).

Cow Pen Creek, Horn Lake, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided funds in the bill, under section 205 projects, for the Cow Pen Creek Flood Control Project. The Corps is urged to proceed with this vitally needed flood control project.

Lavon Lake Modification and East Fork Channel Improvement, Texas.—The Committee has provided funds to initiate planning and construction of the Collin County Road 115, Tickey Creek crossing at Culleoka, Texas.

Millican Lake, Texas.—The Committee, in recommending the full amount of money requested by the Administration for the Millican Reservoir, feels very strongly that prior to any additional appropriation for construction purposes, that the Corps should attempt to determine the extent of the lignite deposits in the area which would be inundated by such construction, as well as the Corps' estimate of the effect on land values.

Peyton Creek, Texas, Local Protection Project.—By resolution dated December 9, 1974, the Matagorda County Commissioners Court withdrew their support and asked that the project be deferred. The budget request of \$200,000 and \$50,000 for Fiscal Year 1976 and 1976 Transition Quarter respectively are no longer required.

Trinity River and Tributaries, Texas.—The Committee in previous years restricted the use of Advance Engineering and Design funds, with respect to the navigation features; however, it was not intended to preclude the study of all alternatives of the Trinity River project, Texas. It was the Committee's intention that while no funds should be

spent on detailed plans and specifications for construction of the navigation aspects of the project, the Corps would proceed with studies to develop a comprehensive analysis of alternatives. These studies should include all the feasible navigation alternatives on the Trinity River.

Wallisville Lake, Texas.—The Committee, again, reaffirms strong support for the Wallisville Lake, Texas project. The Corps is directed to retain the funds previously appropriated for this project to insure completion of the project at the earliest time possible.

Streambank erosion control.—Section 32 of Public Law 93-251 authorized a National Streambank and Erosion Prevention and Control Demonstration Program. The Committee has included \$3,000,000 in the bill for this program. The Committee is informed that the erosion problem is severe and these locations are to be among the initial projects undertaken within this program: South Charleston, Dunbar-Nitro area, Ravenswood, St. Albans, New Martinsville and Moundsville, West Virginia.

Recreation facilities at completed projects.—Funds are included in this category for Millwood Lake, Ark. and Casey Cove Road leading into the Holmes Creek Recreation Area.

Emergency Streambank and Shoreline Protection (Sec. 14).—The Committee has included \$250,000 in the bill for erosion control of Lake Erie shoreline between Lake Ashtabula County line and Ash-tabula Harbor, Ohio.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	161,948,000	
Budget Estimate, 1976	153,600,000	53,000,000
Recommended, 1976	160,000,000	59,000,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	-1,948,000	
Budget Estimate, 1976	+6,400,000	+6,000,000

Funds under this heading are distributed to projects and activities as shown in the following table:

Project	Committee recommendation—	
	Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
1. General Investigations:		
(a) Surveys:		
Atchafalaya Basin (water and land resources)	\$700,000	\$135,000
Mississippi River, Phillips County, Ark.	176,000	30,000
St. Francis River Basin below Wappapello Lake, Ark. and Mo.	100,000	25,000
Berwick lock—Atchafalaya Basin, La.	15,000	10,000
Bayou du Chien, Ky.	23,000	
Lake Neark, Ark.	20,000	20,000
Lake Providence Harbor, La.	60,000	10,000
Laconia Circle Area, Desha County, Ark.	71,000	15,000
Louisiana State Penitentiary levee	15,000	15,000
Mississippi River-East Bank levees, Kentucky and Tennessee	20,000	20,000
Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and tributaries, Tennessee	80,000	15,000
Wolf and Loosahatchie Rivers, and Nacconah Creek, Miss.	100,000	80,000
Yazoo River Basin, Miss.	600,000	100,000
West Memphis, Ark.	50,000	25,000
Subtotal, surveys	2,030,000	500,000
(b) Collection and study of basic data	150,000	50,000
Subtotal, general investigations	2,180,000	550,000
2. Construction and planning:		
Mississippi River levees	11,000,000	16,600,000
Mud Lake Pumping Station	160,000	
Channel improvement	38,000,000	15,000,000
Old River, La.	3,000,000	500,000
St. Francis Basin	19,650,000	3,650,000
Channel improvement on 15 mi Bayou	(50,000)	(150,000)

Project	Committee recommendation—	
	Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
2. Construction and planning—Continued		
Redfoot Lake-Lake No. 9	415,000	1,690,000
Ceche Basin, Ark.	3,000,000	1,100,000
West Tennessee tributaries, Tennessee	2,470,000	1,220,000
Tensas Basin:		
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc.	3,000,000	1,350,000
Red River backwater	1,000,000	2,000,000
Yazoo Basin:		
Arkabutla Lake	330,000	30,000
Enid Lake	270,000	130,000
Grenada Lake	660,000	1,300,000
Sardis Lake	360,000	1,400,000
Greenwood	290,000	10,000
Upper Auxiliary channels	1,000,000	1,400,000
Main Stem	250,000	100,000
Tributaries:		
Ascalmore-Tippo and Oppossum Bayous (tributaries)	850,000	1,360,000
All work except Ascalmore-Tippo and Oppossum Bayous	2,980,000	300,000
Streambank erosion control evaluation and demonstration	1,000,000	500,000
Big Sunflower River (including Steele Bayou)		600,000
Yazoo backwater:		
All except Muddy Bayou control structure	5,420,000	2,000,000
Muddy Bayou, control structure (Yazoo backwater)	1,380,000	
Lower Red River south bank, La.	90,000	50,000
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries, La.	300,000	160,000
Atchafalaya Basin, La.	20,000,000	15,000,000
Teche Vermilion Basin, La.	900,000	500,000
West Kentucky tributaries, Kentucky	35,000	200,000
Eastern Rapides and South Central Avoyelles Parishes, La.	340,000	
Bushley Bayou, La. (Phase I)	150,000	150,000
Mississippi River East Bank, Vicksburg-Yazoo Area, Miss. (Phase I)	100,000	50,000
Mississippi River, East Bank, Natchez Area, Miss. (Phase I)	100,000	50,000
Greenville Harbor, Miss. (Phase I)	200,000	100,000
Subtotal, construction and planning	118,700,000	43,400,000
3. Maintenance		
	145,600,000	116,000,000
Total	166,430,000	59,925,000
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippage	-6,480,000	-950,000
Total	160,000,000	59,000,000

1 Increase in budget. 2 Unbudgeted 3 Planning.

Nonconnah Creek, Mississippi.—The Corps has taken too long to complete the study on the Nonconnah Creek flood control project. The needed flood control and other benefits which could be derived from this project are vital. The Corps should complete the work on this study and forward their recommendations to the Congress at the earliest possible time.

Operation and Maintenance.—The Committee has recommended an additional \$1,800,000 in fiscal year 1976 and an additional \$700,000 in the transition quarter to be applied to needed maintenance for Lower Red River, Louisiana; Boeuf and Tensas River; Arkabutla Lake, Enid Lake, Grenada Lake and Sardis Lake, Mississippi.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	494,577,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	547,700,000	136,900,000
Recommended, 1976	576,073,000	153,116,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+81,496,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	+28,373,000	+16,216,000

Increased funds for projects in the operation and maintenance category are shown in the following table:

	Budget: 1976 and transition quarter	Allowance: 1976 and transition quarter	Increase
GIWW-Mobile District, Ala., Fla., and Miss.	\$941,000	\$1,562,000	+ \$621,000
Transition quarter	235,000	391,000	+156,000
Perdido Pass, Ala.	177,000	200,000	+23,000
Transition quarter	44,000	60,000	+16,000
Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia.	1,832,000	2,489,000	+657,000
Transition quarter	433,000	786,000	+353,000
McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, Arkansas and Oklahoma.	14,728,000	16,728,000	+2,000,000
Transition quarter	3,377,000	3,800,000	+423,000
Quachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.	1,897,000	2,885,000	+1,078,000
Transition quarter	961,000	961,000	
Crescent City Harbor, Calif.	450,000	0	+450,000
Transition quarter	0	0	
Half Moon Bay Harbor, Calif.	0	140,000	+140,000
Transition quarter	0	0	
Humboldt Harbor and Bay, Calif.	787,000	847,000	+60,000
Transition quarter	150,000	150,000	
Moss Landing Harbor, Calif.	150,000	150,000	
Transition quarter	0	150,000	+150,000
Noya River and Harbor, Calif.	500,000	500,000	
Transition quarter	225,000	225,000	
Oceanside Harbor, Calif.	20,000	520,000	+500,000
Transition quarter	0	20,000	+20,000
San Francisco Bay and delta model structure, Calif.	165,000	250,000	+85,000
Transition quarter	50,000	50,000	
Santa Cruz Harbor, Calif.	298,000	320,000	+22,000
Transition quarter	0	50,000	+50,000
John Martin Reservoir, Colo.	496,000	571,000	+75,000
Transition quarter	120,000	166,000	+46,000
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Fla.	2,160,000	3,173,000	+1,013,000
Transition quarter	515,000	1,049,000	+534,000
Kahului Harbor, Hawaii	2,050,000	3,000,000	+950,000
Transition quarter	600,000	830,000	+230,000
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Ill., Minn., Wis., and Iowa (Great River study).		775,000	+775,000
Transition quarter		100,000	+100,000
North Branch of Chicago River, Ill.	50,000	150,000	+100,000
Transition quarter	0	50,000	+50,000
Green River Lake, Ky.	799,000	898,000	+99,000
Transition quarter	167,000	200,000	+33,000
Atchafalaya River, Morgan City to Gulf of Mexico, La.	1,135,000	2,500,000	+1,365,000
Transition quarter	409,000	809,000	+400,000
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, La.	162,000	270,000	+108,000
Transition quarter	50,000	50,000	
Bayou Teche and Vermillion Rivers, La.	205,000	425,000	+220,000
Transition quarter	65,000	65,000	
Gulf Intracoastal W. W., La.	5,390,000	7,500,000	+2,110,000
Transition quarter	1,500,000	1,500,000	
Houma Navigation Canal, La.	474,000	1,000,000	+526,000
Transition quarter	400,000	400,000	
Mermentau River, La.	447,000	525,000	+78,000
Transition quarter	150,000	150,000	
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the gulf, La.	14,757,000	17,000,000	+2,243,000
Transition quarter	2,950,000	4,800,000	+1,850,000
Nanticoke River, Md.	0	100,000	+100,000
Transition quarter	0	100,000	+100,000
Saginaw River, Mich. diked disposal project.	25,000	100,000	+75,000
Transition quarter	0	4,100,000	+4,100,000
East Fork-Tombigbee River, Miss.	0	3,000,000	+3,000,000
Transition quarter	0	200,000	+200,000
Black River, Mo.	0	400,000	+400,000
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N.J.	1,200,000	1,600,000	+400,000
Transition quarter	20,000	20,000	
Buttermilk Channels, N.Y.	549,000	600,000	+51,000
Transition quarter	0	0	
Cape Vincent Harbor, N.Y.	0	4,000	+4,000
Transition quarter	0	6,000	+6,000
Ashtabula Harbor (diked disposal), Ohio.	0	75,000	+75,000
Transition quarter	0	1,200,000	+1,200,000
Cleveland Harbor (diked disposal), Ohio.	3,500,000	3,500,000	
Transition quarter	0	3,500,000	+3,500,000
Fairport Harbor (diked disposal), Ohio.	0	200,000	+200,000
Transition quarter	0	1,800,000	+1,800,000
Huron Harbor (diked disposal), Ohio.	1,480,000	2,500,000	+1,020,000
Transition quarter	0	200,000	+200,000
Lorain Harbor (diked disposal), Ohio.	0	200,000	+200,000
Transition quarter	0	1,000,000	+1,000,000

	Budget: 1976 and transition quarter	Allowance: 1976 and transition quarter	Increase
Port Clinton Harbor (diked disposal), Ohio		\$30,000	+\$30,000
Transition quarter		30,000	
Broken Bow, Okla.	\$511,000	552,000	+41,000
Transition quarter	130,000	160,000	+30,000
Pine Creek Lake, Okla.	358,000	437,000	+81,000
Transition quarter	89,000	127,000	+38,000
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Oreg.	4,290,000	4,500,000	+210,000
Transition quarter	2,600,000	2,600,000	
Charleston Harbor, S.C.	3,895,000	5,955,000	+2,060,000
Transition quarter	724,000	724,000	
Dale Hollow Lake, Ky. and Tenn.	1,299,000	1,815,000	+516,000
Transition quarter	325,000	390,000	+65,000
Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex.	2,127,000	3,500,000	+1,373,000
Transition quarter	400,000	800,000	+400,000
Stillhouse Hollow Lake, Tex.	502,000	642,000	+140,000
Transition quarter	127,000	186,000	+59,000
Whitney Lake, Tex.	1,067,000	1,449,000	+382,000
Transition quarter	278,000	420,000	+142,000
Wright Patman Dam and Lake, Tex.	721,000	1,900,000	+1,179,000
Transition quarter	200,000	200,000	
James River, Va.	670,000	1,000,000	+330,000
Transition quarter	140,000	140,000	
Norfolk Harbor, Va.	1,340,000	1,680,000	+340,000
Transition quarter	350,000	350,000	
Chief Joseph Dam-Rufus Woods Lake, Wash.	1,998,000	2,000,000	+2,000
Transition quarter	600,000	600,000	
Gray's Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash.	4,524,000	4,700,000	+176,000
Transition quarter	550,000	550,000	
Lake Washington Ship Canal, Wash.	1,520,000	1,600,000	+80,000
Transition quarter	425,000	425,000	
Other adjustments			-1,000,000
Transition quarter			-100,000
Fiscal year 1976	80,429,000	109,402,000	+28,973,000
Transition quarter	19,140,000	35,456,000	+16,316,000

HOPPER DREDGES

The Committee has received extensive testimony concerning the essential dredging requirements throughout the country. Critical shoaling problems have occurred in most of the major ports. It is the Committee's view that additional hopper class dredge capability must be developed by both the private sector and the Corps of Engineers. The private sector is encouraged to proceed with as many new hopper dredges as possible.

The testimony received indicates that the private sector has plans to build three hopper class dredges within the foreseeable future. Since these dredges take a long period to build and cost in excess of \$20,000,000 each, the Committee is not convinced that there will be sufficient hopper class dredge capability to meet the urgent needs that currently exist.

Therefore, in addition to the rehabilitation and modification of existing dredges proposed in the budget, within available funds, the Corps is directed to proceed with the construction of one hopper dredge to replace the dredge McKenzie which was sunk last year. In addition, the Corps should proceed with a review of its requirements and the designs necessary for additional hopper class dredges needed to complement the capability available in the private sector to meet urgent dredging requirements of this class dredge.

The Committee's action is in no way to be construed to diminish contract dredging work which should be accomplished to the maximum extent possible compatible with competent and efficient capability by the private sector in the public interest.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$15,000,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	40,400,000	\$3,750,000
Recommended, 1976	40,400,000	3,750,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+25,400,000	
Budget estimate, 1976		

This appropriation item is required to finance flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations, and repair of flood control and Federal hurricane and shore protection works.

GENERAL EXPENSES

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$40,100,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	42,700,000	\$18,675,000
Recommended, 1976	42,500,000	10,650,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+2,400,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	-200,000	-25,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the division offices, the River and Harbor Board, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

SPECIAL RECREATION USE FEES

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$700,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	1,900,000	
Recommended, 1976	1,200,000	
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+500,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	-700,000	

This appropriation will allow the Corps of Engineers to use recreation fees collected for authorized recreation purposes, including fee collection, recreation facility development and items essential to the health and safety of the using public as authorized by law. Testimony presented to the Committee did not justify the substantial increase requested.

REVOLVING FUND

Limitation on capital.—The Committee recommends a total limitation of \$248,000,000 for 1976 and \$254,000,000 in the transition quarter on the total capital of the revolving fund. These are the same amounts included in the budget request.

The Committee urges the Corps to proceed with the renovation and improvement of the facilities associated with the model testing, public use facilities and the shelter housing the model of the San Francisco Bay and Delta. This facility, in its present state, is no longer economical to maintain and does not meet current needs.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$19,427,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	20,485,000	\$8,660,000
Recommended, 1976	20,892,000	8,794,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+1,465,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	+407,000	+134,000

Funds provided under this heading are allocated to surveys and activities as follows:

Name and location of study	Type of project ¹	House allowance	
		Fiscal year 1976	Transition quarter
California:			
Central Valley:			
Delta support studies	Sp. Inv.	\$475,000	\$124,000
East Side division, Mid-Valley Canal	Fees.-I, M&I	475,000	
Total water management study	Sp. Inv.	275,000	86,000
Energy research and development (geothermal)		550,000	140,000
Geothermal resources investigations		1,150,000	490,000
Klamath, Butte Valley division (see Oregon)			
Lahontan Basin total water management study (see Nevada)			
Lake-Yolo Counties study	Appr.-I	50,000	13,000
Mendocino County study	Appr.-I, M&I	50,000	13,000
Napa County study	Appr.-I, M&I	50,000	13,000
Sacramento River drainage and seepage utilization	Appr.-I	50,000	50,000
San Joaquin Valley drainage	Appr.-I	50,000	50,000
Solano County water	Fees.-I, M&I	100,000	50,000
Suisun Marsh management study	Appr.	50,000	13,000
Ventura County water management	Fees.-I, M&I	179,000	17,000
Total, California		3,104,000	1,059,000
Colorado:			
CRSP power peaking capacity	Fees.-P	60,000	10,000
Dominguez Reservoir	Fees.-M&I, P	150,000	36,000
Energy research and development (pump storage)		250,000	80,000
Front Range unit (Long's Peak division, P-SMBP)	Fees.-M&I	29,000	
Uncompahgre improvement	Fees.-I	140,000	50,000
Upper Colorado resource study	Fees.-I, M&I	250,000	105,000
Water resources planning and engineering research		2,647,000	685,000
Total, Colorado		3,526,000	966,000
Idaho:			
Minidoka, North Side pumping division extension	Fees.-I	5,000	
Southwest Idaho water management study	Sp. Inv.	175,000	86,000
Upper Snake River water management study	Sp. Inv.	189,000	99,000
Total, Idaho		369,000	185,000
Kansas:			
Chikankia	Fees.-M&I	45,000	
Kansas State power plan—Phase II	Appr.	160,000	30,000
Total, Kansas		205,000	30,000

See footnotes at end of table p. 59.

Name and location of study	Type of project ¹	House allowance	
		Fiscal year 1976	Transition quarter
Montana:			
Billings water supply unit (P-SMBP).....	Fees.-M&I	\$15,000	
Eastern Montana basins.....	Appr.	64,000	
Total water management study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota).			
Total, Montana		79,000	
Nebraska:			
Highland unit (Elkhorn division, P-SMBP).....	Fees.-I	20,000	\$30,000
Nevada:			
Lahontan Basin total water management study.....	Sp. Inv.	50,000	30,000
New Mexico:			
Elephant Butte Reservoir—Fort Quitman.....	Sp. Inv.	328,000	82,000
Gallup.....	Fees.-M&I	150,000	139,000
Raton water supply.....	Appr., M&I	40,000	10,000
Tucumanari.....	Fees.	42,000	9,000
Total, New Mexico		560,000	240,000
North Dakota:			
Apple Creek unit, North Dakota pumping division (P-SMBP).....	Fees.-M&I, I	150,000	40,000
Garrison diversion unit, M&I facilities (P-SMBP).....	Fees.-M&I	22,000	20,000
Total water management study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota).			
Total, North Dakota		172,000	60,000
Oklahoma:			
Cache Creek.....	Fees.-M&I	70,000	20,000
Criner Hills.....	Appr.-M&I, I	60,000	10,000
McGee Creek.....	Fees.-M&I	150,000	50,000
Oklahoma State water plan.....	Appr.	100,000	
Total, Oklahoma		380,000	80,000
Oregon:			
Klamath, Butte Valley division.....	Fees.-I, M&I	75,000	32,000
Rogue River Basin, Grants Pass division.....	Fees.-I, M&I	225,000	25,000
Tualatin, second phase.....	Fees.-I, M&I	57,000	
Umatilla Basin.....	Fees.-I, M&I	66,000	20,000
Walla Walla, reformulation (see Washington).			
Willamette River.....	Fees.-I, M&I	45,000	28,000
Total, Oregon		468,000	105,000
South Dakota:			
Oshe unit, M&I water facilities (James division, P-SMBP).....	Fees.-M&I	55,000	35,000
Total water management study, Missouri River upstream of Gavin's Point (P-SMBP).	Sp. Inv.	265,000	80,000
Total, South Dakota		320,000	115,000
Texas:			
Elephant Butte Reservoir—Fort Quitman (see New Mexico):			
Lake Meredith salinity study.....	Appr.	100,000	25,000
Texas basins.....	Fees.-I, M&I	290,000	75,000
Total, Texas		390,000	100,000
Utah:			
Central Utah, Ute Indian unit.....	Fees.-I, M&I, P	509,000	125,000
CRSP power peaking capacity (see Colorado).			
Upper Colorado resource study (see Colorado).			
Washington:			
Chief Joseph Dam, Colville Indian Reservation and adjacent areas.	Appr.-I, M&I	100,000	10,000
Columbia Basin, Grand Coulee Dam third powerplant extension.	Fees.-P	121,000	49,000
Walla Walla reformulation.....	Fees.-M&I, I	58,000	
Yakima, Yakima Indian Reservation.....	Appr.	40,000	
Yakima, Bumping Lake enlargement, reformulation.....	Fees.-I	125,000	25,000
Yakima Valley water management study.....	Sp. Inv.	150,000	80,000
Total, Washington		594,000	164,000
Wyoming:			
CRSP power peaking capacity (see Colorado).			
Seminole Dam modification (Kendrick project).....	Fees.-M&I, I, P	28,000	
Sublette.....	Fees.-I, M&I	130,000	40,000
Total water management study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota).			
Upper Snake River water management study (see Idaho).			
Total, Wyoming		158,000	40,000

See footnotes at end of table p. 59.

Name and location of study	Type of project ¹	House allowance	
		Fiscal year 1976	Transition quarter
Various States:			
Colorado River water quality improvement program.....	Fees.	\$1,875,000	\$640,000
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies.....		530,000	178,000
General engineering and research:			
Atmospheric water resources management program.....		4,649,000	1,632,000
General planning studies.....		200,000	70,000
Special investigations:			
Environmental and interagency coordination activities.....		1,376,000	409,000
Minor work in connection with completed project investigations.....		877,000	290,000
Investigations of existing projects.....		379,000	60,000
Print reports.....		35,000	10,000
Projects not yet identified.....		36,000	5,000
Western energy expansion study.....	Appr.-P	215,000	75,000
Total, various States		10,172,000	3,369,000
Classified pay raise (E.O. 11811) ²		444,000	115,000
Distributive charges for service facilities, unliquidated obligations, etc.....		-118,000	-19,000
General reduction due to slippage, savings, and carryover balances.....		-510,000	
Appropriation		20,892,000	6,794,000

¹ Explanation of symbols used under type of project: Appr.—Appraisal; Fees.—Feasibility; Sp. Inv.—Special investigations; I—Irrigation; P—Power; M&I—Municipal and industrial water.

² This amount is remainder of classified pay raise not distributed to individual line items. Total classified pay raise amounted to \$620,000. The difference of \$176,000 has been distributed with \$49,000 to atmospheric water resources management program, \$97,000 to water resources planning and engineering research program, and \$30,000 to Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies.

³ Unbudgeted.

⁴ Increase in budget.

⁵ Increase in budget for Cosumnes River division.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$244,123,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	298,681,000	\$81,050,000
Recommended, 1976.....	323,268,000	97,684,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	+79,145,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	+24,587,000	+6,634,000

Funds provided under this heading are allocated to projects and activities as follows:

State and project	Budget estimate fiscal year 1976			House allowance		
	Construction	Planning	Transition quarter	Fiscal year 1976		Transition quarter
				Construction	Planning	
Arizona:						
Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie			\$320,000			\$320,000
California:						
Central Valley project:						
Sacramento River division						
San Luis unit:						
Wetlands distribution and drainage system	15,153,000		4,905,000	19,046,000		5,450,000
San Luis drain	800,000		947,000	800,000		947,000
All other San Luis unit facilities	14,047,000		1,498,000	14,047,000		1,498,000
Subtotal, San Luis unit	30,000,000		7,350,000	33,893,000		7,895,000
Auburn-Folsom South unit:						
Auburn area facilities (includes Auburn Dam and Reservoir)	26,735,000		8,985,000	29,210,000		11,050,000
Folsom South area facilities (includes Folsom South Canal)	395,000		54,000	395,000		54,000
Foresthill Divide area (includes Sugar Pine Dam and Reservoir)	300,000		75,000	500,000		75,000
Other facilities	45,000			45,000		
Subtotal, Auburn-Folsom South unit	27,475,000		9,114,000	30,150,000		11,179,000
Miscellaneous project programs	10,360,000		3,100,000	11,310,000		3,350,000
San Felipe division	9,000,000		3,260,000	9,000,000		3,260,000
Total, Central Valley project	91,835,000		27,745,000	99,353,000		30,605,000
Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie. (See Arizona.)						
Colorado:						
Fryingpan-Arkansas project	32,326,000		8,896,000	33,006,000		10,900,000
San Luis Valley Closed Basin					775,000	50,000
Idaho:						
Teton Basin project, Lower Teton division	15,217,000		2,100,000	15,217,000		2,100,000
Upper Snake River project, Salmon Falls division			150,000		500,000	150,000
New Mexico:						
Brantley project	1,000,000		1,700,000	1,000,000		1,700,000
Nevada:						
Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie. (See Arizona.)						
Southern Nevada water project		1,000,000			1,000,000	
Oklahoma:						
Mountain Park project	8,460,000		2,300,000	8,460,000		2,300,000
Oregon:						
Rogue River Basin project, Meritt division		80,000			80,000	
Tualatin project	7,550,000		2,800,000	7,550,000		2,800,000
Texas:						
Palmetto Bend project	12,296,000		3,994,000	12,296,000		3,994,000
Washington:						
Chief Joseph Dam project, Manson unit	930,000		85,000	930,000		85,000
Columbia Basin project:						
Irrigation facilities	15,428,000		4,876,000	18,700,000		5,350,000
Third powerplant	57,000,000		13,500,000	66,000,000		13,500,000
Total, Columbia Basin project	72,428,000		18,376,000	84,700,000		18,850,000
Walla Walla project, Touchet division		100,000	150,000		200,000	175,000
Various:						
Drainage and minor construction program:						
All-American Canal System, California	5,000		1,000	5,000		1,000
Boise project, Payette division, Idaho	680,000		150,000	680,000		150,000
Belle Fourche project, South Dakota	250,000		650,000	250,000		650,000
Chief Joseph Dam project, Whitestone Coulee unit	123,000		123,000	123,000		123,000
Gila project, Arizona	129,000		10,000	129,000		10,000
Kendrick project, Wyoming	374,000		200,000	374,000		200,000
Klamath project, Oregon-California	1,658,000		618,000	1,658,000		618,000
Lower Rio Grande project, Mercedes division, Texas	245,000		93,000	245,000		93,000
Miscellaneous engineering services, Colorado	10,000		3,000	10,000		3,000
Palisades project, Idaho	65,000		65,000	65,000		65,000
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	2,128,000		665,000	2,128,000		665,000
Rathdrum Prairie project, East Greenacres unit, Idaho	418,000		418,000	418,000		418,000
Recreation facilities at existing reservoirs, various States	362,000		96,000	362,000		96,000
San Angelo project, Texas	20,000		5,000	20,000		5,000
Ventura River project, Lake Casitas Reservoir, Calif.				1,500,000		325,000
Washita Basin project, Oklahoma	35,000			35,000		
Washoe project, Nevada-California	825,000		115,000	825,000		115,000
Weber Basin project, Utah	38,000			38,000		
Total, drainage and minor construction	7,365,000		2,598,000	8,865,000		2,973,000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects:						
Carlsbad project, New Mexico	130,000			130,000		
Crooked River project, Ochoco Irrigation District, Oregon	180,000		10,000	180,000		10,000
Humboldt project, Nevada	350,000			350,000		
Rio Grande project, El Paso County Improvement District No. 1, Texas	1,500,000		237,000	1,500,000		237,000
Rogue River Basin project, Medford and Rogue River Valley Irrigation District, Oregon	100,000		6,000	100,000		6,000
Salt River project, Arizona	1,594,000		200,000	1,594,000		200,000
Shoshone project, Garland division, Wyoming	700,000		140,000	700,000		140,000
Tucumcari project, New Mexico	157,000			157,000		
Tumalo Irrigation District, Oregon	771,000			771,000		
Uncompahgre project, Colorado	220,000		4,000	220,000		4,000
Total, rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	5,702,000		596,000	5,702,000		596,000
Reformulation of authorized projects			400,000			

60

61

State and project	Budget estimate fiscal year 1976		House allowance			
	Construction	Planning	Fiscal year 1976			
			Construction	Planning		
Subtotal, exclusive of Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program.....	257,262,000	2,080,000	71,804,000	279,226,000	1,855,000	77,598,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM						
Colorado:						
Narrows unit.....	3,140,000		400,000	3,140,000		400,000
Montana:						
Canyon Ferry unit (just abatement).....	1,800,000		400,000	1,800,000		400,000
Lower Marias unit, Fiber Dam and Reservoir.....				1,000,000		500,000
Nebraska:						
Nebraska Mid-State division.....		500,000	100,000		500,000	100,000
North Loup division.....		175,000	50,000		175,000	50,000
O'Neill unit.....		645,000	150,000		645,000	150,000
North Dakota:						
Garrison diversion dam.....	10,900,000		2,700,000	10,900,000		2,700,000
South Dakota:						
Oahe unit.....	7,870,000		2,700,000	10,000,000		3,200,000
Wyoming:						
Riverton unit.....	2,500,000		500,000	2,500,000		500,000
Various:						
Transmission divisions.....	21,198,000		10,480,000	21,236,000		10,520,000
Drainage and minor construction program:						
Ainsworth unit, Nebraska.....	11,000		200,000	11,000		200,000
Bestwick division, Nebraska-Kansas.....	1,300,000		30,000	1,300,000		30,000
East Bench unit, Montana.....	290,000		550,000	290,000		550,000
Farwell unit, Nebraska.....	855,000		40,000	855,000		40,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska.....	265,000		6,000	265,000		6,000
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming.....	70,000		340,000	70,000		340,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming.....	3,300,000			3,300,000		
Total, drainage and minor construction.....	6,091,000		1,166,000	6,091,000		1,166,000
Total, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program.....	53,499,000	1,320,000	18,646,000	56,667,000	1,320,000	19,686,000
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation.....	310,761,000	3,400,000	90,450,000	335,893,000	3,175,000	97,284,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays.....	-15,480,000		1,600,000	-15,800,000		1,600,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation.....	298,681,000		91,050,000	323,268,000		97,884,000

1 Represents pay raise costs associated with Executive order that has not been distributed to projects.

2 Includes \$2,000,000 for Bacon Siphon and tunnel No. 2, \$200,000 for rehabilitation of fish hatcheries and \$1,072,000 for construction of reversible pump units and drainage.

3 Includes \$250,000 for Bacon Siphon and tunnel No. 2, \$100,000 for rehabilitation of fish hatcheries and \$124,000 for construction of reversible pump units and drainage.

4 Includes \$200,000 for New Melones-Tracy transmission line and \$750,000 for Trinity River Action Plan.

5 Includes \$50,000 for New Melones-Tracy transmission line and \$200,000 for Trinity River Action Plan.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$24,621,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	40,160,000	\$15,590,000
Recommended, 1976.....	41,557,000	16,399,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	+16,936,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	+1,397,000	+809,000

The recommended appropriation is distributed to projects and activities under this heading as follows:

State and project	House Allowance		Transition Quarter
	Fiscal year 1976		
	Construction	Planning	
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			
Colorado:			
Curecanti unit.....	\$9,700,000		\$858,000
Various:			
Transmission division.....	5,188,000		1,905,000
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS			
Colorado:			
Animas-La Plata project.....		\$464,000	103,000
Dallas Creek project.....	1,271,000		450,000
Dolores project.....		407,000	300,000
Fruitland Mesa project.....	727,000		150,000
San Juan-Chama project.....	3,509,000		1,900,000
San Miguel project.....		458,000	125,000
Savery-Pot Hook project.....	1,680,000		350,000
West Divide project.....		269,000	100,000
New Mexico:			
Animas-La Plata project (see Colorado).....			
San Juan-Chama project (see Colorado).....			
Utah:			
Central Utah project, Bonneville unit.....	13,800,000		5,980,000
Central Utah project, Jensen unit.....	570,000		1,696,000
Central Utah project, Uintah unit.....		150,000	75,000
Central Utah project, Upalco unit.....		100,000	25,000
Wyoming:			
Lyman project.....	840,000		1,250,000
Savery-Pot Hook project (see Colorado).....			

See footnote at end of table.

State and project	House Allowance		
	Fiscal year 1976		Transition Quarter
	Construction	Planning	
Various:			
Drainage and minor construction program:			
Colorado River storage project:			
Glen Canyon unit, Arizona-Utah.....	299,000		
Participating projects:			
Central Utah project, Vernal unit, Utah.....	195,000		85,000
Emery County project, Utah.....	824,000		70,000
Hammond project, New Mexico.....	258,000		
Total, drainage and minor construction program.....	1,576,000		135,000
Subtotal.....	\$38,861,000	1,848,000	15,402,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays.....	-1,724,000		160,000
Total, Upper Colorado River Basin Fund.....	37,137,000	1,848,000	15,562,000
Recreational and Fish and Wildlife facilities:			
Recreational facilities.....	1,050,000		175,000
Fish and wildlife facilities.....	² 1,522,000		³ 662,000
Total, Recreational and fish and wildlife facilities.....	2,572,000		837,000
Total, Upper Colorado River storage project.....	41,557,000		16,399,000

¹ Represents pay raise costs associated with Executive Order that has not been distributed to projects.

² Includes an additional \$47,000 for Bonneville fish studies and \$1,000,000 for Flaming Gorge modification outlet.

³ Includes an additional \$8,000 for Bonneville fish studies and \$449,000 for Flaming Gorge modification outlet.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	23,000,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	29,240,000	8,810,000
Recommended, 1976.....	29,205,000	8,810,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	+6,205,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	-35,000	

The allowance includes \$21,892,000 for the Granite Reef Division, \$650,000 for the Salt-Gila Division, \$5,750,000 for transmission facilities and \$913,000 for miscellaneous items.

APPROPRIATION TO LIQUIDATE CONTRACT AUTHORITY

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$2,800,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	17,440,000	1,500,000
Recommended, 1976.....	17,440,000	1,500,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	-15,360,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....		

This appropriation is required for the liquidation of contract authority in connection with the Navajo project participating agreement.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$27,650,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	19,670,000	7,130,000
Recommended, 1976.....	19,670,000	7,130,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	-7,900,000	
Appropriation, 1976.....		

The funds provided are for the construction and operation and maintenance of certain works directed toward the enhancement and protection of the quality of water in the Colorado River for use in the U.S. and Mexico.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

State and project	House Allowance		
	Fiscal Year 1976		Transition Quarter
	Construction	Planning	
TITLE II			
Colorado:			
Grand Valley Systems Improvement and Management unit.....		\$816,000	\$104,000
Paradox Valley unit.....		509,000	104,000
Nevada:			
Las Vegas Wash unit.....		207,000	
Utah:			
Crystal Geysler unit.....		53,000	52,000
Total, Title II.....		1,585,000	260,000
TITLE I			
Various:			
Measures below Imperial Dam.....	\$18,085,000		6,870,000
Total, Title I.....	18,085,000		6,870,000
Total, Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Projects.....	19,670,000		7,130,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$100,800,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	131,810,000	\$33,665,000
Recommended, 1976.....	132,162,000	34,017,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	+31,362,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	+352,000	+352,000

This appropriation is required to finance the operation and maintenance of Bureau projects for irrigation, power, municipal and industrial water supplies, and other benefits. In addition to the operation and maintenance of power generation transmission facilities and the storage dams and reservoirs of completed projects, the Bureau operates and maintains irrigation works until the water users are able to undertake the responsibility.

The Committee recommendation includes increases over the budget as follows:

	Fiscal year 1976	Transition quarter
Central Valley Project, Calif.....	+\$262,000	+\$192,000
Glendo Unit, Wyoming (road reconstruction).....	+200,000	+160,000
General reduction.....	-110,000	

LOAN PROGRAM

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$13,825,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	15,515,000	\$3,355,000
Recommended, 1976.....	23,315,000	6,155,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	+9,490,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	+7,800,000	+2,800,000

This appropriation provides for loans to non-Federal organizations for construction and rehabilitation of distribution systems and for loans and grants to construct small irrigation projects.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

State and project	House allowance	
	Fiscal year 1976	Transition quarter
Arizona:		
Graham-Curtis project.....	\$1,355,000	\$400,000
California:		
Buttonwillow Improvement District (Supplemental).....	1,500,000	1,500,000
Calaveras County Water District.....	1,200,000	
Consolidated Irrigation District.....	1,600,000	1,400,000
La Branza Water District.....	1,500,000	442,000
Nevada Irrigation District.....	1,600,000	
Pond-Poso Improvement District.....	5,539,000	1,344,000
Redwood Valley County Water District.....	2,000,000	1,700,000
San Luis Water District.....	1,511,000	148,000
San Luis Water District (Supplemental).....		1,500,000
Valley Center Municipal Water District (Supplemental).....	1,500,000	1,500,000
Colorado:		
Water Supply and Storage Company.....	58,000	20,000
Montana:		
Buffalo Rapids Irrigation District.....	1,400,000	1,200,000
Nebraska:		
Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District.....	4,660,000	780,000
Texas:		
Hidalgo and Willacy Counties Water Control and Improvement District No. 1.....	600,000	150,000
Utah:		
Roy Water Conservancy Subdistrict.....	520,000	
Administration of loan program.....	265,000	71,000
Subtotal.....	23,808,000	6,155,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays.....	-493,000	
Total, loan program.....	23,315,000	6,155,000

¹ Unbudgeted.

EMERGENCY FUND

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$600,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	1,000,000	\$200,000
Recommended, 1976	400,000	200,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	-200,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	-600,000	

The Emergency Fund is utilized to assure the continuous operation of irrigation and power systems in the event of droughts, canal bank failures, damage to transmission lines and other emergencies affecting Bureau projects.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$20,920,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	21,420,000	\$5,600,000
Recommended, 1976	21,290,000	5,600,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+370,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	-130,000	

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the reclamation program as performed by the Department, Denver regional and other offices in the seven regions.

ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$540,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	660,000	\$200,000
Recommended, 1976	652,000	198,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+112,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	-8,000	-2,000

This appropriation provides for the conduct of investigations, surveys and comprehensive studies for the development and utilization of water and related resources to assure adequate and economical power supplies to Alaska. The Committee recommends reductions of \$8,000 from the budget request for Fiscal Year 1976 and \$2,000 for the Transition Quarter.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$760,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	840,000	\$210,000
Recommended, 1976	837,500	209,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+77,500	
Budget estimate, 1976	-2,500	-1,000

This appropriation item covers the expenses of the Alaska Power Administration in the operation and maintenance of the Eklutna Project which supplies power to the greater Anchorage, Alaska, area, and the operation for the Snettisham Project which supplies power to the Juneau, Alaska, area. The Committee recommends reductions of \$2,500 from the budget request for Fiscal Year 1976 and \$1,000 for Transition Quarter.

The Alaska Power Administration is currently operating under the authority of a Secretarial order, although it is looking into the possibility of seeking legislative authority. The Committee again strongly urges that the agency seek legislation from the appropriate Committees of Congress to accomplish the objectives of this program.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$172,000,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	0	0

The 1976 budget of the Bonneville Power Administration is the first to be submitted pursuant to P.L. 93-454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974. This "self-financing" legislation provides the authority for the Bonneville Power Administration to use its operating receipts and \$1.25 billion in borrowing authority to finance its programs. Heretofore, the operation and maintenance and construction programs have been financed by appropriations from Congress. Under the self-financing program, however, this budget requires no appropriations.

The Committee has reviewed the Bonneville Power Administration budget for 1976, which provides for a total program of \$268,418,000. The budget has been formulated in accordance with the requirements of the Government Corporation Control Act, and in accordance with that Act includes a provision for contingencies which the Committee directs shall provide for the purchase of power in low water years; repair and/or replacement of facilities affected by natural and man-made emergencies including the resulting additional costs for contracting, construction, and operation and maintenance work; unavoidable increased costs for the planned program due to necessary but unforeseen adjustments including engineering and design changes, contractor and other claims, changes in established procedures, and relocations; pay raises and other costs directly attributable to general price escalations. The Committee further directs that the purchase and handling of power for the account of others on a trust basis be netted out of the reimbursable programs as shown in the revised Program and Financing Schedule submitted to the Committee.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$946,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	1,024,000	\$263,000
Recommended, 1976	1,000,000	257,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+54,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	-24,000	-6,000

The Southeastern Power Administration markets power generated at the Corps of Engineers hydroelectric generating plants in a 10-state area of the Southeast. Deliveries are made by means of transmission facilities owned by others.

This appropriation is required for system operation and maintenance, wheeling charges, purchase of energy and general administration in the Southeastern power marketing area. The Committee recommends reductions of \$24,000 in Fiscal Year 1976 and \$6,000 in the Transition Quarter.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$620,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	700,000	\$125,000
Recommended, 1976	680,000	125,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+60,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	-20,000	0

The Southwestern Power Administration is responsible for marketing of power produced at Corps of Engineers hydroelectric generating plants in the Southwest. The construction appropriation is required primarily to continue minor modifications and additions to existing facilities, and expansion and modernization of communications and control systems. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$20,000 in Fiscal Year 1976.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$5,795,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	6,136,000	\$1,870,000
Recommended, 1976	6,000,000	1,850,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+205,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	-136,000	-20,000

This appropriation is required for system operation and maintenance, purchase of power and wheeling charges and general administration. The Committee recommends reductions of \$136,000 in Fiscal Year 1976 and \$20,000 in the Transition.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$1,747,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	1,852,000	\$480,000
Recommended, 1976	1,830,000	480,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+83,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	-22,000	0

This appropriation provides for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Co-Chairman and his staff and the Federal share of the Commission's administrative expenses. The increase over 1975 is required principally to finance the increased cost of the Federal Government's contribution to the administrative expenses of the Commission.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS
(Funds appropriated to President)

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$293,500,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	293,500,000	\$47,500,000
Recommended, 1976	293,200,000	50,000,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	-300,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	-300,000	+2,500,000

The budget program and proposed allowance follow:

Program	1975	1976	Allowance
Area redevelopment	\$125,000,000	\$125,000,000	\$122,500,000
Research, demonstration, and L.D.D.	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Highway program	160,000,000	160,000,000	162,200,000
Total	293,500,000	293,500,000	293,200,000

AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The Committee recommends a total of \$293,200,000 for the Appalachian Regional Development Program. This is a reduction of \$300,000 from the budget estimate.

The Appalachian Regional Commission has not developed a specific plan for the expenditure of \$5,000,000 for two proposed new programs incident to rural transportation and enterprise development. Therefore, the Committee feels that these new programs should not be implemented at this time.

The bill provides \$2,500,000 for a mountain craft center in Appalachia.

APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAY SYSTEM

The Appalachian Development Highway System currently consists of some 3,278 miles. There are 435 miles on the system which have been rated adequate and do not require improvement. A total of 2,685 remaining miles have been authorized for construction assistance and are within the Congressional limitation of 2,700 miles. In addition, 1,600 miles of access roads to the development corridor have been authorized. In this connection, the Committee has included an additional \$2,200,000 in 1976 and \$2,500,000 in the transition quarter for

this program. The funds are included to complete the long delayed construction of the highway 56 access road in Tennessee and the north-west extension of the Tupelo, Mississippi access road. By September 30, 1976, 1,600 miles of the development corridors and 720 miles of the access roads will be completed or under construction. An additional 1,050 miles of the development corridors and 30 miles of access roads will be in the design or right-of-way acquisition stage during 1976.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$77,500	
Budget estimate, 1976	79,000	\$19,000
Recommended, 1976	79,000	19,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+1,500	
Budget estimate, 1976		0

This appropriation provides for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff in representing interests of the Federal Government in the Delaware River Basin Commission.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$238,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	215,000	\$53,000
Recommended, 1976	215,000	53,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	-23,000	
Budget estimate, 1976		

Funds provided under this heading represent the Federal share (24 percent) of the cost of operating the Delaware River Basin Commission as provided in the legislation establishing the Commission. The bulk of the costs are carried by the contributing states.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$33,097,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	35,910,000	\$8,558,000
Recommended, 1976	35,610,000	8,558,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975	+2,513,000	
Budget estimate, 1976		-300,000

The Federal Power Commission administers the several provisions of the Federal Power Act and the Natural Gas Act and performs other work related to both Federal and private electric power development and associated natural resources.

The funds are allocated to activities as follows:

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Hydroelectric regulation	\$5,553,000	\$1,350,000
Electric power industry systems evaluation	3,665,000	819,000
Electric power utilities regulation	4,563,000	1,109,000
Natural gas pipeline regulation	10,694,000	2,586,000
Natural gas producers regulation	5,311,000	1,292,000
Natural gas industry systems evaluation	456,000	96,000
Services to other agencies and public	2,375,000	567,000
Energy utilization	650,000	94,000
Administration	2,643,000	645,000
Subtotal	35,910,000	8,558,000
Slippage and other reductions	-300,000	0
Total	35,610,000	8,558,000

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975	\$135,165,000	
Budget estimate, 1976	219,935,000	\$52,000,000
Recommended, 1976	202,500,000	49,230,000
Comparison:		
Appropriations, 1975	+67,335,000	
Budget estimate, 1976		-2,770,000

The Committee recommends a total of \$202,500,000 in the bill for salaries and expenses which is a reduction of \$17,435,000 from the budget request, but an increase of \$67,335,000 over the appropriation for 1975. A total of \$49,230,000 is recommended for the transition quarter.

Public Law 93-438, the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 established the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). ERDA and NRC became operational on January 19, 1975. The duties of the NRC include nuclear facility licensing and related functions, reactor safety research, and new programs and studies directed by the Energy Reorganization Act. The regulatory duties of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission include the review and licensing involved with applications to construct and operate nuclear powerplants so that the public can be certain that the plants constructed will operate with a maximum of safety.

The funds recommended in the bill provide for a total of 2,336 permanent positions which is an increase of 233 new positions over 1975. A total of \$113,626,000 is included for other services which is an increase of about \$32,700,000 over the 1975 level.

No funds are included in the bill for the 5 passenger vehicles requested in the budget. The Committee suggests that the GSA motor pool be used to meet automobile requirements.

The reduction is applied to payments for GSA rental, new automobiles, change in selected resources, the appropriate lapse for hiring 233 new positions, and a modest decrease in contractual services. None of the recommended reduction is applied to the safety and safeguards program.

Further, the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill for 1975 provides \$44,400,000 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The funds provided in that bill did not pass the Congress until mid-June and were not available to the Commission until late June. The NRC could not therefore utilize all of the funds made available in FY 1975, and

there will be a substantial unobligated balance available for carryover into 1976. The Committee has taken this carryover into account in determining the total funds recommended for NRC in 1976.

The Committee strongly supports all of the Nuclear Regulation Commission activities. The Commission has an important service to perform to help alleviate the energy problem and to insure and reassure the safety of nuclear power to the people, in the public interest.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$52,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	52,000	\$13,000
Recommended, 1976.....	52,000	13,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	0	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	0	

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by a compact among the four states in the basin, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania and West Virginia plus the District of Columbia and the Federal Government.

The Commission has the responsibility for Basin-wide water quality planning program coordination and assistance.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$77,500	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	79,000	\$19,000
Recommended, 1976.....	79,000	19,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	+1,500	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	0	

This appropriation will provide for the costs of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff in representing interests of the Federal Government on the Susquehanna River Basin Commission.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$150,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	150,000	\$38,000
Recommended, 1976.....	150,000	38,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	0	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	0	

Funds provided under this heading represent the Federal share of the cost of operating the Susquehanna River Basin Commission as provided for in legislation establishing the Commission.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriation, 1975.....	\$77,400,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	87,800,000	\$27,500,000
Recommended, 1976.....	99,754,000	27,984,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	+22,354,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	+11,954,000	+484,000

The funds provided under this appropriation are distributed to the projects and activities as follows:

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
CAPITAL OUTLAY		
Water resources development:		
Multipurpose facilities:		
Duck River project:		
Normandy dam and reservoir.....	\$8,417,000	\$211,000
Columbia dam and reservoir.....	10,400,000	2,550,000
Bear Creek multipurpose water control system.....	10,645,000	5,700,000
Tetico dam and reservoir.....	23,742,000	5,400,000
Additions and improvements at multipurpose dams.....	700,000	175,000
Navigation facilities:		
Railway bridge alterations at Decatur, Ala.....	4,000,000	1,800,000
Additions and improvements at navigation facilities.....	600,000	150,000
Flood control facilities:		
South Chickamauga Creek project.....	901,000	250,000
South Chickamauga Creek project.....	750,000	250,000
Recreation facilities:		
Investigations for future facilities.....	800,000	200,000
Land Between The Lakes (development).....	46,000	0
Fertilizer and munitions development.....	2,035,000	850,000
Fertilizer and munitions development.....	3,879,000	875,000
General service activities:		
Reno Bridge.....	16,000	0
Sparta demonstration project.....	275,000	0
General facilities.....	837,000	102,000
Total capital outlay.....	68,043,000	18,513,000
PROGRAM EXPENSES		
Water resources development expenses.....	\$12,066,000	\$3,105,000
General resources development expenses.....	10,050,000	3,090,000
Land Between The Lakes operation.....	2,650,000	710,000
Fertilizer and munitions development operation—Chemical facilities.....	9,103,000	2,281,000
General service activities.....	1,050,000	285,000
Total expenses.....	34,919,000	9,471,000
Total program.....	102,962,000	27,984,000
Unobligated balance available.....	3,208,000	0
Appropriations.....	99,754,000	27,984,000

Appropriations to the Tennessee Valley Authority are limited to the water resources development program and related activities in the area normally financed by the Federal Government. All TVA power projects begun since the mid-1950's have been financed from its electric power revenues and through the sale of bonds and notes authorized by Congress in 1959.

Through the years the Committee has strongly supported the Tennessee Valley Authority. The committee reflects with great pride on its consistent and constant support of the vital and important programs of this agency which have, among other accomplishments and achievements, prevented much flood damage, promoted naviga-

tion, produced electric power, created reforestation, encouraged industrial development and generally improved economic conditions of the Tennessee Valley area.

The Committee recommends a total of \$99,754,000 which is an increase of \$11,954,000 in the budget request, for the Tennessee Valley Authority. The increase provides \$1,300,000 to accelerate the Bear Creek multipurpose water control system project which has experienced prolonged construction delays; \$2,300,000 to accelerate completion of the Normandy Dam and \$6,000,000 to provide for accelerated construction of the Columbia Dam following a slow-down of construction earlier this year, both dams being part of the Duck River project; \$275,000 for completion of the Sparta water demonstration project; \$2,000,000 to begin construction of the railway bridge alteration project at Decatur, Alabama; \$1,000,000 to advance the Lower Elk Community demonstration project; and \$750,000 to begin construction of the South Chickamauga Creek project. Funding for these projects during the Transition Quarter has been adjusted as required.

The suggested allowance includes reductions in the budget request of several items totaling \$1,671,000. These reductions are recommended because the Committee does not feel that testimony presented adequately justified requested increases, including \$500,000 for chemical facilities; \$702,000 for fertilizer research and development; \$232,000 for fertilizer introduction; \$50,000 for scientific cooperation; and a total of \$187,000 for General Resources Development, including \$130,000 for agricultural projects, \$16,000 for forest and wild land resources development, \$2,000 for minerals resources projects, and \$39,000 for interagency health service demonstrations. Funding for these projects during the Transition has been adjusted as required.

The bill provides the budget request of \$23,742,000 for construction of the Tellico dam reservoir. The Committee directs that the project, for which an environmental impact statement has been completed and provided the Committee, should be completed as promptly as possible for energy supply and flood protection in the public interest.

The Committee continues to be concerned over the continuing escalation of electric power rates by the Tennessee Valley Authority, especially in view of the fact that TVA is generally regarded as the low-cost power yardstick for the nation. The Committee fears that the yardstick test is being eroded by the recent rate escalation.

In this connection, the Committee strongly recommends that TVA as quickly as possible develop its own coal resources—open its own mines on a larger scale and utilize its own coal supply during this period of higher coal prices in order to inject more competition in the market at this time.

The Committee strongly recommends that TVA make a thorough study of any possible anti-trust and price-fixing violations existing in the coal industry.

It should be pointed out that TVA is required by law to make annual payments into the Treasury which, in the current year, is estimated to be \$91,371,000—\$3,571,000 more than the FY 1975 appropriation of \$87,800,000. Over the years, TVA has paid \$982,781,519 into the Treasury, and the total is estimated to rise to \$1,078,781,519 by the end of

FY 1976. The total includes \$245,000,000 of repayment on the appropriation investment and \$833,781,519 in interest on the investment.

In addition, TVA is also required by law to make payments in lieu of taxes. It is estimated that these payments will amount to \$50,172,000 in FY 1976.

The Committee recommends that the Tennessee Valley Authority make a study of the feasibility of contracting more construction projects on a competitive bid basis.

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

	Regular fiscal year	Transition quarter
Appropriations, 1975.....	\$9,775,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	9,678,000	\$2,370,000
Recommended, 1976.....	7,750,000	1,400,000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1975.....	-2,025,000	
Budget estimate, 1976.....	-1,920,000	-970,000

The Committee recommends a total of \$7,750,000 for the Water Resources Council which is a decrease of \$1,920,000 from the budget request of \$9,670,000.

Authorization for comprehensive planning has not passed the House, funds requested for this item have therefore been passed over without prejudice.

The Committee has included a total of \$5,000,000 for Title III planning grants to states. This is an increase of \$2,000,000 over the budget request of \$3,000,000.

The Committee does not look with favor to the Water Resources Council reprogramming funds to be used for purposes other than for which funds were originally provided without specific prior approval of the appropriate Committees of Congress.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee has again recommended language in the bill to limit payment to the General Services Administration for standard level user charges. There should be no curtailment of services for 1976.

CHANGES IN APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3, Rule XXI of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill which directly or indirectly change the application of existing law.

1. The bill includes, in most instances, special one-time appropriations for all agencies for the three-month transition period from July 1, 1976 to September 30, 1976 due to the change in the beginning of fiscal year 1977 from July 1, 1976 to October 1, 1976.

2. The bill provides that certain appropriation items remain available until expended where the programs or projects are continuing in nature under the provisions of authorizing legislation but for which

that legislation does not specifically authorize such extended availability. Most of these items have been carried in previous appropriation bills.

3. The Committee has included limitations for official entertainment or reception and representation expense for selected agencies in the bill.

4. For the Energy Research and Development Administration language is provided to merge the funds provided in the bill with funds provided for this agency in other appropriation bills because two appropriation subcommittees have jurisdiction over various ERDA programs.

5. The bill contains language for the Corps of Engineers under Flood control, Mississippi River and Tributaries directing that not less than \$250,000 be available for bank stabilization measures.

6. Language is included for General Investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation limiting the amount of the Federal Government's cost of an investigation requested by State, municipal or other interests.

7. Language is included in Bureau of Reclamation, Construction and Rehabilitation prohibiting the use of appropriations to initiate construction of transmission facilities in certain circumstances. In addition, the bill restricts the final point of discharge for the Interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit.

8. The bill, under the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, limits funds available for certain facilities at Lake Powell.

9. Language is provided under the Upper Colorado River Storage Project allowing Federal agencies to receive advances for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities.

10. Language is included to make available until expended funds advanced from water users for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects.

11. The bill restricts the liability of the Government on the Bureau of Reclamation's Loan Program.

12. Certain of the restrictions under the Administrative Provisions for the Bureau of Reclamation might, in some circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law.

13. Funds are included in the bill for the Alaska Power Administration. This Administration is not specifically authorized by law.

14. Certain transfers are permitted under General Provisions—Department of the Interior to meet unforeseen emergencies. These provisions have been carried in previous appropriation bills.

15. Language is provided under the Appalachian Regional Development programs limiting the amounts available for the Appalachian Development Highway System.

16. Language is included in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Salaries and Expenses appropriation permitting transfers of funds to other agencies and for those agencies to merge these funds with the appropriations to which transferred.

17. The bill language limits the amount available for recurring operating expenses of river basin commissions funded under the Water Resources Council.

18. Title V—General Provisions contains language, carried in previous appropriation acts, which place limitations on the use of funds in the bill which might under some circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law.

INFLATIONARY IMPACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 2(1)(4), Rule XI of the House of Representatives, the Committee estimates that enactment of this bill would have minimal overall inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

The amount proposed for appropriation in this bill totals \$7.2 billion for fiscal year 1976 and \$2.1 billion for the transition quarter. These amounts are \$153.9 million for 1976 and \$98 million for the transition quarter above the President's request. This is an increase of only about 2.8 percent over the President's budget request.

Further, this bill is clearly well within the guidelines of the budget targets established recently by the Congress in H. Con. Res. 218, the Congressional budget resolution.

When the President's budget was being prepared, inflation was one of the major problems being considered. Today, unemployment and recession are major problems. In addition, the Country is gravely concerned about energy related problems. The Energy Research and Development Administration which was created by the Congress last year, did not officially begin its operation until after the President's budget was formulated. The Committee has recommended certain changes to the budget request which are deemed necessary to carry out energy research programs.

Unemployment and energy related problems are clearly today's problems. Unemployment has reached about 9.2 percent. Without sufficient energy supplies, now or in the future, our economy cannot function.

Jobs will be provided for energy research and development, to build and maintain water supply, flood control, hydro-electric power, navigation, irrigation, recreation facilities and to provide lasting capital assets for the Nation in the public interest.

The spending contained in this bill will contribute to solving both the unemployment and energy problems.

Hence the expenditures proposed in this bill, clearly, will contribute to economic recovery, rather than inflation.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On pages 2 and 3 in connection with Energy Research and Development Administration, "Operating Expenses":

**** official entertainment expenses (not to exceed \$15,000) ****

**** Provided, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of Government for the performance of work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the amount appropriated in any other appropriation act for "Operating Expenses" for the Energy Research and Development Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, shall be merged, without limitation, with this appropriation.*" and for the transition period

Provided, That the amount appropriated in any other appropriation act for "Operating Expenses" for the Energy Research and Development Administration for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, shall be merged, without limitation, with this appropriation.

On page 4, in connection with Plant and Capital Equipment.

Provided, That the amount appropriated in any other appropriation Act for "Plant and capital equipment" for the Energy Research and Development Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, shall be merged, without limitation, with this appropriation.

and for the transition quarter

Provided, That the amount appropriated in any other appropriation Act for "Plant and capital equipment" for the Energy Research and Development Administration for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, shall be merged, without limitation, with this appropriation.

On page 5, in connection with Energy Research and Development Administration, "General Provisions":

Sec. 101. Not to exceed 5 percentum of appropriations made available for the current fiscal year for "operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred between such appropriations, but neither such appropriation, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased by more than 5 percentum by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

Similar language of all of the above have been carried in previous appropriation acts for the Atomic Energy Commission.

On page 15, in connection with Operation and maintenance:

** * *, and such advances shall remain available until expended.*

On page 21, in connection with Bonneville Power Administration Fund.

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93-454, are hereby specifically approved for construction of the following major transmission facilities: (a) transmission lines and related facilities to integrate generation into the main Bonneville Power Administration system from WPPSS No. 3 and No. 5 Nuclear Generating Plants near Satsop, Washington.

For the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, expenditures at a rate not greater than the quarterly rate provided for fiscal year 1976 are hereby approved.

On page 28, in connection with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Salaries and expenses":

** * * official entertainment expenses (not to exceed \$1,000) * * **

and

** * * Provided, that from this appropriation, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of Government for the performance of work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriations to which transferred * * **

MINORITY VIEWS OF THE HONORABLE SILVIO O. CONTE

The proposed Dickey-Lincoln Dam in northern Maine has always been—and will always be—an environmental disaster and an economic boondoggle. I will offer an amendment on the House floor to strike out all funding for this project.

I have long opposed the Dickey-Lincoln project on environmental grounds. Now, following the publication of a GAO report on the "Economic Benefits and Cost of the Dickey-Lincoln Hydroelectric Project," I also have overwhelming economic grounds to oppose this project.

Picture the colossal size of this project. The upper dam at Dickey, two miles wide and 335 feet high, would be the 11th largest dam in the world and larger than Egypt's Aswan Dam.

It would destroy finally and irrevocably the St. John River, the last major wilderness river in New England. Behind the Dickey Dam, the St. John would be inundated by a reservoir 46 to 57 miles long. Because the flow of the St. John shrinks to a small trickle in summer, the water level of the reservoir would fluctuate up and down by 25 to 40 feet, creating a giant (30,000 acres) "bathtub ring."

For environmentalists and outdoorsmen, the St. John River basin is a mecca. Blanketed by rich forests, the valley is the habitat of white-tailed deer, moose and bald eagles, and the river offers some of the best brook trout fishing found anywhere. The area is unique. Flooding it with another lake, when Maine already has 3,500 lakes, would be a crime perpetrated on future generations of Americans. (I have extolled the environmental ecstasies of the St. John in greater detail elsewhere; see Congressional Record, May 22, 1975, E2707-2710, and May 5, 1975, E2195-2197).

Economically, Dickey-Lincoln would not be a wise investment of taxpayer funds. For an immense cost, it would produce a piddling amount of electricity. The larger dam would produce only 725 megawatts of "peaking power" for only two and a half hours a day. After two and a half hours, the turbines would have to be shut off for the rest of the day; otherwise, the reservoir would run dry in a matter of weeks.

A two-and-a-half hour spurt of "peaking power," out of a peak period lasts six hours, will create more problems than it will solve. Where is the other 3½ hours of peaking power to come from? More-

over, who says that New England needs this power? Forecasts of peak power demand for 1985, are obsolete. They were done before 1973, and since then the astronomical increase in the price of oil has dropped electricity consumption by 12 to 18 percent in the past year.

For example, Boston Edison Company reports that in 1974 "peak load" consumption was down 6.8 percent from the previous year. During that period, Boston Edison had seven percent growth factor, indicating that the real cutback in peak power demand in the Boston area was close to 14 percent.

Peak power is needed in the summer. It occurs when the temperature rises and the air-conditioners are turned on. So, from a cost viewpoint, it is outrageous to spend a billion dollars for such a marginal purpose.

The true cost of the Dickey-Lincoln project is still unknown, despite the GAO report just released.

The GAO report cites a Corps of Engineers cost estimate of \$521.8 million made in July 1974. However, the GAO also details the shocking number of cost contingencies that promise to balloon the project pricetag. The corps' cost estimate is based on plans drafted in 1963 to 1967. These plans are wholly obsolete and unreliable. To get a realistic cost estimate, the 1967 plans have to be trashed and the corps will have to start from scratch.

As the GAO report points out, the benefit-to-cost ratio for Dickey-Lincoln is inflated, and it is shrinking. It is inflated by the use of an artificially low rate of cost of money to the Government (three and a quarter percent) over a 100-year amortization period.

Furthermore, the benefit-to-cost ratio is pumped up by the assignment of large values in the project to "recreation" and "downstream operations"—even though these millions of dollars will be enjoyed by Canadians, not Americans.

Moreover, the benefit-to-cost ratio is shrinking. In 1965, when it was authorized, the Dickey-Lincoln Dam was figured to have a ratio of 1.8 to 1 (meaning that benefits outweighed costs by 80 percent).

However, the ratio drops to 1.5 to 1 if the interest rate of 5 and 7/8 percent (for cost of money to the Government) is used, a rate the Corps recognizes. Furthermore, the benefit-cost ratio shrinks to 1.3 to 1 if the more realistic 6 and 7/8 percent interest rate is used (which OMB recognizes). A ratio of 1.3 to 1 is embarrassingly small and brings the economic justification for this project into question.

I note that a letter circulated this week by a colleague from Massachusetts points out a paradox: that environmentalists are opposing this appropriation though a substantial portion of it would be ear-

marked for an environmental impact statement. There are two replies to that objection.

First, it's not necessary to stick your finger in a light bulb socket to know you are going to get shocked. Similarly, it's not always necessary to consult a team of "experts" to recognize a potential environmental disaster. The Corps has supplied a number of precedents in this area.

Second, an environmental impact statement, written by the Corps on a Corps project, would not be sufficient in this case. For projects authorized prior to 1973, the Corps provides an environmental impact statement that meets the statutory requirements. But it declines to provide a comprehensive and balanced review of the project, as has been required for all public works projects since October 1973 by the "Statement of Principles and Standards" promulgated by the Water Resources Council and signed by the President.

Without consideration of these "principles and standards", an EIS would be little more than a commitment and recognition of Dickey-Lincoln.

Dickey-Lincoln has been projected to save New England Electricity consumers about \$12 million a year—out of total bill surpassing \$2 billion. That's a drop in the bucket, and it would not be available until 1985.

This project won't solve the employment problems in Maine, as a significant labor force won't be mounted until 1981, 1982, and 1983. Even then, maximum employment won't exceed 1,800 man-years. After that, employment will drop to nothing.

Maine will be victimized by a "boom and bust" employment spectre, and in the meantime hundreds of jobs in the timber and paper industries will be lost due to the flooding and loss of access to 300,000 acres of prime timberlands.

The last justification for Dickey-Lincoln is that it is needed to protect the town of Fort Kent (population 4,500) from springtime floods. An easier and cheaper way to solve this problem would be to build flood dikes. This could be done within 18 months and would cost about \$1.6 million. In its final environmental impact statement on the dike proposal, the Corps states that Dickey-Lincoln dams are not a practical solution to Fort Kent's flooding problems because the dams "could not possibly be built quickly enough to solve Fort Kent's immediate problem."

Whether the final cost for Dickey-Lincoln is \$600 million or \$1 billion, I am convinced that greater public benefits can be gained from alternative projects.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL)
AUTHORITY FOR 1975 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1976**

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—TRUST FUNDS

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual action by the Congress. Thus these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligation) authority, 1975 (2)	Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority (3)	Increase (+) or decrease (-) (4)
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Trust.....	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	-----
Department of the Interior:			
Reclamation trust funds.....	8,274,000	11,385,000	+\$3,111,000
Bonneville Power Administration trust funds.....	6,727,000	-----	-6,727,000
Energy Research and Development Administration: Advances for cooperative work.....	256,000	235,000	-21,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust fund accounts.....	3,150,000	3,334,000	+184,000
Water Resources Council: River Basin Commissions.....	3,480,000	2,904,000	-576,000
Total permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds.....	43,887,000	39,858,000	-4,029,000

88

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES OF NEW (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976 AND THE TRANSITION PERIOD
PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY RESEARCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1976**

Item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1975 (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1976 and transition period 6 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976 and transition period (6)
TITLE I—ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION (EXCEPT FOSSIL FUELS RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT)					
Operating expenses.....					
Transition period.....	2,446,487,000	3,005,387,000	3,036,120,000	+589,633,000	+30,733,000
Plant and capital equipment.....					
Transition period.....	788,452,000	914,731,000	931,939,000	-----	+17,208,000
Total, Title I.....					
Transition period.....	3,234,939,000	874,292,000	872,022,000	+83,570,000	-2,270,000
		1,100,007,000	185,276,000	183,286,000	-1,990,000
		3,879,679,000	3,908,142,000	+673,203,000	+28,463,000
		1,100,007,000	1,115,225,000	-----	+15,218,000

See footnote at end of table.

87

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES OF NEW (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976 AND THE TRANSITION PERIOD—Con.

PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY RESEARCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1976

Item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1975 (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1976 and transition period 6 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976 and transition period (6)
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
Department of the Army					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
General investigations.....	65,284,000	62,200,000	63,924,000	-1,360,000	+1,724,000
Transition period.....		15,550,000	17,182,000		+1,632,000
Construction, general.....	974,841,000	1,092,700,000	1,157,015,000	+182,174,000	+64,315,000
Transition period.....		360,000,000	408,883,000		+48,883,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.....	161,948,000	153,600,000	160,000,000	-1,948,000	+6,400,000
Transition period.....		53,000,000	59,000,000		+6,000,000
Operation and maintenance, general.....	494,577,000	547,700,000	576,073,000	+81,496,000	+28,373,000
Transition period.....		136,900,000	153,116,000		+16,216,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	15,000,000	40,400,000	40,400,000	+25,400,000	
Transition period.....		3,750,000	3,750,000		

General expenses.....	40,100,000	42,700,000	42,500,000	+2,400,000	-200,000
Transition period.....		10,675,000	10,650,000		-25,000
Special recreation use fees.....	700,000	1,900,000	1,200,000	+500,000	-700,000
Transition period.....					
Total, TITLE II.....	1,752,450,000	1,941,200,000	2,041,112,000	+288,662,000	+99,912,000
Transition period.....		579,875,000	652,581,000		+72,706,000

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

General Investigations.....	19,427,000	20,485,000	20,892,000	+1,465,000	+407,000
Transition period.....		6,660,000	6,794,000		+134,000
Construction and Rehabilitation.....	244,123,000	298,681,000	323,268,000	+79,145,000	+24,587,000
Transition period.....		91,050,000	97,884,000		+6,834,000
Upper Colorado River Storage Project.....	24,621,000	40,160,000	41,557,000	+16,936,000	+1,397,000
Transition period.....		15,590,000	16,399,000		+809,000
Colorado River Basin project.....	23,000,000	29,240,000	29,205,000	+6,205,000	-35,000
Transition period.....		8,810,000	8,810,000		
Colorado River Basin project (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization).....	(32,800,000)	(17,440,000)	(17,440,000)	(-15,360,000)	
Transition period.....		(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)		
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control project.....	27,650,000	19,670,000	19,670,000	-7,980,000	
Transition period.....		7,130,000	7,130,000		
Operation and maintenance.....	100,800,000	131,810,000	132,162,000	+31,362,000	+352,000
Transition period.....		33,665,000	34,017,000		+352,000

See footnote at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES OF NEW (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976 AND THE TRANSITION PERIOD—Con.
PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY RESEARCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1976

Item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1975 (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1976 and transition period 6 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976 and transition period (6)
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
Bureau of Reclamation					
Loan program	13,825,000	15,515,000	23,315,000	+9,490,000	+7,800,000
Transition period		3,355,000	6,155,000		+2,800,000
Emergency Fund	600,000	1,000,000	400,000	-200,000	-600,000
Transition period		200,000	200,000		
General Administrative Expenses	20,920,000	21,420,000	21,290,000	+370,000	-130,000
Transition period		5,600,000	5,600,000		
Total	474,966,000	577,981,000	611,759,000	+136,793,000	+33,778,000
Transition period		172,060,000	182,989,000		+10,929,000
Alaska Power Administration				+112,000	-8,000
General investigations	540,000	660,000	652,000		-2,000
Transition period		200,000	198,000		

06

Operation and maintenance	760,000	840,000	837,500	+77,500	-2,500
Transition period		210,000	209,000		-1,000
Total	1,300,000	1,500,000	1,489,500	+189,500	-10,500
Transition period		410,000	407,000		-3,000
Bonneville Power Administration fund					
Construction	133,500,000		(1)	-133,500,000	
Transition period					
Operation and maintenance	38,500,000			-38,500,000	
Transition period					
Total	172,000,000			-172,000,000	
Transition period					
Southeastern Power Administration					
Operation and maintenance	946,000	1,024,000	1,000,000	+54,000	-24,000
Transition period		263,000	257,000		-6,000
Southwestern Power Administration					
Construction	620,000	700,000	680,000	+60,000	-20,000
Transition period		125,000	125,000		
Operation and maintenance	5,795,000	6,136,000	6,000,000	+205,000	-136,000
Transition and period		1,870,000	1,850,000		-20,000
Total	6,415,000	6,836,000	6,680,000	+265,000	-156,000
Transition period		1,995,000	1,975,000		-20,000
Total, title III	655,627,000	587,341,000	620,928,500	-34,698,500	+33,587,500
Transition period		174,728,000	185,628,000		+10,900,000

91

See footnote at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES OF NEW (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976 AND THE TRANSITION PERIOD—Con.

PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY RESEARCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1976

Item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1975 (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1976 and transition period 6 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976 and transition period (6)
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES (excluding ERDA)					
Appalachian Region Commission: Salaries and expenses	1,747,000	1,852,000	1,830,000	+83,000	-22,000
Transition period		480,000	480,000		
Appalachian region development programs (funds Appropriated to the President)	293,500,000	293,500,000	293,200,000	-300,000	-300,000
Transition period		47,500,000	50,000,000		+2,500,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	77,500	79,000	79,000	+1,500	
Transition period		19,000	19,000		
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	238,000	215,000	215,000	-23,000	
Transition period		53,000	53,000		
Total	315,500	294,000	294,000	-21,500	
Transition period		72,000	72,000		

92

Federal Power Commission	33,097,000	35,910,000	35,610,000	+2,513,000	-300,000
Transition period		8,558,000	8,558,000		
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:					
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	52,000	52,000	52,000		
Transition period		13,000	13,000		
Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Salaries and expenses	135,165,000	219,935,000	202,500,000	+67,335,000	-17,435,000
Transition period		52,000,000	49,230,000		-2,770,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	77,500	79,000	79,000	+1,500	
Transition period		19,000	19,000		
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	150,000	150,000	150,000		
Transition period		38,000	38,000		
Total	227,500	229,000	229,000	+1,500	
Transition period		57,000	57,000		
Tennessee Valley Authority: Payment Tennessee Valley Authority fund	77,400,000	87,800,000	99,754,000	+22,354,000	+11,954,000
Transition period		27,500,000	27,984,000		+484,000

93

See footnote at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES OF NEW (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976 AND THE TRANSITION PERIOD—Con.

PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY RESEARCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1976

Item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1975 (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1976 and transition period 6 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976 and transition period (6)
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES (excluding ERDA)—Continued					
Water Resources Council: Water resources planning	9,775,000	9,670,000	7,750,000	-2,025,000	-1,920,000
Transition period		2,370,000	1,400,000		-970,000
Total, title IV	551,279,000	649,242,000	641,219,000	+89,940,000	-8,023,000
Transition period		138,550,000	137,794,000		-756,000

94

Total, new budget (obligational) authority titles II, III, and IV (excluding ERDA)	2,959,356,000	3,177,783,000	3,303,259,500	+343,903,500	+125,476,500
Transition period		893,153,000	976,003,000		+82,850,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, titles I, II, III, and IV	6,194,295,000	7,057,462,000	7,211,401,500	+1,017,106,500	+153,939,500
Transition period		1,993,160,000	2,091,228,000	+1,993,160,000	+98,068,000
Memoranda:					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations	(32,800,000)	(17,440,000)	(17,440,000)	(-15,360,000)	
Transition period		(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)		
Total appropriations, including appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations	(6,227,095,000)	(7,074,902,000)	(7,228,841,500)	(+1,001,746,500)	(+153,939,500)
Transition period		(1,994,660,000)	(2,092,728,000)	(+1,993,160,000)	(+98,068,000)

¹ Public Law 93-454 created the Bonneville Power Administration Fund to be financed from power revenues and sale of bonds; direct appropriations are no longer required.

95

PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY RESEARCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1976

DECEMBER 4 (legislative day DECEMBER 2), 1975.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 8122]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 8122) making appropriations for public works for water and power development and energy research, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian Regional Development Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Energy Research and Development Administration, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976 and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

FISCAL YEAR 1976

Budget estimates considered by House.....	\$7, 057, 462, 000
Amount of bill as passed by House.....	7, 225, 401, 500
Increase by Senate Committee (net).....	+228, 859, 000
Amount of bill reported to Senate.....	7, 454, 260, 500
Budget estimates considered by Senate.....	7, 300, 162, 000
Amount of appropriations, 1975.....	6, 194, 295, 000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Over the budget estimates, 1976.....	+154, 098, 500
Over the appropriation, 1975.....	+1, 259, 965, 500

This lengthy publication was not digitized. Please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library or the government documents department of a local library to obtain a copy of this item.

MAKING APPROPRIATION FOR PUBLIC WORKS,
FISCAL YEAR 1976

DECEMBER 10, 1975.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, from the committee of conference,
submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 8122]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8122) making appropriations for public works for water and power development and energy research, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Energy Research and Development Administration, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, 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 3, 5, 7, 9, 44, 45, 48 and 50.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 46, 47, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, and 57, 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 \$25,000; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert **\$3,130,765,000**; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert **\$941,507,000**; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert **\$907,642,000**; and the Senate agree 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 proposed by said amendment insert **\$185,776,000**; and the Senate agree 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:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert **\$66,336,000**; 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:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert **\$17,110,000**; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert **\$1,228,648,000**; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert **\$408,741,000**; 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 **\$38,160,000**; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert **\$2,992,000**; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert **\$288,200,000**; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert **\$162,200,000**; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 13, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 38, 41, 51, and 52.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN M. SLACK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
TOM BEVILL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN T. MYERS,
CLAIR W. BURGNER,
E. A. CEDERBERG,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
CLIFFORD P. CASE.

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. 8122) making appropriations for public works for water and power development and energy research, including the Corps of Engineers-Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Energy Research and Development Administration, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement of the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The conferees are agreed to the language included in the Senate report relating to employee housing.

**TITLE I—ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
ADMINISTRATION**

OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 1: Provides limitation of \$25,000 for official entertainment expense instead of \$15,000 as proposed by the House and \$27,000 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$3,130,765,000 for fiscal year 1976 instead of \$3,049,120,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,131,892,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The funds appropriated for operating expenses are allocated as shown in the following table:

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

	Appropriation fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1976	Conference allowance
OPERATING EXPENSES			
Solar, geothermal, and advanced energy systems development:			
Solar energy development.....	\$8,770,000	\$66,700,000	\$182,700,000
Geothermal energy development.....	13,800,000	31,170,000	31,170,000
Physical research.....	281,600,000	312,610,000	2315,500,000
Total, solar, geothermal, and advanced energy systems develop- ment.....	304,170,000	410,480,000	429,370,000
Conservation research and development:			
Electric power transmission.....	6,372,000	16,000,000	11,830,000
Energy storage systems.....	5,800,000	13,000,000	14,000,000
Total, conservation research and development.....	12,172,000	29,000,000	25,830,000

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

	Appropriation fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1976	Conference allowance
Nuclear energy development:			
Fusion power research and development.....	85,030,000	120,000,000	120,000,000
Fission power reactor development.....	384,000,000	406,459,000	404,000,000
Naval reactor development.....	167,000,000	186,200,000	186,200,000
Space nuclear systems.....	26,600,000	30,900,000	28,000,000
Nuclear materials.....	646,080,000	971,712,000	958,500,000
Advanced isotope separation technology.....	11,700,000	25,060,000	25,000,000
Total nuclear energy development.....	1,320,498,000	1,740,871,000	1,721,700,000
National security:			
Weapons.....	819,997,000	897,749,000	849,115,000
Laser fusion.....	41,400,000	64,000,000	59,500,000
Nuclear materials security.....	5,863,000	11,945,000	11,945,000
Total, national security.....	867,260,000	973,694,000	920,560,000
Environmental and safety research:			
Biomedical and environmental research.....	132,215,000	156,515,000	166,515,000
Waste management.....	29,570,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Operational safety.....	3,210,000	5,160,000	5,160,000
Total, environmental and safety research.....	164,995,000	201,575,000	211,675,000
Program support:			
Program direction.....	148,543,000	179,764,000	175,592,000
Community operations.....	8,065,000	7,650,000	9,075,000
Security investigations.....	9,460,000	12,290,000	11,400,000
Information services.....	8,180,000	9,480,000	9,455,000
EEO assigned facilities.....	1,650,000	1,984,000	1,984,000
Total, program support.....	175,898,000	211,168,000	207,506,000
Cost of work for others.....	11,690,000	12,660,000	12,660,000
Total program costs.....	2,856,683,000	3,579,548,000	3,529,301,000
Change in selected resources.....	221,901,000	303,459,000	286,464,000
Gross obligation.....	3,078,584,000	3,883,007,000	3,815,765,000
Revenues applied.....	622,190,000	692,170,000	670,000,000
Net obligations.....	2,446,394,000	3,190,837,000	3,145,765,000
Change in unobligated balances.....	93,000	---	-15,000,000
Total, operating budget authority.....	2,446,487,000	3,190,837,000	3,130,765,000

¹ The Conferees are agreed that the amount for solar energy is allocated as follows:

	Amounts
Solar energy building and facilities.....	\$28,500,000
Solar thermal.....	10,600,000
Photovoltaic.....	16,000,000
Wind energy conversion.....	11,000,000
Bioconversion to fuels.....	6,000,000
Ocean thermal energy conversion.....	6,000,000
Resource analysis.....	1,500,000
Solar storage.....	1,500,000
Solar Institute.....	1,600,000
Total.....	82,700,000

² Funding levels for subprograms concur with Senate report 94-505.

³ Funding levels for subprograms concur with Senate report 94-505, except for conceptual engineering which is \$4,000,000. The reductions for fiscal year 1976 and transition quarter are applied to the overall nuclear materials program.

⁴ Funding levels for subprograms concur with Senate report 94-505, except for program direction which is decreased by \$2,408,000.

The Conferees are in agreement that the off-continent test readiness program should not be terminated, nor the scientific team associated with the program dismantled. Accordingly, the Conferees agree that from within the total sum available for the weapons program, such amounts as are necessary, but not to exceed \$8,000,000, may be utilized for this program activity.

Amendment No. 3: Deletes language proposed in Senate bill which read, "Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation".

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$941,507,000 for the transition period instead of \$941,439,000 as proposed by the House and \$942,252,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds are allocated as shown in the table below.

TRANSITION QUARTER

	Budget estimate fiscal year 1976	Conference allowance
OPERATING EXPENSES		
Solar, geothermal, and advanced energy systems development:		
Solar energy development.....	\$17,400,000	\$24,500,000
Geothermal energy development.....	3,850,000	18,750,000
Physical research.....	80,342,000	82,800,000
Total, solar, geothermal, and advanced systems development.....	101,592,000	116,050,000
Conservation research and development:		
Electric power transmission.....	4,100,000	2,673,000
Energy storage systems.....	3,400,000	3,400,000
Total, conservation research and development.....	7,500,000	6,073,000
Nuclear energy development:		
Fusion power research and development.....	37,000,000	37,000,000
Fission power reactor development.....	111,588,000	110,000,000
Naval reactor development.....	52,900,000	52,900,000
Space nuclear systems.....	8,000,000	7,500,000
Nuclear materials.....	262,392,000	260,000,000
Advanced isotope separation technology.....	7,700,000	7,300,000
Total, nuclear energy development.....	479,580,000	474,700,000
National security:		
Weapons.....	242,087,000	220,000,000
Laser fusion.....	18,100,000	18,000,000
Nuclear materials security.....	3,006,000	3,006,000
Total, national security.....	263,203,000	241,006,000
Environmental and safety research:		
Biomedical and environmental research.....	40,500,000	44,000,000
Waste management.....	11,400,000	11,400,000
Operational safety.....	1,400,000	1,400,000
Total, environmental and safety research.....	53,300,000	56,800,000
Program support:		
Program direction.....	47,625,000	46,900,000
Community operations.....	1,914,000	2,204,000
Security investigations.....	2,825,000	2,600,000
Information services.....	2,686,000	2,645,000
EEO assigned facilities.....	516,000	516,000
Total, program support.....	55,566,000	54,865,000
Cost of work for others.....	3,095,000	3,095,000
Total program costs.....	963,836,000	952,589,000
Change in selected resources.....	112,505,000	95,918,000
Gross obligation.....	1,076,341,000	1,048,507,000
Revenues applied.....	182,400,000	107,000,000
Total, operating budget authority.....	963,941,000	941,507,000

¹ Funding levels for subprograms concur with House report 94-319.

² Funding levels for subprograms concur with Senate report 94-505.

Amendment No. 5: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which read as follows, "Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation".

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$907,642,000 for 1976 instead of \$872,022,000 as proposed by the House and \$941,292 as proposed by the Senate.

The Committee of Conference is unanimous in its strong support for the important Tokamak fusion project which is an essential step toward meeting the goal of a demonstration fusion reactor. The funds provided will initiate the required work, and as agreed to by the Conference represents a significant commitment to the project.

The changes from the Senate include:

CONSTRUCTION

Ten megawatt solar thermal test facility	-----	-\$5,000,000
Safeguard and security upgrading, (nuclear materials)	-----	-5,350,000
Safeguard and security upgrading (weapons)	-----	-7,800,000
Component test facility, Oak Ridge National Lab	-----	-4,000,000
Tokamak fusion test reactor	-----	-8,000,000
14 MEV high intensity neutron facility	-----	-2,500,000

The amounts provided for capital equipment not related to construction, FY 1976 are as follows:

Solar, geothermal, and advanced energy systems development:		
Solar energy development	-----	1,000,000
Geothermal energy development	-----	620,000
Physical research	-----	32,300,000
Total solar, geothermal and advanced system development	-----	33,920,000
Conservation research and development:		
Electric power transmission	-----	1,700,000
Energy storage systems	-----	750,000
Total conservation research and development	-----	2,450,000
Nuclear energy development:		
Fusion power research and development	-----	17,000,000
Fission power reactor development	-----	49,900,000
Naval reactor development	-----	8,800,000
Space nuclear systems	-----	2,600,000
Nuclear materials	-----	28,100,000
Advanced isotope separation technology	-----	3,200,000
Total nuclear energy development	-----	109,600,000
National security:		
Weapons	-----	58,150,000
Laser fusion	-----	8,500,000
Nuclear materials security	-----	2,220,000
Total national security	-----	68,870,000
Environmental and safety research:		
Biomedical and environmental research	-----	10,150,000
Waste management	-----	3,350,000
Operational safety	-----	880,000
Total environmental and safety research	-----	14,380,000

Program Support:

Program direction	-----	3,452,000
Information services	-----	750,000
Total program support	-----	4,202,000
Total capital equipment obligations	-----	233,422,000

Amendment No. 7: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which read as follows, " : *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation".

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$185,776,000 for the transition period instead of \$183,286,000 as proposed by the House and \$186,686,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Change from Senate action follows:

10-megawatt solar thermal facility	-----	-\$1,250,000
------------------------------------	-------	--------------

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT NOT RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION

The amounts provided for capital equipment not related to construction, for the transition quarter, are as follows:

Solar, geothermal, and advanced energy systems development:		
Geothermal energy development	-----	\$200,000
Physical research	-----	8,000,000
Total solar, geothermal and advanced energy systems development	-----	8,200,000
Conservation research and development:		
Electric power transmission	-----	480,000
Energy storage systems	-----	220,000
Total conservation research and development	-----	700,000
Nuclear energy development:		
Fusion power research and development	-----	4,500,000
Fission power reactor development	-----	8,600,000
Naval power reactor development	-----	1,325,000
Space nuclear systems	-----	650,000
Nuclear materials	-----	10,850,000
Advanced isotope separation technology	-----	800,000
Total nuclear energy development	-----	26,725,000
National security:		
Weapons	-----	14,870,000
Laser fusion	-----	2,350,000
Nuclear materials security	-----	611,000
Total national security	-----	17,831,000
Environmental and safety research:		
Biomedical and environmental research	-----	2,640,000
Waste management	-----	840,000
Operational safety	-----	220,000
Total environmental and safety research	-----	3,700,000

Program support:	
Program direction.....	940,000
Information services.....	130,000
Total program support.....	1,070,000
Total capital equipment.....	58,228,000

Amendment No. 9: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which read as follows, " : *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation".

**TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS**

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$66,856,000 for 1976 instead of \$63,924,000 as proposed by the House and \$66,952,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$17,110,000 for the transition period instead of \$17,182,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,811,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers are agreed that the funds provided for the Wabash River Navigation project, Indiana and Illinois are for the study from Ohio River to Terre Haute, Indiana.

The funds appropriated for General Investigations are to be allocated as shown in the following table.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Survey	Type of survey	Conference recommendation	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
Alabama:			
Mobile County.....	BE.....	\$40,000	\$20,000
Mobile Harbor.....	Nav.....	100,000	30,000
Montgomery to Gadsden, Coosa River channel (detailed economic restudy).....	Nav.....	315,000	60,000
Village Creek.....	FC.....	45,000	20,000
Alaska:			
Metropolitan Anchorage.....	FC.....	183,000	75,000
Rivers and harbors in Alaska (hydro interim).....	FC.....	250,000	65,000
Southcentral railbelt area.....	FC.....	334,000	80,000
Arizona:			
Gila River and tributaries (Gila drain), Arizona and New Mexico.....	FC.....	1,200,000	145,000
Phoenix Metropolitan Area.....	FC.....	1,815,000	1,200,000
Arkansas:			
Little Rock metropolitan area.....	FC.....	1,475,000	1,125,000
Quachita River Basin, Ark. and La.....	FC.....	240,000	75,000
Pine Bluff Metropolitan Area.....	FC.....	275,000	25,000
Red River below Denison Dam (Bayou Dorcheat).....	Comp.....	15,000	10,000
White River Basin Reservoir.....	FC.....	1,100,000	125,000
White River Bull Shoals and Norfolk.....	FC.....	25,000	50,000
White River, Piney Creek.....	FC.....	20,000	5,000
White River, Polk Bayou.....	FC.....	20,000	5,000

See footnotes at end of table.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Survey	Type of survey	Conference recommendation	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
California:			
Alameda Creek upper basin.....	FC.....	75,000	30,000
Antelope Valley.....	FC.....	40,000	10,000
Calleguas Creek.....	FC.....	90,000	25,000
Carmel River and tributaries.....	FC.....	50,000	
Coast of northern California.....	Nav.....	50,000	10,000
Eel River.....	FC.....	50,000	20,000
Fisherman's Wharf, San Francisco County.....	Nav.....	45,000	
Guadalupe River.....	FC.....	1,100,000	160,000
Humboldt Harbor and Bay.....	Nav.....	60,000	50,000
Los Angeles County drainage area review.....	FC.....	70,000	20,000
Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor (San Pedro model study).....	Nav.....	1,750,000	1,175,000
North Coast of Los Angeles County.....	Nav.....	25,000	15,000
Northern California Streams.....	FC.....	303,000	65,000
Novato Creek and tributaries.....	FC.....	32,000	
Oceanside Harbor.....	Nav.....	50,000	25,000
Pajaro River.....	FC.....	58,000	24,000
Sacramento River deepwater ship channel.....	Nav.....	120,000	45,000
Sacramento River-San Joaquin Delta.....	FC.....	50,000	15,000
Sacramento Valley navigation.....	Nav.....	45,000	25,000
Salinas River including part of Salinas-Monterey metropolitan area.....	FC.....	325,000	60,000
San Diego County streams flowing into Pacific Ocean.....	FC.....	1,160,000	130,000
San Diego County, vicinity of Oceanside.....	BE.....	20,000	
San Diego Harbor—Sweetwater River.....	Nav.....	25,000	15,000
San Francisco Bay and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta water quality and waste disposal.....	FC.....	1,100,000	15,000
San Francisco Bay area (in depth).....	Nav.....	260,000	95,000
San Francisco Bay, collection and disposal of floating debris.....	Nav.....	45,000	15,000
San Joaquin River basin.....	FC.....	1,190,000	155,000
San Luis Obispo County.....	FC.....	60,000	15,000
Santa Ana River basin and Orange County.....	FC.....	350,000	65,000
Santa Clara River.....	FC.....	90,000	20,000
Sunset Harbor.....	Nav.....	30,000	10,000
Upper Putah Creek.....	FC.....	25,000	
Ventura County.....	BE.....	80,000	20,000
Walnut Creek Basin.....	FC.....	50,000	25,000
Colorado:			
Metropolitan Denver and South Platte River and tributaries, Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming, total.....	FC.....	600,000	121,000
Connecticut:			
Connecticut River basin authorization report, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont.....	Comp.....	50,000	50,000
New Haven Harbor.....	Nav.....	31,000	
Rippowam River.....	FC.....	30,000	10,000
Delaware:			
Christina River Basin, total.....	FC.....	70,000	15,000
District of Columbia:			
Metropolitan Washington, D.C., water supply, total.....	Spec.....	150,000	160,000
Florida:			
Clearwater Pass.....	Nav.....	39,000	29,000
Cross-Florida barge canal.....	Spec.....	600,000	225,000
Four River basins.....	FC.....	385,000	30,000
Jacksonville Harbor (Mill Cove).....	Nav.....	20,000	11,000
Jacksonville metropolitan area.....	FC.....	320,000	100,000
Manatee Harbor.....	Nav.....	30,000	15,000
Miami Harbor.....	Nav.....	49,000	
Monroe County.....	BE.....	15,000	20,000
Nassau County (Amelia Island).....	BE.....	102,000	
Okeechobee Waterway.....	Nav.....	75,000	25,000
Pensacola and Tallahassee metropolitan and other urban areas.....	FC.....	1,150,000	55,000
St. Johns County.....	BE.....	80,000	30,000
Shores of northwest Florida.....	BE.....	65,000	20,000
Tampa Harbor, East Bay channels.....	Nav.....	65,000	
Volusia County shores.....	BE.....	60,000	40,000
Georgia:			
Metropolitan Atlanta area.....	FC.....	\$585,000	\$55,000
Satilla River basin.....	FC.....	61,000	20,000
Savannah River basin, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.....	FC.....	83,000	40,000
Guam:			
Harbors and rivers in territory of Guam, total.....	Nav.....	50,000	22,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

Survey	Type of survey	Conference recommendation	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
Hawaii:			
Harbors and rivers in Hawaii	FC	75,000	15,000
Hawaii framework	Comp	16,000	
Kaneohe Bay and part of Metropolitan Honolulu	Nav	300,000	80,000
Idaho:			
Big Wood River and tributaries	FC	22,000	31,000
Boise metropolitan region and Upper Snake River and tributaries, Idaho and Wyoming	FC	160,000	10,000
Columbia River and tributaries, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming	FC	1,075,000	311,000
Pacific Northwest River basin, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington	Comp	100,000	10,000
Illinois:			
Chicago-south end of Lake Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana	FC	192,000	32,000
East Cape Girardeau, Clear Creek, North Alexander, Preston, and Miller Pond Drainage and Levee District	FC	60,000	15,000
Fox River, Ill. and Wis.	FC	250,000	50,000
Kaskaskia Island Drainage and Levee District	FC	20,000	10,000
LaMoine River basin study	FC	25,000	
Mississippi River, Cassville, Wis., to mile 300, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and Wisconsin	FC	107,000	25,000
Mississippi River, Coon Rapids Dam to Ohio River, Ill., Iowa, and Mo.	FC	136,000	30,000
Mississippi River old channel mile 111-117, Illinois and Missouri	FC	30,000	5,000
Muscotlen Bay	Nav	26,000	13,000
Rock River at Rockford	FC	65,000	30,000
Saline River	FC	70,000	20,000
Saline River and tributaries	Nav	50,000	15,000
Silver Creek	FC	50,000	35,000
Indiana:			
Columbus	FC	35,000	10,000
Fort Wayne metropolitan area	FC	43,000	40,000
Indiana shoreline erosion, Lake Michigan	BE	80,000	20,000
Wabash River authorization report, Indiana and Illinois	Comp	1,150,000	135,000
Wabash River navigation, Indiana and Illinois	Nav	1,325,000	175,000
Iowa:			
Des Moines River Erosion	FC	15,000	20,000
Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa and Minn.	FC	92,000	30,000
Upper Big Sioux River, Iowa and S. Dak.	FC	120,000	30,000
Kansas:			
Arkansas River, Great Bend, Kansas to John Martin Dam, Colo.	FC	75,000	20,000
Arkansas River, Great Bend, Kansas to Tulsa, Okla.	FC	140,000	5,000
Grand (Neosho) River, Kans., and Okla.	FC		10,000
Kansas River and tributaries	FC	50,000	65,000
Verdigris River, Kans. and Okla.	FC	170,000	45,000
Kentucky:			
Green and Barren Rivers	Nav	25,000	8,000
Louisville Harbor	Nav	30,000	10,000
Lower Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers below Barkley Canal, Ky. and Tenn.	Nav	100,000	30,000
Metropolitan Lexington region	FC	250,000	50,000
Upper Cumberland River basin (resume study)	FC	175,000	25,000
Louisiana:			
Barataria Bay Waterway (Dupre Cut)	Nav	50,000	15,000
Barataria Bay Waterway, entrance channel	Nav	70,000	15,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway—High level highway crossings	Nav	70,000	20,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Louisiana-Texas section, Louisiana and Texas	Nav	50,000	20,000
Louisiana coastal area	FC	160,000	70,000
Ouachita River Basin, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas)			
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge, La., to Natchez, Miss.	Nav	35,000	10,000
Mississippi River—Gulf Outlet (enlargement)	Nav	90,000	15,000
New Orleans—Baton Rouge metropolitan area	FC	635,000	100,000
Maine:			
Passamaquoddy Tidal Project	Spec	100,000	50,000
St. John River, total	FC	60,000	40,000
Maryland:			
Atlantic coast of Maryland and Assateague Island, Va.	BE	15,000	
Baltimore Harbor and channels spoil disposal, Maryland and Virginia	Nav	80,000	
Baltimore metropolitan streams	FC	90,000	20,000
Chesapeake Bay study, Maryland and Virginia	Spec	2,035,000	395,000

See footnotes at end of table.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

Survey	Type of survey	Conference recommendation	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
Massachusetts:			
Boston Harbor (debris)	Nav	45,000	10,000
Boston Harbor (35 ft channel)	Nav	30,000	10,000
Cape Cod easterly shores	BE	45,000	15,000
Hoosic River, Mass., N.Y., and Vt.	FC	40,000	10,000
Plum Island	BE	25,000	15,000
Quincy, coastal streams	FC	59,000	
Michigan:			
Grand Haven Harbor	Nav	60,000	15,000
Grand Haven Harbor and River (small boat)	Nav	15,000	5,000
Great Lakes connecting channels and harbors	FC	50,000	15,000
Great Lakes, particularly Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, including Metropolitan Duluth-Superior, Mich., Minn., N.Y., Ohio, Pa., and Wis.	Nav	540,000	50,000
Great Lakes—St. Lawrence Seaway navigation season extension, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin	Spec	2,900,000	390,000
Monroe Harbor	Nav	20,000	5,000
Water levels of the Great Lakes, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin	Spec	220,000	75,000
Minnesota:			
Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.	Nav	85,000	
Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area	Comp	63,000	
Reservoirs at the headwaters of the Mississippi River	FC	50,000	25,000
Upper Mississippi River small craft locks, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa and Missouri	Nav		35,000
Mississippi:			
Gulfport Harbor	Nav	60,000	30,000
Pascagoula River Basin	FC	77,000	28,000
Pearl River	Nav	45,000	25,000
Missouri:			
Cape La Croix Creek, Cape Girardeau	FC	100,000	30,000
Metropolitan region of Kansas City, Mo. and Kans.	FC	600,000	125,000
Plattin Creek	FC	40,000	10,000
St. Genevieve	FC	70,000	20,000
St. Louis Harbor, Mo. and Ill.	Nav	75,000	20,000
St. Louis metropolitan area, Missouri and Illinois	FC	385,000	85,000
Montana:			
Flathead and Clark Fork River Basins, total	FC	75,000	20,000
Nebraska:			
Platte River and tributaries, total	FC	50,000	25,000
New Hampshire:			
Connecticut River streambank erosion (Wilder Lake, N.H. and Vt. to Turners Falls Dam, Mass.)	FC	45,000	30,000
North and Foss Beaches	BE	30,000	15,000
New Jersey:			
Camden metropolitan area	FC	234,000	66,000
Delaware Bay, shore of New Jersey	FC	25,000	5,000
Hackensack River, N.J. and N.Y.	FC	50,000	15,000
Kill Van Kull Channel, Newark Bay Channel, N.J. and N.Y.	Nav	100,000	35,000
Rahway River	FC	247,000	155,000
Raritan River basin	FC	168,000	52,000
New Mexico:			
Pecos River and tributaries at Carlsbad	FC	140,000	40,000
Rio Grande and tributaries, New Mexico and Colorado	FC	375,000	90,000
Rio Puerco at Gallup	FC	112,000	23,000
New York:			
Big Sandy Creek, Mexico Bay	Nav	50,000	10,000
Buffalo metropolitan area	FC	275,000	
Delaware River tributaries in New York	FC	40,000	10,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway (Troy lock and dam)	Nav	50,000	25,000
Gowanus Creek Channel	Nav	20,000	10,000
Iroquois Creek	FC	25,000	10,000
Morrisville and vicinity	FC	10,000	10,000
Northeastern United States Water Supply, New York, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia	Spec	910,000	165,000
Ogdensburg Harbor	Nav	20,000	10,000
Oswego River basin	FC	65,000	60,000
St. Lawrence Seaway, additional locks	Nav	202,000	30,000
Susquehanna River basin authorization report, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland	Comp	569,000	131,000
Wallkill River, N.Y. and N.J.	FC	48,000	12,000
Westchester County streams, New York and Byram River, Conn.	FC	150,000	150,000

See footnotes at end of table.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

Survey	Type of survey	Conference recommendation	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
North Carolina:			
Cape Fear River	FC	40,000	
Carolina Beach	Nav	85,000	25,000
Lumber River	FC	40,000	20,000
Neuse River	FC	123,000	42,000
Roanoke River (South Boston and vicinity), N.C. and Va.	FC	75,000	35,000
Sugar Creek Basin, N.C. and S.C.	FC	65,000	41,000
North Dakota:			
Red River of the North, N. Dak. and Minn., total	FC	190,000	90,000
Ohio:			
Central Ohio survey	FC	50,000	15,000
Cleveland Harbor	Nav	186,000	
Cuyahoga River Basin	FC	40,000	40,000
Lake Erie—Wastewater management, Ohio, Michigan, New York, and Pennsylvania (sec. 108a, Public Law 92-500).	Spec	310,000	250,000
Maumee River Basin, Ohio, Ind., and Mich.	Comp	57,000	
Muskingum River Basin	FC	50,000	15,000
Ohio River port development	Nav	60,000	30,000
Oklahoma:			
Canadian River and tributaries	FC	210,000	50,000
Central Oklahoma project	Nav	50,000	
Tankitiller Ferry Lake	FC	20,000	45,000
Tulsa urban study	FC	50,000	50,000
Oregon:			
Chetco River	Nav	67,000	
Columbia River at the mouth	Nav	25,000	5,000
Marys River	FC	90,000	
Portland metropolitan area	FC	255,000	85,000
Silvies River and tributaries	FC	100,000	25,000
Tillamook Bay and Bar	Nav	24,000	11,000
Willamette River and basin authorization report	Comp	160,000	20,000
Pennsylvania:			
Beaver River Basin, Pa. and Ohio	FC	275,000	65,000
Chester Creek Basin	FC	105,000	25,000
Potomac River, North Branch (mine drainage), Pa., Md. and W. Va.	FC	270,000	53,000
Raystown Dam hydro study	FC	87,000	26,000
Schuylkill River review	Nav	45,000	20,000
Susquehanna River Basin, mine drainage	FC	125,000	20,000
Rhode Island:			
Pawcatuck River and Narragansett Bay drainage basins, Rhode Island and Massachusetts	FC	660,000	153,000
Point Judith Harbor and Pond	Nav	50,000	
Providence Harbor (debris)	Nav	55,000	
Folly Beach	BE	25,000	10,000
Georgetown Harbor	Nav	60,000	20,000
South Dakota:			
Eastern South Dakota water supply	FC	10,000	30,000
Missouri River, S. Dak., Nebr., N. Dak., and Mont.	FC	175,000	30,000
Tennessee:			
Metropolitan region of Memphis	FC	150,000	70,000
Metropolitan region of Nashville	FC	150,000	40,000
Texas:			
Brazos River and tributaries	FC	400,000	125,000
Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	FC	75,000	20,000
Colorado River and tributaries	FC	1,775,000	150,000
Colorado River Channels to Bay City, Tex.	Nav	25,000	25,000
Corpus Christi ship channel, Harbor Island	Nav	1,400,000	1,000,000
Galveston Bay area navigation study	Nav	117,000	30,000
Galveston Bay shore erosion control	BE	50,000	35,000
Johnson Creek	FC	215,000	50,000
Lake Wichita Holiday Creek	FC	57,000	
Linnville Bayou-Caney, Creek Tres Palacios	FC	42,000	25,000
Lower Sabine River and tributaries	FC	25,000	20,000
Palo Blanco Creek and Cibolo Creek vicinity of Falfurrias	FC	65,000	25,000
Red River and tributaries, Texas and Oklahoma	FC	96,000	45,000
Sabine-Neches Water	Nav	45,000	
San Diego Creek, Alice	FC	20,000	7,000
San Jacinto River and tributaries	FC	50,000	25,000
Texas coast hurricane	Spec	445,000	100,000

See footnotes at end of tables.

Survey	Type of survey	Conference recommendation	
		Fiscal year 1976	1976 transition quarter
Utah:			
Colorado River and tributaries above Lee Ferry, Utah, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming.	FC	70,000	15,000
Jordan River Basin	FC	35,000	
Virginia:			
Chowan River, Virginia and North Carolina	FC	170,000	50,000
James River	FC	100,000	25,000
Norfolk Harbor anchorage area	Nav	75,000	25,000
Potomac River streams draining into Alexandria area	FC	50,000	
Roanoke River, upper basin	FC	50,000	35,000
Washington:			
Chehalis River and tributaries	FC	100,000	25,000
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Hoquiam River	Nav	100,000	25,000
Metropolitan Spokane and Spokane River and tributaries, Washington and Idaho	FC	146,000	25,000
Okanogan River and tributaries	FC	100,000	25,000
Puget Sound and adjacent waters authorization report	Comp	200,000	30,000
Snohomish River and tributaries	Nav	75,000	25,000
Yakima Valley, regional water management supply	FC	100,000	25,000
West Virginia:			
Gauley River	FC	150,000	40,000
Kanawha River basin authorization report, West Virginia, North Carolina and Virginia	Comp	200,000	63,000
Metropolitan region of Charleston	FC	400,000	190,000
Metropolitan region of Huntington, W. Va., Ashland, Ky., and Portsmouth, Ohio	FC	450,000	105,000
Metropolitan region of Wheeling, W. Va. and Ohio	FC	300,000	65,000
Wisconsin:			
Chippewa River	FC	80,000	40,000
Harbors between Kenosha and Kewaunee	Nav	52,000	30,000
Total, all States		38,807,000	10,090,000
Coordination studies with other agencies		1,970,000	450,000
Review of authorized projects:			
Restudies of deferred projects		250,000	43,000
Review of completed projects (sec. 216, Public Law 91-611)		599,000	167,000
Review for deauthorization (sec. 12, Public Law 93-251)		300,000	50,000
Detailed economic restudies (Montgomery to Gadsden, Ala.)		315,000	60,000
Study of alternatives (Red River Lake, Ky.)		100,000	50,000
Subtotal, review of authorized projects		1,249,000	310,000
Collection and study of basic data:			
Steam gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)		440,000	110,000
Precipitation studies (National Weather Service)		260,000	65,000
Fish and Wildlife studies (U.S.F. & W.S.)		1,500,000	425,000
International water studies		340,000	94,000
Flood plain management services		11,000,000	2,825,000
Hydrologic studies		270,000	68,000
Scientific and technical information centers		100,000	25,000
Coastal data collection		150,000	38,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data		14,060,000	3,650,000
Research and development		12,250,000	3,200,000
Subtotal		29,529,000	7,610,000
Anticipated additional unobligated carryover balances		-1,500,000	-500,000
Grand total		66,836,000	17,110,000

¹ Increase in budget.² Unbudgeted.³ Listed under Alabama.

Note: Explanation of symbols used under type of project: Nav—navigation; FC—flood control; BE—beach erosion; Comp.—comprehensive basin survey; Spec.—survey under special studies.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$1,228,648,000 for 1976 instead of \$1,157,015,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,255,663,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers agree with the Senate report language relating to the Dade County (Miami) Beach erosion and hurricane protection project in Florida.

The conferees agree that of the funds provided for the Tocks Island project, not to exceed \$500,000 is to be used for the continued planning and design of the relocation of route 209. The use of the remaining funds is subject to action by the authorizing committees.

The Conferees are in agreement that no further funds will be provided for the Big Pine, Indiana project pending resolution of the differences in the State of Indiana on this project.

The Conferees are in agreement that within available funds the Corps may continue further studies on alternatives and environmental matters on the LaFarge Lake and Channel Improvement project, Wisconsin.

The funds appropriated for Construction, general are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation :

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Alabama:				
(N) John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam (rehab) - Transition period	1,580,000	-----	3,340,000	-----
(MP) Jones Bluff lock and dam - Transition period	350,000	-----	5,350,000	-----
(N) Mobile Harbor (Theodore Channel) - Transition period	2,100,000	-----	1,800,000	-----
(N) Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss - Transition period	1,100,000	80,000	180,000	-----
(FC) Tombigbee River and tributaries. (See Mississippi)	52,000,000	-----	72,000,000	-----
(MP) West Point Lake. (See Georgia.)	21,900,000	-----	29,000,000	-----
Alaska:				
(FC) Chena River Lakes, Fairbanks - Transition period	13,000,000	-----	13,000,000	-----
(N) Humboldt Harbor - Transition period	10,075,000	-----	10,075,000	-----
(MP) Snettisham power project - Transition period	2,980,000	-----	2,980,000	-----
	700,000	-----	700,000	-----
	4,000,000	-----	7,500,000	-----
	2,000,000	-----	2,000,000	-----

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Arizona:					
(FC)	Indian Bend Wash.....	1, 150, 000	-----	1, 150, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	500, 000	-----	500, 000	-----
(FC)	Phoenix and vicinity (including New River)—Stage 1.....	900, 000	-----	900, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	200, 000	-----	200, 000	-----
(FC)	Phoenix and vicinity (including New River)—Stage 2.....	-----	350, 000	-----	350, 000
	Transition period.....	-----	15, 000	-----	15, 000
Arkansas:					
(MP)	DeGray Lake.....	3, 500, 000	-----	3, 500, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	900, 000	-----	900, 000	-----
(FC)	DeQueen Lake.....	1, 300, 000	-----	1, 300, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	40, 000	-----	40, 000	-----
(FC)	Dierks Lake.....	905, 000	-----	905, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	-----	-----	-----	-----
(FC)	Gillham Lake.....	600, 000	-----	600, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	203, 000	-----	203, 000	-----
(N)	McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River nav sys- tem, bk stab and chan rect, Arkansas and Oklahoma.....	2, 779, 000	-----	2, 779, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	-----	-----	-----	-----

18

(N)	McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River nav sys- tem, locks and dams, Arkansas and Okla- homa.....	3, 000, 000	-----	5, 350, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	700, 000	-----	1, 600, 000	-----
(MP)	Norfolk Lake—Highway bridge.....	-----	300, 000	-----	300, 000
	Transition period.....	-----	125, 000	-----	125, 000
(MP)	Norfolk Lake—Units 3 and 4.....	-----	250, 000	-----	250, 000
	Transition period.....	-----	80, 000	-----	80, 000
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.....	2, 000, 000	-----	4, 400, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	2, 300, 000	-----	2, 900, 000	-----
(FC)	Pine Mountain Lake.....	-----	146, 000	-----	186, 000
	Transition period.....	-----	50, 000	-----	70, 000
(FC)	Posten Bayou.....	-----	-----	-----	75, 000
	Transition period.....	-----	-----	-----	15, 000
(N)	Red River emergency bank protection (See Louisiana).....	-----	-----	-----	-----
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.....	3, 150, 000	-----	4, 000, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	2, 100, 000	-----	2, 400, 000	-----
(FC)	Village Creek, Jackson and Lawrence Coun- ties.....	-----	160, 000	-----	160, 000
	Transition period.....	-----	40, 000	-----	40, 000
California:					
(FC)	Alameda Creek (Del Valle Reservoir).....	1, 810, 000	-----	1, 810, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	-----	-----	-----	-----
(N)	Bodega Bay.....	-----	50, 000	-----	-----
	Transition period.....	-----	10, 000	-----	10, 000
(FC)	Buchanan Dam—H. V. Eastman Lake.....	2, 200, 000	-----	2, 200, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	1, 000, 000	-----	1, 000, 000	-----
(FC)	Chester, North Fork of Feather River.....	1, 200, 000	-----	1, 200, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	1, 500, 000	-----	1, 500, 000	-----
(FC)	Corte Madera Creek.....	250, 000	-----	250, 000	-----
	Transition period.....	1, 000, 000	-----	-----	-----

19

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
California—Continued					
(FC)	Cucamonga Creek	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Transition period	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake and Channel	1,800,000		1,800,000	
	Transition period	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Fairfield vicinity streams		275,000		275,000
	Transition period				
(FC)	Hidden Dam-Hensley Lake	2,380,000		3,100,000	
	Transition period	600,000		800,000	
(N)	Humboldt Harbor and Bay		40,000		40,000
	Transition period		20,000		20,000
(BE)	Imperial Beach	100,000		100,000	
	Transition period	50,000		50,000	
(FC)	Lytle and Warm Creeks	8,506,000		8,506,000	
	Transition period				
(MP)	Marysville Lake		840,000		840,000
	Transition period				
(FC)	Merced County streams		500,000		500,000
	Transition period		280,000		280,000
(FC)	Napa River Basin	500,000		500,000	
	Transition period	1,200,000		1,200,000	

20

(MP)	New Melones Lake	40,100,000		43,000,000	
	Transition period	13,500,000		15,000,000	
(FC)	Pajaro River		75,000		75,000
	Transition period		65,000		65,000
(FC)	Pine Flat Lake and Kings River	905,000		905,000	
	Transition period				
(N)	Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor		50,000		50,000
	Transition period				
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	200,000		200,000	
	Transition period	50,000		50,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River Bank protection	2,800,000		3,000,000	
	Transition period	1,500,000		1,600,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	1,660,000		1,660,000	
	Transition period				
(N)	San Diego Harbor	3,200,000		8,000,000	
	Transition period	900,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	San Diego River (Mission Valley)		75,000		75,000
	Transition period		25,000		25,000
(BE)	San Diego (Sunset Cliffs). (Seg. A.)				30,000
	Transition period				5,000
(N)	San Francisco Bay to Stockton (J. F. Blad- win and Stockton ship channels)	500,000		500,000	
	Transition period	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	San Luis Rey River				100,000
	Transition period				35,000
(FC)	Walnut Creek	800,000		800,000	
	Transition period	600,000		600,000	

21

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Colorado:					
(FC)	Arkansas River and tributaries above John Martin Dam.....		250,000		250,000
	Transition period.....		80,000		80,000
(FC)	Bear Creek Lake.....	14,800,000		14,800,000	
	Transition period.....	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Chatfield Lake.....	2,100,000		2,100,000	
	Transition period.....	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Trinidad Lake.....	4,400,000		4,460,000	
	Transition period.....	300,000		500,000	
Connecticut:					
(FC)	Danbury.....	5,800,000		5,800,000	
	Transition period.....	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Park River.....		308,000	1,500,000	
	Transition period.....			2,000,000	
Delaware:					
(N)	Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (Pt. II).....	600,000		600,000	
	Transition period.....	446,000		446,000	
District of Columbia:					
(FC)	Potomac Estuary Pilot Water Treatment Plant, District of Columbia, Md. and Va.....		630,000		630,000
	Transition period.....				

22

Florida:					
(FC)	Central and Southern Florida.....	8,500,000		10,000,000	
	Transition period.....	2,150,000		3,650,000	
(FC)	Dade County (Bal Harbour) (reimburse- ment).....	2,300,000		2,300,000	
	Transition period.....				
(FC)	Four River Basins.....	3,700,000		4,200,000	
	Transition period.....	1,770,000		3,000,000	
(N)	Jacksonville Harbor (1965 Act).....	3,500,000		5,000,000	
	Transition period.....	550,000		1,500,000	
(N)	Panama City Harbor.....	600,000		600,000	
	Transition period.....	70,000		70,000	
(BE)	Pinellas County.....	150,000		150,000	
	Transition period.....				
(N)	Port Everglades Harbor.....		100,000		100,000
	Transition period.....		35,000		35,000
(N)	St. Lucie Inlet.....				175,000
	Transition period.....				30,000
(N)	Tampa Harbor (main channel).....	5,500,000		6,350,000	
	Transition period.....	1,575,000		2,312,000	
Georgia:					
(MP)	Carters Lake.....	2,954,000		2,954,000	
	Transition period.....				
(MP)	Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake, Ga. and S.C.....	4,400,000		4,400,000	
	Transition period.....	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(N)	Savannah Harbor (widening and deepening).....	850,000		850,000	
	Transition period.....	850,000		850,000	
(BE)	Tybee Island.....	1,169,000		1,169,000	
	Transition period.....				
(MP)	West Point Lake, Ala. and Ga.....	2,600,000		2,600,000	
	Transition period.....	543,000		543,000	

23

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Hawaii:					
(N)	Barbers Point (deep draft) Harbor, Oahu		100,000		200,000
	Transition period		25,000		50,000
(N)	Honolulu Harbor, Oahu		60,000		60,000
	Transition period		25,000		25,000
(FC)	Iao Stream, Maui		105,000		105,000
	Transition period				
(FC)	Kaneohe-Kailua Area	400,000		400,000	
	Transition period	600,000		600,000	
(N)	Lahaina, small boat harbor	700,000			
	Transition period	200,000		100,000	
Idaho:					
(MP)	Dworshak Dam and Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000	
	Transition period	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Ririe Lake	3,800,000		3,800,000	
	Transition period	900,000		900,000	
Illinois:					
(FC)	Carlyle Lake	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Transition period	450,000		450,000	
(FC)	Columbia Drainage and Levee District No. 3	400,000		400,000	
	Transition period	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	East Moline		182,000		182,000
	Transition period				

24

(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity—Cahokia Creek Low Dam				
	Transition period	750,000		750,000	
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity—Interior flood control	1,400,000		1,400,000	
	Transition period	850,000		850,000	
(FC)	Freeport			50,000	
	Transition period			25,000	
(FC)	Harrisonville and Ivy Landing Drainage and Levee District No. 2	1,300,000		1,775,000	
	Transition period	550,000		550,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, Pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	2,800,000		2,800,000	
	Transition period	630,000		630,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway, duplicate locks, Illinois and Indiana		400,000		
	Transition period		100,000		
(FC)	Kaskaskia Island Drainage and Levee District		200,000		200,000
	Transition period		80,000		80,000
(N)	Kaskaskia River navigation	6,300,000		6,300,000	
	Transition period	850,000		850,000	
(FC)	Levee district No. 23 (Dively), Kaskaskia River	400,000		400,000	
	Transition period				
(FC)	Little Calumet River			150,000	
	Transition period			140,000	
(N)	Lock and dam 53 (temporary lock), Illinois and Kentucky	21,100,000		21,100,000	
	Transition period	2,150,000		2,150,000	
(FC)	Louisville Lake		175,000		175,000
	Transition period		70,000		70,000

25

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Illinois—Continued					
(FC)	Milan		91,000		121,000
	Transition period				20,000
(N)	Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri rivers (regulating works), Illinois and Missouri	3,000,000		3,000,000	
	Transition period	700,000		700,000	
(N)	Mississippi River (chain of rocks)			905,000	
	Transition period				
(FC)	Moline		130,000		130,000
	Transition period		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Rock Island	300,000		300,000	
	Transition period	80,000		80,000	
(FC)	Rockford	200,000		200,000	
	Transition period	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Saline River and tributaries	380,000		380,000	
	Transition period				
(N)	Smithland locks and dam, Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky	34,000,000		42,000,000	
	Transition period	14,885,000		14,885,000	
(FC)	South Beloit		30,000		30,000
	Transition period		20,000		20,000

26

(FC)	Wood River drainage and levee district				70,000
	Transition period				25,000
Indiana:					
(FC)	Big Blue Lake		150,000		150,000
	Transition period		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Big Pine Lake	700,000		550,000	
	Transition period	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Big Walnut Lake (land aquisition)		300,000		830,000
	Transition period		105,000		400,000
(FC)	Brookville Lake	2,635,000		2,635,000	
	Transition period	885,000		885,000	
(N)	Cannelton locks and dams, Indiana and Kentucky	620,000		620,000	
	Transition period	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Evansville	1,850,000		1,850,000	
	Transition period	1,350,000		1,350,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway, Calument-Sag modifica- tion pt. I. (See Illinois.)				
(N)	Illinois Waterway, duplicate locks, (See Illinois)				
(FC)	Island levee	200,000		200,000	
	Transition period	580,000		580,000	
(FC)	Lafayette Lake			300,000	
	Transition period			100,000	
(FC)	Levee unit No. 5	300,000		300,000	
	Transition period	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Mason J. Niblack levee (pumping facilities)	1,019,000		1,273,000	
	Transition period	573,000		573,000	
(N)	Newburgh locks and dam, Indianapolis and Kentucky	7,800,000		7,800,000	
	Transition period	575,000		575,000	

27

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Indiana—Continued					
(FC)	Patoka Lake	5,000,000		5,000,000	
	Transition period	1,865,000		1,865,000	
(N)	Smithland locks and dam. (See Illinois).				
(N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indianapolis and Kentucky	1,810,000		1,810,000	
	Transition period	50,000		50,000	
Iowa:					
(FC)	Bettendorf	100,000		100,000	
	Transition period	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Big Sioux River at Sioux City, Iowa and S.D.			200,000	
	Transition period			500,000	
(FC)	Clinton	3,500,000		3,500,000	
	Transition period	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(FC)	Davenport		240,000		240,000
	Transition period		60,000		60,000
(FC)	Marshalltown	1,500,000		1,500,000	
	Transition period	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	300,000		500,000	
	Transition period	200,000		600,000	
(N)	Missouri River, Sioux City to Mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	3,000,000		3,000,000	
	Transition period	1,000,000		1,000,000	

28

(FC)	Ottumwa			110,000	
	Transition period				
(FC)	Saylorville Lake	4,730,000		6,230,000	
	Transition period	550,000		550,000	
(FC)	Waterloo	7,550,000		7,550,000	
	Transition period	1,450,000		1,450,000	
Kansas:					
(FC)	Arkansas-Red basins chloride control. (See Oklahoma).				
(FC)	Big Hill Lake	400,000		400,000	
	Transition period	209,000		209,000	
(FC)	Cedar Point Lake		200,000		200,000
	Transition period		54,000		54,000
(FC)	Clinton Lake	6,900,000		7,500,000	
	Transition period	2,500,000		2,600,000	
(FC)	Dodge City	2,150,000		2,150,000	
	Transition period	216,000		216,000	
(FC)	El Dorado		180,000		180,000
	Transition period				
(FC)	El Dorado Lake	9,600,000		9,600,000	
	Transition period	5,152,000		5,152,000	
(FC)	Great Bend		146,000		146,000
	Transition period				
(FC)	Hillsdale Lake	1,550,000		3,000,000	
	Transition period	800,000		1,900,000	
(FC)	Indian Lake		200,000		
	Transition period		75,000		
(FC)	Kansas City 1962 modification	7,500,000		7,500,000	
	Transition period	2,150,000		2,150,000	
(N)	Kansas River navigation		50,000		50,000
	Transition period		50,000		50,000

29

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Kansas—Continued				
(FC) Lawrence	1, 100, 000		1, 100, 000	
Transition period	574, 000		574, 000	
(FC) Marion	1, 200, 000		1, 500, 000	
Transition period	429, 000		440, 000	
(FC) Missouri River levee system. (See Iowa.)				
(N) Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth. (See Iowa.)				
(FC) Perry Lake area (road improvements)	200, 000		200, 000	
Transition period	400, 000		400, 000	
(FC) Towanda Lake		200, 000		
Transition period		75, 000		
(FC) Winfield		108, 000		108, 000
Transition period				
(FC) Wolf-Coffee Lake		400, 000		
Transition period		100, 000		
Kentucky:				
(FC) Big Sandy River, dam No. 3			305, 000	
Transition period				
(FC) Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area, Ky. and Tenn.		350, 000		500, 000

	Transition period			200, 000
(FC) Boone County				50, 000
Transition period				15, 000
(FC) Booneville Lake		209, 000		209, 000
Transition period				
(FC) Camp Ground Lake		190, 000		190, 000
Transition period		10, 000		10, 000
(N) Cannelton locks and dams. (See Indiana.)				
(FC) Carr Fork Lake	5, 914, 000		5, 914, 000	
Transition period				
(FC) Cave Run Lake	3, 900, 000		4, 400, 000	
Transition period	750, 000		1, 000, 000	
(FC) Dayton		105, 000		105, 000
Transition period				
(FC) Frankfort, North Frankfort area	200, 000		200, 000	
Transition period				
(FC) Kehoe Lake			750, 000	
Transition period			700, 000	
(MP) Laurel River Lake	4, 700, 000		5, 200, 000	
Transition period	644, 000		1, 144, 000	
(N) Lock and dam 53 (temporary lock). (See Illinois.)				
(FC) Martin	600, 000		600, 000	
Transition period	350, 000		350, 000	
(FC) Martins Fork Lake	2, 900, 000		4, 450, 000	
Transition period	1, 240, 000		1, 240, 000	
(N) Newburg locks and dam. (See Indiana.)				
(FC) Paintsville Lake	1, 300, 000		1, 300, 000	
Transition period	750, 000		750, 000	
(FC) Red River Lake	1, 000, 000			
Transition period	527, 000			
(N) Smithland locks and dam. (See Illinois.)				

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Kentucky—Continued				
(FC) Southwestern Jefferson County	1,680,000		1,680,000	
Transition period	1,420,000		1,420,000	
(FC) Taylorsville Lake	4,574,000		5,100,000	
Transition period	2,465,000		2,465,000	
(FC) Tug Fork Valley (Phase I)		200,000		200,000
Transition period		75,000		75,000
(N) Uniontown locks and dam. (See Indiana.)				
(MP) Wolf Creek Dam—Lake Cumberland (rehab.)	6,050,000		10,000,000	
Transition period	3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC) Yatesville Lake	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Transition period	800,000		800,000	
Louisiana:				
(N) Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Transition period	2,100,000		2,100,000	
(FC) Bayou Bodcau and tributaries	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Transition period	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N) Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche Jump Waterway	400,000		400,000	
Transition period	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N) Calcasieu River at Devil's Elbow	5,022,000		5,022,000	
Transition period				

32

(FC) Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity	22,000,000		16,000,000	
Transition period	7,350,000		5,350,000	
(FC) Larose to Golden Meadow	1,600,000		1,600,000	
Transition period	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N) Mississippi River Outlets, Venice, La.	500,000		500,000	
Transition period	550,000		550,000	
(N) Mississippi River, Gulf outlet	1,000,000		1,600,000	
Transition period	475,000		1,350,000	
(FC) Monroe Floodwall			870,000	
Transition period			460,000	
(FC) New Orleans to Venice	6,100,000		6,100,000	
Transition period	2,700,000		2,700,000	
(N) Ouachita and Black Rivers. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC) Ouachita River Levees	2,100,000		2,100,000	
Transition period	320,000		320,000	
(N) Overton-Red River Waterway (lower 31 mi only)	1,100,000		1,500,000	
Transition period	50,000		50,000	
(N) Red River emergency bank protection, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas	4,000,000		5,000,000	
Transition period	1,475,000		1,700,000	
(FC) Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam. (See Arkansas.)				
(N) Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, La.	17,300,000		25,000,000	
Transition period	4,070,000		10,000,000	
(N) Vermilion lock (replacement)		133,000		133,000
Transition period				
Maine:				
(MP) Dickey-Lincoln School Lakes		1,060,000		2,110,000
Transition period		395,000		435,000
(N) Frenchboro Harbor	565,000		565,000	
Transition period				

33

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Maryland:					
(FC)	Bloomington Lake, Md. and W. Va.	6,200,000		8,220,000	
	Transition period	3,300,000		3,300,000	
(N)	Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (pt. II). (See Delaware.)				
(FC)	Potomac Estuary Pilot Water Treatment Plant. (See District of Columbia.)				
Massachusetts:					
(FC)	Charles River Dam	11,000,000		11,000,000	
	Transition period	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Charles River Natural Valley storage areas		200,000		200,000
	Transition period		90,000		90,000
(N)	Edgartown Harbor		135,000		135,000
	Transition period				
(FC)	North Nashua River		60,000		60,000
	Transition period		20,000		20,000
(FC)	Saxonville			100,000	
	Transition period			600,000	
(N)	Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Transition period	400,000		400,000	
Michigan:					
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	974,000		974,000	
	Transition period				
(N)	Lexington Harbor	500,000		500,000	
	Transition period	320,000		320,000	

34

(N)	Ludington Harbor		45,000		45,000
	Transition period		15,000		15,000
(N)	New Buffalo Harbor	311,000		311,000	
	Transition period				
(FC)	Ottawa River Harbor, Mich. and Ohio		70,000		70,000
	Transition period		10,000		10,000
(FC)	Red Run Drain and Lower Clinton River		500,000		500,000
	Transition period		115,000		115,000
(FC)	River Rouge 1962 Act	2,200,000		2,800,000	
	Transition period	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River 1958 Act	2,300,000		2,300,000	
	Transition period	880,000		880,000	
(N)	Tawas Bay Harbor			50,000	
	Transition period				
Minnesota:					
(N)	Beaver Bay Harbor		100,000		100,000
	Transition period				
(FC)	Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak.	900,000		900,000	
	Transition period	100,000		100,000	
(N)	Knife River Harbor		60,000		60,000
	Transition period				
(N)	Lutsen Harbor		85,000		85,000
	Transition period				
(FC)	Mankato and North Mankato	2,200,000		2,200,000	
	Transition period	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Rochester (phase I)		110,000		110,000
	Transition period		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Roseau River			100,000	
	Transition period			500,000	
(FC)	Twin Valley Lake		250,000		250,000
	Transition period		60,000		60,000
(FC)	Winona		400,000		400,000
	Transition period		110,000		110,000

35

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Mississippi:					
(FC)	Edinburg Lake (Phase I) Transition period		350,000		350,000
(FC)	Tallahala Creek Lake Transition period	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. (See Alabama.)	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Mississippi and Alabama Transition period	700,000		700,000	
(N)	Yazoo River, Belzoni Bridge (advance par- ticipation) Transition period	800,000		800,000	
		150,000		150,000	
Missouri:					
(FC)	Blue River Channel, Kansas City Transition period		400,000		400,000
(MP)	Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir Transition period	24,100,000	100,000	24,100,000	100,000
(MP)	Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir Transition period	5,100,000		5,100,000	
(FC)	Little Blue River Channel Transition period	45,500,000		45,500,000	
(FC)	Little Blue River Lakes (land acquisition) Transition period	14,450,000		14,450,000	
		2,100,000		2,100,000	
		850,000		850,000	
		2,500,000		2,500,000	
		800,000		800,000	

36

(FC)	Long Branch Lake Transition period	3,500,000		4,300,000	
(FC)	Meramec Park Lake Transition period	2,000,000		2,400,000	
(N)	Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers (regulating works). (See Illinois.)	5,500,000		5,500,000	
(FC)	Mississippi River Agricultural Area No. 8 (Elsberry Drainage District) Transition period	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Missouri River levee system. (See Iowa.)		168,000		168,000
(N)	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Perry County Drainage and Levee District 1, 2, 3 Transition period		155,000		155,000
(FC)	Pine Ford Lake Transition period				500,000
(FC)	Smithville Lake Transition period	14,000,000		14,000,000	
(FC)	Union Lake, State Highway 185 (advance participation) Transition period	5,400,000		5,400,000	
		1,030,000		1,030,000	
Montana:					
(FC)	Billings (Western Unit) Transition period		110,000		110,000
(MP)	Libby Dam, Lake Koocanusa Transition period	14,800,000		14,800,000	
(MP)	Libby Reregulating Dam power units Transition period	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Miles City Transition period		200,000		250,000
			75,000		75,000
					40,000
					15,000

37

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Nebraska:					
(MP)	Gavins Point Dam-Lewis and Clark Lake (relocation of Niobrara), Nebraska and South Dakota	3,700,000		5,700,000	
	Transition period	1,276,000		1,276,000	
(FC)	Missouri River levee system. (See Iowa)				
(N)	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Papillion Creek and tributaries lakes	8,900,000		6,900,000	
	Transition period	3,100,000		3,100,000	
Nevada:					
(FC)	Humboldt River and tributaries		75,000		75,000
	Transition period		85,000		85,000
New Jersey:					
(N)	Corson Inlet-Ludlam Beach		130,000		130,000
	Transition period		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Elizabeth	1,560,000		1,560,000	
	Transition period	540,000		540,000	
(N)	Great Egg Harbor and Peck Beach		150,000		150,000
	Transition period		50,000		50,000
(N)	Newark Bay, Hackensack, and Passaic Rivers			1,500,000	
	Transition period			700,000	

38

New Mexico:					
(FC)	Cochiti Lake	3,200,000		3,200,000	
	Transition period	318,000		318,000	
(FC)	Los Esteros Lake	3,400,000		4,800,000	
	Transition period	944,000		944,000	
New York:					
(N)	Cattaraugus Harbor		110,000		110,000
	Transition period				
(N)	Dunkirk Harbor		70,000		70,000
	Transition period		35,000		35,000
(BE)	East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay (pt. 1)	1,630,000		2,980,000	
	Transition period	100,000			
(FC)	Eastlake-Chagrin River, Ohio and N. Y. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Ellicott Creek				150,000
	Transition period				70,000
(BE)	Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet	2,700,000		2,700,000	
	Transition period	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point	1,350,000		1,350,000	
	Transition period	400,000		400,000	
(BE)	Hamlin Beach State Park (reimbursement)	733,000		733,000	
	Transition period				
(N)	Irondequoit Bay			50,000	
	Transition period			30,000	
(FC)	Ithaca	90,000		90,000	
	Transition period	56,000		56,000	
(N)	New York Harbor collection and removal of drift	900,000		900,000	
	Transition period	500,000		500,000	
(N)	New York Harbor, anchorages	1,600,000		2,600,000	
	Transition period	1,100,000		1,100,000	

39

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
New York—Continued				
(N) Port Ontario				50,000
Transition period				40,000
(FC) Scajaquada Creek		125,000		125,000
Transition period				
(FC) Staten Island (Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill)		100,000		100,000
Transition period				
(FC) Wellsville	595,000		595,000	
Transition period				
(FC) Yonkers	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Transition period	500,000		500,000	
North Carolina:				
(N) Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, highway bridges	400,000		400,000	
Transition period	130,000		130,000	
(FC) B. Everett Jordan Dam and Lake	11,400,000		11,400,000	
Transition period	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC) Carolina Beach and vicinity	433,000		433,000	
Transition period	200,000		200,000	
(FC) Falls Lake	6,400,000		6,400,000	
Transition period	2,116,000		2,116,000	
(FC) Howards Mill Lake		100,000		100,000

40

(N) Transition period		50,000		50,000
(N) Little River Inlet. (See South Carolina.)				
(N) Manteo (Shallow Bag) Bay		70,000		70,000
Transition period				
(N) Morehead City Harbor (1970 Act)	700,000		700,000	
Transition period	500,000		500,000	
(FC) Randleman Lake		120,000		120,000
Transition period		60,000		60,000
(FC) Reddies River Lake		150,000		150,000
Transition period		40,000		40,000
(FC) Roaring River Lake		150,000		150,000
Transition period		50,000		50,000
North Dakota:				
(FC) Burlington Dam		300,000		300,000
Transition period		200,000		200,000
(MP) Garrison Dam—Lake Sakakawea	100,000		100,000	
Transition period	50,000		50,000	
(FC) Kindred Lake				100,000
Transition period				30,000
(FC) Minot	4,100,000		4,100,000	
Transition period	2,974,000		2,974,000	
(FC) Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Lake Oahe	200,000		200,000	
Transition period	50,000		50,000	
Ohio:				
(FC) Alum Creek Lake	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Transition period	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Caesar Creek Lake	11,200,000		11,800,000	
Transition period	3,310,000		4,100,000	
(FC) Chillicothe	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Transition period	600,000		600,000	
(FC) East Fork Lake	7,000,000		7,000,000	
Transition period	1,439,000		1,439,000	

41

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Ohio—Continued					
(FC)	Eastlake—Chagrin River Transition period		80,000		80,000
(N)	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia Transition period	3,866,000		3,866,000	
(BE)	Lakeview Park, Lorain Transition period		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Mill Creek Transition period	2,000,000 1,260,000		2,000,000 1,260,000	
(FC)	Muskingum River Lakes (rehab) Transition period	250,000 150,000		250,000 150,000	
(N)	Ottawa River Harbor. (See Michigan.)				
(FC)	Paint Creek Lake Transition period	709,000		709,000	
(FC)	Point Place Transition period		80,000 10,000		80,000 10,000
(N)	Willow Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia Transition period	4,100,000 600,000		5,300,000 600,000	
Oklahoma:					
(FC)	Arcadia Lake Transition period		300,000 100,000		300,000 100,000

42

(FC)	Arkansas-Red Basins chloride control, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Texas Transition period		1,260,000 446,000		2,200,000 746,000
(FC)	Arkansas-Red River Basins chloride control, area VIII Transition period			200,000 100,000	
(FC)	Birch Lake Transition period	3,300,000 605,000		3,300,000 605,000	
(FC)	Candy Lake Transition period			300,000 450,000	
(FC)	Clayton Lake Transition period	2,500,000 2,030,000		2,500,000 2,030,000	
(FC)	Copan Lake Transition period	1,300,000 2,270,000		9,000,000 4,400,000	
(MP)	Fort Gibson Lake—Units 5 and 6 Transition period		350,000 100,000		350,000 100,000
(FC)	Hugo Lake Transition period	2,224,000		2,224,000	
(FC)	Kaw Lake Transition period	7,500,000 1,408,000		8,200,000 1,500,000	
(FC)	Lukfata Lake Transition period			50,000 100,000	
(N)	McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation system. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC)	Optima Lake Transition period	9,800,000 1,525,000		9,800,000 1,525,000	
(FC)	Skiatook Lake Transition period	2,000,000 1,770,000		4,000,000 2,770,000	
(FC)	Waurika Lake Transition period	13,800,000 4,109,000		13,800,000 4,109,000	

43

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Oregon:					
(FC)	Applegate Lake (Land Acquisition)-----	300,000		1,100,000	
	Transition period-----	100,000		800,000	
(FC)	Beaver Drainage District-----	100,000		100,000	
	Transition period-----	200,000		200,000	
(MP)	Bonneville lock and dam (2d powerhouse) Oregon and Washington-----	17,500,000		24,500,000	
	Transition period-----	13,000,000		13,600,000	
(MP)	Bonneville lock and dam (modification for peaking), Oregon and Washington-----	1,900,000		1,900,000	
	Transition period-----	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Cascadia Lake-----		200,000		
	Transition period-----		200,000		
(FC)	Catherine Creek Lake-----	400,000		150,000	
	Transition period-----	250,000			
(N)	Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, Oreg. and Wash. (40-ft channel)-----	1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Transition period-----	350,000		350,000	
(N)	Coos Bay-----			2,000,000	
	Transition period-----			3,500,000	
(MP)	Cougar Lake-----	740,000		740,000	
	Transition period-----	300,000		300,000	

44

(FC)	Days Creek Lake (Phase I)-----		100,000		500,000
	Transition period-----		25,000		
(FC)	Elk Creek Lake-----	6,600,000			
	Transition period-----	3,000,000			
(MP)	John Day lock and dam—Lake Umatilla, Oreg. and Wash-----	5,065,000		5,525,000	
	Transition period-----	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(MP)	Lost Creek Lake-----	24,000,000		24,000,000	
	Transition period-----	8,600,000		8,600,000	
(FC)	Lower Columbia River Bank Protection, Oregon and Washington-----	450,000		450,000	
	Transition period-----	300,000		300,000	
(MP)	McNary lock and dam, Lake Wallula, Ore- gon and Washington-----	4,100,000		4,100,000	
	Transition period-----	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Scappoose Drainage District-----	100,000		100,000	
	Transition period-----	400,000		400,000	
(MP)	The Dalles lock and dam. (See Washington)				
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection-----	400,000		400,000	
	Transition period-----	950,000		950,000	
Pennsylvania:					
(FC)	Blue Marsh Lake-----	10,500,000		10,500,000	
	Transition period-----	2,900,000		2,900,000	
	(Relocate Gruber Wagon Works) Transition period-----			431,000	
(FC)	Chartiers Creek-----	1,200,000		1,200,000	
	Transition period-----	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Cowanessque Lake-----	12,400,000		12,400,000	
	Transition period-----	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	DuBois-----	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Transition period-----				

45

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Pennsylvania—Continued				
(N) Gray's Landing lock and dam		300,000		300,000
Transition period		130,000		130,000
(N) Point Marion lock		200,000		200,000
Transition period		90,000		90,000
(FC) Pottstown		50,000		50,000
Transition period		20,000		20,000
(BE) Presque Isle Peninsula	750,000		750,000	
Transition period	10,000		10,000	
(FC) Raystown Lake	4,500,000		4,500,000	
Transition period	1,900,000		1,900,000	
(FC) Tioga-Hammond Lakes	31,000,000		34,250,000	
Transition period	9,314,000		9,314,000	
(MP) Tocks Island Lake (relocation of Route 209 only)			2,500,000	
Transition period			2,100,000	
(FC) Tyrone	1,700,000		1,700,000	
Transition period	750,000		750,000	
Puerto Rico:				
(FC) Portugues and Bucana Rivers	5,000,000		6,400,000	
Transition period	1,225,000		1,750,000	
South Carolina:				

46

(N) Cooper River, Charleston Harbor	3,000,000		3,500,000	
Transition period	1,273,000		1,773,000	
(N) Little River Inlet, S.C. and N.C.		380,000		380,000
Transition period		100,000		100,000
(N) Murrells Inlet		300,000		300,000
Transition period				
(MP) Richard B. Russell dam and lake. (See Georgia.)				
South Dakota:				
(FC) Big Sioux River at Sioux City, Iowa and S. Dak. (See Iowa.)				
Transition period				
(FC) Big Stone Lake—Whetstone River. (See Minnesota.)				
(MP) Gavins Point Dam—Lewis & Clark Lake (relocation of Niobrara). (See Nebraska.)				
(FC) Sacred Heart Hospital, emergency bank sta- bilization, Yankton, S. Dak.	125,000		125,000	
Transition period				
Tennessee:				
(FC) Big South Fork National River and Recre- ation Area. (See Kentucky)				
(MP) Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir	1,000,000		1,300,000	
Transition period	420,000		520,000	
Texas:				
(FC) Alpine		70,000		70,000
Transition period		20,000		20,000
(FC) Aquilla Lake			1,500,000	
Transition period			700,000	
(FC) Arkansas-Red Basins choride control. (See Oklahoma.)				

47

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Texas—Continued					
(FC)	Aubrey Lake	2,500,000		2,500,000	
	Transition period	3,314,000		3,314,000	
(FC)	Big Pine Lake		300,000		300,000
	Transition period		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Big Spring		65,000		65,000
	Transition period		20,000		20,000
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	1,473,000		1,473,000	
	Transition period				
(FC)	Carl L. Estes Dam and Lake		400,000		400,000
	Transition period		135,000		135,000
(FC)	Clear Creek		300,000		300,000
	Transition period		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Cloptin Crossing Lake (Phase I)				300,000
	Transition period				100,000
(FC)	Cooper Lake and channels	1,500,000		1,500,000	
	Transition period	685,000		685,000	
(BE)	Corpus Christi Beach			100,000	
	Transition period			200,000	
(N)	Corpus Christi ship channel (1968 Act)	1,900,000		2,900,000	
	Transition period	650,000		650,000	
(FC)	El Paso	4,000,000		4,000,000	
	Transition period	1,332,000		1,332,000	

48

(FC)	Freeport and vicinity, hurricane flood protection	4,300,000		4,300,000	
	Transition period	900,000		900,000	
(N)	Freeport Harbor		100,000		100,000
	Transition period		30,000		30,000
(N)	Galveston Channel (1971 auth)	1,400,000		1,400,000	
	Transition period				
(N)	GIWW-Texas Section—Relocation in Matagorda Bay		35,000		35,000
	Transition period		15,000		15,000
(N)	Gulf IWW-Harbor of Refuge at Seadrift				30,000
	Transition period				12,000
(FC)	Highland Bayou	2,085,000		2,085,000	
	Transition period	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Lake Brownwood Modification		238,000		238,000
	Transition period				
(FC)	Lakeview Lake	2,500,000		2,500,000	
	Transition period	2,398,000		2,398,000	
(FC)	Lavon Lake Modification and East Fork Channel improvement	3,680,000		3,880,000	
	Transition period	581,000		731,000	
(FC)	Lower Rio Grande Basin (Phase I)		200,000		350,000
	Transition period		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Millican Lake		450,000		450,000
	Transition period		110,000		110,000
(N)	Mouth of Colorado River		70,000		70,000
	Transition period				
(FC)	Pecos and vicinity		150,000		150,000
	Transition period		40,000		40,000
(FC)	Peyton Creek		200,000		
	Transition period		50,000		

49

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Texas—Continued				
(FC) Plainview		120,000		120,000
Transition period		40,000		40,000
(FC) Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)	7,900,000		7,900,000	
Transition period	1,225,000		1,225,000	
(N) Red River emergency bank protection. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC) Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC) San Antonio Channel improvement	2,200,000		2,200,000	
Transition period	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC) San Gabriel River	6,850,000		7,000,000	
Transition period	2,607,000		3,000,000	
(FC) Taylors Bayou	650,000		650,000	
Transition period	490,000		490,000	
(FC) Texas City and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Transition period	85,000		85,000	
(FC) Three Rivers		150,000		150,000
Transition period		50,000		50,000
(FC) Trinity River project		800,000		800,000
Transition period		300,000		300,000

50

(FC) Vince and Little Vince Bayous	200,000		200,000	
Transition period	250,000		250,000	
Virginia:				
(FC) Buena Vista (Phase I)		150,000		150,000
Transition period		60,000		60,000
(FC) Four Mile Run, City of Alexandria and Arlington County	6,265,000		6,265,000	
Transition period	1,900,000		1,900,000	
(FC) Gathright Lake	8,600,000		10,000,000	
Transition period	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC) Potomac Estuary Pilot Water Treatment Plant. (See District of Columbia.)				
(FC) Tug Fork Valley. (See Kentucky.)				
(FC) Verona Lake (Phase I)		350,000		350,000
Transition period		160,000		160,000
(BE) Virginia Beach (reimbursement)	230,000		230,000	
Transition period				
Washington:				
(MP) Bonneville lock and dam. (See Oregon.)				
(MP) Chief Joseph Dam additional units	52,600,000		66,600,000	
Transition period	14,500,000		20,500,000	
(N) Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, Oregon and Washington (40-ft channel). (See Oregon.)				
(BE) Ediz Hook		170,000		170,000
Transition period				
(MP) Ice Harbor additional units	2,300,000		2,300,000	
Transition period	400,000		400,000	
(MP) John Day lock and dam. (See Oregon.)				
(MP) Little Goose lock and dam, Lake Bryan	900,000		900,000	
Transition period				

51

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Washington—Continued				
(MP) Little Goose—Additional units.....	16,000,000		18,000,000	
Transition period.....	2,800,000		2,800,000	
(FC) Lower Columbia River Basin bank protection. (See Oregon.)				
(MP) Lower Granite lock and dam.....	13,100,000		13,100,000	
Transition period.....	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(MP) Lower Granite—additional units.....	14,900,000		17,900,000	
Transition period.....	2,800,000		2,800,000	
(MP) Lower Monumental lock and dam.....	950,000		950,000	
Transition period.....				
(MP) Lower Monumental—Additional units.....	4,800,000		5,800,000	
Transition period.....	2,500,000		3,500,000	
(MP) McNary lock and dam. (See Oregon.)				
(MP) The Dalles—additional units.....	700,000		700,000	
Transition period.....	300,000		300,000	
(FC) Wahkiakum County Consolidated Diking District No. 1.....	200,000		200,000	
Transition period.....	300,000		300,000	

52

(FC) Wenatchee Canyons 1 and 2.....		284,000		284,000
Transition period.....		130,000		130,000
West Virginia:				
(FC) Beech Fork Lake.....	6,800,000		8,000,000	
Transition period.....	1,500,000		1,600,000	
(FC) Bloomington Lake. (See Maryland.)				
(FC) Burnsville Lake.....	6,200,000		6,200,000	
Transition period.....	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC) Coal River Basin.....	500,000		500,000	
Transition period.....	400,000		400,000	
(FC) East Lynn Lake.....	4,700,000		4,700,000	
Transition period.....	300,000		300,000	
(N) Hannibal locks and dam. (See Ohio.)				
(FC) R. D. Bailey Lake.....	16,800,000		22,300,000	
Transition period.....	4,750,000		5,300,000	
(FC) Rowlesburg Lake.....		100,000		100,000
Transition period.....		40,000		40,000
(FC) Tug Fork Valley. (See Kentucky.)				
Wisconsin:				
(FC) Lafarge Lake and Channel improvement.....	3,000,000			
Transition period.....	1,400,000			
(N) Northport Harbor.....		100,000		100,000
Transition period.....		25,000		25,000
(FC) Prairie Du Chien.....		50,000		50,000
Transition period.....		20,000		20,000
(FC) State Road and Ebner Coulees.....		127,000		127,000
Transition period.....		80,000		80,000
Wyoming:				
(FC) Sheridan.....	600,000		600,000	
Transition period.....				

53

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1976/transition		Conference allowance for fiscal year 1976/transition	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)
Miscellaneous:				
(BE) Small Beach erosion control projects (Sec. 103)-----			500,000	
Transition period-----			300,000	
(N) Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$1,000,000 (Sec. 107)-----	1,500,000		3,000,000	
Transition period-----	500,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$1,000,000 (Sec. 205)-----	4,000,000		8,300,000	
Transition period-----	1,000,000		3,415,000	
(FC) Small snagging and clearing projects (Sec. 208)-----			450,000	
Transition period-----			100,000	
(FC) Emergency streambank and shoreline pro- tection (1974 modification—Sec. 14)-----	1,000,000		3,000,000	
Transition period-----	250,000		500,000	

54

Recreation facilities at completed projects-----	20,000,000		15,000,000	
Transition period-----	4,000,000		3,000,000	
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)-----	1,900,000		1,900,000	
Transition period-----	500,000		500,000	
Mitigation of shore damages attributable to navigation projects (Sec. 111)-----	600,000		600,000	
Transition period-----	150,000		150,000	
Streambank erosion control evaluation and demonstration (Sec. 32, 1974 Act)-----			3,000,000	
Transition period-----			1,000,000	
Shoreline erosion control (Sec. 54)-----			500,000	
Transition period-----			125,000	
Aquatic plant control (1965 Act)-----	1,600,000		1,400,000	
Transition period-----	450,000		400,000	
Employees compensation-----	2,190,000		2,190,000	
Transition period-----	600,000		600,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slip- pages-----	-62,035,000		-72,035,000	
Transition period-----	-21,165,000		-22,947,000	
Total-----	1,068,650,000	24,050,000	1,202,356,000	26,292,000
Transition period-----	353,785,000	6,215,000	402,109,000	6,632,000
Total, Construction, General FY 1976-----	(1,092,700,000)		(1,228,648,000)	
Total, Construction, General Transi- tion-----	(360,000,000)		(408,741,000)	

55

Amendment No. 13: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which reads as follows:

That not to exceed \$8,000,000 of this appropriation or from any previous appropriation under this head shall be for construction or improvement of recreation facilities at full Federal expense at projects which were completed or which received an appropriation for project construction prior to the approval of Public Law 89-72: Provided further,

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$408,741,000 for the transition quarter instead of \$408,883,000 as proposed by the House and \$401,578,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated for the transition quarter are to be allocated as shown in the above table.

Amendment No. 15: Deleted language proposed by the House which read as follows:

"None of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Corps of Engineers shall be used for the Tomahawk Lake project, Kansas.

The Senate deleted funds for this project and language is no longer necessary.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$163,250,000 for 1976 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$160,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$60,300,000 for the transition period as proposed by the Senate instead of \$59,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Within available funds the conferees are agreed that an additional \$1,450,000 in FY 1976 and \$600,000 in the transition quarter shall be available for the Larto Lake to Jonesville area, La. under the Tensas Basin.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$582,073,000 for 1976 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$576,073,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees are in agreement that O & M funds are to be provided as shown in the House and Senate reports.

REVOLVING FUND

Amendment No. 19: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate appropriating \$700,000 for 1976 and \$950,000 for the transition period. The amendment reads as follows:

"REVOLVING FUND

For the design of hopper dredges, \$700,000, to remain available until expended.

For "Revolving Fund" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, for the design and construction of hopper dredges, \$950,000, to remain available until expended."

The managers agree with the Senate report language.

SPECIAL RECREATION USE FEES

Amendment No. 20: Corrects citation

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 21: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which reads as follows:

Not to exceed \$10,000 for official reception and representation expenses;

Amendment No. 22: Provides limitation of \$248,700,000 on the capital of the revolving fund 1976 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$248,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Provides limitation of \$255,000,000 on the capital of the revolving fund for the transition period as proposed by the Senate instead of \$254,000,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISION

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate providing language as follows:

"GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 201. To enable payment of any valid claims on the Federal Government for the construction of an airport facility at Kelley Flats, Montana, section 502 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1968 (81 Stat. 773) is amended by deleting the amount "\$140,000" contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the amount "\$240,000": Provided, That this amendment shall not be construed to change any obligations which have been undertaken, in agreement with the Federal Government, by non-Federal sponsors of the airport facility to contribute to the payment of the construction costs of the facility."

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

The managers agree to the projects added in the Senate Report. Both House and Senate provided \$4,649,000 for FY 1976 and \$1,632,000 for the Atmospheric Water Resources Management Program (Project Skywater). Further, the Committee of Conference agrees

that the Bureau of Reclamation should allocate from within the amount made available, sufficient funds (estimated at approximately \$35,000) to complete the cloud seeding and cloud physics research program under a contract with the University of Wyoming.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment appropriating \$327,308,000 for 1976 instead of \$324,268,000 as proposed by the House and \$327,158,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate. The Conferees agree with the language in the Senate report relating to the Nueces River project, Texas. The changes from the Senate bill are as follows:

Miscellaneous project programs, Central Valley project, California:

New Melones-Tracy transmission line.....	+ \$100,000
Trinity River Action plan.....	+ 300,000
Southern Nevada water project, Nevada.....	+ 250,000
Canyon Ferry unit, dust abatement, Montana.....	- 500,000
Lower Marias Unit, Tiber Dam and Reservoir, Mont.....	+ 500,000

Amendment No. 26: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which reads as follows:

That not to exceed \$600,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be made available for restoration of the Scoggins Valley Road from Oregon Highway No. 47 to Henry Hagg Lake (Scoggins Dam), which shall be nonreimbursable: *Provided further,*

Amendment No. 27: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate providing language which reads as follows:

Provided further, That funds appropriated herein for the repairs to the Savage Rapids Dam, of the Rogue River Basin project, Grants Pass Division, may be transferred to the Oregon Fish and Game Commission on a reimbursable basis for such work on the South fishway facilities as determined desirable by the Secretary of the Interior

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment appropriating \$98,834,000 for the transition quarter instead of \$97,884,000 as proposed by the House and \$98,584,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amend-

ment of the House to the amendment of the Senate. The changes from the Senate bill are as follows:

	<i>Transition quarter</i>
Miscellaneous project programs, California Central Valley project:	
New Melones-Tracy transmission line.....	+ \$50,000
Trinity River Action plan.....	+ 200,000
Southern Nevada water project, Nevada.....	+ 250,000
Lower Marias Unit, Tiber Dam and Reservoir, Mont.....	+ 250,000

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate providing language which reads as follows:

: Provided further, That not to exceed \$1,400,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be made available for restoration of the Scoggins Valley Road from Oregon Highway No. 47 to Henry Hagg Lake (Scoggins Dam), which shall be nonreimbursable

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment appropriating \$41,152,000 for fiscal year 1976 instead of \$41,557,000 as proposed by the House and \$41,867,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate. The changes from the Senate bill are as follows:

Dallas Creek project, Colorado.....	+ \$400,000
Fruitland Mesa project, Colorado.....	+ 125,000
Savery-Pot Hook project, Colorado.....	+ 250,000
Jensen Unit, Central Utah project, Utah.....	+ 50,000
Fish and Wildlife facilities, San Juan-Chama project, New Mexico.....	- 1,540,000

Amendment No. 31: Provides limitation of \$38,160,000 for the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund instead of \$38,985,000 as proposed by the House and \$37,335,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Provides limitation of \$2,992,000 for construction of fish and wildlife facilities instead of \$2,572,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,532,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increases over the House amount provide for Fontenelle Reservoir and Seedskaadee Wildlife Refuge.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Amendment No. 33: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which adds language as follows:

: Provided further, That the amount appropriated herein includes \$15,394.83 for Colorado River Front Work and Levee

System due the Cocopah Indian Tribe because of a revision of the reservation boundary provided for in a decision of the Department of the Interior and a final judgment of the United States District Court

LOAN PROGRAM

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$22,665,000 for 1976 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$23,315,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$9,205,000 as proposed by the Senate for the transition period instead of \$6,155,000 as proposed by the House.

EMERGENCY FUND

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for 1976 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 37: Technical change adds "activities of the" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which reads as follows:

as specified in section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended (40 App. U.S.C. 105), which activities are hereby authorized pending the enactment of H.R. 4073, or similar authorizing legislation,

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 39: Technical change. Changes "programs authorized by" to "activities specified in" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Technical change. Insert "40 App. U.S.C. 2-405," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which reads as follows:

which activities are hereby authorized pending the enactment of H.R. 4073 or similar authorizing legislation,

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$288,200,000 instead of \$293,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$283,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Provides limitation of \$162,200,000 for 1976 instead of \$162,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$160,000,000 as proposed by the Senate for the Appalachian Highway system.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$50,000,000 for the transition period as proposed by the House instead of \$47,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Provides limitation of \$37,500,000 for the transition period as proposed by the House instead of \$35,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers are agreed that funds are provided for the mountain craft center in Tennessee, highway 56 access road in Tennessee, and the northwest extension of the Tupelo, Mississippi access road.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 46: Provides limitation of \$7,000 for official entertainment expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$215,423,000 for 1976 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$202,500,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees are agreed that a total of 2,289 permanent positions are provided to carry out the activities of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Amendment No. 48: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which read as follows:

and any moneys received by the Commission resulting from cooperative nuclear safety research programs notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the revised statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended"

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$51,425,000 for the transition quarter as proposed by the Senate instead of \$49,230,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which read as follows:

, to remain available until expended

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Amendment No. 1: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate \$100,025,000 for 1976 instead of \$99,754,000 as proposed by the House and \$91,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment appropriating \$30,550,000 for the transition quarter instead of \$27,984,000 as proposed by the House and \$28,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. The

managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following table:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

	Budget estimate		Conference action	
	Fiscal year 1976	Transition quarter	Fiscal year 1976	Transition quarter
CAPITAL OUTLAY				
Water resources development: Multipurpose facilities:				
Duck River project:				
Normandy Dam and Reservoir.....	\$6,117,000	\$211,000	\$8,417,000	\$211,000
Columbia Dam and Reservoir.....	4,400,000	1,100,000	10,400,000	2,550,000
Bear Creek multipurpose water control system.....	9,345,000	5,700,000	10,645,000	5,700,000
Tellico Dam and Reservoir.....	23,742,000	5,400,000	23,742,000	5,400,000
Additions and improvements at multipurpose dams.....	700,000	175,000	700,000	175,000
Navigation facilities:				
Railway bridge alterations at Decatur, Ala.....	2,000,000	3,600,000	2,000,000	3,600,000
Additions and improvements at navigation facilities.....	600,000	150,000	600,000	150,000
Flood control facilities:				
South Chickamauga Creek project.....	0	0	750,000	250,000
Other flood control programs.....	901,000	250,000	901,000	250,000
Recreation facilities:				
Investigations for future facilities.....	800,000	200,000	800,000	200,000
Land Between The Lakes (development).....	46,000	0	46,000	0
Fertilizer and munitions development.....	2,035,000	850,000	2,035,000	850,000
Fertilizer and munitions development.....	4,379,000	1,000,000	4,379,000	1,000,000
General service activities:				
Reno Bridge.....	16,000	0	16,000	0
Sparta water demonstration project.....	0	0	275,000	0
General facilities.....	837,000	102,000	837,000	102,000
Total, capital outlay.....	55,918,000	18,738,000	66,543,000	20,438,000
PROGRAM EXPENSES				
Water resources development.....	12,066,000	3,105,000	12,066,000	3,105,000
General resources development:				
Reclamation of orphan strip mine demonstration.....	0	0	2,600,000	350,000
Lower Elk Community development project.....	0	0	1,000,000	1,000,000
Other general resources development programs.....	9,237,000	2,137,000	9,237,000	2,137,000
Land Between the Lakes operation.....	2,650,000	710,000	2,650,000	710,000
Fertilizer and munitions development operation.....	10,037,000	2,515,000	10,037,000	2,515,000
Chemical facilities.....	1,100,000	295,000	1,100,000	295,000
General service activities.....	1,100,000	295,000	1,100,000	295,000
Total, program expenses.....	35,090,000	8,762,000	38,690,000	10,112,000
Total program.....	91,008,000	27,500,000	105,233,000	30,550,000
Unobligated balance available.....	3,208,000	0	3,208,000	0
Reduction for lapse, savings and slippage.....	0	0	2,000,000	0
Appropriations.....	87,800,000	27,500,000	100,025,000	30,550,000

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$10,722,000 for 1976 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54: Provides limitation of \$1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,396,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55: Provides limitation as proposed by the Senate which reads as follows:

\$2,765,000, for preparation of assessments and plans (42 U.S.C. 1962 d(c)),

Amendment No. 56: Provides limitation as proposed by the Senate which reads as follows:

\$303,000 for preparation of plans (33 U.S.C. 1289),

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates \$2,350,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,400,000 as proposed by the House.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1976 and the transition period recommended by the Committee of Conference with comparisons to the fiscal year 1975 amount, the 1976 and transition period budget estimates, and the House and the Senate bills for 1976 and the transition period follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975.....	\$6,194,295,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976.....	17,300,162,000
Transition period.....	12,040,630,000
House bill, fiscal year 1976.....	7,225,401,500
Transition period.....	2,100,728,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1976.....	7,489,660,500
Transition period.....	2,104,126,000
Conference agreement.....	7,440,912,500
Transition period.....	2,115,033,000
Conference agreement compared with—	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975.....	+1,246,617,500
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976.....	+140,750,000
Transition period.....	+74,403,000
House bill, fiscal year 1976.....	+215,511,000
Transition period.....	+14,305,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1976.....	-48,748,000
Transition period.....	+10,907,000

¹ Includes \$242,700,000 for fiscal year 1976 and \$47,470,000 for the transition quarter not considered by House—these requests included in H. Doc. 94-195, S. Doc. 94-84, and S. Doc. 94-112.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN M. SLACK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
TOM BEVILL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN T. MYERS,
CLAIR W. BURGNER,
E. A. CEDERBERG,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.



Ninety-fourth Congress of the United States of America

AT THE FIRST SESSION

Begun and held at the City of Washington on Tuesday, the fourteenth day of January, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-five

An Act

Making appropriations for public works for water and power development and energy research, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Energy Research and Development Administration, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, for public works for water and power development and energy research, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Energy Research and Development Administration, and related independent agencies and commissions, and for other purposes, namely :

TITLE I—ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Administration in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic and other energy information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed \$25,000); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$3,130,765,000 and any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 and the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, as amended, and fees received for tests or investigations under the Act of May 16, 1910, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2301; 50 U.S.C. 98h; 30 U.S.C. 7)) received by the Energy Research and Development Administration notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated in any other appropriation act for "Operating expenses" for the Energy Research and Development Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, shall be merged, without limitation, with this appropriation.

For "Operating expenses" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$941,507,000, to remain available until expended:

Provided, That the amount appropriated in any other appropriation act for "Operating expenses" for the Energy Research and Development Administration for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, shall be merged, without limitation, with this appropriation.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

For expenses of the Administration, as authorized by law, in connection with the purchase and construction of plant and the acquisition of capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase of not to exceed three hundred and thirty-four for replacement only, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of not to exceed two, acquisition without reimbursement of not to exceed two, and hire of aircraft; \$907,642,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in any other appropriation Act for "Plant and capital equipment" for the Energy Research and Development Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, shall be merged, without limitation, with this appropriation.

For "Plant and capital equipment," except for purchase of motor vehicles and aircraft, for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$185,776,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in any other appropriation Act for "Plant and capital equipment" for the Energy Research and Development Administration for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, shall be merged, without limitation, with this appropriation.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made available for the current fiscal year for "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred between such appropriations, but neither such appropriation, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, restudy of authorized projects, and when authorized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authorization for construction, \$66,836,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$1,500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to

the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565), to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

For "General investigations" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$17,110,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration or participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction): \$1,228,648,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$8,000,000 of this appropriation or from any previous appropriation under this head shall be for construction or improvement of recreation facilities at full Federal expense at projects which were completed or which received an appropriation for project construction prior to the approval of Public Law 89-72: *Provided further*, That \$1,900,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

For "Construction, general" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$408,741,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1), \$163,250,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than \$250,000 shall be available for bank stabilization measures as determined by the Chief of Engineers to be advisable for the control of bank erosion of streams in the Yazoo Basin, including the foothill area, and where necessary such measures shall complement similar works planned and constructed by the Soil Conservation Service and be limited to the areas of responsibility mutually agreeable to the District engineer and the State Conservationist.

For "Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$60,300,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of

H. R. 8122—4

harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation; \$582,073,000, to remain available until expended.

For "Operation and maintenance, general" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$153,116,000 to remain available until expended.

REVOLVING FUND

For the design of hopper dredges, \$700,000, to remain available until expended.

For "Revolving Fund" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, for the design and construction of hopper dredges, \$950,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For expenses necessary for emergency flood control, hurricane, and shore protection activities, as authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, as amended, \$40,400,000, to remain available until expended.

For "Flood control and coastal emergencies" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$3,750,000 to remain available until expended.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Coastal Engineering Research Center; commercial statistics; and miscellaneous investigations; \$42,500,000.

For "General expenses" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$10,650,000.

SPECIAL RECREATION USE FEES

For construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities, including collection of special recreation use fees, to remain available until expended, \$1,200,000, to be derived from the special account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601): *Provided*, That not more than 40 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for the enhancement of the fee collection system established by section 4 of such Act, including the promotion and enforcement thereof.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in the manner authorized by 5 U.S.C. 4110, uniforms, and allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; not to exceed \$10,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund,

Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed two hundred and eighteen of which two hundred and twelve shall be for replacement only), and hire of passenger motor vehicles: *Provided*, That the total capital of the revolving fund shall not exceed \$248,700,000.

For "Administrative provisions" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, appropriations in this title shall be available for expenses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in the manner authorized by 5 U.S.C. 4110, uniforms, and allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress: *Provided*, That the total capital of the revolving fund shall not exceed \$255,000,000.

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 201. To enable payment of any valid claims on the Federal Government for the construction of an airport facility at Kelley Flats, Montana, section 502 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1968 (81 Stat. 773) is amended by deleting the amount "\$140,000" contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the amount "\$240,000": *Provided*, That this amendment shall not be construed to change any obligations which have been undertaken, in agreement with the Federal Government, by non-Federal sponsors of the airport facility to contribute to the payment of the construction costs of the facility.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects, to remain available until expended, \$20,892,000: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Provided further*, That \$530,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

For "General investigations" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, to remain available until expended, \$6,794,000: *Provided*, That \$178,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations

and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565).

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$327,308,000, of which \$140,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$600,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be made available for restoration of the Scoggins Valley Road from Oregon Highway No. 47 to Henry Hagg Lake (Scoggins Dam), which shall be nonreimbursable: *Provided further*, That the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit shall not be determined until development by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of California of a plan, which shall conform with the water quality standards of the State of California as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to minimize any detrimental effect of the San Luis drainage waters: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein for the repairs to the Savage Rapids Dam, of the Rogue River Basin Project, Grants Pass Division, may be transferred to the Oregon Fish and Game Commission on a reimbursable basis for such work on the south fishway facilities as determined desirable by the Secretary of the Interior.

For "Construction and rehabilitation" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, to remain available until expended, \$98,834,000, of which \$78,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,400,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be made available for restoration of the Scoggins Valley Road from Oregon Highway No. 47 to Henry Hagg Lake (Scoggins Dam), which shall be nonreimbursable.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

For the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, as authorized by the Act of April 11, 1956, as amended (43 U.S.C. 620d), to remain available until expended, \$41,152,000, of which \$38,160,000 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of April 11, 1956, and \$2,992,000 shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities authorized by section 8 thereof, and may be expended by bureaus of the Department through or in cooperation with State or other Federal agencies, and advances to such Federal agencies are hereby authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein approved shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any national monument.

For the "Upper Colorado River storage project" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, to remain available until

H. R. 8122—7

expended, \$16,399,000 of which \$15,562,000 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado River Basin fund" authorized by section 5 of said act of April 11, 1956, and \$837,000 shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities authorized by section 8 thereof.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

For advances to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund, as authorized by section 403 of the Act of September 30, 1968 (82 Stat. 894), for the construction, operation, and maintenance of projects authorized by title III of said Act, to remain available until expended \$46,645,000, of which \$17,440,000 is for liquidation of contract authority provided by section 303(b) of said Act.

For advances to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund, as authorized by section 403 of the Act of September 30, 1968, for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, to remain available until expended, \$10,310,000 of which \$1,500,000 is for liquidation of contract authority provided by section 303(b) of said Act.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS

For construction, operation and maintenance of projects authorized by the Act of June 24, 1974, Public Law 93-320, to remain available until expended, \$19,670,000.

For "Colorado River Basin salinity control projects" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, to remain available until expended, \$7,130,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, \$132,162,000, of which \$110,110,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$3,989,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced by water users for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and such advances shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated herein includes \$15,394.83 for Colorado River Front Work and Levee System due the Cocopah Indian Tribe because of a revision of the reservation boundary provided for in a decision of the Department of the Interior and a final judgment of the United States District Court.

For "Operation and maintenance" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$34,017,000 of which \$27,950,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$978,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River Dam fund.

LOAN PROGRAM

For loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a-421d), and August 6, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a-

422k), as amended, including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, \$22,665,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any contract under the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended, not yet executed by the Secretary, which calls for the making of loans beyond the fiscal year in which the contract is entered into shall be made only on the same conditions as those prescribed in section 12 of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1197).

For "Loan program" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, to remain available until expended, \$9,205,000.

EMERGENCY FUND

For an additional amount for the "Emergency fund", as authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (43 U.S.C. 502), to remain available until expended for the purposes specified in said Act, \$1,000,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund.

For the "Emergency fund" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, to remain available until expended, \$200,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, \$21,290,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

For "General administrative expenses" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, to be derived from the reclamation fund \$5,600,000.

SPECIAL FUNDS

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the Reclamation fund, the Colorado River Dam fund, or the Colorado River development fund, are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43 U.S.C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618a) respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and Maintenance" and "General Administrative Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund from which derived.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed twenty-nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of two aircraft; payment of claims for damages to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiations and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the

reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-467): *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research under the head "General Investigations".

Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law.

No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization, or (c) of any individual when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in the payment of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Not to exceed \$225,000 may be expended from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation" for work by force account on any one project or Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program unit and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or no acceptable bid has been received and, other than otherwise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allotment for any project from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation" contained in this Act, shall be available for construction work by force account: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to work performed under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 724).

ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations to promote the development and utilization of the water, power, and related resources of Alaska, \$652,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$30,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon, as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565).

H. R. 8122—10

For "General investigations" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$198,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of projects in Alaska and of marketing electric power and energy, \$837,500.

For "Operation and maintenance" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$209,000.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93-454, are hereby specifically approved for construction of the following major transmission facilities: (a) transmission lines and related facilities to integrate generation into the main Bonneville Power Administration system from WPPSS No. 3 and No. 5 Nuclear Generating Plants near Satsop, Washington.

For the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, expenditures at a rate not greater than the quarterly rate provided for fiscal year 1976 are hereby approved.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$1,000,000.

For "Operation and maintenance" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$257,000.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$680,000, to remain available until expended.

For "Construction" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$125,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, including purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$6,000,000.

H. R. 8122—11

For "Operation and maintenance" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$1,850,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 301. Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 302. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 303. Appropriations in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency, or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686): *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials, and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 304. No part of any funds made available by this Act to the Southwestern Power Administration may be made available to any other agency, bureau, or office for any purposes other than for services rendered pursuant to law to the Southwestern Power Administration.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the activities of the Federal Cochairman and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, as specified in section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended (40 App. U.S.C. 105), which activities are hereby authorized pending the enactment of H.R. 4073 or similar authorizing legislation, \$1,830,000.

For "Salaries and expenses" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$480,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities specified in the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, 40 App. U.S.C. 2-405, except expenses authorized by section 105 of said Act,

including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, to remain available until expended, which activities are hereby authorized pending the enactment of H.R. 4073 or similar authorizing legislation, \$288,200,000, of which \$162,200,000 shall be available for the Appalachian Development Highway System, but no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for expenses in connection with commitments for contracts or grants for the Appalachian Development Highway System in excess of the total amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

For "Appalachian regional development programs" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$50,000,000, of which \$37,500,000 shall be available for the Appalachian Development Highway System.

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), \$79,000.

For "Salaries and expenses" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$19,000.

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), \$215,000.

For "Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$53,000.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$35,610,000.

For "Salaries and expenses" including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$250 for official reception and representation expenses, for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$8,558,000.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin the Federal contribution toward the expenses of the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of its business in the conservancy district established pursuant to the Act of July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 748), as amended by the Act of September 25, 1970 (Public Law 91-407), \$52,000.

For "Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin" for period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$13,000.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed \$7,000); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; \$215,423,000: *Provided*, That from this appropriation, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred.

For "Salaries and expenses" in accordance with the above provisions for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$51,425,000.

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), \$79,000.

For "Salaries and expenses" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$19,000.

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), \$150,000.

For "Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$38,000.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C., ch. 12A), including hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$100,025,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation and other funds available to the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed one aircraft for replacement only, and the purchase of not to exceed two hundred and thirty-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only.

For "Payment to the Tennessee Valley Authority fund" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$30,550,000, to remain available until expended, and include hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1962—1962d-3), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals (42 U.S.C. 1962a-4(5), and 42 U.S.C. 1962a-4(5)), and hire of passenger motor vehicles (42 U.S.C. 1962a-4(6)), \$10,722,000, to remain available until expended, including \$1,300,000, for carrying out the provisions of title I and administering the provisions of titles II, III, and IV of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1962d(b)), \$2,765,000, for preparation of assessments and plans (42 U.S.C. 1962d(c)), \$303,000, for preparation of plans (33 U.S.C. 1289), \$1,354,000, for expenses of river basin commissions under title II of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1962d(a)), and \$5,000,000 for grants to States under title III of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1962c(a)): *Provided*, That the share of the expenses of any river basin commission borne by the Federal Government pursuant to title II of the Act shall not exceed \$250,000 annually for recurring operating expenses, including the salary and expenses of the chairman.

For "Water resources planning" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, \$2,350,000.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein, except as provided by section 204 of Public Law 93-554.

Sec. 502. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for paying to the Administrator of the General Services Administration in excess of 90 per centum of the standard level user charge established pursuant to section 210(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, for space and services.

This Act may be cited as the "Public Works for Water and Power Development and Energy Research Appropriation Act, 1976".

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

*Vice President of the United States and
President of the Senate.*

December 15, 1975

Dear Mr. Director:

The following bills were received at the White House on December 15th:

✓ H.J. Res. 733 ✓
✓ H.R. 8122
✓ H.R. 8674 ✓

Please let the President have reports and recommendations as to the approval of these bills as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Linder
Chief Executive Clerk

The Honorable James T. Lynn
Director
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D. C.

