The original documents are located in Box 50, folder "1976/07/12 HR14236 Public Works for Water and Power Development and Energy Research, Appropriation Act of 1977 (2)" of the White House Records Office: Legislation Case Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

94TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 94-1297

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1977

JUNE 24, 1976.—Ordered to be printed

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

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 14236]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14236) "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 September 30, 1977, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, 24 and 25, 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 *$4,147,563,000*; 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 *$1,572,410,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$71,920,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

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

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,436,745,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16:

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

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$348,811,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

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

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$27,495,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21:

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

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$303,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

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

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$125,930,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$12,665,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

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

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 5, 12, and 17.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN M. SLACK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
TOM BEVILL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN T. MYERS,
CLAIR W. BURGENER,
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
WALTER D. HUDDLESTON,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROMAN HRUSKA,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
HENRY BELLMON,
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. 14236) 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 September 30, 1977, and for other purposes, submit the following Joint Statement of the House and the Senate in explanation of the effects of the action agreed upon by the Managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

TITLE I—ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Operating Expenses

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $4,147,563,000 for Operating expenses instead of $4,172,783,000 as proposed by the House and $4,118,186,000 as proposed by the Senate.

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

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

FISCAL YEAR 1977 BUDGET—PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION OPERATING EXPENSES BUDGET AUTHORITY

OPERATING EXPENSES BUDGET AUTHORITY

Item	Fiscal year 1977	
	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
Solar energy development:		
Direct thermal applications:		
A. Solar heating and cooling of buildings:		
1. Commercial demonstrations	$16,700,000	$33,000,000
2. Residential demonstrations	8,100,000	21,100,000
3. Research and development	10,500,000	13,700,000
4. Development in support of demonstrations	10,000,000	17,000,000
B. Agriculture process heat applications	3,900,000	7,800,000
Technology support and utilization:		
A. Solar energy resource assessment	1,500,000	6,000,000
B. Solar Energy Research Institute	1,500,000	2,500,000
C. Technology utilization and information dissemination	1,000,000	3,000,000
Solar electric applications:		
A. Solar thermal electric conversion	30,900,000	51,300,000
B. Photovoltaic energy conversion	28,200,000	59,400,000
C. Wind energy conversion	16,000,000	20,500,000
D. Ocean thermal energy conversion	9,200,000	13,500,000
Fuels from biomass	4,300,000	9,700,000
Total solar energy development	141,800,000	258,500,000

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1977 BUDGET—PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION OPERATING EXPENSES BUDGET AUTHORITY
OPERATING EXPENSES BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Item	Fiscal year 1977 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1977 Conference allowance
Geothermal energy development:		
Engineering R. & D	11, 500, 000	13, 500, 000
Resource exploration and assessment	10, 000, 000	9, 000, 000
Hydrothermal technology applications	12, 200, 000	14, 000, 000
Advanced technology applications	10, 100, 000	11, 900, 000
Environmental control and institutional studies	4, 800, 000	4, 800, 000
Total geothermal energy development	48, 600, 000	53, 200, 000
Conservation research and development:		
Electric energy systems	20, 960, 000	23, 000, 000
Energy storage	20, 840, 000	31, 000, 000
Total conservation research and development	41, 800, 000	54, 000, 000
Fusion power research and development:		
Magnetic fusion	168, 000, 000	195, 000, 000
Laser fusion	71, 400, 000	80, 000, 000
Total fusion power research and development	239, 400, 000	275, 000, 000
Fuel cycle research and development:		
Uranium resource assessment	31, 335, 000	31, 335, 000
Support of nuclear fuel cycle	56, 700, 000	56, 700, 000
Waste management (commercial)	75, 000, 000	82, 500, 000
Total fuel cycle research and development	163, 035, 000	170, 535, 000
Fission power reactor development	630, 260, 000	630, 260, 000
Environmental research and safety:		
Biomedical and environmental research	182, 916, 000	197, 316, 000
Operational safety	7, 707, 000	8, 307, 000
Environmental control technology	15, 577, 000	19, 077, 000
Reactor safety facilities	33, 300, 000	28, 300, 000
Total environmental research and safety	239, 500, 000	253, 000, 000
High energy physics	167, 500, 000	170, 000, 000
Basic energy sciences:		
Nuclear science	81, 200, 000	90, 500, 000
Material sciences	51, 100, 000	56, 400, 000
Molecular, mathematical and geosciences	50, 500, 000	50, 500, 000
Total basic energy sciences	182, 800, 000	197, 400, 000
Nuclear materials security and safeguards	25, 740, 000	27, 420, 000
Naval reactor development	191, 500, 000	191, 500, 000
Space nuclear systems	31, 000, 000	31, 000, 000
Nuclear explosives applications	1, 300, 000	1, 300, 000
Uranium enrichment activities:		
Uranium enrichment	[1] 888, 345, 000	888, 345, 000
Advanced isotope separation technology	36, 830, 000	36, 830, 000
Total uranium enrichment activities	925, 175, 000	925, 175, 000
National security:		
Weapons activities	1, 012, 005, 000	999, 500, 000
Weapons materials production	354, 635, 000	362, 735, 000
Total national security	1, 366, 640, 000	1, 362, 235, 000
Program support:		
Program direction	[1] 214, 860, 000	216, 085, 000
Supporting activities:		
Community operations	6, 415, 000	10, 507, 000
Security investigations	10, 050, 000	10, 050, 000
Information services	10, 905, 000	10, 905, 000
General systems studies	11, 000, 000	10, 000, 000
General technology transfer	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000
Manpower development	700, 000	700, 000
EEO assigned facilities	2, 075, 000	2, 075, 000
Total supporting activities	43, 145, 000	46, 327, 000
Cost of work for others	20, 100, 000	20, 100, 000
Total program support	278, 105, 000	282, 422, 000

[1] Amended budget request.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1977 BUDGET—PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION OPERATING EXPENSES BUDGET AUTHORITY
OPERATING EXPENSES BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Item	Fiscal year 1977 Budget estimate	Fiscal year 1977 Conference allowance
Change in working capital and inventories	78, 016, 000	78, 016, 000
Subtotal budget authority	4, 752, 171, 000	4, 960, 963, 000
Revenues applied:		
Enrichment revenues	−539, 100, 000	661, 900, 000
Miscellaneous revenues	−76, 000, 000	−76, 000, 000
Total revenues applied	−615, 100, 000	−737, 900, 000
Net budget authority	4, 137, 071, 000	4, 223, 063, 000
Appropriation transfer	500, 000	500, 000
Change in unobligated balances	0	−76, 000, 000
Total operating budget authority	4, 137, 571, 000	4, 147, 563, 000

The Conferees are in agreement with the language in the House Report on the Magnetic Fusion Program and with the language in the Senate Report on the Biomedical and Environmetal Research Program.

The Conferees agree that no less than $10,000,000 of the total amount for the laser fusion program is to continue the on-going research and development work at KMS during fiscal year 1977.

The Conferees are agreed that the reduction applied to the weapons program is a general reduction.

Amendment No. 2: Deletes limitation proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3: 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 making the appropriation for Operating expenses available only upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

Plant and Capital Equipment

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $1,572,410,000 for Plant and capital equipment instead of $1,525,500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,610,485,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The funds appropriated for Plant and capital equipment are allocated as shown in the following table:

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT, FISCAL YEAR 1977

Project No.	Project title	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	Conference allowance
	CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS		
	Solar Energy Development		
77-18	Solar energy facilities, various locations		$10, 000, 000
	Fusion Power Research and Development		
77-2-a	Magnetic fusion: Computer building, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, Livermore, California	$5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000
77-3-a	Laser fusion: Electron beam fusion facilities, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, N. Mex	9, 100, 000	9, 100, 000

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—Continued

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT, FISCAL YEAR 1977

Project No.	Project title	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	Conference allowance
	CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS—Continued		
	Fission Power Reactor Development		
77-4-a	Modificatons to reactors	5,000,000	5,000,000
77-4-b	Breeding nondestructive assay facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho	9,500,000	9,500,000
77-4-c	High performance Fuel Laboratory, Richland, Wash		1,500,000
77-4-d	Fuel storage facility, Richland, Wash		1,500,000
77-5-a	Computer building acquisition, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho Falls, Idaho	950,000	950,000
	Environmental Research and Safety		
77-6-a	Modifications and additions to biomedical and environmental research facilities various locations	4,200,000	3,200,000
	High-Energy Physics		
77-7-a	Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations	3,600,000	3,600,000
	Basic Energy Sciences		
77-8-a	Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	1,300,000	1,300,000
77-8-b	Expanded experimental capabilities, Bates Linear Accelerator, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Mass	5,000,000	5,000,000
77-8-c	Increased flux, high flux beam reactor, Brookhaven National Laboratory, N.Y	2,500,000	2,500,000
77-8-d	Conversion of steam plant facilities, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tenn	12,200,000	10,200,000
	Uranium Enrichment Activities		
77-9-a	Expansion of feed vaporization and sampling facilities, gaseous diffusion plants, multiple sites	9,000,000	8,000,000
77-9-b	Air and nitrogen system uprating, gaseous diffusion plant, Oak Ridge, Tenn	5,200,000	5,200,000
77-9-c	Upgrade ventilation systems, technical services building, gaseous diffusion plant, Portsmouth, Ohio	3,000,000	3,000,000
77-9-d	Centrifuge plant demonstration facility, Oak Ridge, Tenn	30,000,000	25,000,000
77-10-a	Fire protection upgrading, gaseous diffusion plants, multiple sites	8,300,000	8,300,000
77-10-b	Modifications to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act, gaseous diffusion plants, and Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald. Ohio	8,200,000	8,200,000
	National security		
	Weapons activities:		
77-11-a	Safeguards and research and development laboratory facility, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, N. Mex	3,000,000	4,000,000
77-11-b	Safeguards and site security improvements, various locations	5,700,000	5,700,000
77-11-c	8-inch artillery fired atomic projectile production facilities, various locations	12,000,000	10,000,000
77-11-d	Tritium confinement system, Savannah River, S.C	3,500,000	3,500,000
77-12-a	Fire and safety project, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, Calif	2,300,000	2,300,000
77-12-b	Life safety corridor modifications, Bendix Plant, Kansas City, Mo	3,100,000	3,100,000
77-12-c	Modifications to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tenn	6,400,000	6,400,000
77-12-d	Upgrade reliability of fire protection, Bendix Plant, Kansas City, Mo	7,800,000	7,800,000
77-12-e	Sludge disposal facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tenn	3,000,000	3,000,000
	Weapons Materials Production:		
77-13-a	Fluorinel dissolution process and fuel receiving improvements, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, (A-E and long-lead procurement)	10,000,000	10,000,000
77-13-b	Improved confinement of radioactive releases, reactor areas, Savannah River, S.C	6,000,000	6,000,000
77-13-c	Seismic protection, reactor areas, Savannah River, S.C	3,000,000	3,000,000
77-13-d	High level waste storage and waste management facilities, Savannah River, S.C	25,000,000	25,000,000
77-13-e	High level waste storage and handling facilities, Richland, Wash	18,000,000	18,000,000
77-13-f	Waste isolation pilot plant, site undesignated, (A-E, land acquisition, and long-lead procurement)	6,000,000	6,000,000
77-13-g	Safeguards and security upgrading, production facilities, multiple sites	7,700,000	7,700,000
77-13-h	Personnel protection and support facility, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho	10,500,000	10,500,000
77-14	General plant projects	74,610,000	74,610,000
77-15	Construction planning and design	7,200,000	7,200,000

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—Continued

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT, FISCAL YEAR 1977

Project No.	Project title	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	Conference allowance
	INCREASE IN PRIOR YEAR PROJECTS		
	Solar energy development		
76-2-a	5-megawatt solar thermal test facility	10,000,000	12,000,000
76-2-b	10-megawatt central receiver solar thermal powerplant (A-E and long-lead procurement)	2,500,000	2,500,000
	Fusion power research and development		
	Magnetic fusion:		
76-5-a	Tokamak fusion test reactor, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Plainsboro, N.J	80,000,000	75,000,000
76-5-b	14-Mev intense neutron source facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, N. Mex	14,400,000	14,400,000
76-5-c	14-Mev high-intensity neutron facility, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory· California	2,500,000	2,500,000
75-3-b	Laser fusion: High-energy laser facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, N. Mex	9,700,000	9,700,000
	Fission power reactor development		
67-3-a	Fast flux test facility	80,000,000	75,000,000
	High-energy physics		
75-6-c	Position-electron joint project, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory and Stanford Linear Accelerator Center	25,000,000	25,000,000
	Uranium enrichment activities		
76-8-e	Conversion of existing steam plants to coal capability, gaseous diffusion plants and Feed Materals Production Center, Fernald, Ohio	5,300,000	5,300,000
76-8-g	Enriched uranium production facilities, Portsmouth, Ohio	170,000,000	170,000,000
76-14	Safeguards and security upgrading Portsmouth, Ohio	5,350,000	5,350,000
74-1-g	Cascade uprating program, gaseous diffusion plants	161,000,000	161,000,000
71-1-f	Process equipment modifications, gaseous diffuson plants	267,800,000	267,800,000
	National security		
	Weapons activities:		
86-10-c	Phermex enhancement, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, N. Mex	4,150,000	4,150,000
76-14	Safeguards and security upgrading	7,800,000	7,800,000
71-9(1)	New plutonium recovery facility, Rocky Flats, Colo	25,300,000	23,300,000
71-9(5)	DP site plutonium processing facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, N. Mex	13,400,000	13,400,000
	Weapons materials production:		
76-8-a	Additional facilities, high level waste storage, Savannah River, S.C	26,000,000	26,000,000
76-8-b	Additional high level waste storage facilities, Richland, Wash	9,900,000	9,900,000
76-5-1-c	New waste calcining facility, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho	29,000,000	29,000,000
	General reduction, anticipated slippage		−11,675,000
	Total, fiscal year 1977 construction budget authority	1,285,960,000	1,267,285,000
	CAPITAL EQUIPMENT NOT RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION		
	Capital equipment—Obligations:		
	Solar energy development	5,700,000	7,400,000
	Geothermal energy development	1,500,000	1,500,000
	Conservation research and development: electric energy systems and energy storage	5,000,000	6,000,000
	Fusion power research and development:		
	Magnetic fusion	19,800,000	23,000,000
	Laser fusion	10,800,000	12,800,000
	Total fusion power research and development	30,600,000	35,800,000
	Fuel cycle research and development	15,600,000	14,000,000
	Fission power reactor development	49,002,000	49,002,000
	Environmental research and safety:		
	Biomedical and environmental research	10,418,000	11,418,000
	Operational safety	1,000,000	1,100,000
	Environmental control technology	560,000	560,000
	Total environmental research and safety	11,978,000	13,078,000
	High energy physics	20,800,000	21,800,000
	Basic energy sciences	15,400,000	16,400,000
	Nuclear materials security and safeguards	2,400,000	3,932,000
	Naval reactor development	6,000,000	6,000,000
	Space nuclear systems	3,200,000	3,200,000

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—Continued

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT, FISCAL YEAR 1977

Project No. Project title	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	Conference allowance
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT NOT RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION—Continued		
Uranium enrichment activities:		
Uranium enrichment	17,243,000	17,000,000
Advanced isotopes separation technology	7,000,000	7,000,000
Total uranium enrichment activities	24,243,000	24,000,000
National security:		
Weapons activities	73,100,000	70,000,000
Weapons materials production	23,691,000	29,691,000
Total national security	96,791,000	99,691,000
Program support:		
Program direction	4,325,000	4,325,000
Supporting activities: Information services	900,000	900,000
Total program support	5,225,000	5,225,000
Total program obligations	293,439,000	307,028,000
Unobligated balance brought forward		−1,903,000
Total capital equipment budget authority	293,439,000	305,125,000
Grand total, plant and capital equipment	1,579,399,000	1,572,410,000

Amendment No. 5: 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 making the appropriation for Plant and capital equipment available only upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

Geothermal Resources Development Fund

Amendment No. 6: Adds limitation on the indebtedness of the Geothermal resources development fund as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army

Corps of Engineers—Civil

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $71,920,000 for General investigations instead of $70,110,000 as proposed by the House and $72,180,000 as proposed by the Senate.

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

	General Investigations, State and project	Budget Estimate 1977	Conference Allowance 1977
	ALABAMA		
(FC)	BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON	---	50,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR	92,000	92,000
(SPEC)	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY URBAN STUDY	---	150,000
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK	50,000	50,000
(N)	WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE RIVERS	---	100,000
	ALASKA		
(N)	COOK INLET SHOALS, ALAS	41,000	41,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN ANCHORAGE	349,000	349,000
(FC)	RIVERS AND HARBORS IN ALASKA (HYDRO INTERIM)	210,000	210,000
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR	---	30,000
(FC)	SOUTHCENTRAL RAILBELT AREA	60,000	60,000
	AMERICAN SAMOA		
(N)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN AMERICAN SAMOA	50,000	50,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES (GILA DRAIN), ARIZ. & N.M.	40,000	40,000
(FC)	PHOENIX METROPOLITAN AREA	465,000	465,000
	ARKANSAS		
(FC)	LITTLE ROCK METROPOLITAN AREA	470,000	470,000
(FC)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, ARK	100,000	100,000
(FC)	PINE BLUFF METROPOLITAN AREA	242,000	242,000
(COMP)	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM (AUTH. RPT)ARK LA OKLA TEX	55,000	55,000
(C)	WHITE RIVER BASIN ARK & MO (AUTH RPT)	75,000	75,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BASIN RESERVOIRS	125,000	125,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	ALAMEDA CREEK UPPER BASIN	160,000	160,000
(FC)	ANTELOPE VALLEY	40,000	150,000
(N)	COAST OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	30,000	30,000
(FC)	EEL RIVER	50,000	50,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER	80,000	80,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR & BAY, CALIF	60,000	60,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW	100,000	100,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBORS (INC. SAN PEDRO BAY MODEL STUDY)	365,000	725,000
(N)	NORTH COAST OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF	15,000	15,000
(FC)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS	220,000	220,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR	75,000	75,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS-BANK PROTECTION AND EROSION CONTROL	---	75,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL	150,000	150,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA	200,000	200,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO VALLEY NAV, CALIF	40,000	70,000
(FC)	SALINAS RIVER INCL. PART OF SALINAS-MONTEREY METROPOLITAN AREA	420,000	420,000
(FC)	SAN DIEGO COUNTY STREAMS FLOWING INTO THE PACIFIC OCEAN	50,000	200,000
(BE)	SAN DIEGO COUNTY, VICINITY OF OCEANSIDE	70,000	125,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR & SWEETWATER RIVER, CALIF	15,000	15,000
(FC)	SAN FRAN BAY & SAC.-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, WATER QUAL & WASTE DISPOSAL	80,000	100,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA (IN-DEPTH STUDY)	270,000	270,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR & BAY (COLL & DISP DEBRIS), CALIF	25,000	25,000
(FC)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN	200,000	320,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	50,000	50,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN & ORANGE COUNTY	300,000	300,000
(FC)	SANTA CLARA RIVER	45,000	125,000
(N)	SUNSET HARBOR	30,000	30,000
(BE)	VENTURA COUNTY	75,000	75,000
(FC)	VENTURA RIVER	---	50,000
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK BASIN	20,000	20,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	METRO DENVER & SOUTH PLATTE RIVER & TRIBS, COLO., NEBR., & WYO	385,000	385,000

	General Investigations, State and project	Budget Estimate 1977	Conference Allowance 1977
	CONNECTICUT		
(COMP)	CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT CONN.,MASS.,N.H.,&VT	75,000	175,000
(N)	NEW HAVEN HARBOR	89,000	89,000
(FC)	RIPPOWAM RIVER, CONN	40,000	100,000
(BE)	SHERWOOD ISLAND STATE PARK	30,000	30,000
	DELAWARE		
(FC)	CHRISTINA RIVER BASIN	50,000	50,000
(N)	MURDERKILL AND ST. JONES RIVER	---	10,000
	DIST OF COLUMBIA		
(SPEC)	METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON, D.C. WATER SUPPLY	600,000	600,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	APALACHICOLA RIVER BELOW JIM WOODRUFF LOCK & DAM	59,000	59,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS	377,000	377,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR (MILL COVE)	40,000	40,000
(FC)	JACKSONVILLE METROPOLITAN AREA	390,000	390,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FLA	25,000	62,000
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY	---	25,000
(BE)	MONROE COUNTY	50,000	50,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY (ST LUCIE CANAL)	75,000	75,000
(N)	PENSACOLA HARBOR	---	50,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA-TALLAHASSEE METROPOLITAN & OTHER URBAN AREAS	235,000	375,000
(BE)	SAINT JOHNS COUNTY	88,000	88,000
(BE)	SHORES OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA	90,000	150,000
(BE)	VOLUSIA COUNTY SHORES	50,000	100,000
	GEORGIA		
(FC)	METRO SAVANNAH AREA, GA	100,000	100,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN ATLANTA AREA	350,000	350,000
(FC)	SATILLA RIVER BASIN	75,000	75,000
(FC)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA,NC, & SC	104,000	104,000
	GUAM		
(N)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN THE TERRITORY OF GUAM	100,000	230,000
	HAWAII		
(FC)	HARBORS AND RIVERS IN HAWAII	240,000	240,000
(N)	KANEOHE BAY AND PART OF METROPOLITAN HONOLULU	360,000	360,000
(FC)	KIHEI DISTRICT	---	75,000
(FC)	LAVA FLOW CONTROL, ISL. OF HAWAII	---	40,000
	IDAHO		
(FC)	BIG WOOD RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	142,000	142,000
(FC)	COLUMBIA RIVER & TRIBS, IDAHO, MONT., ORE., WASH., & WYO	950,000	950,000
(COMP)	PACIFIC NORTHWEST RIVER BASIN, IDAHO, MONT., ORE., & WASH	30,000	30,000
	ILLINOIS		
(FC)	CHICAGO-SOUTH END OF LAKE MICHIGAN, ILL. & IND.	280,000	280,000
(FC)	DEGOGNIA & FOUNTAIN BLUFF DRAIN & LEVEE DIST & GRAND TOWER, IL	86,000	86,000
(FC)	E.C.GIRARDEAU, CLR.CR.,N. ALEX., PRESTON, & MILLER POND D&L DIST	75,000	75,000
(FC)	FOX RIVER, ILL. & WISC	300,000	300,000
(N)	MISS RIVER YR-RND NAV, IL, MO, IA, WI, MN (FUNDS IN R.I.)	40,000	40,000
(FC)	MISS. RIVER, CASSVILLE, WISC. TO MI 300, ILL., IOWA, MO., & WISC	53,000	53,000
(FC)	MISS. RIVER, COON RAPIDS DAM TO OHIO RIVER, ILL., IOWA, & MO	124,000	124,000
(FC)	QUAD CITIES URBAN STUDY	---	75,000
(FC)	ROCK RIVER AT ROCKFORD	150,000	150,000
(N)	SALINE RIVER NAVIGATION	---	30,000
(FC)	SILVER CREEK, IL	135,000	135,000

	General Investigations, State and project	Budget Estimate 1977	Conference Allowance 1977
	INDIANA		
(FC)	COLUMBUS	85,000	85,000
(FC)	FORT WAYNE, INDIANA METROPOLITAN AREA	80,000	**120,000**
(BE)	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, LAKE MICHIGAN	50,000	80,000
(COMP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT, IND. & ILL	100,000	100,000
(N)	WABASH RIVER NAVIGATION, IND. & ILL	150,000	150,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	DES MOINES RIVER BANK EROSION, IOWA	110,000	200,000
(FC)	IOWA & CEDAR RIVERS, IOWA & MINN	150,000	150,000
(FC)	LAKE MANAWA	---	5,000
(FC)	METRO SIOUX CITY & MO. RIV, SD, NB, IA	100,000	100,000
	KANSAS		
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER, GREAT BEND, KANS. TO JOHN MARTIN DAM, COLO	170,000	170,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER, GREAT BEND, KANS. TO TULSA, OKLA	260,000	330,000
(FC)	KANSAS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	290,000	290,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE, KANSAS	40,000	40,000
(FC)	VERDIGRIS RIVER, KANS. & OKLA	225,000	225,000
	KENTUCKY		
(FC)	CLARKS RIVER BASIN	---	30,000
(N)	GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY	112,000	112,000
(N)	LOUISVILLE HARBOR, KY	30,000	30,000
(N)	LOWER CUMBERLAND & TENN RIVERS BELOW BARKLEY CANAL, KY. & TENN	180,000	180,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LEXINGTON REGION	153,000	153,000
(FC)	UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN	80,000	80,000
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY (DUPRE CUT)	50,000	50,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, ENTRANCE CHANNEL	50,000	50,000
(N)	BAYOU MANCHAC AND AMITE	---	10,000
(N)	GULF IWW-LA. SECTION, HIGH LEVEL HIGHWAY CROSSINGS	65,000	65,000
(N)	GULF IWW-TEX. SECTION, LA. & TEX	150,000	150,000
(FC)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA	160,000	160,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS-BATON ROUGE METROPOLITAN AREA	421,000	421,000
(FC)	WEST BANK MISS RIV IN VIC OF NEW ORLEANS, LA	50,000	50,000
	MAINE		
(N)	FORE RIVER CHNL, PORTLAND HBR, ME	76,000	76,000
(SPEC)	PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL STUDY	50,000	500,000
(FC)	ST. JOHN RIVER	90,000	150,000
	MARYLAND		
(FC)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN STREAMS	200,000	200,000
(FC)	BEAVER DAM CREEK AND CABIN BRANCH	---	20,000
(SPEC)	CHESAPEAKE BAY STUDY, MD. & VA	1,840,000	1,840,000
(N)	CHESAPEAKE CITY BRIDGE	---	40,000
(FC)	MONONGAHELA YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, MD PA WV.	50,000	50,000
(FC)	SMITH ISLAND	---	25,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR (DEBRIS)	52,000	102,000
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR (35 FT CHANNEL)	---	50,000
(BE)	CAPE COD EASTERLY SHORES	40,000	80,000
(FC)	HOOSIC RIVER, MASS., N.Y., & VT	40,000	40,000
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR	42,000	42,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR & RIVER (SMALL BOAT)	25,000	25,000
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS & HARBORS, MICH	80,000	80,000
(FC)	GRT LAKES,ONTARIO & ERIE,(METRO DULUTH-SUPERIOR),MI,MN,NY,OH,PA&WI	427,000	427,000
(SPEC)	GRT LAKES-ST LAWRENCE SWY. NAV SSN. EST., MI,IL,IN,MN,NY,OH,PA,WI	650,000	760,000
(N)	LITTLE GIRL'S POINT	---	70,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MICH	30,000	100,000

	General Investigations, State and project	Budget Estimate 1977	Conference Allowance 1977
(SPEC)	WATER LVLS OF THE GRT LAKES, MI,IL,IN,MN,NY,OH,PA,&WI	220,000	880,000
	MINNESOTA		
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT THE HEADWATERS OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER	100,000	150,000
(N)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI (SMALL CRAFT LOCKS), MINN. IOWA, MO., & WISC	140,000	140,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR	60,000	60,000
(FC)	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN	100,000	100,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER	40,000	40,000
	MISSOURI		
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU JACKSON METRO AREA	100,000	100,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF KANSAS CITY, MO. & KANS.	414,000	414,000
(FC)	MISS. RIVER, OLD CHANNEL MILE 111-117	---	100,000
(FC)	PLATTIN CREEK	50,000	50,000
(FC)	ST. GENEVIEVE	50,000	50,000
(N)	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO. & ILL	50,000	50,000
(FC)	ST. LOUIS METROPOLITAN AREA, MO. & ILL	165,000	165,000
	MONTANA		
(FC)	FLATHEAD AND CLARK FORK RIVER BASINS	75,000	220,000
	NEBRASKA		
(FC)	PLATTE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	75,000	75,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS	30,000	30,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	CONN. RIV. STRBK. EROS. (WILDER LK.,NH&VT TO TURNERS FALLS DAM,MA)	80,000	110,000
(BE)	NORTH AND FOSS BEACHES	40,000	40,000
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR	---	20,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(FC)	CAMDEN METROPOLITAN AREA	285,000	285,000
(FC)	DELAWARE BAY, SHORE OF NEW JERSEY	40,000	40,000
(FC)	HACKENSACK RIVER, N.J. & N.Y	115,000	115,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL CHANNEL, NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, N.J. & N.Y	35,000	35,000
(FC)	RAHWAY RIVER	146,000	146,000
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN	174,000	174,000
(FC)	THIRD RIVER	---	70,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	PECOS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES AT CARLSBAD	60,000	60,000
(FC)	PUERCO RIVER AT GALLUP	50,000	50,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE & TRIBUTARIES, N.M. & COLO	565,000	565,000
	NEW YORK		
(N)	BIG SANDY CREEK MEXICO BAY	50,000	50,000
(FC)	DELAWARE RIVER TRIBUTARIES IN NEW YORK STATE	50,000	50,000
(N)	GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, NY	40,000	40,000
(N)	GREAT LAKES TO HUDSON RIVER WATERWAY	50,000	50,000
(FC)	IRONDEQUOIT CREEK, NY	40,000	40,000
(FC)	MORRISONVILLE AND VICINITY, NY	30,000	30,000
(N)	OGDENSBURG HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
(FC)	OSWEGO RIVER BASIN	464,000	464,000
(N)	ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY, ADDITIONAL LOCKS	200,000	250,000
(COMP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT, N.Y., PA., & MD	400,000	400,000
(FC)	UPPER ALLEGHENY RIVER BASIN, NY & PA	50,000	50,000
(FC)	WALLKILL RIVER, N.Y. & N.J	50,000	50,000
(FC)	WESTCHESTER COUNTY STREAMS, NY AND BYRAM RIVER, CT	160,000	180,000

	General Investigations, State and project	Budget Estimate 1977	Conference Allowance 1977
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(BE)	BOGUE BANKS AND BOGUE INLET, N. C	60,000	60,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET	48,000	48,000
(FC)	LUMBER RIVER, NC & SC	35,000	35,000
(FC)	NEUSE RIVER	75,000	75,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER (SOUTH BOSTON & VICINITY), N.C. & VA	85,000	85,000
(FC)	SUGAR CREEK BASIN, N.C. & S.C	230,000	230,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, N.D. & MINN	335,000	335,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY	110,000	110,000
(FC)	CUYAHOGA RIVER BASIN	130,000	130,000
(SPEC)	LAKE ERIE-WASTEWATER MGMT. (SEC. 108A,PL 92-500),OH,MICH.,N.Y.,PA	770,000	770,000
(FC)	MIAMI RIVER, LITTLE MIAMI RIVER & MILL CR, OHIO	100,000	100,000
(FC)	MILTON DAM AND RESERVOIR	---	25,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER BASIN	50,000	50,000
(N)	OHIO PORT DEVELOPMENT, OHIO	50,000	50,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	CANADIAN RIVER & TRIBUTARIES OK TX NM	100,000	200,000
(FC)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE	45,000	45,000
(FC)	TULSA URBAN STUDY	170,000	400,000
	OREGON		
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, ORE & WASH	82,000	82,000
(FC)	PORTLAND-VANCOUVER METROPOLITAN AREA	358,000	620,000
(FC)	SILVIES RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	131,000	131,000
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR	10,000	80,000
(COMP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT, OREGON	92,000	92,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(FC)	BEAVER RIVER BASIN, PA. & OH	250,000	250,000
(FC)	CHESTER CREEK WATERSHED	70,000	70,000
(FC)	POTOMAC RIVER, NORTH BRANCH (MINE DRAINAGE),PA., MD., & W. VA	250,000	250,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE-HYDRO STUDY	138,000	138,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER REVIEW	50,000	50,000
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, MINE DRAINAGE, PA., MD., & N.Y	137,000	137,000
	RHODE ISLAND		
(FC)	PAWCATUCK RIV & NARRAGANSETT BAY DRAIN. BASIN,. R.I.,MASS.&CONN	599,000	800,000
(N)	PROVIDENCE HARBOR (DEBRIS)	39,000	39,000
(N)	SAKONNET HARBOR	---	30,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(BE)	FOLLY BEACH	25,000	50,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR	42,000	42,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER, S.D., MONT., NEBR. & N.D	81,000	81,000
(FC)	UPPER BIG SIOUX RIVER & EASTERN SD WATER SUPPLY, SD & IA	140,000	140,000
	TENNESSEE		
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF MEMPHIS	196,000	196,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE	300,000	300,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK AND TRIBS	---	75,000
(FC)	BRAZOS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	236,000	236,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	70,000	110,000
(FC)	COLORADO RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	180,000	200,000
(N)	COLORADO RIVER CHANNEL TO BAY CITY	50,000	100,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, HARBOR ISLAND	150,000	150,000

	General Investigations, State and project	Budget Estimate 1977	Conference Allowance 1977
(N)	GALVESTON BAY AREA NAV. STUDY	105,000	150,000
(BE)	GALVESTON COUNTY SHORE EROSION	100,000	315,000
(FC)	JOHNSON CREEK	154,000	154,000
(FC)	LINNVILLE BAYOU & CANEY CREEK, TRES PALACIOS	65,000	65,000
(FC)	LOWER SABINE RIVER, TEX	100,000	250,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL	---	40,000
(FC)	NUECES RIVER AND TRIBS	---	50,000
(FC)	PALO BLANCO CREEK AND CIBOLO CREEK IN VICINITY OF FALFURRIAS	---	50,000
(N)	SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY	95,000	95,000
(FC)	SAN DIEGO CREEK	45,000	45,000
(FC)	SAN JACINTO RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	75,000	100,000
(SPEC)	TEXAS COAST HURRICANE, TEX	310,000	400,000
	UTAH		
(FC)	COLO. RIV & TRIBS, ABOVE LEE FERRY, UTAH,ARIZ.,COL.,N.M.&WY	30,000	30,000
(FC)	JORDAN RIVER BASIN	50,000	50,000
	VIRGIN ISLANDS		
(FC)	VIRGIN ISLANDS (CROWN BAY)	60,000	60,000
	VIRGINIA		
(FC)	CHOWAN RIVER, VA. & N.C.	200,000	200,000
(N)	HAMPTON ROADS DRIFT REMOVAL	---	50,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR & CHANNELS (ANCHORAGES)	50,000	50,000
(BE)	NORFOLK VICINITY OF WILLOUGHBY SPIT	---	25,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER, UPPER BASIN	90,000	90,000
	WASHINGTON		
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	100,000	150,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN SPOKANE & SPOKANE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, WASH. & IDAHO	55,000	55,000
(FC)	OKANOGAN RIVER & TRIBS	80,000	80,000
(COMP)	PUGET SOUND & ADJACENT WATERS AUTH REPORT, WASH	150,000	200,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, ELLIOTT BAY, WASH	63,000	63,000
(N)	SNOHOMISH RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	142,000	142,000
(FC)	YAKIMA VALLEY, REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT	80,000	150,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	GAULEY RIVER	280,000	280,000
(FC)	ISLAND CREEK	---	50,000
(COMP)	KANAWHA RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT,W.VA., N.C., & VA.	200,000	200,000
(FC)	METRO REGION OF HUNTINGTON, W.VA.(ASHLAND, KY. PORTSMOUTH, OHIO)	450,000	450,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF WHEELING, W.VA. & OHIO	220,000	220,000
	WISCONSIN		
(FC)	CHIPPEWA RIVER	100,000	100,000
(N)	HARBORS BETWEEN KENOSHA & KEWAUNEE	120,000	120,000
(FC)	WISCONSIN RIVER PORTAGE	---	40,000
	Total, ALL STATES	33,625,000	40,420,000
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	3,100,000	3,000,000
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS:		
	RESTUDIES OF DEFERRED PROJECTS	75,000	1/ 145,000
	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECTS (SEC. 216, PL 91-611)	720,000	720,000
	REVIEW FOR DEAUTHORIZTION (SEC. 12, PL 93-251)	375,000	375,000
	Total	1,170,000	1,240,000

General Investigations, State and project	Budget Estimate 1977	Conference Allowance 1977
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA:		
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	465,000	465,000
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	280,000	280,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE STUDIES (USF & WS)	2,000,000	2,000,000
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	300,000	300,000
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	10,000,000	10,000,000
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	290,000	290,000
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	125,000	125,000
COASTAL DATA COLLECTION	400,000	300,000
Total	13,860,000	13,760,000
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	12,500,000	13,500,000
Total, GEN INVESTIGATIONS	64,255,000	71,920,000

1/ Includes $70,000 for Kaunakakai Deep Draft Harbor, Hawaii

Amendment No. 8: Provides limitation of $2,000,000 for transfer to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,800,000 as proposed by the House.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $1,436,745,000 for Construction, general, instead of $1,416,477,000 as proposed by the House and $1,436,759,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Conferees agree that not to exceed $1,500,000, within available funds, may be used, if needed, for the relocation of Route 209 at the Tocks Island project, Pennsylvania.

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

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Construction	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Planning	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Construction	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Planning
	ALABAMA				
(N)	JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD LOCK & DAM (REHAB).....	591,000	---	591,000	---
(MP)	JONES BLUFF LOCK AND DAM.....	1,700,000	---	4,000,000	---
(N)	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, ALA. & MISS.....	84,000,000	---	104,000,000	---
	ALASKA				
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, FAIRBANKS.....	24,000,000	---	24,000,000	---
(MP)	SNETTISHAM.....	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
	ARIZONA				
(FC)	INDIAN BEND WASH.....	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---
(FC)	PHOENIX AND VICINITY (INCLUDING NEW RIVER) STAGE 1.....	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	PHOENIX AND VICINITY (INCLUDING NEW RIVER) STAGE 2.....	---	394,000	---	394,000
	ARKANSAS				
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE.....	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE.....	896,000	---	896,000	---
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE.....	682,000	---	682,000	---
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK. RIVER NAV SYSTEM, LOCKS & DAMS,ARK. AND OKLA.....	2,247,000	---	2,247,000	---
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE - HIGHWAY BRIDGE.....	---	625,000	---	625,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE - UNITS 3 & 4.....	---	470,000	---	470,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, ARK. & LA.....	3,700,000	---	7,000,000	---
(FC)	PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE.....	---	365,000	---	365,000
(FC)	POSTEN BAYOU.....	---	75,000	---	75,000
(FC)	RED RIVER LEVEES AND BANK STAB BELOW DENISON DAM, ARK., LA. & TEX.....	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK, JACKSON AND LAWRENCE COUNTIES...	---	100,000	---	100,000
	CALIFORNIA				
(N)	BODEGA BAY.....	---	115,000	---	115,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM-H.V. EASTMAN LAKE.....	2,060,000	---	2,760,000	---
(FC)	BUTLER VALLEY DAM-BLUE LAKE.....	---	---	---	351,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD CREEK.....	---	---	---	370,000
(FC)	CUCAMONGA CREEK.....	5,100,000	---	7,000,000	---
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL.....	3,300,000	---	750,000	---
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM-HENSLEY LAKE.....	1,901,000	---	2,101,000	---

(N)	HUMBOLT HARBOR AND BAY.....	---	---	500,000	---
(BE)	IMPERIAL BEACH.....	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FC)	LYTLE AND WARM CREEKS.....	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	---
(MP)	MARYSVILLE LAKE.....	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS.....	---	650,000	---	650,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER BASIN.....	6,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE.....	59,000,000	---	64,000,000	---
(N)	PORT SAN LUIS.....	---	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION.....	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, CHICO LANDING TO RED BLUFF...	---	---	1,500,000	---
(BE)	SAN DIEGO (SUNSET CLIFFS) (SEG. A).....	---	75,000	---	100,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR.....	9,030,000	---	7,480,000	---
(N)	SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY.....	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FC)	SAN DIEGO RIVER(MISSION VALLEY).....	---	240,000	---	100,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON (J.F. BALDWIN & STOCKTON SHIP CHANS).....	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER.....	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK.....	---	---	400,000	---
(BE)	SURFSIDE-SUNSET AND NEWPORT BEACH.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER.....	200,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK.....	5,800,000	---	5,800,000	---
(FC)	WILDCAT SAN PABLO CREEKS.....	---	---	---	200,000
	COLORADO				
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ABOVE JOHN MARTIN DAM (PHASE I).....	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE.....	12,500,000	---	12,500,000	---
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE.....	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---
(FC)	LAS ANIMAS.....	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE.....	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---
	CONNECTICUT				
(FC)	DANBURY.....	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---
(FC)	NEW LONDON HURRICANE BARRIER.....	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	PARK RIVER.....	9,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
	DELAWARE				
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION.....	---	---	500,000	---
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
	POTOMAC ESTUARY PILOT WATER TREATMENT PLANT....	---	---	1,000,000	---
	FLORIDA				
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA.....	6,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
(FC)	DADE COUNTY.....	---	---	2,800,000	---
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY.....	---	---	3,900,000	---

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Construction	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Planning	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Construction	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Planning
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS	5,000,000	---	8,000,000	---
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR (1965 ACT)	7,868,000	---	5,368,000	---
(BE)	MANATEE COUNTY	---	---	---	50,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR	600,000	---	600,000	---
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	SAINT LUCIE INLET	---	45,000	---	45,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR (MAIN CHANNEL)	5,000,000	---	8,500,000	---
	GEORGIA				
(MP)	CARTERS LAKE	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE (FIFTH UNIT)GA & SC	---	210,000	---	210,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA. & S.C.	10,300,000	---	10,300,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXTENSION	---	---	---	200,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR (WIDENING AND DEEPENING)	1,986,000	---	1,986,000	---
(MP)	WEST POINT LAKE, GA. & ALA	5,000,000	---	6,500,000	---
	HAWAII				
(N)	BARBERS POINT (DEEP DRAFT) HARBOR, OAHU	---	36,000	---	36,000
(FC)	IAO STREAM	---	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	KANEOHE-KAILUA AREA	8,200,000	---	8,200,000	---
(N)	WAIANAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR	---	---	1,000,000	---
	IDAHO				
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---
(FC)	RIRIE LAKE	6,800,000	---	6,800,000	---
	ILLINOIS				
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE	1,020,000	---	1,020,000	---
(FC)	COLUMBIA DRAINAGE & LEVEE DIST. NO. 3	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FC)	EAST MOLINE	---	---	400,000	---
(FC)	ELDRED & SPANKEY DRAINAGE & LEVEE DISTRICT	---	---	---	100,000
(FC)	FREEPORT	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	FULTON	---	---	400,000	---
(FC)	HARRISONVILLE & IVY LANDING DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT NO. 2	2,189,000	---	2,189,000	---
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, CALUMET-SAG MODIFICATION PART I, ILL. & IND.	2,259,000	---	2,259,000	---
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, DUPLICATE LOCKS, ILL. AND IND.	---	130,000	---	---
(FC)	KASKASKIA ISLAND DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION	5,000,000	---	5,800,000	---

(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 53 (TEMPORARY LOCK), ILL. & KY.	8,800,000	---	8,800,000	---
(FC)	LOUISVILLE LAKE	---	150,000	---	150,000
(N)	MISS. RIVER, CHAIN OF ROCKS, ILL & MO.	---	---	500,000	---
(N)	MISS RI BTWN THE OHIO & MO RIVERS (REGULATING WORKS), ILL. & MO.	3,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
(FC)	MOLINE	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	ROCK ISLAND	220,000	---	220,000	---
(FC)	ROCKFORD	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---
(N)	SMITHLAND LOCKS AND DAM, ILL., IND. & KY.	34,000,000	---	39,000,000	---
(FC)	SNY ISLAND LEVEE AND DRAINAGE	---	---	---	50,000
(FC)	SOUTH BELOIT	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT	---	100,000	---	100,000
	INDIANA				
(FC)	BIG BLUE LAKE	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	BIG WALNUT LAKE (LAND ACQUISITION)	1,400,000	---	450,000	---
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE	1,740,000	---	1,740,000	---
(N)	CANNELTON LOCKS AND DAMS, IND. & KY.	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	EVANSVILLE	1,400,000	---	1,200,000	---
(FC)	LAFAYETTE LAKE	1,300,000	---	---	---
(FC)	LEVEE UNIT NO. 5	750,000	---	750,000	---
(FC)	MARION	---	175,000	---	175,000
(FC)	MASON J. NIBLACK LEVEE (PUMPING FACILITIES)	103,000	---	103,000	---
(N)	NEWBURGH LOCKS & DAM, IND. & KY.	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE	11,300,000	---	10,000,000	---
(N)	UNIONTOWN LOCKS AND DAM, IND. & KY.	2,200,000	---	1,700,000	---
	IOWA				
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER AT SIOUX CITY, IOWA AND S.D.	1,700,000	---	1,700,000	---
(FC)	CLINTON	7,400,000	---	7,400,000	---
(FC)	DAVENPORT	---	139,000	---	139,000
(FC)	MARSHALLTOWN	1,639,000	---	1,359,000	---
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IOWA, KANSAS, MISSOURI, AND NEBRASKA	3,200,000	---	3,200,000	---
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER, SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IOWA, KANS., MO., & NEB.	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---
(FC)	OTTUMWA	101,000	---	101,000	---
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE	3,500,000	---	4,600,000	---
(FC)	WATERLOO	6,100,000	---	6,100,000	---
	KANSAS				
(FC)	BIG HILL LAKE	500,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE	6,550,000	---	6,550,000	---
(FC)	DODGE CITY	2,380,000	---	174,000	---
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE	15,800,000	---	15,800,000	---
(FC)	GREAT BEND	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	GROVE LAKE	---	---	500,000	---

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Construction	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Planning	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Construction	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Planning
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE	8,000,000	---	9,000,000	---
(FC)	KANSAS CITY 1962 MODIFICATION	3,800,000	---	3,800,000	---
(N)	KANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION	---	140,000	---	140,000
(FC)	LAWRENCE	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---
(FC)	MARION	1,300,000	---	2,168,000	---
(FC)	ONAGA LAKE	---	137,000	---	137,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE AREA (ROAD IMPROVEMENTS)	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	TOWANDA LAKE	---	---	---	100,000
	KENTUCKY				
(FC)	BIG SOUTH FORK NATIONAL RIVER AND RECREATION AREA, KY. & TENN	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	BOONE COUNTY	---	---	367,000	---
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE	1,900,000	---	2,900,000	---
(FC)	DAYTON FLOODWALL	---	---	150,000	---
(FC)	KEHOE LAKE	3,000,000	---	3,375,000	---
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE	3,200,000	---	3,200,000	---
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE	6,500,000	---	6,500,000	---
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE	3,300,000	---	3,300,000	---
(FC)	SOUTHWESTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY	4,800,000	---	6,300,000	---
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE	5,300,000	---	5,300,000	---
(FC)	TUG FORK VALLEY (PHASE I)	---	150,000	---	150,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND (REHAB)	22,000,000	---	26,000,000	---
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE	3,800,000	---	3,800,000	---
	LOUISIANA				
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU AND TRIBUTARIES	400,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY	12,000,000	---	12,000,000	---
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS, VENICE,LA	2,810,000	---	2,810,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE	5,600,000	---	5,600,000	---
(N)	OVERTON-RED RIVER WATERWAY (LOWER 31 MILES ONLY)	1,645,000	---	1,645,000	---
(N)	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, LA., ARK., OKLA., & TEX	2,326,000	---	5,000,000	---
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, LA	11,200,000	---	16,200,000	---
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, SHREVEPORT, LA. TO INDEX, ARK	---	---	---	100,000

	MAINE				
(MP)	DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL LAKES	---	500,000	---	2,000,000
	MARYLAND				
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS	---	280,000	---	280,000
(FC)	BLOOMINGTON LAKE, MD. & W.VA	11,800,000	---	14,400,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER DAM	9,930,000	---	10,500,000	---
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATL STORAGE AREAS (LA)	---	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	NORTH NASHUA RIVER	---	160,000	---	160,000
(FC)	SAXONVILLE	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(N)	WEYMOUTH-FORE AND TOWN RIVERS	2,470,000	---	2,470,000	---
	MICHIGAN				
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	LEXINGTON HARBOR	403,000	---	403,000	---
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR	---	---	800,000	---
(N)	OTTAWA RIVER HARBOR, MICH. & OHIO	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	RED RUN DRAIN AND LOWER CLINTON RIVER	---	650,000	---	650,000
(FC)	RIVER ROUGE 1962 ACT	2,959,000	---	2,959,000	---
(FC)	SAGINAW RIVER 1958 ACT	4,050,000	---	4,050,000	---
(N)	TAWAS BAY HARBOR	800,000	---	800,000	---
	MINNESOTA				
(FC)	BIG STONE LAKE - WHETSTONE RIVER, MINN. & S.D.	1,900,000	---	1,900,000	---
(FC)	MANKATO AND NORTH MANKATO	7,200,000	---	7,200,000	---
(FC)	ROCHESTER (PHASE I)	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	ROSEAU RIVER	3,600,000	---	3,600,000	---
(FC)	TWIN VALLEY LAKE	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	WINONA	---	364,000	---	364,000
	MISSISSIPPI				
(FC)	EDINBURG LAKE (PHASE I)	---	75,000	---	75,000
(FC)	TALLAHALA CREEK LAKE	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MISS. & ALA	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL,KANSAS CITY	---	500,000	---	500,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND RESERVOIR	40,000,000	---	44,000,000	---
(MP)	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	73,500,000	---	79,000,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER CHANNEL	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE	3,880,000	---	3,880,000	---
(FC)	MERAMEC PARK LAKE	4,500,000	---	9,500,000	---
(FC)	PERRY COUNTY D&LD NO.1,2&3	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	PINE FORD LAKE	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	PROSPERITY LAKE (PHASE I)	---	---	---	75,000

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Construction	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Planning	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Construction	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Planning
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE	15,700,000	---	16,700,000	---
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FC)	UNION LAKE, STATE HIGHWAY 185 (ADVANCE PARTICIPATION)	700,000	---	700,000	---
	MONTANA				
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA	6,000,000	---	8,000,000	---
(MP)	LIBBY REREGULATING DAM POWER UNITS	---	260,000	---	260,000
(MP)	LIBBY ADDTL UNITS & REREG DAM	---	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	MILES CITY	---	85,000	---	85,000
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES	1,100,000	---	550,000	---
	NEVADA				
(FC)	GLEASON CREEK DAM (CHANNEL ALTERNATIVE)	---	75,000	---	75,000
	NEW JERSEY				
(N)	CORSON INLET-LUDLAM BEACH	---	197,000	---	197,000
(FC)	ELIZABETH	1,780,000	---	1,780,000	---
(N)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH	---	142,000	---	142,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK, AND PASSAIC RIVERS	980,000	---	980,000	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE	3,300,000	---	3,900,000	---
(FC)	LOS ESTEROS LAKE	7,800,000	---	7,800,000	---
	NEW YORK				
(FC)	DANSVILLE AND VICINITY	---	100,000	---	100,000
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR	---	180,000	---	180,000
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY (PART I)	1,200,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	ELLICOTT CREEK	---	240,000	---	240,000
(FC)	ENDICOTT, JOHNSON CITY & VESTAL	---	---	1,000,000	---
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET	1,780,000	---	1,780,000	---
(N)	IRONDEQUOIT BAY	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	ITHACA	105,000	---	105,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT	790,000	---	2,500,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, ANCHORAGES	2,340,000	---	2,340,000	---
(N)	PORT ONTARIO HARBOR	---	150,000	---	240,000
(FC)	SAWMILL AT ELMSFORD AND GREENBURGH, N.Y.	---	---	---	60,000
(FC)	SCAJAQUADA CREEK	---	---	400,000	---

(FC)	WELLSVILLE	420,000	---	420,000	---
(FC)	YONKERS	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE	11,000,000	---	12,000,000	---
(FC)	FALLS LAKE	6,800,000	---	8,000,000	---
(FC)	HOWARDS MILL LAKE	---	50,000	---	25,000
(N)	MASONBORO INLET	---	---	250,000	---
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR (1970 ACT)	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	RANDLEMAN LAKE	---	250,000	---	100,000
(FC)	REDDIES RIVER LAKE	---	125,000	---	75,000
(FC)	ROARING RIVER LAKE (PHASE I)	---	185,000	---	185,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	BURLINGTON DAM	---	690,000	---	930,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM - LAKE SAKAKAWEA	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	KINDRED LAKE	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	MINOT	6,082,000	---	6,082,000	---
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER, GARRISON DAM TO LAKE OAHE	800,000	---	800,000	---
	OHIO				
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR	1,900,000	---	1,900,000	---
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE	6,100,000	---	6,100,000	---
(FC)	CHILLICOTHE	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	CUYAHOGA RIVER BASIN	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	EAST FORK LAKE	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	---
(N)	HURON HARBOR	---	---	2,000,000	---
(BE)	LAKEVIEW PARK	---	---	1,260,000	---
(FC)	MILL CREEK	1,400,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (REHAB)	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	NEWARK (LOG POND RUN)	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	POINT PLACE	---	90,000	---	90,000
(N)	WEST HARBOR	---	---	---	65,000
(N)	WILLOW ISLAND LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO & W. VA.	900,000	---	900,000	---
	OKLAHOMA				
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE	---	428,000	---	428,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL, OKLA., KANS., & TEX	---	1,850,000	---	2,400,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE	1,900,000	---	2,850,000	---
(FC)	CANDY LAKE	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	CLAYTON LAKE	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	COPAN LAKE	7,000,000	---	9,000,000	---
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE - UNITS 5 & 6	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE	4,600,000	---	6,000,000	---
(FC)	LUKFATA LAKE	500,000	---	500,000	---

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Construction	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Planning	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Construction	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Planning
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	---
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE	2,500,000	---	5,500,000	---
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE	21,000,000	---	21,000,000	---
	OREGON				
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	BEAVER DRAINAGE DISTRICT	1,399,000	---	1,399,000	---
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE - ORE. & WASH.	48,000,000	---	48,000,000	---
(N)	COOS BAY	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE	871,000	---	871,000	---
(FC)	DAYS CREEK LAKE (PHASE I)	---	100,000	---	500,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM - LAKE UMATILLA, ORE. & WASH.	3,100,000	---	3,100,000	---
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE	7,500,000	---	7,500,000	---
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BANK PROTECTION, ORE. & WASH.	300,000	---	300,000	---
(MP)	MC NARY LOCK AND DAM, LAKE WALLULA, ORE & WASH	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	SCAPPOOSE DRAINAGE DISTRICT	2,880,000	---	2,880,000	---
(MP)	STRUBE LAKE AND COUGAR ADDITIONAL UNIT	---	---	---	150,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION	450,000	---	1,000,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FC)	BLUE MARSH	13,569,000	---	13,569,000	---
(FC)	CHARTIERS CREEK	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE	12,600,000	---	15,600,000	---
(N)	ELK CREEK HARBOR	---	---	---	185,000
(N)	GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM	---	170,000	---	170,000
(N)	POINT MARION LOCK	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	POTTSTOWN	---	150,000	---	150,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA	750,000	---	750,000	---
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE	2,400,000	---	2,400,000	---
(FC)	TAMAQUA	---	---	---	50,000
(FC)	TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES	35,500,000	---	40,000,000	---
(MP)	TOCKS ISLAND LAKE	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	TREXLER DAM	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	TYRONE	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS	6,250,000	---	6,250,000	---

	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(FC)	BROADWAY LAKE	---	---	---	90,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
(BE)	HUNTING ISLAND BEACH	1,194,000	---	1,194,000	---
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, S.C. & N.C.	---	227,000	---	227,000
(N)	MURRELLS INLET	---	---	800,000	---
	TENNESSEE				
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR	1,761,000	---	1,761,000	---
	TEXAS				
(FC)	ALPINE	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE	1,400,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL, AREA VIII	3,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
(FC)	AUBREY LAKE	1,000,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	BIG PINE LAKE	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	BIG SPRING	---	110,000	---	110,000
(FC)	CARL L. ESTES DAM AND LAKE	---	500,000	---	300,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK	---	140,000	---	200,000
(FC)	CLOPTON CROSSING LAKE (PHASE I)	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS	1,260,000	---	1,260,000	---
(BE)	CORPUS CHRISTI BEACH	700,000	---	1,179,000	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	3,100,000	---	3,100,000	---
(FC)	EL PASO	2,300,000	---	2,300,000	---
(FC)	FREEPORT AND VICINITY, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR	---	121,000	---	121,000
(N)	GIWW-HARBOR OF REFUGE AT SEADRIFT	---	38,000	---	38,000
(N)	GIWW-TEXAS SECTION - RELOCATION IN MATAGORDA BAY	---	75,000	---	75,000
(FC)	HIGHLAND BAYOU	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
(FC)	LAKEVIEW LAKE	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	LAVON LAKE MOD, & EAST FORK CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	1,900,000	---	4,100,000	---
(FC)	LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN (PHASE I)	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	MILLICAN LAKE	---	435,000	---	435,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER	---	60,000	---	100,000
(FC)	PLAINVIEW	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	PORT ARTHUR & VICINITY (HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION)	4,300,000	---	4,300,000	---
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	3,500,000	---	3,500,000	---
(FC)	SAN GABRIEL RIVER	10,500,000	---	10,500,000	---
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	TENNESSEE COLONY LAKE (LAND ACQUISITION)	---	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL INDUSTRIAL CANAL	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	TEXAS CITY & VICINITY (HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION)	600,000	---	600,000	---

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Construction	Budget Estimate FY 1977 Planning	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Construction	Conference Allowance FY 1977 Planning
(FC)	THREE RIVERS	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	TRINITY RIVER PROJECT	---	800,000	---	800,000
(FC)	VINCE AND LITTLE VINCE BAYOUS	945,000	---	945,000	---
	VIRGINIA				
(FC)	BUENA VISTA (PHASE I)	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	FOURMILE RUN, CITY OF ALEXANDRIA AND ARLINGTON COUNTY	8,300,000	---	10,000,000	---
(FC)	GATHRIGHT LAKE	11,500,000	---	11,500,000	---
(FC)	VEKONA LAKE (PHASE I)	---	240,000	---	240,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH (REIMB)	260,000	---	260,000	---
	WASHINGTON				
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM ADDITIONAL UNITS	78,000,000	---	78,000,000	---
(BE)	EDIZ HOOK	---	---	2,000,000	---
(MP)	ICE HARBOR ADDITIONAL UNITS	2,100,000	---	2,100,000	---
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE ADDITIONAL UNITS	24,600,000	---	25,075,000	---
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE ADDITIONAL UNITS	21,900,000	---	21,900,000	---
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM	11,000,000	---	11,475,000	---
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL ADDITIONAL UNITS	19,900,000	---	19,900,000	---
(FC)	SKAGIT RIVER LEVEE	---	---	---	100,000
(MP)	THE DALLES ADDITIONAL UNITS	300,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	VANCOUVER LAKE AREA	---	---	---	200,000
(FC)	WAHKIAKUM COUNTY CONSOLIDATED DIKING DISTRICT NO. 1	600,000	---	600,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	---
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE	6,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	R.D. BAILEY LAKE	7,500,000	---	10,300,000	---
(FC)	ROWLESBURG LAKE	---	145,000	---	145,000
	WISCONSIN				
(FC)	LAFARGE LAKE AND CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	NORTHPORT HARBOR	---	125,000	---	125,000
(FC)	PRAIRIE DU CHIEN	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES	---	300,000	---	300,000
	MISCELLANEOUS				
(N)	SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION COSTING UP TO $1,000,000 (SEC. 107)	---	---	4,500,000	---
(FC)	SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND RELATED PURPOSES NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION COSTING UP TO $1,000,000 (SEC. 205)	---	---	13,000,000	---
(BE)	SMALL BEACH EROSION PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION COSTING UP TO $1,000,000 (SEC 103)	---	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	---	---	2,000,000	---
	RECREATION FACILITIES AT COMPLETED PROJECTS	22,000,000	---	22,000,000	---
	SMALL SNAGGING AND CLEARING (SEC. 208)	---	---	500,000	---
	FISH AND WILDLIFE STUDIES (U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE)	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES ATTRIBUTIBLE TO NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SEC. 111)	---	---	1,000,000	---
	STREAMBANK EROSION CONTROL EVALUATION AND DEMONSTRATION (SEC. 32, 1974 ACT)	---	---	3,000,000	---
	SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEMONSTRATION (SEC. 54, 1974 ACT)	---	---	1,500,000	---
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT)	1,600,000	---	2,300,000	---
	EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION	2,108,000	---	2,108,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGES	-79,640,000	---	80,300,000	---
	Total,	1,244,049,000	22,283,000	1,409,756,000	26,989,000
	Total, CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL	(1,266,332,000)		(1,436,745,000)	

Amendment No. 10: Deletes earmarking language proposed by the House which is no longer needed.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $231,497,000 for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries as proposed by the Senate instead of $227,667,000 as proposed by the House.

REVOLVING FUND

Amendment No. 12: 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 appropriates $6,600,000 for design and construction of hopper dredges.

The Committee of Conference is agreed that provided the dredging industry is capable of performing the service within the procedures prescribed by the Corps of Engineers under the testing of the market program, which gives private industry up to a 25 percent cost differential, private dredging interests will be awarded the work.

The Committee supports a public and private mixture of hopper dredges which should be maintained and the Committee urges the development of private hopper dredges.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $22,140,000 for Flood control and coastal emergencies as proposed by the Senate instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 14: Provides limitation of $291,000,000 on the capital of the revolving fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $285,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $24,762,000 for General investigations as proposed by the Senate instead of $24,487,000 as proposed by the House.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $348,811,000 for Construction and rehabilitation instead of $351,386,000 as proposed by the House and $347,811,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The change from the Senate allowance provides a total of $3,500,000 for the Nueces River project, Texas.

Amendment No. 17: 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 provides that $300,000 is to be made available to the Secretary for expenses related to investigations of the Teton River Dam structure failure.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $44,680,000 for the Colorado River basin salinity control projects as proposed by the Senate instead of $44,700,000 as proposed by the House.

LOAN PROGRAM

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $27,495,000 for the Loan program instead of $22,209,000 as proposed by the House and $28,495,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The change from the Senate allowance provides a total of $1,000,000 for the Graham-Curtis Canal Companies, Arizona loan.

EMERGENCY FUND

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $1,000,000 for the Emergency fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Funds Appropriated to the President

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $303,000,000 for the Appalachian regional development programs instead of $300,500,000 as proposed by the House and $306,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The change from the House bill adds $2,500,000 for Area development.

Tennessee Valley Authority

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $125,930,000 for Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority Fund instead of $120,930,000 as proposed by the House and $127,130,000 as proposed by the Senate. The change from the House bill adds $2,500,000 for work on Pickwick Lock, $2,500,000 for strip mine reclamation demonstrations, $1,000,000 for fertilizer research and development and deducts $1,000,000 for savings and slippage.

The Conferees express concern over the recent pattern of continued escalating power rate increases by Tennessee Valley Authority. As the TVA Board announced a further increase effective in July, this represents the fifteenth power rate increase by the Authority in the past nine years.

The Conferees believe that TVA has ample sources of revenue to effectively function without continuing a rate escalation policy.

The Conferees urge the Board of Directors of TVA to reexamine their policy on escalating power rates, to study all possible alternatives and proposals to avoid any further power rate increase and to take all possible steps to restore its position as the low-cost power yardstick agency of the Nation, in the public interest.

Water Resources Council

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $12,665,000 for Water resources planning instead of $11,965,000 as proposed by the House and $14,665,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Provides limitation for Administration and coordination of $1,648,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,524,000 as proposed by the House. The Conferees have included $75,000 for the special study of the Connecticut River Basin.

Amendment No. 25: Provides limitation of $3,248,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,172,000 as proposed tby he House for preparation of assessment and plans.

Amendment No. 26: Provides limitation of $3,000,000 for grants to states instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Conference Total—With Comparisons

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1977 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons of the fiscal year 1976 amount, the 1977 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1977 follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976	$7, 514, 156, 500
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1977	[1] 9, 398, 895, 000
House bill, fiscal year 1977	9, 645, 609, 000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1977	9, 718, 885, 000
Conference agreement	9, 703, 713, 000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976	+2, 189, 556, 500
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1977	+304, 818, 000
House bill, fiscal year 1977	+58, 104, 000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1977	−15, 172, 000

[1] Includes $178,800,000 of budget estimates not considered by the House, contained in S. Doc. 94–208. Excludes $200 million contained in this bill submitted as a FY 1976 supplemental in H. Doc. 94–523.

Joe L. Evins,
Edward P. Boland,
Jamie L. Whitten,
John M. Slack,
Otto E. Passman,
Tom Bevill,
George Mahon,
John T. Myers,
Clair W. Burgener,
Elford A. Cederberg,
Managers on the Part of the House.

John C. Stennis,
John L. McClellan,
Warren G. Magnuson,
John O. Pastore,
Joseph M. Montoya,
J. Bennett Johnston,
Walter D. Huddleston,
Jennings Randolph,
Mark O. Hatfield,
Milton R. Young,
Roman Hruska,
Richard S. Schweiker,
Harry Bellmon,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

○

94TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
No. 94-960

PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY RESEARCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1977

JUNE 17, 1976.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 14236]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 14236) 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 program, 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 September 30, 1977, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

Budget estimates considered by House	$9,220,095,000
Amount of bill as passed by House	9,645,609,000
Increase by Senate Committee (net)	+49,176,000
Amount of bill reported to Senate	9,694,785,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	9,398,895,000
Amount of appropriations, 1976	7,514,156,500
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Over the budget estimates, 1977	295,890,000
Over the appropriation, 1976	2,180,628,000

Note: The above amounts do not reflect the amount of $200,000,000 requested by the President (H. Doc. 94-523) as a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1976/TQ and included in the bill as passed by the House and approved by the Committee for payments of claims resulting from the Teton Dam disaster which would become available immediately upon enactment of the bill.

57-010 O

HEARINGS BY THE COMMITTEE

The Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations held 27 sessions of hearings (22 different days) in connection with the fiscal year 1977 appropriation bill. In addition, two open executive sessions were held on this bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies funded by this bill, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local government officials and representatives, and hundreds of citizens of all walks of life from throughout the United States. The printed hearings are as follows:

Corps of Engineers, Parts 1, 2, and 9

February 18, 19, 23–25, March 2, and May 26, 1976.

Bureau of Reclamation and Power Agencies, Parts 3 and 9

March 4, and May 26, 1976.

Energy Research and Development Administration, Part 5

(Printing incomplete)—March 16, 18, 23, 24, and May 27, 1976.

Independent Agencies and Commissions, Parts 4 and 9

March 3, 9, 11, and May 26, 1976.

Members of Congress and Public Witnesses, Parts 6, 7, and 8

(Printing incomplete)—Record open for 10 days after last hearing in April. March 29–Apr. 1, April 5–7, 1976.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND VOTES

The Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations, by unanimous vote of a quorum present (12 members present) at an open executive session on June 10, 1976, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee on Appropriations, by unanimous vote of a quorum present at an open executive session on June 17, 1976, recommends that the bill, H.R. 14236, as amended, be reported and passed.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Bill page	Report page
TITLE I		
Energy Research and Development Administration:		
Geothermal Resources Development Fund	4	27
Operating expenses	2	5
Plant and capital equipment	3	22
TITLE II		
Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
Construction, general	6	43
Flood control and coastal emergencies	8	63
General expenses	8	64
General investigations	5	34
Mississippi River and tributaries	7	58
Operation and maintenance, general	7	60
Revolving fund	8	61
Special Recreation use fees	8	64
TITLE III		
Department of Interior:		
Alaska Power Administration:		
General investigations	19	87
Operation and maintenance	19	87
Bonneville Power Administration Fund	19	88
Bureau of Reclamation:		
Colorado River Basin project	13	83
Colorado River Basin salinity control projects	14	83
Construction and rehabilitation	11	75
Emergency fund	15	87
General administrative expenses	15	87
General investigations	10	68
Loan program	14	85
Operation and maintenance	14	85
Upper Colorado River storage project	13	80
Southeastern Power Administration	20	89
Southwestern Power Administration:		
Construction	20	89
Operation and maintenance	20	90
TITLE IV		
Independent Offices:		
Appalachian Regional Commission	22	91
Appalachian Regional Development programs	22	91
Delaware River Basin Commission	23	92
Federal Power Commission	23	92
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	24	93
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	24	93
Susquehanna River Basin Commission	25	94
Tennessee Valley Authority	25	95
Water Resources Council	26	97

Introduction and Summary of the Bill

The Public Works for Water and Power Development and Energy Research Appropriation Bill, 1977, provides funds for fiscal year 1977 under title I for the Energy Research and Development Administration programs; under title II for the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program; under title III for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation and power agencies; and under title IV for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Regional Development Programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council.

The grand total of new budget (obligational) authority recommended by the Committee in the bill is $9,694,785,000. This is an increase of $295,890,000 over the amended budget estimates of $9,398,895,000. Changes to the House allowance total +$49,176,000. It should be noted that subsequent to consideration of the bill by the House, budget amendments in the amount of $178,800,000 were submitted and considered by the Committee. These amendments are contained in Senate Documents 94–208. The House passed bill provides $9,645,609,000, an increase of $425,514,000 over the budget estimates of $9,220,095,000 considered by the House.

The amounts discussed in the above paragraph do not include the President's budget request of June 11, 1976 (H.Doc. 94–523) to provide $200,000,000 in new budget authority for the payment of claims related to the Teton Dam failure. This amount is included in the bill and as passed by the House is to become available immediately upon enactment of this bill (H.R. 14236).

In addition to new budget (obligational) authority, the bill, as recommended by the Committee, provides appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations in the amount of $20,600,000, the same as the House allowance and budget estimate.

Also, in addition to the amounts in the recommended bill, permanent legislation authorizes the continuation of certain government activities without consideration by the Congress during the annual appropriations process. Details of these activities are listed in the "Permanent—Federal Funds" and "Permanent—Trust Funds" tables appearing at the end of this report. In fiscal year 1976, these activities were estimated to total $69,527,000. The estimate for fiscal year 1977 is $74,971,000.

Details with respect to the recommended appropriations and the changes made from the House allowance and budget requests are found in the narrative and tabulations included in this report. A comparative statement of new budget (obligational) authority for fiscal year 1976, budget estimates for fiscal year 1977, House allowance, and amounts recommended by the Committee also appear at the end of the report.

TITLE I

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

The Energy Research and Development Administration was created by the Congress by Public Law 93–438, the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, October 11, 1974. This Act brought together under a single agency the major Federal activities in energy research and development. ERDA officially came into existence on Janury 19, 1975, and this is its second annual appropriation. The first ERDA appropriation became available in January 1976. Funds recommended in this bill provide for all ERDA programs except for the fossil energy research programs and certain conservation programs which are included in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill.

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $5,734,771,000 for ERDA's programs and activities. This is a net increase of $6,488,000 over the House allowance. The Committee believes this amount is sufficient to continue to provide the sound foundation needed for the significantly increased research and development budgets which will necessarily follow in the future fiscal years. The research, development and demonstration of new energy technologies will be costly and will require substantial investments. Even though the costs involved will be substantial, it is the policy and conviction of the Congress and the Administration that energy self-sufficiency and diversification of energy sources are important national goals that must be met and that the commitment of significant monetary resources is inescapable.

Operating Expenses

Appropriation, 1976	$3, 149, 015, 000
Budget estimate, 1977	[1] 4, 137, 571, 000
House allowance	4, 172, 783, 000
Committee recommendation	4, 096, 586, 000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	−40, 985, 000
House allowance	−76, 197, 000

[1] Includes budget amendment of $8,675,000 (S. Doc. 94–208) not considered by House.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $4,096,586,000 for fiscal year 1977 which is a net decrease of $76,197,000 from the House allowance and a net decrease of $40,985,000 from the budget request.

The total amount approved by the Committee for operating expenses for fiscal year 1977 is $4,909,986,000, of which $4,096,586,000 is the appropriation recommended. The remainder or difference of $813,400,000 is derived from estimated revenues ($737 million) and changes in unobligated balances ($76 million) which, under existing law, are applied to operating expenses, thereby reducing the amount of the appropriation required for the approved program.

Subsequent to the House Committee action, a budget amendment totaling $8,675,000 for operating expenses was transmitted to the Senate for consideration. These amounts are included in the figures shown and are in addition to the estimates considered by the House.

The budget structure for the appropriation "Operating Expenses" reflects the estimated total costs to be incurred for each of ERDA's major functional programs in fiscal year 1977 (cost-based budget), which the Committee continues to use and endorse. However, to facilitate matters, including comparability with the House Committee report, the Committee recommendations are stated in terms of the more familiar new budget (obligational) authority. A cost tabulation is also shown in this report.

A summary of the Committee recommendations, on both budget authority and cost basis and by major program activity with the budget estimate and House allowance, is shown in the following tables:

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
Operating Expenses—Budget Authority

Item	Appropriation fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Solar energy development	$108,650,000	$141,800,000	$282,900,000	$220,000,000
Geothermal energy development	30,770,000	48,600,000	52,100,000	53,400,000
Conservation research and development: Electric energy systems and energy storage	33,498,000	41,800,000	51,960,000	51,900,000
Fusion power research and development:				
Magnetic fusion	131,650,000	168,000,000	204,500,000	186,600,000
Laser fusion	65,500,000	71,400,000	80,000,000	77,700,000
Total fusion power research and development	197,150,000	239,400,000	284,500,000	264,300,000
Fuel cycle research and development	65,293,000	163,035,000	178,035,000	163,035,000
Fission power reactor development	445,894,000	630,260,000	630,260,000	630,260,000
Environmental research and safety:				
Scientific and technical education			3,000,000	
Biomedical and environmental research	174,647,000	182,916,000	197,316,000	197,316,000
Operational safety	6,886,000	7,707,000	8,307,000	8,307,000
Environmental control technology	12,567,000	15,577,000	19,077,000	19,600,000
Reactor safety facilities		33,300,000	28,300,000	28,300,000
Total environmental research and safety	194,100,000	239,500,000	256,000,000	253,523,000
High energy physics	152,820,000	167,500,000	170,000,000	167,500,000
Basic energy sciences	173,980,000	182,800,000	198,175,000	197,400,000
Nuclear materials security and safeguards	13,619,000	25,740,000	29,100,000	25,740,000
Naval reactor development	221,180,000	191,500,000	191,500,000	191,500,000
Space nuclear systems	31,500,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
Nuclear explosives applications		1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Uranium enrichment activities:				
Uranium enrichment	693,804,000	[1] 888,345,000	882,345,000	888,345,000
Advanced isotope separation technology	29,450,000	36,830,000	36,830,000	36,830,000
Total uranium enrichment activities	723,254,000	925,175,000	919,175,000	925,175,000
National security:				
Weapons activities	859,011,000	1,012,005,000	987,005,000	1,012,005,000
Weapons materials production	279,511,000	354,635,000	362,735,000	362,735,000
Total national security	1,138,522,000	1,366,640,000	1,349,740,000	1,374,740,000
Program support:				
Program direction	180,833,000	[1] 214,860,000	216,085,000	214,860,000
Supporting activities:				
Community operations	9,085,000	6,415,000	10,507,000	10,507,000
Security investigations	11,475,000	10,050,000	10,050,000	10,050,000
Information services	9,610,000	10,905,000	10,905,000	10,905,000
General systems studies	9,200,000	11,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
General technology transfer	1,800,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Manpower development		700,000	700,000	700,000
EEO assigned facilities	2,039,000	2,075,000	2,075,000	2,075,000
Total supporting activities	43,209,000	43,145,000	46,237,000	46,237,000
Cost of work for others	12,983,000	20,100,000	20,100,000	20,100,000
Total program support	237,025,000	278,105,000	282,422,000	281,197,000
Change in working capital and inventories	66,760,000	78,016,000	78,016,000	78,016,000
Subtotal budget authority	3,833,515,000	4,752,171,000	4,986,183,000	4,909,986,000
Revenues applied:				
Enrichment revenues	−591,510,000	−539,100,000	−661,900,000	−661,900,000
Miscellaneous revenues	−78,490,000	−76,000,000	−76,000,000	−76,000,000
Total revenues applied	−670,000,000	−615,100,000	−737,900,000	−737,900,000
Net budget authority	3,163,515,000	4,137,071,000	4,248,283,000	4,172,086,000
Appropriation transfer	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Change in unobligated balances	−15,000,000		−76,000,000	−76,000,000
Total operating budget authority	3,149,015,000	[1] 4,137,571,000	4,172,783,000	4,096,586,000

[1] Reflects amended budget request (S. Doc. 94-268) not considered by the House.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
Operating Expenses—Cost Basis

Item	Appropriation fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Solar energy development	$80,530,000	$110,500,000	$219,000,000	$140,500,000
Geothermal energy development	31,170,000	44,300,000	47,200,000	47,900,000
Conservation research and development: Electric energy systems and energy storage	25,830,000	35,840,000	43,940,000	43,300,000
Fusion power research and development:				
Magnetic fusion	120,000,000	156,000,000	183,300,000	170,000,000
Laser fusion	59,500,000	69,300,000	75,800,000	74,000,000
Total Fusion Power Research and development	179,500,000	225,300,000	259,100,000	244,000,000
Fuel cycle research and development	57,025,000	138,770,000	149,970,000	138,770,000
Fission power reactor development	385,515,000	544,960,000	544,960,000	544,960,000
Environmental research and safety:				
Science and technical education			2,200,000	
Biomedical and environmental research	164,465,000	174,734,000	185,534,000	185,534,000
Operational safety	6,310,000	5,058,000	5,558,000	5,558,000
Environmental control technology	11,455,000	14,155,000	16,755,000	17,200,000
Reactor safety facilities		24,700,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
Total environmental research and safety	182,230,000	218,647,000	231,047,000	229,292,000
High energy physics	148,300,000	162,900,000	164,800,000	162,900,000
Basic energy sciences	167,200,000	174,000,000	185,500,000	185,000,000
Nuclear materials security and safeguards	11,975,000	22,340,000	24,940,000	22,340,000
Naval reactor development	186,200,000	202,600,000	202,600,000	202,600,000
Space nuclear systems	28,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Nuclear explosives applications		1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Uranium enrichment activities:				
Uranium enrichment	682,958,000	[1] 878,095,000	873,095,000	878,095,000
Advanced isotope separation technology	25,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000
Total uranium enrichment activities	707,958,000	912,095,000	907,095,000	912,095,000
National security:				
Weapons activities	849,304,000	971,605,000	952,805,000	971,605,000
Weapons materials production	267,692,000	334,405,000	340,505,000	340,505,000
Total National Security	1,116,996,000	1,306,010,000	1,293,310,000	1,312,110,000
Program support:				
Program direction	180,833,000	[1] 214,860,000	216,385,000	214,860,000
Supporting activities:				
Community operations	9,085,000	6,415,000	10,507,000	10,507,000
Security investigations	11,475,000	10,050,000	10,050,000	10,050,000
Information services	9,610,000	10,905,000	10,905,000	10,905,000
General systems studies	9,200,000	11,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
General technology transfer	1,800,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Manpower development		700,000	700,000	700,000
EEO assigned facilities	2,039,000	2,075,000	2,075,000	2,075,000
Total supporting activities	43,209,000	43,145,000	46,237,000	46,237,000
Cost of work for others	12,660,000	18,240,000	18,240,000	18,240,000
Total program support	236,702,000	273,570,000	280,862,000	279,337,000
Total program	3,545,131,000	4,405,507,000	4,585,324,000	4,496,104,000
Increase or decrease in selected resources:				
Goods and services on order	254,458,000	268,648,000	322,843,000	335,866,000
Change in inventories and working capital	66,760,000	78,016,000	78,016,000	78,016,000
Total increase or decrease in selected resources	321,218,000	346,664,000	400,859,000	412,828,000
Total gross obligations	3,866,349,000	4,752,171,000	4,986,183,000	4,909,986,000
Revenues applied:				
Enrichment revenues	−591,510,000	−539,100,000	−661,900,000	−661,900,000
Miscellaneous revenues	−78,490,000	−76,000,000	−76,000,000	−76,000,000
Total revenues applied	−670,000,000	−615,100,000	−737,900,000	−737,900,000
Total net obligations	3,196,349,000	4,128,396,000	4,246,283,000	4,172,086,000
Appropriation transfers	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Unobligated balance brought forward	−47,834,000		−76,000,000	−76,000,000
Total operating budget authority	3,149,015,000	[1] 4,137,571,000	4,172,783,000	4,096,586,000

I. SOLAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends a total of $220,000,000 in new budget authority, an increase of $78.2 million over the budget estimate, for Solar Energy Research and Development operating expenses. The purpose of this program is to significantly expand the Nation's energy supply through the development and demonstration of solar energy systems that are economically attractive and environmentally acceptable.

The commitment to this program is shown in the following table which includes the total level of funding for the Solar program for the last five years for both "operating expenses" and "plant and capital equipment."

APPROPRIATION—OPERATING EXPENSES, PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT
(BUDGET AUTHORITY)

Fiscal year	*Funding level*	*Percent increase from previous year*
1973	$4,000,000	100
1974	15,000,000	275
1975	43,000,000	186
1976 (estimate)	115,000,000	167
1977 (recommended)	261,900,000	128

An ERDA report predicted that solar energy can provide up to 7 percent of our country's energy needs by the turn of the century and up to 25 percent by the year 2020. Thus if the technology can be developed, and made economically attractive, solar energy will play an invaluable role in the United States long range needs to become energy independent.

In making the recommended increases noted below, the Committee has significantly accelerated those solar subprograms which can have a near term impact. The significant increases for commercial and residential demonstrations will enable ERDA to expand the number of demonstrations, thus testing various technologies under a wide variety of geographical conditions. A higher number of demonstrations will also accelerate the commercialization of these technologies since the publicity and interest generated by the demonstrations will enhance the overall appeal of solar energy as an energy source.

The Committee is enthusiastic over the prospects for solar power and strongly supports the program as evidenced by the significant increases above the budget recommended in the bill. Based on the testimony received, the Committee concurs with the House Committee that "a word of caution should be noted. Witnesses testified that at the present stage of development, solar systems for houses and buildings are not cost competitive with existing energy sources. Also, the advanced solar systems, which hopefully will provide significant amounts of electricity to the Nation, are in the embryonic stage of development. An optimistic timetable shows that solar energy will not make a significant contribution to the energy supply until far into the future. Thus the near and intermediate term outlook is for solar energy to produce a small amount of energy relative to the overall energy demand."

The following table lists the Committee's recommendations for new budget authority for the various subprograms within solar energy.

SUMMARY OF SOLAR ENERGY ESTIMATES BY SUBPROGRAM—BUDGET AUTHORITY

[In thousands of dollars]

Operating expense	Fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Direct thermal applications:				
A. Solar heating and cooling of buildings:				
1. Commercial demonstrations	$18,200	$16,700	$35,000	$30,200
2. Residential demonstrations	5,900	8,100	27,000	15,300
3. Research and development	5,000	10,500	15,000	12,500
4. Development in support of demonstrations	6,000	10,000	20,000	14,000
B. Agricultural process heat applications	4,750	3,900	7,000	5,400
Technology support and utilization:				
A. Solar energy resource assessment	1,000	1,500	6,500	5,500
B. Solar Energy Research Institute	2,200	1,500	2,500	2,500
C. Utilization and information dissemination	600	1,000	3,000	3,000
D. Solar storage	1,600	0		0
Solar electric applications:				
A. Solar thermal electric conversion	14,300	30,900	57,200	42,000
B. Photovoltaic energy conversion	21,600	28,200	64,200	45,000
C. Wind energy conversion	14,900	16,000	21,000	20,000
D. Ocean thermal energy conversion	8,100	9,200	13,000	14,000
Fuels from biomass	4,500	4,300	11,500	10,600,000

A description of the solar energy subprograms follows:

A. DIRECT THERMAL APPLICATIONS

(1) Solar Heating and Cooling of Buildings.—This program involves demonstration programs to provide for residential and commercial solar heating and hot water demonstrations in several cycles by the end of 1977 and combined solar heating and cooling by the end of 1979. A cycle includes construction of a set of demonstration projects, followed by data collection and analysis, and development of improved systems based on the data. The results will lead to recommendations of possible changes in procedure and legislation needed to win broad acceptance of solar energy.

(2) Agricultural and Process Heat Applications.—The objective in this area is to investigate and develop technologies which will permit the economical and competitive use of solar energy in grain drying, crop curing, animal shelters, greenhouses, agricultural food processing and to supply a significant fraction of the energy requirements of industry.

B. TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT AND UTILIZATION

This subprogram supports the technical subprograms included in the solar energy program. Activities in Technology Support and Utilization include the assessment, promotion, marketing and communicating all aspects of solar R. & D., its resources and its potential economic viability in the energy marketplace.

Included in this subprogram are funds for the Solar Energy Research Institute (SERI). The Committee recommends a $1,000,000 increase for SERI to a level of $2,500,000. SERI will perform research, development and related functions to support the National Solar Energy Program. The fiscal year 1977 request for SERI provides for costs associated with start-up activities and partial conceptual design of facilities that may be required as a part of an accepted SERI proposal. The programmatic costs of the SERI are included under the technical subprograms.

The increase is to help insure that further delays in the implementation of SERI will not occur.

C. SOLAR ELECTRIC APPLICATIONS

The objective of this program is to develop and demonstrate the conversion of solar energy to electric energy, with a possible initial energy contribution by 1985, and a moderate contribution by 2000.

Different approaches to achieve these objectives include:

(1) Photovoltaic Energy Conversion.—The overall objective of the Photovoltaic Energy Conversion program is to develop economically viable electric power systems suitable for a variety of applications and capable of significantly contributing to the Nation's energy requirements.

(2) 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 commericial electric power, and to accelerate their commercial implementation through demonstration of large-scale experimental systems.

(3) Ocean Thermal Energy 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.

(4) Solar Thermal Electric Conversion.—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.

D. FUELS FROM BIOMASS

This subprogram involves the photosynthetic production, collection, storage, and conversion of organic matter (biomass) into useful clean fuels. The Biomass sources which are being considered include terrestrial crops produced from agriculture and forestry operations, marine crops, agricultural and animal wastes and forestry residues.

GENERAL

The Committee urges ERDA to fully consider submitted project proposals such as those discussed in the plant and capital equipment report section, solar energy facilities at various locations, as may be required under the appropriate solar subprograms listed above.

II. Geothermal Energy Development

The Committee recommends a total of $52,100,000 for operating expenses for Geothermal Energy Development. The potentially usable geothermal resources of the United States are quite substantial. ERDA has a number of subprograms underway which have the common goal of providing America with the option to exploit those resources. ERDA's interest in geothermal energy can be broken down into two broad categories—acceleration of the development of geothermal energy through the use of existing technology and research and development leading towards eventual development of plants which can exploit geopressured and hot dry rock geothermal systems.

ERDA's major effort in expanding the use of geothermal energy for the intermediate term is the Geothermal Resources Development Fund. The purpose of this program is to stimulate the development of commercial development of geothermal energy by minimizing a lender's financial risk associated with the introduction of new technology. An additional goal is to "develop normal borrower-lender relationships which will in time encourage the flow of credit without the need of Federal assistance." (Further comments on the Geothermal Resource Development Fund occur in another portion of the report.)

ERDA also is making a substantial effort to develop the technologies for exploiting the substantial geothermal resources which are in the form of hot dry rock and geopressured areas. The following table lists the various subprograms within the Geothermal Development Program.

A brief description of the various subprograms along with comments on the Committees recommendations follows:

SUMMARY OF GEOTHERMAL ENERGY ESTIMATES BY SUBPROGRAM—BUDGET AUTHORITY

[In thousands of dollars]

Operating expenses	Fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Engineering research and development	$10,600	$11,500	$13,500	$13,500
Resource exploration and assessment	3,600	10,000	4,000	10,000
Hydrothermal technology applications	5,700	12,200	12,200	15,000
Advanced technology applications	6,900	10,100	13,800	10,100
Utilization experiments	0	0	3,000	0
Environmental control and institutional studies	3,900	4,800	5,600	4,800

A. ENGINEERING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The objective is to bring the technologies required for geothermal development to the point of readiness for practical application, thereby establishing the technical foundation for growth and development.

B. RESOURCE EXPLORATION AND ASSESSMENT

Objectives are to improve existing exploration and assessment technology for use by the United States Geological Survey and by industry, to accelerate the identification of geothermal resources, to verify the potential usefulness of these resources for geothermal

energy applications and to apply such technology to the confirmation of candidate geothermal sites.

C. HYDROTHERMAL TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS

Objective is to establish the technical feasibility of using liquid-dominated geothermal resources for both electric power generation and non-electric uses.

The Committee recommends that $2 million of the increase over the budget estimate for hydrothermal technology applications be provided for applications of low- and moderate-temperature geothermal heat.

D. ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS

The objective of this subprogram is to prove the technical feasibility of using geothermal resources that require technologies which will be able to eventually use the widely distributed conductive heat of the earth's crust.

E. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL AND INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES

Studies conducted under this program will assess the environmental impact of geothermal activities and the development of improved environmental control technologies.

III. Conservation Research and Development

The Committee recommends a total of $51,900,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 1977 for electric energy systems and energy storage. The remainder of the Conservation R. & D. efforts are included in the Interior Appropriation Bill.

The objective of the Electric Energy Systems effort includes research and development in advanced technologies for increasing power transmission capability with reduced power losses, increased system reliability, and lower operating costs. Energy Storage efforts include developing energy saving technologies through storage of available lower cost base load energy for use in meeting peak load demand.

The increase recommended provides an additional $5.1 million for the electric energy systems and $5.0 million for the electric storage programs in budget authority for fiscal year 1977.

IV. Fusion Power Research and Development

The Committee recommends a total of $264,300,000 for Fusion Power Research and Development, including $186,600,000 for the Magnetic Fusion program.

The essential fuel material which would be used in 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.

There are two approaches to attain the production of electricity through the fusion process—magnetic fusion and laser fusion. Magnetic fusion utilizes powerful magnets to hold the fuel in mid-air as the thermonuclear burn occurs. In laser fusion, powerful lasers will implode the fuel to attain a thermonuclear burn. The following table shows the appropriations for the fusion power program for the past several years.

Appropriation—Operating expenses, plant, and capital equipment
(budget authority)

Fiscal year	*Funding level*[1]	*Percent increase from previous year*
1973	$79,000,000	46
1974	111,500,000	41
1975	183,000,000	64
1976 (estimate)	250,400,000	37
1977 (recommended)	420,800,000	68

[1] Includes funds for magnetic fusion and laser fusion.

A. MAGNETIC FUSION

The Committee is encouraged by the various scientific advances made within the past year in the magnetic fusion program. The Committee recommends an increase of $18,600,000 over the budget request for this program. The recommended increase will provide for expanded research in a number of subprograms and modest efforts in areas other than the mainline programs. The Committee points out that the budget request provided an increase of $36,350,000 over fiscal year 1976. The Committee's recommendation would provide $54,950,000 over fiscal year 1976.

B. LASER FUSION

The Committee recommends a total of $77,700,000, an increase of $6,300,000, for the Laser Fusion program. This program has the same objective as the magnetic fusion program, but utilizes lasers to initiate the thermonuclear burn. The research and development conducted in this program also has relevance in weapons research.

The laser fusion program is characteriized by cooperative development effort of the ERDA laboratories, universities and industry. The Committee believes this is a healthy direction and encourages ERDA to continue to assure strong participation of non-ERDA organizations in this program.

V. Fuel Cycle Research and Development

The Committee recommends a total of $163,035,000, the same as the budget and an increase of nearly $100,000,000 over the funding level

for fiscal year 1976, for Fuel Cycle Research and Development. This program is concerned with all portions of the nuclear fuel cycle. The three major subprograms are (1) Uranium Resource Assessment (2) Support of Nuclear Fuel Cycle and (3) Waste Management (Commercial). The following table shows the Committee's recommendations for these three subprograms.

A. URANIUM RESOURCE ASSESSMENT

This program consists of (a) evaluation and analysis of domestic uranium ore reserves and potential resources, (b) identifying areas favorable for the occurrence of uranium and (c) R & D on improved techniques for assessment, discovery and production of the resources.

Ample supplies of uranium are essential for the long term health of nuclear energy and the attainment of Energy Independence. Witnesses testified that, although there are enough supplies for the intermediate term, it is important that new discoveries be made for the long term needs. The Committee recommends the full budget request of $31,335,000 for this program.

B. SUPPORT OF NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE

The purpose of this program is to develop, on a commercially applicable basis, the technology for reprocessing spent reactor fuels and the recycling of the used products and to improve the operability and maintainability of large integrated reprocessing and recycle facilities.

The availability of a reprocessing and recycle capability will significantly reduce the demand for natural uranium and the associated mining, milling and enrichment capacity. The Committee supports the full budget request of $56,700,000.

C. WASTE MANAGEMENT (COMMERCIAL)

This program provides for the long term management of radioactive waste. Subprograms include (a) terminal storage R & D, (b) waste processing R & D and (c) supporting studies and evaluations.

The Committee recommends $75,000,000. the full budget request, which is an increase of $62,000,000 over the fiscal year 1976 appropriation of $13,000,000.

VI. Fission Power Reactor Development

The Committee recommends a total of $630,260,000, as proposed in the budget request, for the Fission Power Reactor Development Program. This program includes research on a number of advanced reactor concepts—the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor, the High Temperature Gas Reactor, Gas Cooled Reactors and Light Water Reactor Technology.

The major portion of these funds is for the continued research and development of the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR). The LMFBR is projected to utilize uranium in the range of 60 times more efficiently than existing reactors. The impact of that fact should

not be understimated. The LMFBR technology may make an enormous contribution someday to America's energy supply. As mentioned earlier in the report, almost every industrialized country is proceeding rapidly with the development of LMBFR's and some countries have demonstration plants actually operating.

Funds are included in the bill to proceed with a demonstration plant to prove out the technology. Under the present timetable this plant would become operable around 1983. Critics who oppose the breeder would foreclose the possibility of developing a demonstration plant which, as witnesses testified to the Committee, 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.

Also included is the Light Water Reactor Technology subprogram which has the objective of increasing the productivity and on line availability of light water reactors and reducing the cost of light water reactors to be committed in the next 5–10 years.

The following table lists the recommended totals for the various subprograms of the Fission Power Reactor Development Program.

Summary of Fission Power Reactor Development by Subprogram

(Budget Authority)

	Fiscal year 1977 budget	*Committee recommendation*
Liquid metal fast breeder reactor	$534, 760, 000	$534, 760, 000
Water cooled breeder reactor	37, 000, 000	37, 000, 000
Gas cooled reactors	28, 700, 000	28, 700, 000
Light water reactor technology	12, 500, 000	12, 500, 000
Supporting activities	17, 300, 000	17, 300, 000
Total	630, 260, 000	630, 260, 000

VII. Environmental Research and Safety

The Committee recommends a total of $253,523,000 for Environmental Research and Safety, which is an increase of $14,023,000 over the budget request. The Environmental Safety and Research Program is divided into five subprograms.

A brief explanation of each subprogram and description of Committee recommendations follows.

A. BIOMEDICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Program provides data and conducts research on the health and environmental effects of pollutants released to the environment by existing and developing energy technologies and conducts various research programs. A wide variety of research programs are conducted in health studies, biological studies, environmental studies, physical and technological studies, analysis and assessment and education and training.

The recommended increase includes $3,500,000 for the artificial heart, $2,000,000 for expanded research in nuclear medicine, and increased research on the health and environmental impact of both nuclear and non-nuclear generation of energy, including $800,000 for manned undersea activities research.

B. OPERATIONAL SAFETY

The objective of this program is to: (1) Provide ERDA with a quick response capability for performing aerial radiological measurements in an emergency situation; (2) to aid the State of Colorado in cleaning up the structures which were partially built by using uranium mill tailings in the construction material; and (3) Safety Studies and Development of Operations guidelines.

Safety studies and Development of Operations guidelines.

The increase over the budget is for safety studies and the development of operational guidelines primarily in fossil fuel facilities.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

The program provides for assessing all ongoing and planned energy technology development activities to ensure that the proper emphasis is given to environmental control research, development, and demonstration.

The increase recommended in the bill will accelerate ERDA's efforts to assess the technology being developed to minimize the environmental impact of generating energy.

D. REACTOR SAFETY FACILITIES

The primary responsibility for nuclear safety research rests with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). However, Section 205 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 stipulates that ERDA should provide research services and facilities to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the purpose of conducting NRC sponsored safety research.

One of the experiments anticipated to be conducted by the NRC is the Plenum Fill Experiment. ERDA is responsible for budgeting for facility construction while NRC will be responsible for budgeting for the test specification preparation and analysis associated with the experimental program.

The Committee is concerned about the dramatic increase in the cost for the Plenum Fill Experimental Facility. The estimated cost has risen from about $2,000,000 to $27,400,000.

This significant increase in the estimated total cost shows that the planning, research and conceptual design and engineering have not, at this time, been well conceived for this facility.

The Committee has included $2,300,000 in budget authority for the development of detailed engineering and design and cost estimates. The Committee will review this project when the final design and cost data are available.

VIII. High Energy Physics

The Committee recommends a total of $167,500,000, the same as the request for High Energy Physics. The goal of this program is the exploration and understanding of energy and matter in their most basic form. The majority of the funds are for the operation of various accelerators involved in research. Numerous experimental and

theoretical research programs are involved in basic research about the structure behavior of matter and its manifestations as and relationship to energy.

IX. Basic Energy Sciences

The Committee recommends a total of $197,400,000 for Basic Energy Sciences. This is an increase of $14,600,000 over the budget request. The funds included for this program will provide $90,500,000 for the Nuclear Science subprogram, which is an increase of $9,300,000 over the budget request; $56,400,000 for the Material Sciences subprogram, which is an increase of $5,300,000 over the budget request; and $50,500,000 for the Molecular, Mathematical, and Geosciences subprogram, which is the same as the budget request.

A. nuclear science

The major objective of this subprogram is improving our understanding of nuclear processes and phenomena through basic experimental and theoretical studies carried out primarily at ERDA laboratories and at universities. Most of this research is carried out at smaller reactors and research reactors.

B. material sciences

This research effort is to expand the base of knowledge of materials properties and behavior. Improved or new materials and expanded knowledge of the properties of conventional materials are required in all aspects of energy generation, conversion, transmission, storage utilization and conservation.

The increase is to accelerate materials research because of the important role materials will play in the development of various future energy technologies.

C. molecular, mathematical and geosciences

The research efforts in this subprogram include research in radiation science, chemical physics, basic research in geothermal energy, and study to improve the efficiency with which computers are applied.

X. Nuclear Materials Security and Safeguards

The Committee recommends a total of $25.740.000 for operating expenses for the Nuclear Materials Security and Safeguards program, the same as the budget request.

The objective of the program is to protect the public against death, injury or property damage from nuclear events which could potentially be produced by malevolent use of nuclear materials or sabotage of nuclear facilities.

The program designs safeguards systems for both civilian and ERDA facilities. The increased operating funds will be used primarily for designing safeguards systems using physical protection and materials control and accountability elements and testing these systems in operating plant environments. The recommended increase restores the reduction made by the Office of Management and Budget.

XI. Naval Reactor Development

The Committee recommends the full budget request of $191,500,000 for operating expenses of the Naval Reactors Development program. This program provides for the design and development of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores to meet the military requirements of the Department of Defense. Efforts continue on the development of an advanced reactor core with longer life for application to nuclear powered guided-missile cruisers and on the development of advanced reactors for submarines.

XII. Space Nuclear Systems

The Committee recommends the full budget request of $31,000,000 for operating expenses of the Space Nuclear Systems program.

This program provides nuclear power systems for the civilian space program and the Department of Defense which utilizes satellites for communication, surveillance and command and control of the Nation's strategic and tactical forces.

Improved power systems utilizing nuclear isotopes are also needed in underseas research, advanced anti-submarine warfare detection systems and potentially for an unmanned defense radar system.

Additionally, a terrestrial power development subprogram is involved in the potential application of space technology to energy programs on earth.

XIII. Nuclear Explosive Application Program

The full budget estimate of $1,300,000 is recommended for the Nuclear Explosive Application Program. These funds would provide for the initiation of laboratory studies of radioactive waste disposal activities. ERDA would investigate the feasibility of utilizing a very deep (20,000–30,000 ft.) underground cavity for permanent disposal of nuclear fuel reprocessing wastes.

A subprogram will provide the support base for the U.S. government during Peaceful Nuclear Explosive-related treaty negotiations.

There are no funds included in this bill for underground nuclear tests, other than those for the National Security program.

XIV. Uranium Enrichment Activities

A. uranium enrichment

The Committee recommends $888,345,000, same as the budget estimate for uranium enrichment. The major portion of these funds—$803,265,000—is for the operation of the three uranium enrichment facilities which produce fuel for America's and many of the world's nuclear plants. These costs are recovered through the sale of enriched uranium.

XV. National Security

A. WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommends $1,012,005,000, the same as the budget estimate for Weapons Activities.

The Weapons program provides for the research, development, testing and production of nuclear weapons to meet national defense needs. The weapons complex within ERDA is a national resource that for over 25 years has fulfilled the Nation's nuclear weapons needs.

The Committee is advised that the actual size of the nuclear stockpile is declining in number. However, many weapons in the stockpile are extremely old and must be replaced. The production of new nuclear weapons is needed to maintain an adequate defense posture and to incorporate new technology into new warheads which will be compatible with the new weapons systems being developed by the Department of Defense. It should be noted that the cost of the warheads is relatively small when compared to the total cost of the weapons systems being developed by the Department of Defense. Both ERDA and DOD are involved in judgements affecting safety, security, control and performance features of nuclear weapons.

At times the weapons complex does undertake missions in the civilian energy field. Because of the nature of its research effort it is especially qualified in the area of laser fusion research which will hopefully make a significant contribution towards supplying energy for the Nation.

B. WEAPONS MATERIAL PRODUCTION

The Committee recommends $362,735,000, an increase of $8,100,000, for Weapons Material Production.

The primary objectives of this program are the production of special nuclear materials for weapons, the reprocessing of naval fuels for nuclear submarines and the management of ERDA radioactive waste products.

The Committee increase of $8,100,000 is for extending the operation of the Hanford Reactor in Washington beyond fiscal year 1977. This is a dual purpose reactor which produces both nuclear material for ERDA and steam for producing electricity.

XVI. Program Direction

The Committee recommends a total of $214,860,000, the same as the budget request for Program Direction. This program covers the salaries, travel and other costs associated with program direction and administration of ERDA. The major portion of these funds are for the salaries of personnel directly employed by ERDA.

There seems to be a substantial duplication of staff functions at the program level, assistant administrator level and central staff. For example, the data submitted to the Committee during the recent hearings indicates a substantial duplication in planning, budget, administrative services and other staff functions. There also appears to exist a significant proliferation of personnel in management information systems and studies.

ERDA should review the organization with a view toward identifying these non-programmatic positions, and eliminating overlap and duplication.

XVII. Supporting Activities

The Committee recommends a total of $46,237,000 for Supporting Activities, an increase of $3,092,000 from the budget request.

Supporting Activities is made up of the following subprograms:

A. COMMUNITY OPERATIONS

This program provides Federal payments to communities where large ERDA facilities cause an excessive tax burden on localities.

B. SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

Funds are for the investigation of individuals requiring security clearances and for selective reinvestigations of previously cleared personnel.

C. INFORMATION SERVICES

This program is divided into (1) Public Awareness which creates and encourages the development of general information to the public on all energy conservation technologies and energy sources and (2) "Technical Information Services" which acquires analyzes, organizes and disseminates scientific, technical and practical information on energy.

D. GENERAL SYSTEMS STUDIES

The objective of general systems studies is to develop and apply systems analysis teachings to aid in planning, management and decision-making for the allocation of resources and evaluation of performance in implementing the energy R & D plan.

E. GENERAL TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS PROGRAM

The program consists of R & D commercialization studies, technology transfer of ERDA produced technology and an energy-related inventions evaluation program which takes ideas provided to ERDA from the private sector into further development.

F. MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT

The goal for manpower development is to assure the availability of trained manpower in the right numbers and in the right time-frame to meet the needs of the energy related segments of the economy.

G. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

The Equal Employment Opportunity program provides for staffing and related costs required by ERDA to carry out its responsibilities for the EEO contract compliance.

XVIII. Change in Selected Resources

The Committee recommends an increase of $67,200,000 for fiscal year 1977 for change in selected resources. Selected resources consist of inventories and goods and services on order. The change is based on increases and decreases made in the above programs where applicable.

XIX. Revenues Applied

Anticipated and estimated revenues are applied to finance the program costs, thereby reducing the amount of the overall appropriation required. For fiscal year 1977 revenues are estimated to be $737.9 million.

XX. Unobligated Balances

The Committee recommends a total reduction of $76,000,000 for unobligated balances. $56,000,000 of this reduction is for the purchase of power to enrich uranium for civilian nuclear reactors. ERDA's anticipated purchases of electrical power for the gaseous diffusion plants were lower than anticipated for fiscal year 1976 and the transition quarter. The incident at Brown's Ferry nuclear plant caused TVA to deliver less power to ERDA than anticipated for fiscal year 1976. Therefore, an unobligated balance of $56,000,000 should be available in 1976 and the transition quarter can be carried forward into 1977.

The Committee also recommends a general reduction of $20,000,000 for other anticipated unobligated balances which will be carried forward into 1977.

Plant and Capital Equipment

Appropriation, 1976	$907, 642, 000
Budget estimate, 1977	[1] 1, 579, 399, 000
House allowance	1, 525, 500, 000
Committee recommendation	1, 608, 185, 000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+28, 786, 000
House allowance	+82, 685, 000

[1] Includes budget amendment of $170,125,000 (S. Doc. 94–208) not considered by House.

The amounts recommended by the Committee for plant and capital equipment, along with the budget request and House allowance are shown in the following table:

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Plant and Capital Equipment

FISCAL YEAR 1977

Project No.	Project title	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
	CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS			
	Solar Energy Development			
77-18	Solar energy facilities, various locations	----------	----------	$20, 000, 000
	Fusion Power Research and Development			
77-2-a	Magnetic fusion: Computer building, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, Livermore, California	$5, 000, 000	$5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000
77-3-a	Laser fusion: Electron beam fusion facilities, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, N. Mex	9, 100, 000	9, 100, 000	9, 100, 000
	Fission Power Reactor Development			
77-4-a	Modifications to reactors	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000
77-4-b	Breeding nondestructive assay facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho	9, 500, 000	9, 500, 000	9, 500, 000
77-4-c	High performance Fuel Laboratory, Richland, Wash	----------	1, 500, 000	----------
77-4-d	Fuel storage facility, Richland, Wash	----------	7, 000, 000	----------
77-5-a	Computer building acquisition, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho Falls, Idaho	950, 000	950, 000	950, 000
	Environmental Research and Safety			
77-6-a	Modifications and additions to biomedical and environmental research facilities, various locations	4, 200, 000	3, 200, 000	3, 200, 000
	High-Energy Physics			
77-7-a	Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations	3, 600, 000	3, 600, 000	3, 600, 000
	Basic Energy Sciences			
77-8-a	Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	1, 300, 000	1, 300, 000	1, 300, 000
77-8-b	Expanded experimental capabilities, Bates Linear Accelerator, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Mass	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000
77-8-c	Increased flux, high flux beam reactor, Brookhaven National Laboratory, N.Y	2, 500, 000	2, 500, 000	2, 500, 000
77-8-d	Conversion of steam plant facilities, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tenn	12, 200, 000	10, 200, 000	10, 200, 000
	Uranium Enrichment Activities			
77-9-a	Expansion of feed vaporization and sampling facilities, gaseous diffusion plants, multiple sites	9, 000, 000	8, 000, 000	8, 000, 000
77-9-b	Air and nitrogen system uprating, gaseous diffusion plant, Oak Ridge, Tenn	5, 200, 000	5, 200, 000	5, 200, 000
77-9-c	Upgrade ventilation systems, technical services building, gaseous diffusion plant, Portsmouth, Ohio	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000
77-9-d	Centrifuge plant demonstration facility, Oak Ridge, Tenn	30, 000, 000	25, 000, 000	25, 000, 000
77-10-a	Fire protection upgrading, gaseous diffusion plants, multiple sites	8, 300, 000	8, 300, 000	8, 300, 000
77-10-b	Modifications to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act, gaseous diffusion plauts, and Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio	8, 200, 000	8, 200, 000	8, 200, 000
	National security			
77-11-a	Weapons activities: Safeguards and research and development laboratory facility, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, N. Mex	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	4, 000, 000

See footnote at end of table.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—Continued

Plant and Capital Equipment—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1977

Project No.	Project title	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
	CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS—Con.			
	National Security—Continued			
77-11-b	Safeguards and site security improvements, various locations	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
77-11-c	8-inch artillery fired atomic projectile production facilities, various locations	12,000,000	10,000,000	12,000,000
77-11-d	Tritium confinement system, Savannah River, S.C.	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
77-12-a	Fire and safety project, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, Calif.	$2,300,000	$2,300,000	$2,300,000
77-12-b	Life safety corridor modifications, Bendix Plant, Kansas City, Mo.	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
77-12-c	Modifications to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tenn.	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
77-12-d	Upgrade reliability of fire protection, Bendix Plant, Kansas City, Mo.	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
77-12-e	Sludge disposal facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tenn.	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
77-13-a	Weapons Materials Production: Fluorinel dissolution process and fuel receiving improvements, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, (A-E and long-lead procurement)	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
77-13-b	Improved confinement of radioactive releases, reactor areas, Savannah River, S.C.	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
77-13-c	Seismic protection, reactor areas, Savannah River, S.C.	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
77-13-d	High level waste storage and waste management facilities, Savannah River, S.C.	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
77-13-e	High level waste storage and handling facilities, Richland, Wash.	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
77-13-f	Waste isolation pilot plant, site undesignated, (A-E, land acquisition, and long-lead procurement)	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
77-13-g	Safeguards and security upgrading, production facilities, multiple sites	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000
77-13-h	Personnel protection and support facility, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
77-14	General plant projects	74,610,000	70,000,000	74,610,000
77-15	Construction planning and design	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
	INCREASE IN PRIOR YEAR PROJECTS			
	Solar energy development			
76-2-a	5-megawatt solar thermal test facility	10,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
76-2-b	10-megawatt central receiver solar thermal powerplant (A-E and long-lead procurement)	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	Fusion power research and development			
	Magnetic fusion:			
76-5-a	Tokamak fusion test reactor, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Plainsboro, N.J.	80,000,000	75,000,000	80,000,000
76-5-b	14-Mev intense neutron source facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, N. Mex.	14,400,000	14,400,000	14,400,000
76-5-c	14-Mev high-intensity neutron facility, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, California	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
75-3-b	Laser fusion: High-energy laser facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, N. Mex.	9,700,000	9,700,000	9,700,000
	Fission power reactor development			
67-3-a	Fast flux test facility	80,000,000	75,000,000	80,000,000

See footnote at end of table.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—Con.

Plant and Capital Equipment—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1977

Project No.	Project title	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
	INCREASE IN PRIOR YEAR PROJECTS—Continued			
	High-energy physics			
75-6-c	Positron-electron joint project, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory and Stanford Linear Accelerator Center	$25,000,000	$25,000,000	$25,000,000
	Uranium enrichment activities			
76-8-e	Conversion of existing steam plants to coal capability, gaseous diffusion plants and Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
76-8-g	Enriched uranium production facilities, Portsmouth, Ohio	[4] 170,000,000	150,000,000	170,000,000
76-14	Safeguards and security upgrading Portsmouth, Ohio	5,350,000	5,350,000	5,350,000
74-1-g	Cascade uprating program, gaseous diffusion plants	161,000,000	161,000,000	161,000,000
71-1-f	Process equipment modifications, gaseous diffusion plants	267,800,000	267,800,000	267,800,000
	National security			
	Weapons activities:			
86-10-c	Phermex enhancement, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, N. Mex.	4,150,000	4,150,000	4,150,000
76-14	Safeguards and security upgrading	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
71-9(1)	New plutonium recovery facility, Rocky Flats, Colo.	25,300,000	23,300,000	25,300,000
71-9(5)	DP site plutonium processing facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, N. Mex.	13,400,000	13,400,000	13,400,000
	Weapons materials production:			
76-8-a	Additional facilities, high level waste storage, Savannah River, S.C.	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
76-8-b	Additional high level waste storage facilities, Richland, Wash.	9,900,000	9,900,000	9,900,000
76-5-1-c	New waste calcining facility, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000
	General reduction, anticipated slippage		−23,350,000	
	Total, fiscal year 1977 construction budget authority	1,285,960,000	1,225,500,000	1,299,960,000
	CAPITAL EQUIPMENT NOT RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION			
	Capital equipment—Obligations:			
	Solar energy development	5,700,000	[1] 7,400,000	[1] 7,400,000
	Geothermal energy development	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	Conservation research and development: electric energy systems and energy storage	5,000,000	[2] 6,000,000	[2] 6,000,000
	Fusion power research and development:			
	Magnetic fusion	19,800,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
	Laser fusion	10,800,000	12,800,000	12,800,000
	Total fusion power research and development	30,600,000	35,800,000	35,800,000
	Fuel cycle research and development	15,600,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
	Fission power reactor development	49,002,000	49,002,000	49,002,000
	Environmental research and safety:			
	Biomedical and environmental research	10,418,000	11,418,000	11,418,000
	Operational safety	1,000,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
	Environmental control technology	560,000	560,000	560,000
	Total environmental research and safety	11,978,000	13,078,000	13,078,000
	High energy physics	20,800,000	21,800,000	21,800,000
	Basic energy sciences	15,400,000	[3] 16,400,000	[3] 16,400,000
	Nuclear materials security and safeguards	2,400,000	3,932,000	3,932,000
	Naval reactor development	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
	Space nuclear systems	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000

See footnote at end of table.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—Con.

Plant and Capital Equipment—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1977

Project title	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Uranium enrichment activities:			
Uranium enrichment	$17,243,000	$17,000,000	$17,000,000
Advanced isotopes separation technology	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Total uranium enrichment activities	24,243,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
National security:			
Weapons activities	73,100,000	70,000,000	73,100,000
Weapons materials production	23,691,000	29,691,000	29,691,000
Total national security	96,791,000	99,691,000	102,791,000
Program support:			
Program direction	4,325,000	4,200,000	4,325,000
Supporting activities: Information services	900,000	900,000	900,000
Total program support	5,225,000	5,100,000	5,225,000
Total program obligations	293,439,000	306,903,000	310,128,000
Unobligated balance brought forward		−6,903,000	−1,903,000
Total capital equipment budget authority	293,439,000	300,000,000	308,225,000
Grand total, plant and capital equipment	[5] 1,579,399,000	1,525,500,000	1,608,185,000

[1] Increase is for heating and cooling demonstrations.
[2] Increase is for electrical energy storage program.
[3] Increase includes $500,000 for materials science and $500,000 for molecular, mathematical and geosciences.
[4] Amended budget request (S. Doc. 94-208) not considered by House.
[5] Includes budget amendment of $170,125,000 (S. Doc. 94-208) not considered by House.

Construction Projects

Recommended changes to the budget request follow:

(1) Project 77-18.—Solar energy facilities and projects, various locations. An increase of $20,000,000 is recommended by the Committee, subject to the specific authorization as required for such facilities and projects. Based on information brought to the attention of the Committee, a number of worthy solar energy project proposals have been submitted, such as; a biomass conversion facility in conjunction with existing research facilities at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Ark.; solar thermal demonstration plants for rural and small communities at Hobbs, N. Mex. in conjunction with a public utility system and private industry, and in Arkansas in conjunction with the state's rural electrical cooperatives, among other such proposals. The Committee directs the attention of ERDA to this additional funding for solar energy facilities, and urges ERDA to see that these and other submitted proposals are fully considered and reviewed consistent with the authorization and mandate of the Congress.

(2) Project 77-6-a.—A decrease of $1,000,000 for modifications and additions to various biomedical and environmental research facilities. An amount of $3,200,000 is provided for this project in fiscal year 1977.

(3) Project 77-8-d.—A reduction of $2,000,000 for conversion of steam plant facilities at Oak Ridge Laboratory leaving $10,200,000 to continue work on this project in the coming fiscal year.

(4) Project 77-9-a.—A decrease of $1,000,000 for expansion of feed vaporization and sampling facilities at various locations. The decrease leaves $8,000,000 to proceed with this project in fiscal year 1977.

(5) Project 77-9-d.—A $5,000,000 reduction for the centrifuge plant demonstration facility at Oak Ridge, Tenn. due to project delays. A recent reprogramming proposal cited cost overruns in the present demonstration facility. A total of $25,000,000 is recommended to continue work on this project in fiscal year 1977.

(6) Project 77-11-a.—An increase of $1,000,000 for expanded office space for the safeguard and research and development laboratory, Sandia Laboratories, N. Mex.

(7) Project 76-2-a.—An increase of $2,000,000 to accelerate work on the 5-Megawatt Solar Test facility, which will test solar energy components and subsystems.

Capital Equipment

The Committee recommends restoration of the $3,100,000 House reduction in connection with the weapons activities and a reduction of $5,000,000 in the unobligated balances applied by the House Committee.

Geothermal Resources Development Fund

Appropriations, 1976	
Budget estimate, 1977	$50,000,000
House allowance	30,000,000
Committee recommendation	30,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	−20,000,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $30,000,000 in new budget authority to establish a reserve in the Geothermal Resources Development Fund to guarantee loans. This amount is the same as the House allowance and a decrease of $20,000,000 below the budget estimate. ERDA estimates that costs in fiscal year 1977 will amount to $4,400,000.

A total of $30 million in budget authority will allow ERDA to guarantee approximately $200 million worth of loans as proposed in the budget. The Committee concurs with the House Committee that the justifications did not support the necessity of a $50 million appropriation to support a $200 million loan guarantee level. The Committee has also included a limitation in the bill providing that the indebtedness guaranteed or committed to be guaranteed shall not exceed the aggregate of $200,000,000.

The objectives of the Geothermal Resources Development Fund are to encourage and assist the private sector to accelerate development of geothermal resources and to develop normal borrower-lender relationships which will in time encourage the flow of credit without the need for Federal assistance.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

GENERAL COMMENTS

WATER RESOURCES INVESTMENTS TO THE NATION

Through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works program the Federal government has invested almost $36 billion in the planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance of water reseources projects. The program is essentially a capital investment program that returns significant economic and other benefits to the nation. More than half of this investment has occurred in the last 15 years—a period during which Civil Works expenditures averaged only about 0.6 percent of the Federal budget. Though relatively small in the context of total Federal expenditures, investments in Corps water resources projects have beneficial effects that touch almost every facet of modern American society—navigation projects that provide the Nation with its lowest-cost mode of transportation for bulk commodities; flood control projects that protect the lives, homes and businesses of thousands of Americans; and recreation facilities that enable millions of visitors to relax and enjoy the beauty of our country's waters. These Corps water resources developments form an integral part of the physical web needed to provide both the necessities and the luxuries Americans enjoy today.

The scope of activities included in the Corps Civil Works program is broad. Water resources research and development, comprehensive water resources planning, hydrologic and meteorological data collection and special studies such as the national dam safety study and the national strip-mine study are but a few of the myriad activities comprising the program. Important as these activities are—for they provide the data and information necessary for Congress, the American people and the Corps to make the rational and deliberate choices and judgments regarding the direction of the nation's water resources development and management program—they require only a small fraction of the Federal funds appropriated for the Civil Works program. Well over 80% of Civil Works appropriations have been expended for the design, construction, operation and maintenance of the facilities needed to manage and preserve our nation's vast water resource for the benefit and use of the American people. These investments, together with investments in other types of public works, are the nation's primary capital investments in the assets needed to maintain and improve the American economy and our society.

We benefit now from the wisdom and foresight of our ancestors in providing for a strong Federal role in national water resources development and management, and future generations of Americans will be equally reliant on the measures we provide in carrying out this role. The importance in the future of what we do today perhaps can be best assessed by evaluating the importance now of what was done in the past. One has only to envision great cities like Memphis and New Orleans virtually unprotected from periodic ravages of Mississippi River floodwaters or a U.S. transportation system without deep draft harbors and inland waterways on which to transport the vast quantities of bulk commodities moving to and from the nation's midlands to realize that this country would have attained only a fraction of its economic and social potential without the benefit of past Civil Works expenditures. The significance of these investments can be easily understood by thinking in the abstract of what the nation would be without them, but we need not rely on abstractions to demonstrate their value. It is possible to obtain a measure of value by examining tangible returns—both to the Nation as a whole and to individual communities and groups of citizens throughout the country.

In addition to promoting interstate commerce, protecting life and property, enhancing fish and wildlife habitats, and providing opportunities for outdoor recreation, Corps water resources projects are national investments that not only provide tangible monetary returns, but also stimulate economic growth and development, and reduce public and private economic losses resulting from both excesses and deficiencies in streamflow. Like almost all capital investments, these projects provide tangible and intangible returns throughout their useful lives—many of which will extend decades into the future. Consequently, investments in water resources projects—unlike most other types of Federal investments—are authorized specifically on the basis of anticipated return on the investment. And while the tangible returns on Federal investments in water resources projects are important, they are not the sole consideration in evaluating the importance of the Corps Civil Works program. The projects also play important roles in achieving and maintaining environmental conditions that improve the quality of life for all Americans. Civil Works projects afford substantial opportunities for management and protection of the quality of water and related land resources. Under Federal management, the waters and adjacent lands comprising a Corps project are protected from degradation that would result from uncontrolled use and abuse. Wise use for current needs and thoughtful conservation for future needs are inseparable principles in planning, constructing, operating and maintaining Corps projects.

FLOOD CONTROL

Almost $8 billion has been invested in flood control works constructed by the Corps of Engineers. Over 300 flood control projects are presently operated by the Corps with about 150 more under construction and about 100 additional projects under study. Additionally, scores of local protection projects have been constructed by the Corps and turned over to local authorities for operation and maintenance. The existing projects have prevented more than $47 billion in flood losses—over five times the amount invested in them. But because about

half the Nation's communities and at least 7 percent of its total land area are subject to significant flooding, flood problems are not completely in hand. It is obvious that it will not be possible to provide protection for all of the people and property in the nation's flood-prone areas. A combination of structural protective measures and non-structural measures that will reduce exposure to flood hazards is needed to minimize flood losses in the future.

The job of reducing the Nation's flood losses to an acceptable level is far from complete. In 1972, for example, floods resulting from Hurricane Agnes caused the loss of 122 lives and damages estimated at $3.1 billion, despite the existence of Corps projects that prevented more than $500 million in damages. More than 125,000 families were affected by these disastrous floods and thousands of businesses were destroyed or damaged. Similarly, in 1973, floods along the Mississippi River and its tributaries caused inundation of 13,000,000 acres of land with resultant damages of almost a billion dollars, although many billions of dollars in damages were prevented by Corps projects during the course of this flood.

NAVIGATION

The Corps of Engineers has expended $6 billion for the development of the nation's inland waterways and costal and Great Lakes ports and harbors. More than 25,000 miles of commercially navigable waterways have been developed and are maintained at a current annual cost of about $300 million. Facilitated by locks and dams at 229 sites, almost 2 billion tons of commodities move along these waterways and through these ports each year. One hundred thirty-one of the nation's one hundred fifty largest cities are situated along the commercial navigation waterway system, and 17 percent of the domestic intercity cargo moves on the inland waterways and the Great Lakes. The location of the nation's major commercial and industrial centers along inland waterways is no accident. Access to water transportation helped stimulate the growth of these centers in the past, and continued availability of water transportation is essential for their continued economic well-being in the future.

Federal investment in the inland waterway system has provided a wealth of benefits for the American people. In addition to providing low-cost transportation for many of the bulk commodities such as petroleum, coal and grain, the waterways provide a means for energy-efficient movement of the commodities. Energy requirements per ton-mile of transportation on the water are about two-thirds the requirement for transportation by rail and less than one-third the requirement for transportation by truck. The standardization of channel depths and lock dimensions achieved through Federal development of the inland waterway system has also facilitated orderly and efficient development of the industries using the system.

Traffic on the commercially navigable waterway system has grown seven-fold over the last 25 years, reaching a current total of more than 350 billion ton-miles, or about 14 million ton-miles for every mile of waterway in the system. No other transportation mode is as efficient in commercial use of its right-of-way. In 1971, for example, when

waterway traffic was about 8 million ton-miles per mile of commercially navigable waterway, the corresponding traffic for rail transportation was 3.6 million ton-miles per mile.

About 1850 companies are engaged in commercial operations on the waterways. Capital investment in barges and towing equipment exceeds $2 billion, and more than 80,000 persons are employed aboard the inland fleet. Public and private port and terminal facilities along the waterways represent several billion additional dollars of waterway-dependent investment and they provide employment for thousands of skilled and semi-skilled workers.

About 95 percent of the U.S. population lives in states served by the inland waterway system. Without the system, the nation's transportation cost for goods transported by water would likely be more than $1 billion per year higher than at present. This increase in cost would be reflected in higher prices for goods transported by water and for goods manufactured from waterborne commodities.

WATER SUPPLY

About 7.2 million acre-feet of water supply storage is impounded in 82 Corps multiple purpose reservoirs. Under contracts with 138 state and local water agencies the water supply storage provides 4½ billion gallons of water per day, serving about 4¾ million persons through augmentation of municipal, industrial and rural water supply sources. The cost of providing the storage, about $310 million, is repaid by the users, with interest, thereby recovering all of the Federal investment in making water supply available as an integral part of multiple-purpose water resources development.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

The Corps of Engineers has constructed 65 multiple purpose projects with hydroelectric installations. The installed generating capacity of these projects as of January 1976 totals almost 15.7 million kilowatts, and fiscal year 1975 revenues returned to the Federal treasury total $150 million. Construction underway on 9 additional projects will raise the total installed capacity at Corps projects to more than 20 million kilowatts. This represents about one-fourth of the nation's developed hydroelectric capacity and about 4 percent of the current total national generating capacity from all sources. In fiscal year 1975, Corps hydroelectric projects produced almost 83 billion kilowatt-hours of energy, thereby saving the consumption in that one year alone of more than 141 million barrels of oil or almost 36 million tons of coal which would have been required to produce an equivalent amount of energy from non-nuclear thermal generating stations. The entire cost of hydroelectric power is recovered. Federal policy requires that rates for sale of the power be established at a level high enough to recover the Federal investment in the generating facilities, as well as the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities and cost of marketing the power.

The value of hydroelectric power production goes far beyond the relatively simple considerations associated with financial returns and

even beyond the obvious savings in consumption of non-renewable resources. Among the not-so-obvious values of hydroelectric generation are: its ability to absorb with minimal operating difficulties the short-term variations in peak demands for power in a large power supply system; its role as an attractive component of multiple-purpose water resource projects due to the fact it does not reduce the quantity or degrade the quality of the water resource; its contribution, as the cleanest source of electrical energy, to the national objective of improving environmental quality; and its potential to augment other types of generation, thereby improving the efficiency of existing and proposed thermal facilities and displacing the use of inefficient or obsolescent thermal generation sources for meeting peak demands. All of these factors are important considerations in national and regional power supply planning.

Although about 40 percent of the nation's conventional hydroelectric potential has been developed, substantial additions to our hydroelectric capacity are possible if an aggressive program of developing conventional and pumped-storage hydroelectric projects is pursued over the next 20 years. Such a program could add more than 25 million kilowatts of new conventional hydroelectric capacity and from 30 to 60 million kilowatts of pumped storage hydroelectric capacity. Increases of this magnitude are substantial and they could provide some relief to the nation's energy and environmental problems. For example, this magnitude of hydroelectric development would make it possible to realize an additional savings of more than 85 million barrels of oil or 22 million tons of coal annually. While these figures are relatively small, they accumulate to substantial quantities over a 50-year project life. At a price of $12 per barrel for imported oil the savings over the life of these projects would amount to more than $50 billion.

RECREATION

Through development of facilities for outdoor recreation at its projects, the Corps of Engineers provides recreation opportunities that attract more visitors than any other Federal program. A total of 2,870 recreation areas have been developed by the Corps at 413 water resources projects. More than 352 million visitor-days of use are recorded annually at these projects—a figure which has doubled in the last 10 years. State and local government agencies and private interests operating under concessions granted by the Federal government have assumed responsibility for operation of 938 of the recreation areas. Leases and use fees charged at the more highly developed sites return about $7.2 million to the Federal treasury each year of which about $4.0 million is returned to local governments. About 11 million acres of land and water and more than 44,000 miles of shoreline are managed by the Corps on behalf of the American people as an integral part of the recreation program.

Estimating the national economic impact of the recreation program is difficult, but a recent study of visitors to projects in the Arkansas River System indicated that expenditures of $175 million were made in conjunction with about 25 million visitor-days of use. Extrapolation of the results of this study over the nation produces an estimate of almost $3 billion annually in economic activity directly related to the Corps recreation program.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1976	$66,836,000
Budget estimate, 1977	64,255,000
House allowance	70,110,000
Committee recommendation	72,180,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+7,925,000
House allowance	+2,070,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation for $72,180,000 for fiscal year 1977, which is $7,925,000 over the budget request and $2,070,000 over the House allowance.

Funds are provided under this heading for surveys and activities shown in the following table, with the Committee comments appearing immediately after the table.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Type	Survey	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
	ALABAMA			
(FC)	BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON	---	50,000	50,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR	92,000	92,000	92,000
(SPEC)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY	---	150,000	150,000
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK	50,000	50,000	50,000
(N)	WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE RIVERS	---	100,000	100,000
	ALASKA			
(N)	COOK INLET SHOALS, ALAS	41,000	41,000	41,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN ANCHORAGE	349,000	349,000	349,000
(FC)	RIVERS AND HARBORS IN ALASKA (HYDRO INTERIM)	210,000	210,000	210,000
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR	---	---	30,000
(FC)	SOUTHCENTRAL RAILBELT AREA	60,000	60,000	60,000
	AMERICAN SAMOA			
(N)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN AMERICAN SAMOA	50,000	50,000	50,000
	ARIZONA			
(FC)	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES (GILA DRAIN), ARIZ. & N.M.	40,000	40,000	40,000
(FC)	PHOENIX METROPOLITAN AREA	465,000	465,000	465,000
	ARKANSAS			
(FC)	LITTLE ROCK METROPOLITAN AREA	470,000	470,000	470,000
(FC)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, ARK	100,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	PINE BLUFF METROPOLITAN AREA	242,000	242,000	242,000
(COMP)	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM (AUTH. RPT)ARK LA OKLA TEX	55,000	55,000	55,000
(C)	WHITE RIVER BASIN ARK & MO (AUTH RPT)	75,000	75,000	75,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BASIN RESERVOIRS	125,000	125,000	125,000
	CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	ALAMEDA CREEK UPPER BASIN	160,000	160,000	160,000
(FC)	ANTELOPE VALLEY	40,000	200,000	100,000
(N)	COAST OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	30,000	30,000	30,000
(FC)	EEL RIVER	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER	80,000	80,000	80,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR & BAY, CALIF	60,000	60,000	60,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW	100,000	100,000	100,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBORS (INC. SAN PEDRO BAY MODEL STUDY)	365,000	725,000	725,000
(N)	NORTH COAST OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF	15,000	15,000	15,000
(FC)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS	220,000	220,000	220,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR	75,000	75,000	75,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS-BANK PROTECTION AND EROSION CONTROL	---	75,000	---
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL	150,000	150,000	150,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA	200,000	250,000	200,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO VALLEY NAV, CALIF	40,000	100,000	40,000
(FC)	SALINAS RIVER INCL. PART OF SALINAS-MONTEREY METROPOLITAN AREA	420,000	420,000	420,000
(FC)	SAN DIEGO COUNTY STREAMS FLOWING INTO THE PACIFIC OCEAN	50,000	200,000	200,000
(BE)	SAN DIEGO COUNTY, VICINITY OF OCEANSIDE	70,000	125,000	125,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR & SWEETWATER RIVER, CALIF	15,000	15,000	15,000
(FC)	SAN FRAN BAY & SAC.-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, WATER QUAL & WASTE DISPOSAL	80,000	135,000	80,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA (IN-DEPTH STUDY)	270,000	270,000	270,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR & BAY (COLL & DISP DEBRIS), CALIF	25,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN	200,000	320,000	320,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN & ORANGE COUNTY	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	SANTA CLARA RIVER	45,000	125,000	125,000
(N)	SUNSET HARBOR	30,000	30,000	30,000
(BE)	VENTURA COUNTY	75,000	75,000	75,000
(FC)	VENTURA RIVER	---	50,000	50,000
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK BASIN	20,000	20,000	20,000
	COLORADO			
(FC)	METRO DENVER & SOUTH PLATTE RIVER & TRIBS, COLO., NEBR., & WYO	385,000	385,000	385,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS--CONTINUED

Type	Survey	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
	CONNECTICUT			
(COMP)	CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT CONN.,MASS.,N.H.,&VT	75,000	175,000	175,000
(N)	NEW HAVEN HARBOR	89,000	89,000	89,000
(FC)	RIPPOWAM RIVER, CONN.	40,000	100,000	100,000
(BE)	SHERWOOD ISLAND STATE PARK	30,000	30,000	30,000
	DELAWARE			
(FC)	CHRISTINA RIVER BASIN	50,000	50,000	50,000
(N)	MURDERKILL AND ST. JONES RIVER	----	----	20,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
(SPEC)	METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON, D.C. WATER SUPPLY	600,000	600,000	600,000
	FLORIDA			
(N)	APALACHICOLA RIVER BELOW JIM WOODRUFF LOCK & DAM	59,000	59,000	59,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS	377,000	377,000	377,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR (MILL COVE)	40,000	40,000	40,000
(FC)	JACKSONVILLE METROPOLITAN AREA	390,000	390,000	390,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FLA	25,000	62,000	62,000
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY	----	25,000	25,000
(BE)	MONROE COUNTY	50,000	50,000	50,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY (ST LUCIE CANAL)	75,000	75,000	75,000
(N)	PENSACOLA HARBOR	----	50,000	50,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA-TALLAHASSEE METROPOLITAN & OTHER URBAN AREAS	235,000	375,000	300,000
(BE)	SAINT JOHNS COUNTY	88,000	88,000	88,000
(BE)	SHORES OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA	90,000	150,000	150,000
(BE)	VOLUSIA COUNTY SHORES	50,000	100,000	100,000
	GEORGIA			
(FC)	METRO SAVANNAH AREA, GA	100,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN ATLANTA AREA	350,000	350,000	350,000
(FC)	SATILLA RIVER BASIN	75,000	75,000	75,000
(FC)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA,NC, & SC	104,000	104,000	104,000
	GUAM			
(N)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN THE TERRITORY OF GUAM	100,000	230,000	230,000
	HAWAII			
(FC)	HARBORS AND RIVERS IN HAWAII	240,000	240,000	240,000
(N)	KANEOHE BAY AND PART OF METROPOLITAN HONOLULU	360,000	360,000	360,000
(N)	KAUNAKAKAI DEEP DRAFT HARBOR	----)	70,000)	70,000)
(FC)	KIHEI DISTRICT	----	75,000	75,000
(FC)	LAVA FLOW CONTROL, ISL. OF HAWAII	----	40,000	40,000
	IDAHO			
(FC)	BIG WOOD RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	142,000	142,000	142,000
(FC)	COLUMBIA RIVER & TRIBS, IDAHO, MONT., ORE., WASH., & WYO	950,000	950,000	950,000
(COMP)	PACIFIC NORTHWEST RIVER BASIN, IDAHO, MONT., ORE., & WASH	30,000	30,000	30,000
	ILLINOIS			
(FC)	CHICAGO-SOUTH END OF LAKE MICHIGAN, ILL. & IND.	280,000	280,000	280,000
(FC)	DECOGNIA & FOUNTAIN BLUFF DRAIN & LEVEE DIST & GRAND TOWER, IL	86,000	86,000	86,000
(FC)	E.C.GIRARDEAU, CLR.CR.,N. ALEX., PRESTON, & MILLER POND D&L DIST	75,000	100,000	75,000
(FC)	FOX RIVER, ILL. & WISC	300,000	300,000	300,000
(N)	MISS RIVER 9FT-RND NAV, IL, MO, IA, WI, MN (FUNDS IN R.I.)	40,000	40,000	40,000
(FC)	MISS. RIVER, CASSVILLE, WISC. TO MI 300, ILL., IOWA, MO., & WISC	53,000	53,000	53,000
(FC)	MISS. RIVER, COON RAPIDS DAM TO OHIO RIVER, ILL., IOWA, & MO	124,000	124,000	124,000
(FC)	QUAD CITIES URBAN STUDY	----	150,000	----
(FC)	ROCK RIVER AT ROCKFORD	150,000	150,000	150,000
(N)	SALINE RIVER NAVIGATION	----	60,000	----
(FC)	SILVER CREEK, IL	135,000	135,000	135,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS--CONTINUED

Type	Survey	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
	INDIANA			
(FC)	COLUMBUS	85,000	85,000	85,000
(FC)	FORT WAYNE, INDIANA METROPOLITAN AREA	80,000	80,000	120,000
(BE)	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, LAKE MICHIGAN	50,000	50,000	80,000
(COMP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT, IND. & ILL	100,000	100,000	100,000
(N)	WABASH RIVER NAVIGATION, IND. & ILL	150,000	150,000	150,000
	IOWA			
(FC)	DES MOINES RIVER BANK EROSION, IOWA	110,000	200,000	110,000
(FC)	IOWA & CEDAR RIVERS, IOWA & MINN	150,000	150,000	150,000
(FC)	LAKE MANAWA	----	5,000	5,000
(FC)	METRO SIOUX CITY & MO. RIV, SD, NB, IA	100,000	100,000	100,000
	KANSAS			
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER, GREAT BEND, KANS. TO JOHN MARTIN DAM, COLO	170,000	170,000	170,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER, GREAT BEND, KANS. TO TULSA, OKLA	260,000	330,000	330,000
(FC)	KANSAS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	290,000	290,000	290,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE, KANSAS	40,000	40,000	40,000
(FC)	VERDIGRIS RIVER, KANS. & OKLA	225,000	225,000	225,000
	KENTUCKY			
(FC)	CLARKS RIVER BASIN	----	30,000	30,000
(N)	GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY	112,000	112,000	112,000
(N)	LOUISVILLE HARBOR, KY	30,000	30,000	30,000
(N)	LOWER CUMBERLAND & TENN RIVERS BELOW BARKLEY CANAL, KY. & TENN	180,000	180,000	180,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LEXINGTON REGION	153,000	153,000	153,000
(FC)	UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN	80,000	80,000	80,000
	LOUISIANA			
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY (DUPRE CUT)	50,000	50,000	50,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, ENTRANCE CHANNEL	50,000	50,000	50,000
(N)	BAYOU MANCHAC AND AMITE	----	10,000	10,000
(N)	GULF IWW-LA. SECTION, HIGH LEVEL HIGHWAY CROSSINGS	65,000	65,000	65,000
(N)	GULF IWW-TEX. SECTION, LA. & TEX	150,000	150,000	150,000
(FC)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA	160,000	160,000	160,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS-BATON ROUGE METROPOLITAN AREA	421,000	421,000	421,000
(FC)	WEST BANK MISS RIV IN VIC OF NEW ORLEANS, LA	50,000	50,000	50,000
	MAINE			
(N)	FORE RIVER CHNL, PORTLAND HBR, ME	76,000	76,000	76,000
(SPEC)	PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL STUDY	50,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	ST. JOHN RIVER	90,000	150,000	150,000
	MARYLAND			
(FC)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN STREAMS	200,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	BEAVER DAM CREEK AND CABIN BRANCH	----	20,000	20,000
(SPEC)	CHESAPEAKE BAY STUDY, MD. & VA	1,840,000	1,840,000	1,840,000
(N)	CHESAPEAKE CITY BRIDGE	----	40,000	40,000
(FC)	MONONGAHELA YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, MD PA WV	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	SMITH ISLAND	----	25,000	25,000
	MASSACHUSETTS			
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR (DEBRIS)	52,000	102,000	102,000
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR (35 FT CHANNEL)	----	50,000	50,000
(BE)	CAPE COD EASTERLY SHORES	40,000	80,000	80,000
(FC)	HOOSIC RIVER, MASS., N.Y., & VT	40,000	40,000	40,000
	MICHIGAN			
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR	42,000	42,000	42,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR & RIVER (SMALL BOAT)	25,000	25,000	25,000
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS & HARBORS, MICH	80,000	80,000	80,000
(FC)	GRT LAKES,ONTARIO & ERIE,(METRO DULUTH-SUPERIOR),MI,MN,NY,OH,PA&WI	427,000	427,000	427,000
(SPEC)	GRT LAKES-ST LAWRENCE SWY. NAV SSN. EST., MI,IL,IN,MN,NY,OH,PA,WI	650,000	760,000	760,000
(N)	LITTLE GIRL'S POINT	----	70,000	70,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS--CONTINUED

Type	Survey	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MICH	30,000	100,000	100,000
(SPEC)	WATER LVLS OF THE GRT LAKES, MI,IL,IN,MN,NY,OH,PA,&WI	220,000	880,000	500,000
	MINNESOTA			
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT THE HEADWATERS OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER	100,000	150,000	150,000
(N)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI (SMALL CRAFT LOCKS), MINN. IOWA, MO., & WISC	140,000	140,000	140,000
	MISSISSIPPI			
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR	60,000	60,000	60,000
(FC)	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN	100,000	100,000	100,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER	40,000	40,000	40,000
	MISSOURI			
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU JACKSON METRO AREA	100,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF KANSAS CITY, MO. & KANS.	414,000	414,000	414,000
(FC)	MISS. RIVER, OLD CHANNEL MILE 111-117	---	100,000	100,000
(FC)	PLATTIN CREEK	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	ST. GENEVIEVE	50,000	50,000	50,000
(N)	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO. & ILL	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	ST. LOUIS METROPOLITAN AREA, MO. & ILL	165,000	165,000	165,000
	MONTANA			
(FC)	FLATHEAD AND CLARK FORK RIVER BASINS	75,000	220,000	220,000
	NEBRASKA			
(FC)	PLATTE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	75,000	75,000	75,000
	NEVADA			
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS	30,000	30,000	30,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE			
(FC)	CONN. RIV. STRBK. EROS. (WILDER LK.,NH&VT TO TURNERS FALLS DAM,MA)	80,000	110,000	110,000
(BE)	NORTH AND FOSS BEACHES	40,000	40,000	40,000
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR	---	---	20,000
	NEW JERSEY			
(FC)	CAMDEN METROPOLITAN AREA	285,000	285,000	285,000
(FC)	DELAWARE BAY, SHORE OF NEW JERSEY	40,000	40,000	40,000
(FC)	HACKENSACK RIVER, N.J. & N.Y	115,000	115,000	115,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL CHANNEL, NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, N.J. & N.Y	35,000	35,000	35,000
(FC)	RAHWAY RIVER	146,000	146,000	146,000
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN	174,000	174,000	174,000
(FC)	THIRD RIVER	---	70,000	70,000
	NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	PECOS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES AT CARLSBAD	60,000	60,000	60,000
(FC)	PUERCO RIVER AT GALLUP	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE & TRIBUTARIES, N.M. & COLO	565,000	565,000	565,000
	NEW YORK			
(N)	BIG SANDY CREEK MEXICO BAY	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	DELAWARE RIVER TRIBUTARIES IN NEW YORK STATE	50,000	50,000	50,000
(N)	GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, NY	40,000	40,000	40,000
(N)	GREAT LAKES TO HUDSON RIVER WATERWAY	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	IRONDEQUOIT CREEK, NY	40,000	40,000	40,000
(FC)	MORRISONVILLE AND VICINITY, NY	30,000	30,000	30,000
(N)	OGDENSBURG HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000	40,000
(FC)	OSWEGO RIVER BASIN	464,000	464,000	464,000
(N)	ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY, ADDITIONAL LOCKS	200,000	250,000	250,000
(COMP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT, N.Y., PA., & MD	400,000	400,000	400,000
(FC)	UPPER ALLEGHENY RIVER BASIN, NY & PA	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	WALLKILL RIVER, N.Y. & N.J	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	WESTCHESTER COUNTY STREAMS, NY AND BYRAM RIVER, CT	160,000	180,000	180,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS--CONTINUED

Type	Survey	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
	NORTH CAROLINA			
(BE)	BOGUE BANKS AND BOGUE INLET, N.C	60,000	60,000	60,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET	48,000	48,000	48,000
(FC)	LUMBER RIVER, NC & SC	35,000	35,000	35,000
(FC)	NEUSE RIVER	75,000	75,000	75,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER (SOUTH BOSTON & VICINITY), N.C. & VA	85,000	85,000	85,000
(FC)	SUGAR CREEK BASIN, N.C. & S.C	230,000	230,000	230,000
	NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, N.D. & MINN	335,000	335,000	335,000
	OHIO			
(FC)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY	110,000	110,000	110,000
(FC)	CUYAHOGA RIVER BASIN	130,000	130,000	130,000
(SPEC)	LAKE ERIE-WASTEWATER MGMT. (SEC. 108A,PL 92-500),OH,MICH.,N.Y.,PA	770,000	770,000	770,000
(FC)	MIAMI RIVER, LITTLE MIAMI RIVER & MILL CR, OHIO	100,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	MILTON DAM AND RESERVOIR	---	---	50,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER BASIN	50,000	50,000	50,000
(N)	OHIO PORT DEVELOPMENT, OHIO	50,000	50,000	50,000
	OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	CANADIAN RIVER & TRIBUTARIES OK TX NM	100,000	100,000	200,000
(FC)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE	45,000	45,000	45,000
(FC)	TULSA URBAN STUDY	170,000	400,000	400,000
	OREGON			
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, ORE & WASH	82,000	82,000	82,000
(FC)	PORTLAND-VANCOUVER METROPOLITAN AREA	358,000	620,000	620,000
(FC)	SILVIES RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	131,000	131,000	131,000
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR	10,000	10,000	80,000
(COMP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT, OREGON	92,000	92,000	92,000
	PENNSYLVANIA			
(FC)	BEAVER RIVER BASIN, PA. & OH	250,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	CHESTER CREEK WATERSHED	70,000	70,000	70,000
(FC)	POTOMAC RIVER, NORTH BRANCH (MINE DRAINAGE),PA., MD., & W. VA	250,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE-HYDRO STUDY	138,000	138,000	138,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER REVIEW	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, MINE DRAINAGE, PA., MD., & N.Y	137,000	137,000	137,000
	RHODE ISLAND			
(FC)	PAWCATUCK RIV & NARRAGANSETT BAY DRAIN' BASIN, R.I.,MASS.&CONN	599,000	800,000	800,000
(N)	PROVIDENCE HARBOR (DEBRIS)	39,000	39,000	39,000
(N)	SAKONNET HARBOR	---	---	30,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA			
(BE)	FOLLY BEACH	25,000	25,000	50,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR	42,000	42,000	42,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER, S.D., MONT., NEBR. & N.D	81,000	81,000	81,000
(FC)	UPPER BIG SIOUX RIVER & EASTERN SD WATER SUPPLY, SD & IA	140,000	140,000	140,000
	TENNESSEE			
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF MEMPHIS	196,000	196,000	196,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE	300,000	300,000	300,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS--CONTINUED

Type	Survey	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
	TEXAS			
(FC)	BEAR CREEK AND TRIBS	---	75,000	---
(FC)	BRAZOS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	236,000	236,000	236,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	70,000	110,000	110,000
(FC)	COLORADO RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	180,000	200,000	200,000
(N)	COLORADO RIVER CHANNEL TO BAY CITY	50,000	100,000	100,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, HARBOR ISLAND	150,000	150,000	150,000
(N)	GALVESTON BAY AREA NAV. STUDY	105,000	150,000	150,000
(BE)	GALVESTON COUNTY SHORE EROSION	100,000	315,000	315,000
(FC)	JOHNSON CREEK	154,000	154,000	154,000
(FC)	LINNVILLE BAYOU & CANEY CREEK, TRES PALACIOS	65,000	65,000	65,000
(FC)	LOWER SABINE RIVER, TEX	100,000	250,000	250,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL	---	40,000	40,000
(FC)	NUECES RIVER AND TRIBS	---	50,000	50,000
(FC)	PALO BLANCO CREEK AMD CIBOLO CREEK IN VICINITY OF FALFURRIAS	---	50,000	50,000
(N)	SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY	95,000	95,000	95,000
(FC)	SAN DIEGO CREEK	45,000	45,000	45,000
(FC)	SAN JACINTO RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	75,000	100,000	100,000
(SPEC)	TEXAS COAST HURRICANE, TEX	310,000	400,000	400,000
	UTAH			
(FC)	COLO. RIV & TRIBS, ABOVE LEE FERRY, UTAH,ARIZ.,COL.,N.M.&WY	30,000	30,000	30,000
(FC)	JORDAN RIVER BASIN	50,000	50,000	50,000
	VIRGIN ISLANDS			
(FC)	VIRGIN ISLANDS (CROWN BAY)	60,000	60,000	60,000
	VIRGINIA			
(FC)	CHOWAN RIVER, VA. & N.C.	200,000	200,000	200,000
(N)	HAMPTON ROADS DRIFT REMOVAL	---	50,000	50,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR & CHANNELS (ANCHORAGES)	50,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER, UPPER BASIN	90,000	90,000	90,000
(BE)	NORFOLK VICINITY WILLOUGHBY SPIT	---	---	50,000
	WASHINGTON			
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	100,000	100,000	150,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN SPOKANE & SPOKANE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, WASH. & IDAHO	55,000	55,000	55,000
(FC)	OKANOGAN RIVER & TRIBS	80,000	80,000	80,000
(COMP)	PUGET SOUND & ADJACENT WATERS AUTH REPORT, WASH	150,000	150,000	200,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, ELLIOTT BAY, WASH	63,000	63,000	63,000
(N)	SNOHOMISH RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	142,000	142,000	142,000
(FC)	YAKIMA VALLEY, REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT	80,000	150,000	150,000
	WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	GAULEY RIVER	280,000	280,000	280,000
(FC)	ISLAND CREEK	---	---	50,000
(COMP)	KANAWHA RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT,W.VA., N.C., & VA.	200,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	METRO REGION OF HUNTINGTON, W.VA.(ASHLAND, KY. PORTSMOUTH, OHIO)	450,000	450,000	450,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF WHEELING, W.VA. & OHIO	220,000	220,000	220,000
	WISCONSIN			
(FC)	CHIPPEWA RIVER	100,000	100,000	100,000
(N)	HARBORS BETWEEN KENOSHA & KEWAUNEE	120,000	120,000	120,000
(FC)	WISCONSIN RIVER PORTAGE	---	40,000	40,000
	Total, ALL STATES	33,625,000	40,230,000	39,580,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS--CONTINUED

Type	Survey	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	3,100,000	2,900,000	3,100,000
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS:			
	RESTUDIES OF DEFERRED PROJECTS	75,000	75,000	145,000
	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECTS (SEC. 216, PL 91-611)	720,000	720,000	720,000
	REVIEW FOR DEAUTHORIZTION (SEC. 12, PL 93-251)	375,000	375,000	375,000
	Total	1,170,000	1,170,000	1,240,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA:			
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	465,000	465,000	465,000
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	280,000	280,000	280,000
	FISH AND WILDLIFE STUDIES (USF & WS)	2,000,000	1,800,000	2,000,000
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	300,000	300,000	300,000
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	290,000	290,000	290,000
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	125,000	125,000	125,000
	COASTAL DATA COLLECTION	400,000	300,000	300,000
	Total	13,860,000	13,560,000	13,760,000
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	12,500,000	12,250,000	14,500,000
	ANTICIPATED ADDITIONAL UNOBLIGATED CARRYOVER BALANCES AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	---	---	---
	Total, GEN INVESTIGATIONS	64,255,000	70,110,000	72,180,000

COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

(Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington and Wyoming)

Within the amount provided for the Columbia River and Tributaries study, the Committee intends for the Corps to initiate detailed feasibility studies, and preparation of interim report, on selected pump storage sites in the Columbia River Basin, including the Goose Flats-Omak Lake area.

RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES

New Mexico and Colorado

The Committee recommends the amount of $565,000, the same as the budget request, for this study and directs that $100,000 of this amount be used to initiate the restudy of Abiquiu Dam and Reservoir in accordance with the resolution adopted on December 5, 1975 directing a review to determine whether any modification should be made with respect to the existing Abiquiu Dam and Reservoir project and the Rio Chama Downstream. The study is to consider the reallocation of the storage in the project and channel improvements downstream to enable larger releases which will benefit the water users downstream of Elephant Butte Dam.

RESTORATIONS OF HOUSE REDUCTIONS

The Committee recommends restoration of the House reduction of $200,000 for coordination work with other agencies, $200,000 for fish and wildlife studies for work in accordance with the fish and wildlife coordination act and $250,000 for research and development. Additionally, the Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Corps' research and development program. The Committee believes this additional R. & D. amount is essential to enable the Corps to carry out its mission and activities with maximum effectiveness, economy, and safety, and with proper concern for protection or enhancement of environmental values. Just as with any other comparable activity—in the public sector or private industry—the Corps needs a vigorous, dynamic R. & D. effort to provide timely and practical solutions to water resource problems of growing complexity.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1976	$1, 228, 648, 000
Budget estimate, 1977	1, 266, 332, 000
House allowance	1, 416, 477, 000
Committee recommendation	1, 436, 559, 000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+170, 227, 000
House allowance	+20, 082, 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 project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL								
	ALABAMA								
(N)	JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD LOCK & DAM (REHAB)	48,800,000	48,209,000	591,000	---	591,000	---	591,000	---
(MP)	JONES BLUFF LOCK AND DAM	84,000,000	73,326,000	1,700,000	---	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---
(N)	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, ALA. & MISS.	1,360,000,000	173,352,000	84,000,000	---	100,000,000	---	104,000,000	---
	ALASKA								
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, FAIRBANKS	186,000,000	44,407,000	24,000,000	---	25,000,000	---	24,000,000	---
(MP)	SNETTISHAM	111,000,000	77,054,000	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
	ARIZONA								
(FC)	INDIAN BEND WASH	18,300,000	3,519,000	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---
(FC)	PHOENIX AND VICINITY (INCLUDING NEW RIVER) STAGE 1	18,400,000	5,851,000	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	PHOENIX AND VICINITY (INCLUDING NEW RIVER) STAGE 2	32,900,000	706,000	---	394,000	---	394,000	---	394,000
	ARKANSAS								
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE	69,400,000	65,899,000	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE	16,700,000	15,804,000	896,000	---	896,000	---	896,000	---
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE	17,600,000	16,918,000	682,000	---	682,000	---	682,000	---
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK. RIVER NAV SYSTEM, LOCKS & DAMS, ARK. AND OKLA	524,000,000	499,486,000	2,247,000	---	2,247,000	---	2,247,000	---
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE - HIGHWAY BRIDGE	20,900,000	575,000	---	625,000	---	625,000	---	625,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE - UNITS 3 & 4	22,700,000	330,000	---	470,000	---	470,000	---	470,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, ARK. & LA	173,000,000	84,237,000	3,700,000	---	7,000,000	---	7,000,000	---
(FC)	PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE	23,200,000	835,000	---	365,000	---	365,000	---	365,000
(FC)	POSTEN BAYOU	3,000,000	90,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000
(FC)	RED RIVER LEVEES AND BANK STAB BELOW DENISON DAM, ARK., LA. & TEX	48,700,000	34,610,000	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK, JACKSON AND LAWRENCE COUNTIES	4,240,000	460,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
	CALIFORNIA								
(N)	BODEGA BAY	2,000,000	190,000	---	115,000	---	115,000	---	115,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM-H.V. EASTMAN LAKE	26,200,000	24,140,000	2,060,000	---	2,760,000	---	2,760,000	---
(FC)	BUTLER VALLEY DAM-BLUE LAKE	---	---	---	---	---	351,000	---	351,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD CREEK	262,000,000	---	---	---	---	370,000	---	370,000
(FC)	CUCAMONGA CREEK	71,000,000	4,622,000	5,100,000	---	7,000,000	---	7,000,000	---
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL	181,000,000	42,894,000	3,300,000	---	3,300,000	---	750,000	---
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS	6,170,000	725,000	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM-HENSLEY LAKE	30,600,000	28,699,000	1,901,000	---	2,101,000	---	2,101,000	---
(N)	HUMBOLT HARBOR AND BAY	5,100,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(BE)	IMPERIAL BEACH	930,000	390,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FC)	LYTLE AND WARM CREEKS	32,200,000	29,500,000	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	---
(MP)	MARYSVILLE LAKE	652,000,000	5,190,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS	54,300,000	1,050,000	---	650,000	---	650,000	---	650,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER BASIN	32,500,000	3,485,000	6,000,000	---	6,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE	283,000,000	147,972,000	59,000,000	---	64,000,000	---	64,000,000	---
(N)	PORT SAN LUIS	5,400,000	---	---	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES	11,900,000	10,982,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION	68,800,000	30,670,000	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, CHICO LANDING TO RED BLUFF	6,750,000	3,818,000	---	---	---	---	1,500,000	---
(BE)	SAN DIEGO (SUNSET CLIFFS) (SEG. A)	1,485,000	35,000	---	75,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR	19,300,000	10,270,000	9,030,000	---	7,480,000	---	7,480,000	---
(N)	SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY	14,500,000	10,593,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FC)	SAN DIEGO RIVER(MISSION VALLEY)	32,300,000	1,644,000	---	240,000	---	300,000	---	100,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON (J.F. BALDWIN & STOCKTON SHIP CHANS)	95,200,000	5,333,000	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER	13,800,000	135,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK	17,500,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(BE)	SURFSIDE-SUNSET AND NEWPORT BEACH	9,580,000	3,689,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER	11,900,000	939,000	200,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK	44,000,000	18,279,000	5,800,000	---	5,800,000	---	5,800,000	---
	COLORADO								
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ABOVE JOHN MARTIN DAM (PHASE I)	81,600,000	330,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE	69,700,000	38,883,000	12,500,000	---	12,500,000	---	12,500,000	---
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE	86,400,000	77,444,000	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---
(FC)	LAS ANIMAS	4,300,000	1,025,000	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE	43,800,000	37,061,000	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---
	CONNECTICUT								
(FC)	DANBURY	13,900,000	12,300,000	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---
(FC)	NEW LONDON HURRICANE BARRIER	5,810,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	PARK RIVER	75,800,000	5,298,000	9,000,000	---	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
	DELAWARE								
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION	15,000,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
	POTOMAC ESTUARY PILOT WATER TREATMENT PLANT	9,100,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
	FLORIDA								
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA	543,000,000	223,975,000	6,000,000	---	6,500,000	---	6,000,000	---
(FC)	DADE COUNTY	38,200,000	---	---	---	2,800,000	---	2,800,000	---
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY	11,000,000	---	---	---	3,900,000	---	3,900,000	---
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS	128,000,000	36,861,000	5,000,000	---	8,000,000	---	8,000,000	---
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR (1965 ACT)	36,600,000	28,732,000	7,868,000	---	5,368,000	---	5,368,000	---
(BE)	MANATEE COUNTY	1,270,000	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR	3,700,000	313,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR	13,800,000	135,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	SAINT LUCIE INLET	3,800,000	205,000	---	45,000	---	45,000	---	45,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR (MAIN CHANNEL)	118,000,000	9,495,000	5,000,000	---	8,500,000	---	6,000,000	---

Type	State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
	GEORGIA								
(MP)	CARTERS LAKE	107,200,000	106,000,000	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE (FIFTH UNIT)GA & SC	12,000,000	---	---	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA. & S.C.	231,000,000	10,442,000	10,300,000	---	10,300,000	---	10,300,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXTENSION	5,212,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	200,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR (WIDENING AND DEEPENING)	13,400,000	11,414,000	1,986,000	---	1,986,000	---	1,986,000	---
(MP)	WEST POINT LAKE, GA. & ALA	118,000,000	111,468,000	5,000,000	---	6,500,000	---	6,500,000	---
	HAWAII								
(N)	BARBERS POINT (DEEP DRAFT) HARBOR, OAHU	32,400,000	517,000	---	36,000	---	36,000	---	36,000
(N)	HANALEI SMALL BOAT HARBOR	882,000	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---
(FC)	IAO STREAM	9,500,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	KANEOHE-KAILUA AREA	20,800,000	2,175,000	8,200,000	---	8,200,000	---	8,200,000	---
(N)	WAIANAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR	2,806,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
	IDAHO								
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR	312,000,000	295,109,000	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---
(FC)	RIRIE LAKE	36,500,000	26,392,000	6,800,000	---	6,800,000	---	6,800,000	---
	ILLINOIS								
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE	42,720,000	41,700,000	1,020,000	---	1,020,000	---	1,020,000	---
(FC)	COLUMBIA DRAINAGE & LEVEE DIST. NO. 3	3,800,000	915,000	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FC)	EAST MOLINE	7,900,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	ELDRED & SPANKEY DRAINAGE & LEVEE DISTRICT	7,050,000	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	FREEPORT	8,500,000	683,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	FULTON	8,670,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	HARRISONVILLE & IVY LANDING DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT NO. 2	5,290,000	3,101,000	2,189,000	---	2,189,000	---	2,189,000	---
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, CALUMET-SAG MODIFICATION PART I, ILL. & IND.	93,340,000	91,081,000	2,259,000	---	2,259,000	---	2,259,000	---
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, DUPLICATE LOCKS, ILL. AND IND.	697,000,000	2,265,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---	---
(FC)	KASKASKIA ISLAND DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT	6,880,000	362,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION	124,000,000	96,151,000	5,000,000	---	5,800,000	---	5,800,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER	3,655,000	330,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 53 (TEMPORARY LOCK), ILL. & KY.	37,100,000	24,163,000	8,800,000	---	8,800,000	---	8,800,000	---
(FC)	LOUISVILLE LAKE	49,700,000	979,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(N)	MISS. RIVER, CHAIN OF ROCKS, ILL & MO.	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(N)	MISS RI BTWN THE OHIO & MO RIVERS (REGULATING WORKS), ILL. & MO.	144,000,000	77,561,000	3,500,000	---	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
(FC)	MOLINE	16,400,000	370,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	ROCK ISLAND	7,790,000	6,812,000	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
(FC)	ROCKFORD	6,060,000	1,125,000	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---
(N)	SMITHLAND LOCKS AND DAM, ILL., IND. & KY.	238,000,000	163,218,000	34,000,000	---	39,000,000	---	39,000,000	---
(FC)	SNY ISLAND LEVY & DRAINAGE	943,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	50,000
(FC)	SOUTH BELOIT	1,100,000	50,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT	1,060,000	195,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000

Type	State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
	INDIANA								
(FC)	BIG BLUE LAKE	48,100,000	375,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	BIG WALNUT LAKE (LAND ACQUISITION)	45,100,000	1,800,000	1,400,000	---	900,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE	37,900,000	36,160,000	1,740,000	---	1,740,000	---	1,740,000	---
(N)	CANNELTON LOCKS AND DAMS, IND. & KY.	97,300,000	96,677,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	EVANSVILLE	36,700,000	12,281,000	1,400,000	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
(FC)	LAFAYETTE LAKE	88,900,000	1,412,000	1,300,000	---	---	---	---	---
(FC)	LEVEE UNIT NO. 5	7,350,000	6,521,000	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000	---
(FC)	MARION	2,930,000	125,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000
(FC)	MASON J. NIBLACK LEVEE (PUMPING FACILITIES)	2,840,000	2,737,000	103,000	---	103,000	---	103,000	---
(N)	NEWBURGH LOCKS & DAM, IND. & KY.	104,500,000	101,971,000	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE	41,300,000	18,950,000	11,300,000	---	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
(N)	UNIONTOWN LOCKS AND DAM, IND. & KY.	98,100,000	93,482,000	2,200,000	---	1,700,000	---	1,700,000	---
	IOWA								
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER AT SIOUX CITY, IOWA AND S.D.	6,350,000	989,000	1,700,000	---	1,700,000	---	1,700,000	---
(FC)	CLINTON	23,100,000	6,849,000	7,400,000	---	7,400,000	---	7,400,000	---
(FC)	DAVENPORT	21,100,000	801,000	---	139,000	---	139,000	---	139,000
(FC)	MARSHALLTOWN	8,410,000	6,771,000	1,639,000	---	1,359,000	---	1,359,000	---
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IOWA, KANSAS, MISSOURI, AND NEBRASKA	173,000,000	55,876,000	3,200,000	---	3,200,000	---	3,200,000	---
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER, SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IOWA, KANS., MO., & NEB	450,000,000	407,454,000	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---
(FC)	OTTUMWA	221,000	120,000	101,000	---	101,000	---	101,000	---
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE	90,300,000	72,950,000	3,500,000	---	4,600,000	---	4,600,000	---
(FC)	WATERLOO	33,800,000	17,529,000	6,100,000	---	6,100,000	---	6,100,000	---
	KANSAS								
(FC)	BIG HILL LAKE	9,960,000	2,376,000	500,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE	58,300,000	40,372,000	6,550,000	---	6,550,000	---	6,550,000	---
(FC)	DODGE CITY	6,670,000	4,296,000	2,380,000	---	974,000	---	174,000	---
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE	71,900,000	24,030,000	15,800,000	---	15,800,000	---	15,800,000	---
(FC)	GREAT BEND	15,900,000	700,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	GROVE LAKE	84,500,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE	52,500,000	9,254,000	8,000,000	---	9,000,000	---	9,000,000	---
(FC)	KANSAS CITY 1962 MODIFICATION	47,500,000	18,888,000	3,800,000	---	3,800,000	---	3,800,000	---
(N)	KANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION	4,600,000	100,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000
(FC)	LAWRENCE	11,600,000	6,139,000	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---
(FC)	MARION	4,500,000	2,332,000	1,300,000	---	2,168,000	---	2,168,000	---
(FC)	ONAGA LAKE	57,200,000	1,563,000	---	137,000	---	137,000	---	137,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE AREA (ROAD IMPROVEMENTS)	4,920,000	1,046,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	TOWANDA LAKE	50,200,000	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
	KENTUCKY								
(FC)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY	---	---	---	---	1,463,000	---	---	---
(FC)	BIG SOUTH FORK NATIONAL RIVER AND RECREATION AREA, KY. & TENN.	32,850,000	1,060,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	BOONE COUNTY, KY	737,000	370,000	---	---	---	---	367,000	---
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE	54,900,000	52,830,000	1,900,000	---	2,900,000	---	2,900,000	---
(FC)	DAYTON FLOODWALL	6,730,000	245,000	---	---	---	---	150,000	---
(FC)	KEHOE LAKE	34,900,000	2,490,000	3,000,000	---	3,375,000	---	2,000,000	---
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE	45,600,000	40,433,000	3,200,000	---	3,200,000	---	3,200,000	---
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE	17,800,000	10,537,000	6,500,000	---	6,500,000	---	6,500,000	---

Type	State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE	38,200,000	7,823,000	3,300,000	---	3,300,000	---	2,500,000	---
(FC)	SOUTHWESTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY	40,200,000	6,085,000	4,800,000	---	6,300,000	---	6,300,000	---
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE	57,100,000	12,480,000	5,300,000	---	5,300,000	---	5,300,000	---
(FC)	TUG FORK VALLEY (PHASE I)	55,000,000	520,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND (REHAB)	106,000,000	18,800,000	22,000,000	---	26,000,000	---	26,000,000	---
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE	48,600,000	6,025,000	3,800,000	---	3,800,000	---	3,800,000	---
	LOUISIANA								
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK	20,400,000	8,618,000	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU AND TRIBUTARIES	12,800,000	3,487,000	400,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY	242,000,000	76,839,000	12,000,000	---	12,000,000	---	12,000,000	---
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW	22,800,000	5,092,000	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS, VENICE, LA	4,164,000	1,354,000	2,810,000	---	2,810,000	---	2,810,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET	320,000,000	70,870,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE	85,400,000	35,135,000	5,600,000	---	5,600,000	---	5,600,000	---
(N)	OVERTON-RED RIVER WATERWAY (LOWER 31 MILES ONLY)	21,200,000	8,600,000	1,645,000	---	1,645,000	---	1,645,000	---
(N)	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, LA., ARK., OKLA., & TEX.	44,700,000	22,883,000	2,326,000	---	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	---
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, LA.	956,000,000	50,773,000	11,200,000	---	11,200,000	---	18,200,000	---
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, SHREVEPORT, LA' TO INDEX, ARK'	112,000,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	100,000
	MAINE								
(MP)	DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL LAKES	463,000,000	5,613,000	---	500,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
	MARYLAND								
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS	114,100,000	---	---	280,000	---	280,000	---	280,000
(FC)	BLOOMINGTON LAKE, MD. & W.VA	151,200,000	61,864,000	11,800,000	---	12,000,000	---	16,800,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS								
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER DAM	38,850,000	28,920,000	9,930,000	---	10,500,000	---	10,500,000	---
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATL STORAGE AREAS (LA)	11,100,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	NORTH NASHUA RIVER	1,730,000	80,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000
(FC)	SAKONVILLE	4,230,000	1,205,000	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(N)	WEYMOUTH-FORE AND TOWN RIVERS	24,300,000	21,830,000	2,470,000	---	2,470,000	---	2,470,000	---
	MICHIGAN								
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS	---	---	---	---	281,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	LEXINGTON HARBOR	1,900,000	1,497,000	403,000	---	403,000	---	403,000	---
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR	4,180,000	---	---	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
(N)	OTTAWA RIVER HARBOR, MICH. & OHIO	1,690,000	90,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	RED RUN DRAIN AND LOWER CLINTON RIVER	208,000,000	650,000	---	650,000	---	650,000	---	650,000
(FC)	RIVER ROUGE 1962 ACT	29,400,000	26,441,000	2,959,000	---	2,959,000	---	2,959,000	---
(FC)	SAGINAW RIVER 1958 ACT	53,000,000	12,593,000	4,050,000	---	4,050,000	---	4,050,000	---
(N)	TAWAS BAY HARBOR	1,500,000	227,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
	MINNESOTA								
(FC)	BIG STONE LAKE - WHETSTONE RIVER, MINN. & S.D.	10,700,000	8,478,000	1,900,000	---	1,900,000	---	1,900,000	---
(FC)	MANKATO AND NORTH MANKATO	32,500,000	13,081,000	7,200,000	---	7,200,000	---	7,200,000	---
(FC)	ROCHESTER (PHASE I)	45,300,000	184,000	---	200,000	---	300,000	---	200,000
(FC)	ROSEAU RIVER	13,800,000	1,063,000	3,600,000	---	3,600,000	---	3,600,000	---
(FC)	TWIN VALLEY LAKE	16,200,000	595,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	WINONA	16,100,000	836,000	---	364,000	---	364,000	---	364,000
	MISSISSIPPI								
(FC)	EDINBURG LAKE (PHASE I)	61,150,000	608,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000
(FC)	TALLAHALA CREEK LAKE	39,500,000	3,057,000	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MISS. & ALA	61,600,000	6,697,000	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
	MISSOURI								
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY	78,200,000	845,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND RESERVOIR	215,000,000	92,009,000	40,000,000	---	44,000,000	---	44,000,000	---
(MP)	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	413,000,000	241,289,000	73,500,000	---	79,000,000	---	79,000,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER CHANNEL	28,000,000	4,228,000	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES	93,900,000	20,617,000	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE	19,600,000	11,717,000	3,880,000	---	3,880,000	---	3,880,000	---
(FC)	MERAMEC PARK LAKE	115,000,000	25,803,000	4,500,000	---	9,500,000	---	9,500,000	---
(FC)	PERRY COUNTY D&LD NO.1,263	3,900,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	PINE FORD LAKE	75,200,000	550,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	PROSPERITY LAKE (PHASE I)	30,000,000	---	---	---	---	75,000	---	75,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE	68,100,000	36,871,000	15,700,000	---	16,700,000	---	16,700,000	---
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE	75,830,000	74,630,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FC)	UNION LAKE, STATE HIGHWAY 185 (ADVANCE PARTICIPATION)	2,800,000	2,100,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
	MONTANA								
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA	480,000,000	448,870,000	6,000,000	---	9,000,000	---	7,000,000	---
(MP)	LIBBY REREGULATING DAM POWER UNITS	33,000,000	350,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000
(MP)	LIBBY ADDTL UNITS & REREG DAM	193,000,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	MILES CITY	2,110,000	55,000	---	85,000	---	85,000	---	85,000
	NEBRASKA								
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES	103,300,000	24,412,000	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	550,000	---
	NEVADA								
(FC)	GLEASON CREEK DAM (CHANNEL ALTERNATIVE)	3,450,000	179,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000
	NEW JERSEY								
(N)	CORSON INLET-LUDLAM BEACH	7,703,000	338,000	---	197,000	---	197,000	---	197,000
(FC)	ELIZABETH	28,740,000	9,240,000	1,780,000	---	1,780,000	---	1,780,000	---

Type	State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
(N)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH	8,698,000	378,000	---	142,000	---	142,000	---	142,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK, AND PASSAIC RIVERS	15,434,000	14,454,000	980,000	---	980,000	---	980,000	---
	NEW MEXICO								
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE	93,500,000	89,154,000	3,300,000	---	3,900,000	---	3,900,000	---
(FC)	LOS ESTEROS LAKE	23,700,000	10,279,000	7,800,000	---	7,800,000	---	7,800,000	---
	NEW YORK								
(FC)	DANSVILLE AND VICINITY	1,420,000	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR	2,050,000	150,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY (PART I)	21,300,000	7,340,000	1,200,000	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	ELLICOTT CREEK	6,850,000	535,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000
(FC)	ENDICOTT, JOHNSON CITY & VESTAL	1,000,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET	26,140,000	6,732,000	1,780,000	---	1,780,000	---	1,780,000	---
(N)	IRONDEQUOIT BAY	4,320,000	222,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	ITHACA	3,745,000	3,640,000	105,000	---	105,000	---	105,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT	31,600,000	1,210,000	790,000	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, ANCHORAGES	27,840,000	25,500,000	2,340,000	---	2,340,000	---	2,340,000	---
(N)	PORT ONTARIO HARBOR	4,510,000	90,000	---	150,000	---	240,000	---	240,000
(FC)	SAW MILL AT ELMSFORD AND GREENBURGH, N.Y.	3,120,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	60,000
(FC)	SCAJAQUADA CREEK	2,400,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	WELLSVILLE	3,220,000	2,800,000	420,000	---	420,000	---	420,000	---
(FC)	YONKERS	9,300,000	2,965,000	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA								
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE	79,300,000	60,699,000	11,000,000	---	12,000,000	---	12,000,000	---
(FC)	FALLS LAKE	84,200,000	19,210,000	6,800,000	---	8,000,000	---	8,000,000	---
(FC)	HOWARDS MILL LAKE	23,800,000	673,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	---
(N)	MASONBORO INLET	4,580,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR (1970 ACT)	4,290,000	1,410,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	RANDLEMAN LAKE	29,300,000	1,082,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	50,000
(FC)	REDDIES RIVER LAKE	25,500,000	985,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---	50,000
(FC)	ROARING RIVER LAKE (PHASE I)	24,600,000	315,000	---	185,000	---	185,000	---	185,000
	NORTH DAKOTA								
(FC)	BURLINGTON DAM	81,400,000	2,790,000	---	690,000	---	930,000	---	930,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM - LAKE SAKAKAWEA	295,700,000	292,330,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	KINDRED LAKE	40,300,000	130,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	MINOT	19,100,000	13,018,000	6,082,000	---	6,082,000	---	6,082,000	---
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER, GARRISON DAM TO LAKE OAHE	9,200,000	7,535,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
	OHIO								
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE	49,300,000	42,201,000	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR	13,015,000	11,115,000	1,900,000	---	1,900,000	---	1,900,000	---
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE	54,400,000	39,323,000	6,100,000	---	6,100,000	---	6,100,000	---
(FC)	CHILLICOTHE	10,700,000	2,229,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	CUYAHOGA RIVER BASIN	1,680,000	200,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	EAST FORK LAKE	42,400,000	33,707,000	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	---
(N)	HURON HARBOR	2,620,000	---	---	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(BE)	LAKEVIEW PARK	1,810,000	---	---	---	1,260,000	---	1,260,000	---
(FC)	MILL CREEK	92,300,000	3,939,000	1,400,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (REHAB)	5,110,000	400,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	NEWARK (LOG POND RUN)	1,265,000	293,000	---	---	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	POINT PLACE	4,300,000	136,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000
(N)	WEST HARBOR	1,470,000	---	---	---	---	65,000	---	65,000
(N)	WILLOW ISLAND LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO & W. VA	75,700,000	73,619,000	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
	OKLAHOMA								
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE	45,200,000	1,082,000	---	428,000	---	428,000	---	428,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL, OKLA., KANS., & TEX	544,000,000	7,225,000	---	1,850,000	---	2,400,000	---	2,400,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE	13,000,000	9,449,000	1,900,000	---	2,850,000	---	2,850,000	---
(FC)	CANDY LAKE	21,000,000	1,285,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	CLAYTON LAKE	38,100,000	7,149,000	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	COPAN LAKE	64,900,000	22,141,000	7,000,000	---	9,000,000	---	9,000,000	---
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE - UNITS 5 & 6	12,400,000	450,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE	111,100,000	103,399,000	4,600,000	---	6,000,000	---	4,600,000	---
(FC)	LUKFATA LAKE	30,000,000	1,438,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE	41,800,000	34,591,000	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	---
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE	63,800,000	13,843,000	2,500,000	---	4,000,000	---	5,500,000	---
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE	79,700,000	38,083,000	21,000,000	---	21,000,000	---	21,000,000	---
	OREGON								
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE	63,000,000	3,872,000	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	BEAVER DRAINAGE DISTRICT	2,190,000	791,000	1,399,000	---	1,399,000	---	1,399,000	---
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE - ORE. & WASH.	462,000,000	53,292,000	48,000,000	---	48,000,000	---	48,000,000	---
(N)	COOS BAY	19,100,000	5,913,000	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE	57,500,000	56,629,000	871,000	---	871,000	---	871,000	---
(FC)	DAYS CREEK LAKE (PHASE I)	175,000,000	800,000	---	100,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM - LAKE UMATILLA, ORE. & WASH.	496,000,000	477,583,000	3,100,000	---	3,100,000	---	3,100,000	---
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE	145,000,000	120,083,000	7,500,000	---	7,500,000	---	7,500,000	---
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BANK PROTECTION, ORE. & WASH.	16,100,000	7,794,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(MP)	MC NARY LOCK AND DAM, LAKE WALLULA, ORE & WASH	302,900,000	296,358,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	SCAPPOOSE DRAINAGE DISTRICT	3,950,000	1,070,000	2,880,000	---	2,880,000	---	2,880,000	---
(MP)	STRUBE LAKE AND COUGAR ADDITIONAL UNIT	45,600,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	150,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION	19,800,000	16,164,000	450,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA								
(FC)	BLUE MARSH	59,000,000	29,437,000	13,569,000	---	13,569,000	---	13,569,000	---
(FC)	CHARTIERS CREEK	28,400,000	21,089,000	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE	92,600,000	29,534,000	12,600,000	---	15,600,000	---	15,600,000	---
(N)	ELK CREEK HARBOR	2,290,000	---	---	---	---	185,000	---	---
(N)	GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM	55,400,000	530,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000
(N)	POINT MARION LOCK	36,000,000	365,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	POTTSTOWN	3,140,000	70,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA	5,646,000	3,696,000	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000	---
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE	76,600,000	71,935,000	2,400,000	---	2,400,000	---	2,400,000	---

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL--CONTINUED

Type	State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
(FC)	TAMAQUA	3,904,000	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---
(FC)	TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES	157,700,000	99,110,000	35,500,000	---	40,000,000	---	40,000,000	---
(MP)	TOCKS ISLAND LAKE	426,500,000	61,449,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(MP)	TOCKS ISL. LAKE, ROUTE 209 RELOCATION ONLY	51,500,000	---	---	---	1,500,000	---	---	---
(FC)	TREXLER DAM	16,100,000	989,000	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	TYRONE	31,000,000	6,881,000	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
	PUERTO RICO								
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS	113,000,000	8,095,000	6,250,000	---	6,250,000	---	6,250,000	---
	SOUTH CAROLINA								
(FC)	BROADWAY LAKE	660,000	---	---	---	---	90,000	---	90,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR	90,000,000	5,929,000	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
(BE)	HUNTING ISLAND BEACH	2,681,000	1,487,000	1,194,000	---	1,194,000	---	1,194,000	---
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, S.C. & N.C.	10,900,000	873,000	---	227,000	---	227,000	---	227,000
(N)	MURRELLS INLET	14,600,000	801,000	---	---	---	---	800,000	---
	TENNESSEE								
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR	79,200,000	77,439,000	1,761,000	---	1,761,000	---	1,761,000	---
	TEXAS								
(FC)	ALPINE	5,630,000	90,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE	47,800,000	3,560,000	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL, AREA VIII	26,000,000	1,040,000	3,000,000	---	6,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
(FC)	AUBREY LAKE	175,000,000	7,619,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	---	---
(FC)	BIG PINE LAKE	22,800,000	1,048,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	BIG SPRING	2,890,000	85,000	---	110,000	---	110,000	---	110,000
(FC)	CARL L. ESTES DAM AND LAKE	155,000,000	1,287,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	300,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK	27,900,000	829,000	---	140,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	CLOPTON CROSSING LAKE (PHASE I)	67,700,000	400,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS	61,800,000	16,655,000	1,260,000	---	1,260,000	---	1,260,000	---
(BE)	CORPUS CHRISTI BEACH	1,560,000	381,000	700,000	---	1,179,000	---	1,179,000	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	30,000,000	16,639,000	3,100,000	---	3,100,000	---	3,100,000	---
(FC)	EL PASO	35,500,000	13,819,000	2,300,000	---	2,300,000	---	2,300,000	---
(FC)	FREEPORT AND VICINITY, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION	25,600,000	19,753,000	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR	23,700,000	379,000	---	121,000	---	121,000	---	121,000
(N)	GIWW-HARBOR OF REFUGE AT SEADRIFT	850,000	42,000	---	38,000	---	38,000	---	38,000
(N)	GIWW-TEXAS SECTION - RELOCATION IN MATAGORDA BAY	1,140,000	50,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000
(FC)	HIGHLAND BAYOU	12,100,000	6,000,000	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
(FC)	LAKEVIEW LAKE	174,000,000	6,613,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	LAVON LAKE MOD, & EAST FORK CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	60,200,000	56,231,000	1,900,000	---	4,100,000	---	4,100,000	---
(FC)	LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN (PHASE I)	80,600,000	564,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000

(FC)	MILLICAN LAKE	160,000,000	1,999,000	---	435,000	---	435,000	---	435,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER	8,460,000	560,000	---	60,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	PLAINVIEW	6,700,000	160,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	PORT ARTHUR & VICINITY (HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION)	65,300,000	44,095,000	4,300,000	---	4,300,000	---	4,300,000	---
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	42,700,000	23,715,000	3,500,000	---	3,500,000	---	3,500,000	---
(FC)	SAN GABRIEL RIVER	118,000,000	41,343,000	10,500,000	---	10,500,000	---	10,500,000	---
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU	20,600,000	1,995,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	TENNESSEE COLONY LAKE (LAND ACQUISITION)	509,000,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---	---
(N)	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL INDUSTRIAL CANAL	3,570,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	TEXAS CITY & VICINITY (HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION)	29,100,000	24,147,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	THREE RIVERS	3,860,000	260,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	TRINITY RIVER PROJECT	733,000,000	8,004,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000
(FC)	VINCE AND LITTLE VINCE BAYOUS	9,500,000	3,735,000	945,000	---	945,000	---	945,000	---
	VIRGINIA								
(FC)	BUENA VISTA (PHASE I)	14,660,000	395,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	FOURMILE RUN, CITY OF ALEXANDRIA AND ARLINGTON COUNTY	47,461,000	14,896,000	8,300,000	---	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
(FC)	GATHRIGHT LAKE	68,200,000	47,772,000	11,500,000	---	11,500,000	---	11,500,000	---
(FC)	VERONA LAKE (PHASE I)	55,100,000	760,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH (REIMB)	4,480,000	1,707,000	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
	WASHINGTON								
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM ADDITIONAL UNITS	315,000,000	108,009,000	78,000,000	---	78,000,000	---	78,000,000	---
(BE)	EDIZ HOOK	7,310,000	---	---	---	1,100,000	---	2,000,000	---
(MP)	ICE HARBOR ADDITIONAL UNITS	37,900,000	30,086,000	2,100,000	---	2,100,000	---	2,100,000	---
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE ADDITIONAL UNITS	58,100,000	22,657,000	24,600,000	---	24,600,000	---	25,075,000	---
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE ADDITIONAL UNITS	52,100,000	22,572,000	21,900,000	---	21,900,000	---	21,900,000	---
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM	310,000,000	291,675,000	11,000,000	---	11,000,000	---	11,475,000	---
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL ADDITIONAL UNITS	55,800,000	9,245,000	19,900,000	---	19,900,000	---	19,900,000	---
(FC)	SKAGIT RIVER LEVEE	12,500,000	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000
(MP)	THE DALLES ADDITIONAL UNITS	69,700,000	50,941,000	300,000	---	1,000,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	VANCOUVER LAKE AREA	12,600,000	293,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
(FC)	WAHKIAKUM COUNTY CONSOLIDATED DIKING DISTRICT NO. 1	4,500,000	1,319,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA								
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE	33,800,000	29,264,000	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	---
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE	43,000,000	30,020,000	6,000,000	---	6,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE	34,400,000	30,821,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	R.D. BAILEY LAKE	148,000,000	135,484,000	7,500,000	---	10,300,000	---	10,300,000	---
(FC)	ROWLESBURG LAKE	216,000,000	2,880,000	---	145,000	---	145,000	---	145,000
	WISCONSIN								
(FC)	LAFARGE LAKE AND CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	51,500,000	17,472,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	NORTHPORT HARBOR	2,640,000	165,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000
(FC)	PRAIRIE DU CHIEN	3,120,000	103,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES	15,700,000	361,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL--CONTINUED

Type	State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
	MISCELLANEOUS								
(N)	SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION COSTING UP TO $1,000,000 (SEC. 107)	----	----	----	----	3,000,000	----	4,500,000	----
(FC)	SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND RELATED PURPOSES NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION COSTING UP TO $1,000,000 (SEC. 205)	----	----	----	----	10,000,000	----	13,000,000	----
(BE)	SMALL BEACH EROSION PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION COSTING UP TO $1,000,000 (SEC 103)	----	----	----	----	500,000	----	1,000,000	----
(FC)	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	----	----	----	----	1,500,000	----	2,000,000	----
	RECREATION FACILITIES AT COMPLETED PROJECTS	----	----	22,000,000	----	22,000,000	----	22,000,000	----
	SMALL SNAGGING AND CLEARING (SEC. 208)	----	----	----	----	200,000	----	500,000	----
	FISH AND WILDLIFE STUDIES (U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE)	----	----	2,000,000	----	2,000,000	----	2,000,000	----
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES ATTRIBUTABLE TO NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SEC. 111)	----	----	----	----	600,000	----	1,000,000	----
	STEAMBANK EROSION CONTROL EVALUATION AND DEMONSTRATION (SEC'32, 1974 ACT)	----	----	----	----	----	----	3,000,000	----
	SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEMONSTRATION (SEC 54, 1974 ACT)	----	----	----	----	----	----	1,500,000	----
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT)	----	----	1,500,000	----	2,300,000	----	2,300,000	----
	EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION	----	----	2,108,000	----	2,108,000	----	2,108,000	----
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGES	----	----	-79,640,000	----	-80,240,000	----	-75,776,000	----
	Total,	26,260,767,000	9,388,503,000	1,244,049,000	22,283,000	1,389,343,000	27,134,000	1,410,405,000	26,154,000

REVISED PROJECT CAPABILITIES

As shown on the foregoing table, the Committee has reduced the amounts for those projects listed below due to revised project capabilities. The amount of the decrease from the budget request and the reason for the reduction follow:

Project	Decrease	Reason
San Diego Harbor, Calif	−$1,550,000	Funds transferred in fiscal year 1976 to accelerate project completion. Funds provided in fiscal year 1977 will complete project.
San Diego (Mission Valley), Calif	−140,000	Delay in planning requirements.
Jacksonville Harbor, Fla	−2,500,000	Low bid on contract.
Big Walnut Lake, Ind	−1,150,000	Delay in sec. 221 agreement.
Evansville, Ind	−200,000	Delay in design of pumping plant.
Lafayette Lake, Ind	−1,300,000	Project support withdrawn.
Uniontown lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky.	−500,000	Funds transferred to project in fiscal year 1976 reduce requirement in fiscal year 1977.
Patoka Lake, Ind	−1,300,000	Do.
Marshalltown, Iowa	−280,000	Do.
Dodge City, Kans	−2,206,000	Do.
Kehoe Lake, Ky	−1,000,000	Delay in sec. 221 agreement.
Mill Creek, Ohio	−800,000	Delay in obtaining rights-of-way from local interests.
Aubrey Lake, Tex	−1,000,000	Funds available and delay in sec. 221 agreement.

In addition to the reductions explained above, the Committee has made reductions in the amounts allowed by the House because of revised capabilities reported to the Committee during recall testimony and hearings subsequent to House Committee action. The amount of decrease from the House allowance and the reason for the reduction follow:

Project	Decrease	Reason
Barkley Dam and Lake Barkley, Ky	−$1,463,000	Funds transferred in fiscal year 1976/TQ reduce fiscal year 1977 requirements.
Great Lakes Connecting Channels, Michigan	−181,000	Do.
Rochester, Minn. (Phase I)	−100,000	No additional capability due to delay in approval to initiate Phase II.
Tocks Island Lake, Route 209 relocation only, Pennsylvania.	−1,500,000	No capability/current funds more than sufficient for fiscal year 1977 requirements.
Tennessee Colony Lake, Trinity River Project (land acquisition only).	−1,000,000	No capability/planning and design incomplete, EIS incomplete, no sec. 221 agreement.
The Dalles additional units, Washington and Oregon.	−1,200,000	Capability revised due to design delays.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON

(Baldwin and Stockton Ship Channels, California)

The Committee agrees with the House Committee that the Corps must thoroughly assess and study the matter of ocean salinity intrusion in connection with on-going studies for this project.

RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA

The Committee urges the Corps to maintain optimum work schedules and progress on this project and to expedite the ongoing and fiscal year 1977 work so as to avoid any slippage in the next fiscal year follow-on requirements.

NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT PROJECT, N.Y.

This Committee concurs with the House allowance of $2,500,000, an increase of $1,710,000 over the budget request for this important project. The purpose of this project is the removal of sources of drift, such as derelict vessels, deteriorated shore structures and debris along the shoreline of New York Harbor. The Committee continues to support this project, which is so important to the health and vitality of the 16 million people living in the area.

The total commerce for the port, which ranks first in the U.S. in total tonnage, has increased from 153,800,000 tons in 1965 to 195,095,000 in 1974. About 15 percent of the total waterborne and 13 percent of foreign commerce of the United States are handled by the port of New York. It is not in the national interest to allow this national asset to deteriorate.

HOWARDS MILL LAKE, RANDLEMAN LAKE, AND REDDIES RIVER LAKE, NORTH CAROLINA

Funds to initiate reconstruction planning of these three projects were appropriated in fiscal year 1971, fiscal year 1970, and fiscal year 1970, respectively. Planning has continued in every fiscal year since. The Committee believes that the preconstruction planning phase has continued for entirely too long. In view of the several potential problems, including water quality, reformulation, and reauthorization, the Corps should determine in cooperation with the appropriate local sponsors or State agencies whether further planning should be pursued.

BURLINGTON DAM, NORTH DAKOTA

Again this year tremendous flooding occurred from the Souris River in the City of Minot and vicinity and other areas downstream of the proposed Burlington Dam. But for the successful flood fight waged by the Corps, enormous damages would undoubtedly have been the result. This Committee directs the Corps to make the maximum effort on resolving the remaining issues in order to be able to proceed expeditiously with construction of this needed project. The Corps has reaffirmed in testimony this year that the Burlington project is the only feasible solution to the serious flood problems of that area. This Committee also calls on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to cooperate with the Corps to the maximum. Further, the Corps is to advise the Committee no later than January 15, 1977, as to any remaining unsolved issues in connection with proceeding to construction of this needed project.

TOCKS ISLAND (RELOCATION OF ROUTE 209 ONLY), PENNSYLVANIA

If additional funds are required during fiscal year 1977 beyond those funds previously appropriated for the relocation and construction of Route 209 at the Tocks Island project, the Committee recommends that the Corps use such funds as may be necessary but not to exceed $1,500,000 from within available fiscal year 1977 funds.

MILLICAN LAKE, TEXAS

The Committee concurs with the House Committee report on the proposed Millican Lake project. Further, the Corps is to advise the Committee by September 15, 1976, of its recommendations in light of the report of the Bureau of Mines on the lignite deposits.

GALLIPOLIS LOCK AND DAM, OHIO AND WEST VIRGINIA

The Committee agrees with the House report that early improvement of the existing navigation facilities at Gallipolis Lock and Dam, Ohio and West Virginia is of particular concern. The Committee is advised that the inadequacies of the existing facilities burden essential commodity movements with excessive costs, and shutdowns and delays disrupts supply schedules to the detriment of the economy of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys. Accordingly, the Committee wishes to express its interest in expeditious submission of the project report to the appropriate committees of Congress with a view to authorization this year. It is this Committee's view that further, lengthy, delay is to the detriment of the public interest.

SMALL PROJECTS PROGRAM

The President's budget did not include funds to continue the six small project programs under the special continuing or delegated authorities. The Committee considers these delegated program authorities to be of significant priority and importance. The Committee addressed the lack of budgetary requests for these programs in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill and the harm done as a result of such shortsighted policies on the part of the Administration. There are many, many worthwhile and meritorious small projects which have had to be deferred or suspended in the last few months because of the lack of support of these programs by the Administration. As shown at the end of construction general table, the Committee has recommended increases over the House allowance for these small projects. If the Committee's recommendation is enacted, many eligible projects will proceed based on the particular status priority and merit at the time allocations are made.

SECTION 32, STREAMBANK EROSION CONTROL EVALUATION AND DEMONSTRATION

The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1977 to carry out the Section 32 program, an increase over the budget request inasmuch as no funds were requested in the President's budget. This amount, together with the $4 million appropriated for fiscal year 1976 and the transition quarter, should enable the Corps to undertake a number of demonstration projects in accordance with the authorization. No projects have been undertaken or even finally selected as of this reporting period.

While supporting the increase over the budget request, the Committee emphasizes that the work performed under the Section 32 authority is a research, development and demonstration effort to

develop methods and techniques to prevent and control streambank erosion. It is not designed as an operational authority for correction of streambank erosion problems.

In accordance with the authorization, demonstration projects under this section shall be undertaken on streams selected to reflect a variety of geographical and environmental conditions, including streams with naturally occurring erosion problems and streams with erosion caused or increased by manmade structures. At a minimum, demonstration projects shall be conducted at multiple sites on—

(1) the Ohio River;

(2) that reach of the Missouri River between Fort Randall Dam, South Dakota and Sioux City, Iowa; and

(3) that reach of the Missouri River in North Dakota at or below the Garrison Dam.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Appropriation, 1976	$163,250,000
Budget estimate, 1977	191,220,000
House allowance	227,667,000
Committee recommendation	231,497,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+40,277,000
House allowance	+3,830,000

An appropriation of $231,497,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1977, an increase of $40,277,000 over the budget request and $3,830,000 over the House allowance.

The recommended allocation is shown in the following table.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

	Budget estimate fiscal year 1977	House allowance	Committee recommendation
1. General investigations:			
(a) Surveys:			
Helena and vicinity, Ark		$75,000	$75,000
Laconia Circle area, Desha County, Ark	$94,000	94,000	94,000
Lake Neark, Ark	100,000	100,000	100,000
St. Francis River Basin below Wappapello Lake, Ark. and Mo	145,000	145,000	145,000
West Memphis, Ark	110,000	110,000	110,000
Bayou du Chien, Ky	25,000	25,000	25,000
Atchafalaya Basin (water and land resources), La	475,000	475,000	475,000
Berwick lock—Atchafalaya Basin, La	25,000	25,000	25,000
Lake Providence, La	25,000	25,000	25,000
Louisiana State Penitentiary levee, Louisiana	25,000	25,000	25,000
Yazoo River Basin, Miss	450,000	600,000	600,000
Mississippi River—East Bank levees, Kentucky and Tennessee	130,000	130,000	130,000
Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and tributaries, Tennessee and Kentucky	150,000	150,000	150,000
Wolf and Loosahatchie Rivers and Nonconnah Creek, Tenn. and Miss	150,000	150,000	150,000
Mississippi River, Cairo, Ill., to Baton Rouge, La		50,000	50,000
(b) Collection and study of basic data	156,000	156,000	156,000
Subtotal, general investigations	2,060,000	2,335,000	2,335,000

See footnote at end of table.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

	Budget estimate fiscal year 1977	House allowance	Committee recommendation
2. Construction and planning:			
Mississippi River levees	$29,725,000	$30,225,000	$30,225,000
Channel improvement	36,225,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Old River, La	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Lower Red River, South Bank levees, Louisiana	825,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
Atchafalaya Basin, La	31,665,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
Lower White River:			
Augusta-Clarendon levee		420,000	420,000
Clarendon levee		100,000	100,000
Cache Basin, Arkansas	1,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
St. Francis Basin, Ark. and Mo	9,750,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
Tensas Basin, Ark. and La.:			
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, except Lake Chicot pumping plant	600,000	1,380,000	1,380,000
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, Lake Chicot pumping plant	760,000	1,760,000	4,760,000
Red River Backwater Area, La., Except Tensas Cocodrie Pumping Plant	4,290,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Red River Backwater area, Louisiana, Tensas Cocodrie pumping plant	860,000	2,860,000	2,860,000
Reelfoot Lake—Lake No. 9, Tennessee and Kentucky	1,500,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
West Kentucky tributaries	480,000	480,000	480,000
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries, Louisiana	280,000	330,000	330,000
Teche-Vermilion Basins, La	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
Yazoo Basin, Miss.:			
Sardis Lake	300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Arkabutla Lake	540,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Enid Lake	300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Grenada Lake	870,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
Greenwood	80,000	100,000	100,000
Upper auxiliary channels	3,820,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Main stem	500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Tributaries:			
Except Ascalmore-Tippo and Opossum Bayous	225,000	700,000	700,000
Ascalmore-Tippo and Opossum Bayous	275,000	1,075,000	1,075,000
Big Sunflower River, etc. (including Steele Bayou)	940,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
Yazoo Backwater:			
Except Muddy Bayou control structure	4,538,000	6,000,000	6,830,000
Muddy Bayou control structure	962,000	962,000	962,000
Streambank erosion control		2,000,000	2,000,000
West Tennessee tributaries	2,710,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Bushley Bayou, La	[1] 300,000	[1] 300,000	[1] 300,000
Eastern Rapides and South Central Avoyelles Parishes, La	[1] 100,000	[1] 100,000	[1] 100,000
Greenville Harbor, Miss	[1] 400,000	[1] 400,000	[1] 400,000
Mississippi River, East Bank, Natchez area, Mississippi	[1] 200,000	[1] 200,000	[1] 200,000
Mississippi River, East Bank, Vicksburg-Yazoo area, Mississippi	[1] 140,000	[1] 140,000	[1] 140,000
Subtotal, construction and planning	139,360,000	170,332,000	174,162,000
3. Maintenance	49,800,000	55,000,000	55,000,000
Total	191,220,000	227,667,000	231,497,000

[1] Planning.

St. Francis Basin

The Committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of the following increases over the budget: $75,000 for the County Bridges, Ditch 19, Item 1, Missouri; $325,000 for St. Francis below Marked Tree, Arkansas; $375,000 for Rivervale Outlet Ditch; and $1,305,000 for Cockleburr Slough Ditch. Additionally, the Committee has included $600,000 to initiate construction of Drainage District No. 17 pumping plant. The budget request includes funds to begin acquiring pumps and engines for the pumping plant.

Yazoo Basin

The Committee concurs with the House action on items in the Yazoo Basin and has included an additional $830,000 for the Yazoo backwater work (except muddy Bayou control structure). The Committee

also agrees with the House report language relative to work in the Basin.

Tensas Basin

The amount of $4,760,000 recommended for the Lake Chicot Pumping Plant is to be used to continue to expedite work on this important project. The Corps is to advise the Committee of any delays in proceeding with work on this item.

Old River Control Structure

The Committee directs the Corps to take all such steps that are necessary in the Corps' professional judgment, consistent with sound engineering principles, in rehabilitating the Old River Control Structure and to use such sums as are needed to meet its established requirements from this appropriation account or from any other appropriate account. The Committee is to be advised immediately of any need for additional funds beyond available funds.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1976	$582,073,000
Budget estimate, 1977	583,900,000
House allowance	648,900,000
Committee recommendation	648,900,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+65,000,000
House allowance	----------

The Committee recommends concurence with the House allowance of $648,900,000, an increase of $65,000,000 over the budget request.

Funding provided under this heading is required for the operation and maintenance of over 1,600 completed channels, harbors, and major structures, 222 locks and dams, 260 flood control reservoirs, and 65 multiple-purpose projects with power; including nine new flood control reservoirs and three power projects which will become operational in the coming fiscal year.

Again this year, the Committee is concerned with the continued accumulation of deferred maintenance in channels and harbors and also in structural maintenance and repair of navigation and flood control projects nationwide. At the present time, the estimated cost of this backlog of deferred work amounts to approximately $300 million, including an estimated $120 million of deferred maintenance dredging.

Price escalation, additional requirements, and additional costs imposed by environmental considerations have continued to outpace funding increases over the past several years. This has resulted in a reduced standard of maintenance on many navigation projects. In major harbors authorized depths have been maintained, but in many cases it has not been possible to provide authorized widths and slopes. Additionally, it has been necessary to defer completely maintenance dredging on many smaller harbors in order to accomplish higher priority work. The increase provided for dredging is for improving the level of maintenance of channels and harbors considered most critical of the projects which will require maintenance in fiscal year 1977. The selection of the most critical projects is based on traffic type and volume, the effect on local and national economics, and the present state of maintenance.

As in past years, the Committee prefers not to make specific allocation of its increases to individual projects. The increase recommended includes the individual capabilities for the most critical needs brought to the Committee's attention. However, the attention of the Corps is directed to the testimony and expressed needs such as the many high priority navigation projects needing maintenance.

The Committee has concurred in the request for $200,000 for the Upper Mississippi River environmental resources study relating to maintenance dredging on the Upper Mississippi River. However, because of the expanded and total scope and cost of the proposed continued study, referred to as the Great Study, the Committee must insist that authorization be provided prior to the consideration of any funds beyond the amount in the budget.

GREAT LAKES DIKED DISPOSAL PROGRAM

The Great Lakes Diked Disposal Program, authorized under Sec. 123 of the 1970 Rivers and Harbor Act provides for alternate methods for the disposal of polluted dredged material in lieu of open lake disposal. Currently, 59 of the 115 Great Lake harbors and channels are classified as polluted. Disposal of the polluted material from these harbors will require the construction of 42 separate disposal sites.

The Committee has included $27,703,000 for fiscal year 1977, which is the same as the House allowance and $9,472,000 over the budget request. The Chief of Engineers is directed to use these additional funds to initiate and continue work on high priority disposal sites. In establishing priorities, consideration should be given to the amount and type of commerce, the trend of lake levels elevations, the additional shoaling expected prior to the availability of a disposal site, the impact of reduced drafts on commerce, and other pertinent factors.

REVOLVING FUND

Appropriation, 1976	$700,000
Budget estimate, 1977	----------
House allowance	----------
Committee recommendation	6,600,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+6,600,000
House allowance	+6,600,000

The Committee recommends a fiscal year 1977 appropriation of $6,600,000 to the Revolving Fund to provide for the continued design and construction of hopper dredges initiated in fiscal year 1976 as shown in the following tabulation:

HOPPER DREDGE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976/TQ AND FISCAL YEAR 1977 PROGRAM

Type of hopper dredge	Fiscal year 1976	Transition quarter	Fiscal year 1977
West Coast, shallow draft:			
Design	$300,000	$200,000	----------
Construction	----------	500,000	$3,000,000
Total	300,000	700,000	3,000,000
Medium class:			
Design	300,000	100,000	100,000
Construction	----------	----------	3,000,000
Total	300,000	100,000	3,100,000
Lower Mississippi River:			
Design	100,000	150,000	500,000
Grand total	700,000	950,000	6,600,000

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for maintaining 22.000 miles of inland waterways, 3,000 miles of intracoastal channels, 107 commercial port facilities and approximately 400 smaller ports and harbors throughout the Nation.

Keeping the channels of these waterways, ports, and harbors open to navigation is critical to the economy of the United States. Domestic waterborne commerce presently moves one-sixth of the nation's cargo that travels between cities by all methods of transportation. Additionally, the traffic on waterways continues to increase at a compound rate of slightly more than 5 per cent per year. It is predicted that the volume of this traffic will increase from four to six times in the next 50 years.

Dredging is required to keep these navigation channels open. Approximately two-thirds of the Federal dredging workload is done under contract with private dredging companies. Most of the remaining one-third is done directly by the Corps of Engineers using its fleet of hopper dredges, which are seagoing, self-propelled ships specially designed for working in exposed water. At the present time exposed water work that can be done by contract is limited because the type of dredges owned by industry cannot operate safely and efficiently where adverse wave, wind, and current conditions exist.

Testimony presented in this year's hearings indicates that there is currently a backlog of $120 million worth of maintenance dredging in the U.S. and that there is critical shoaling in most major U.S. ports. For example, in the Southwest Pass channel on the Mississippi River, the Corps was able to maintain the authorized depth of 40 feet only 43 percent of the time between 1973 and 1975, resulting in tremendous losses to the country's economy.

Part of the reason for this shortfall has been the fact that our present supply of hopper dredges is too small, obsolete, and inefficient. The Corps hopper dredge fleet has dwindled from 27 in 1940 to 15 today. Three of the existing vessels are approaching 40 years of age and will have to be retired soon. The average age of the entire fleet is 30 years. At any one time several of the vessels may be unavailable for work because of transit or repair and maintenance down-time, which is increasing with age. The Corps expects to retire 8 of the present vessels by 1992.

In this year's hearings the Corps testified that it needs three additional hopper dredges now and three more by 1983 at the latest. The 1974 National Dredging Study forecast the need by 1985 of 9 to 11 new hopper dredges.

The Committee is encouraged that the private dredging industry has become interested in developing a hopper dredging capability for the first time since 1906. Industry has informed the Committee that there is one large private hopper barge now available for certain kinds of work, one private hopper dredge under construction, one being designed, and one ready for construction. Only the latter of these vessels, however, is designed according to Corps standards for performance of the specialized work for which the present Government fleet was constructed. The Committee has learned that construction work on this vessel may be delayed for an undetermined period of time.

It takes two to three years to build a hopper dredge once the design is completed. The earliest an additional Corps or Industry hopper dredge designed according to Corps standards could be available is fiscal year 1979—only four years from the time the U.S. is expected to need six more.

It is clear that both Industry and the Government must begin construction of additional hopper dredges soon in order to prevent attrition from undermining the Corps' capacity to maintain the entrance channels of U.S. ports and harbors. Furthermore, whether or not Industry performs as hoped, the Corps must develop a residual fleet of modern, efficient hopper dredges for use in emergencies and the national defense.

Accordingly, the Committee continues to encourage private industry efforts in the hopper dredge field. At the same time, the Committee believes that the Corps must be provided the necessary resources to proceed in fiscal year 1977 at a full capability level with the design and construction of hopper dredges. The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for design and $3 million for construction of a medium class dredge and $3 million for construction of a small, shallow draft dredge. Also included is $500,000 for design of a Lower Mississippi River hopper dredge.

The Committee concurs with the House that the Corps is to proceed immediately with the design and modification of the vessel Currituck. This modification is to provide a self-loading capability in order to determine the feasibility of a new sand bypassing and other experimental techniques in shallow draft inlets and in order to utilize the Currituck to apply these techniques on a regular basis in the future should this demonstration project be successful.

If these experimental dredging techniques prove feasible, the private sector is encouraged to develop their capability to make use of them.

Appropriate adjustment has been made on the limitation on the capital of the Revolving Fund.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 1976	$90, 400, 000
Budget estimate, 1977	18, 140, 000
House allowance	30, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	22, 140, 000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+4, 000, 000
House allowance	−7, 860, 000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $22,140,000 for fiscal year 1977, which is an increase of $4,000,000 over the budget request and a decrease of $7,860,000 below the House allowance.

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.

Section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, as amended (33 USC 701 n), established this fund. This legislation provides the authority to utilize certain sums to meet emergency work by transfer to the emergency fund subject to reimbursement and reads,

in part, as follows: "Provided that pending the appropriation of said sum, the Secretary of the Army may allot, from existing flood-control appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized. Such appropriation to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made."

It is clearly the intent of this legislation that funds diverted from other appropriations to meet the urgent flood emergencies through this fund are to be reimbursed. In the future, the Committee is to be advised of transfers in a manner similar to present reporting practices.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1976	$43, 700, 000
Budget estimate, 1977	47, 400, 000
House allowance	47, 200, 000
Committee recommendation	47, 200, 000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	−200, 000
House allowance	----------

An appropriation of $47,200,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1977, which is the same as the House allowance and $200,000 below the budget request.

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.

The reduction of $200,000 is applied to travel, rent, communications and utilities and other services.

SPECIAL RECREATION USE FEE

Appropriation, 1976	$1, 200, 000
Budget estimate, 1977	3, 100, 000
House allowance	2, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	2, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	−1, 100, 000
House allowance	----------

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $2,000,000, which is $1,100,000 below the budget request.

This appropriation allows 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 Public Law 92–347.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

GENERAL COMMENTS

TETON DAM DISASTER

On June 5, 1976, the earth filled Teton Dam, the principal feature of the Lower Teton Division, Teton Basin project, Idaho, failed causing a tremendous wall of water reportedly ranging from 12 to 20 feet in the downstream areas of the dam. A major disaster declaration for this southeastern Idaho area was made on June 6 by the President. On June 11, the President submitted a request to the Congress (H. Doc. 94–523) for a fiscal year 1976 supplemental appropriation in the amount of $200,000,000 to provide reimbursement for damages suffered from the failure of the Teton Dam. This appropriation, to become available immediately upon enactment of this bill, is included in the bill as passed by the House and approved by the Committee.

The Teton Basin project is a multipurpose project designed by the Bureau of Reclamation and being constructed under its supervision for flood control, power generation, recreation and supplemental irrigation water supply for 111,210 acres of farm lands in the Upper Snake River Valley. The project was authorized September 7, 1964 by Public Law 88–583. Funds to initiate preconstruction planning were first appropriated in fiscal year 1967 and for construction in fiscal year 1968. Construction of the dam was initiated following an award of the construction contract in December 1971. The contract required completion of the dam by March 10, 1977. According to information made available to the Committee, construction progressed such that water storage began in October 1975. At the time of failure, the reservoir was nearly full, just 3.5 feet below the spillway.

It is estimated that the reservoir contained approximately 250,000 acre-feet of water of the reservoir capacity of 288.250 acre-feet. About 4 million cubic yards of the dam embankment (about 40 percent of the embankment) were lost. The powerhouse and the warehouse structure were completely submerged in the debris. The Bureau of Reclamation is giving top priority in helping to alleviate the suffering and to repair some of the damage resulting from the failure, particularly to rectification of damages to canal headings and irrigation works which deliver water to crops undamaged by floods, but which would be burned out in a matter of weeks if water were not available. The Bureau has also

assured its maximum cooperation with blue ribbon panels of independent engineering experts appointed to determine the cause of the failure. During its 74 years, the Bureau of Reclamation has designed and constructed more than 300 major dams, 250 of which are earthfill, with heights ranging up to 465 feet above streambed. All of those dams, with the single exception of Teton, have performed satisfactorily.

BENEFITS FROM RECLAMATION PROGRAM

Today, after nearly 75 years of Bureau of Reclamation activities, the great physical structures, works, and facilities of the Reclamation program have proven to be of enormous benefits and contributions to the people and the development of the 17 Western States.

All time records were set in nearly every aspect of project operations in the prior year. Some of the data on the impressive benefits of these projects are as follows: Bureau projects provide irrigation water to approximately 10 million acres of land. Nearly 30 million acre-feet of water was delivered, including about 2 million acre-feet for municipal and industrial use. Almost a third of the population of the 17 Western States, about 18 million people, received water service, including both irrigation and municipal and industrial water deliveries. The food and fiber production from irrigated land would satisfy the annual food needs of nearly 33 million people. About 52 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power were marketed. This clean, non-polluting, power production brings gross revenues to the U.S. Treasury of almost $250 million annually. Flood benefits are obtained each year and accumulated benefits from flood control operations since 1950 are estimated at about $1.3 billion. Over $175 million in flood damages were estimated to have been averted. The total investment in reclamation facilities through fiscal year 1975 since 1902 is about $7.7 billion. The annual gross crop return from irrigated lands exceeded $4.5 billion with the accumulated gross return being about $45 billion. Various independent studies have shown that these projects generate increases in taxes many times over the total Federal investment in the project. Federal Internal Revenue collections attributable to operations of Reclamation projects throughout the 17 Western States total nearly $1.5 billion annually in personal income taxes and corporate profit taxes. This amount does not include state and local taxes. In several instances studies have shown that the Federal income tax revenues derived in one year as a result of project operations exceeded the total Federal investment in the project. Another study made by the University of Denver Research Institute showed that over $4 billion in increased business activity resulted throughout the Nation in one year from all functions of the Reclamation program. This is over and above that which would have occurred without the program. Increased personal income and

corporate profits were estimated at over $3 billion. While this study did not include an estimate of the number of jobs provided, Bureau officials believe the employment equivalent of the increased wages, profits, interests, and rents attributable to the Reclamation program could total as much as 500,000 man-years annually.

PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES FOR COMPUTING AUTHORIZED COST CEILINGS AND PROJECT COST ESTIMATES

The Committee Report accompanying the fiscal year 1976 appropriation bill called on the Bureau to submit a full response to the GAO report (B–164570) entitled "Bureau of Reclamation Procedures and Practices for Computing Authorized Cost Ceilings and Project Cost Estimates Need Improvement," released November 17, 1975. In accordance with the requirements of section 236 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, the Department of the Interior and the Bureau responded to the GAO report on January 27, 1976. Additionally, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, for which the GAO report was made, has held hearings on this matter and made its report on March 1, 1976 containing various recommendations (Fourteenth Report of the House Committee on Government Operations).

The Committee agrees with the Bureau that this matter has generated a great deal of misinformation and confusion concerning the Reclamation Projects and Program. Many mistakenly assume that these reports discuss use of appropriated funds, cost accounting practices, and the reporting of costs. The reports do not touch on any of these. GAO has reviewed and approved Bureau accounting practices.

The reports deal with the methods and practices of the Bureau in estimating the total cost of construction of projects which may take several years to complete; in the way the Bureau had been "cost indexing" the "authorized cost ceilings" and the "estimated total Federal obligations" on the Bureau projects. An understanding of these terms in quotes above is essential in order to understand the complex subject matter of these reports.

The authorization for appropriation is the authority in the enabling legislation authorizing the Congress to appropriate up to a certain amount (based on the authorized cost ceiling) to complete a project. "Estimated total Federal obligations" is an estimate as of a specific date of the total Federal funds that will be required to complete a project. "Cost indexing" is the method used to update cost estimates at the time of authorization to more current prices.

In recent years, cost indexing has usually been authorized by law for Reclamation projects. The reason is that, in today's inflationary marketplace, the estimated costs of projects rise rapidly and, were it not for the allowable cost indexing, the estimated costs would exceed the ceilings set by Congress long before a project was completed. In order to avoid having to reset these ceilings periodically, the Congress usually includes the right to cost index in the authorizing legislation.

However, Congress has never included procedures or methodology to be used in cost indexing.

Thus, the issue is whether the Bureau's methods are acceptable. And cost indexing is not a simple matter of, say, applying the average rate of inflation over the past year to a construction project. The rate of inflation varies greatly—by section of the country, by materials used, by manufactured goods, by labor markets, by the type of work being done.

So long as the authorized cost ceiling of a project exceeds the total estimated cost there are no problems. But should the estimate of total Federal obligations exceed the authorized cost ceiling, then, at some time before the Congress appropriates construction funds in excess of the cost ceiling, the Congress would have to raise the ceiling or limit the amount of work to be completed by the Bureau. The reports of the GAO and the House subcommittee found fault with a number of the cost indexing procedures used by the Bureau to estimate the total cost of its projects and recommended that certain improvements be made and that the Congress legislate clarification as to the extent of indexing authorized.

Some of the recommendations can be implemented without legislation and the Bureau has testified that most of those recommendations are being implemented. The Bureau has also stated that it will continue to cooperate with the various Committees having an interest in the matter. In the remaining one or two areas of disagreement over the appropriate methods and procedures to be used in cost indexing, the Committee does not believe, in the absence of legislation, that the Bureau's methods are unreasonable. The recommendation that the Congress legislate clarification as to the extent of indexing authority is, of course, beyond the jurisdiction of this committee. However, the committee agrees with the improvements the Bureau is implementing.

Most important of all to this Committee in this issue is the fact that actual appropriations have not exceeded the authorized cost ceilings. Nor has the Bureau been seeking funds in excess of the authorized cost ceiling or expended funds is excess of appropriations.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1976	$20,892,000
Budget estimate, 1977	21,030,000
House allowance	24,487,000
Committee recommendation	24,762,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+3,732,000
House allowance	+275,000

An appropriation of $24,762,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1977, which is $275,000 over the House allowance and $3,732,000 over the budget request.

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

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Name and location of study	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
ARIZONA				
Boulder Canyon, Hoover Powerplant Modifications	Feas.-P	75,000	75,000	75,000
CALIFORNIA				
Central Valley:				
Calaveras County division	Appr.-I,M&I,P	---	50,000	50,000
Delta Support Studies	Sp. Inv.	340,000	340,000	340,000
East Side division, Mid-Valley Canal	Feas.-I,M&I	65,000	65,000	65,000
Total Water Management Study	Sp. Inv.	330,000	330,000	330,000
Energy Research and Development (Geothermal)		300,000	300,000	300,000
Geothermal Resources Investigations		1,200,000	2,520,000	2,520,000
Klamath, Butte Valley Division (see Oregon)				
Lahontan Basin Total Water Management Study (see Nevada)				
Lake-Yolo Counties Study	Appr.-I	37,000	37,000	37,000
Mendocino County Study	Appr.-I,M&I	37,000	37,000	37,000
Mojave-Coachella, Reformulation	Feas.	30,000	30,000	30,000
Napa County Study	Appr.-I	37,000	37,000	37,000
Sacramento River Drainage and Seepage Utilization	Appr.-I	100,000	100,000	100,000
San Joaquin Valley Drainage	Appr.	105,000	105,000	105,000
Solano County Water	Feas.	115,000	115,000	115,000
Suisun Marsh Management Study	Appr.	38,000	38,000	38,000
Susanville geothermal investigations	Feas.	---	267,000	267,000
Ventura County Water Management	Feas.-I,M&I	46,000	46,000	46,000

COLORADO				
CRSP Power Peaking Capacity	Feas.-P	102,848	102,848	102,848
Dominguez Reservoir	Feas.-M&I,P	150,000	150,000	150,000
Energy Research and Development (Pumped Storage)		200,000	200,000	200,000
Front Range Unit (Long's Peak Division, P-SMBP)	Feas.-M&I	90,000	90,000	90,000
Grand Mesa, Reformulation	Feas.-I,M&I	58,000	58,000	58,000
Uncompahgre Improvement	Feas.	73,830	73,830	73,830
Upper Colorado Resource Study	Feas.-I,M&I	285,000	285,000	285,000
Water Resources Planning and Engineering Research		2,600,000	2,450,000	2,600,000
IDAHO				
Boise Project, Anderson Ranch Dam and Powerplant	Feas.-P	---	---	75,000
Minidoka, Minidoka Powerplant Rehabilitation & Enlargement	Feas.-P	75,000	75,000	75,000
Southwest Idaho Water Management Study	Sp. Inv.	205,000	205,000	205,000
Upper Snake River, Oakley Fan Division, Reformulation	Feas.	150,000	150,000	150,000
Upper Snake River Water Management Study	Sp. Inv.	204,000	204,000	204,000
KANSAS				
Chikaskia	Feas.-M&I	101,000	101,000	101,000
Kansas State Water Plan--Phase II	Appr.	167,000	167,000	167,000
Solomon River Basin Water Management Study (P-SMBP)	Sp. Inv.	53,000	53,000	53,000
MONTANA				
Eastern Montana Basins	Appr.	25,000	25,000	25,000
Hardin Unit, Reformulation	Feas.	75,000	75,000	75,000
Total Water Management Study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota)				
NEBRASKA				
Crofton unit	Appr.-I	---	50,000	50,000
Highland Unit (Elkhorn Division, P-SMBP)	Feas.-I	40,000	40,000	40,000
NEVADA				
Lahontan Basin Total Water Management Study	Sp. Inv.	80,000	80,000	80,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS--CONTINUED

Name and location of study	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
NEW MEXICO				
Boulder Canyon, Hoover Powerplant Modifications (see Arizona)	Sp. Inv.	168,000	168,000	168,000
Elephant Butte Reservoir - Ft. Quitman	Feas.-M&I	120,000	120,000	120,000
Gallup	Sp. Inv.	100,000	150,000	150,000
Llano-Estacado Total Water Management Study	Appr.-M&I	50,000	100,000	100,000
Raton Water Supply	Feas.-I	40,000	40,000	40,000
Tucumcari				
NORTH DAKOTA				
Apple Creek	Feas.-I,M&I	260,000	260,000	260,000
Garrison Diversion Unit, M&I Facilities (P-SMBP)	Feas.-M&I	50,000	50,000	50,000
Total Water Management Study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota)				
Versippi Alternative, Dickinson unit, Heart Division	Feas.-M&I	---	30,000	30,000
OKLAHOMA				
Cache Creek	Feas.-M&I	44,000	44,000	44,000
Criner Hills	Appr.-M&I	4,000	4,000	4,000
McGee Creek	Feas.-M&I	100,000	100,000	100,000
Oklahoma State Water Plan	Appr.	120,000	120,000	120,000
Seward	Feas.-M&I	100,000	150,000	150,000

OREGON				
Klamath, Butte Valley Division	Feas.-I	120,000	120,000	120,000
Rogue River Basin, Grants Pass Division	Feas.	100,000	100,000	100,000
Rogue River Basin, Medford Division, Reformulation	Feas.	50,000	50,000	50,000
Umatilla Basin	Feas.-I,M&I	69,000	69,000	69,000
Walla Walla, Reformulation (see Washington)				
Willamette River, Molalla Division	Feas.-I,M&I	55,000	55,000	55,000
SOUTH DAKOTA				
Oahe Unit, M&I Water Facilities (James Division, P-SMBP)	Feas.-M&I	50,000	50,000	50,000
Total Water Management Study, Missouri River Upstream of Gavins Point (P-SMBP)	Sp. Inv.	120,000	120,000	120,000
TEXAS				
Elephant Butte Reservoir - Ft. Quitman (see New Mexico)				
Lake Meredith Salinity Study	Appr.	60,000	60,000	60,000
Llano-Estacado Total Water Management Study (see New Mexico)				
Texas Basins	Feas.-I,M&I	114,000	114,000	114,000
UTAH				
Central Utah, Ute Indian Unit	Feas.-I,M&I,P	653,000	653,000	653,000
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	12,000	12,000	12,000
Columbia Basin, Grand Coulee Dam Third Powerplant Extension	Feas.-P	101,000	101,000	101,000
Walla Walla Reformulation	Feas.-M&I	120,000	120,000	120,000
Yakima, Yakima Indian Reservation	Feas.	75,000	75,000	75,000
Yakima, Bumping Lake Enlargement, Reformulation	Feas.-I	25,000	25,000	25,000
Yakima Valley Water Management Study	Sp. Inv.	210,000	210,000	210,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS--CONTINUED

Name and location of study	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
WYOMING				
CRSP Power Peaking Capacity (see Colorado)				
Minidoka, Minidoka Powerplant Rehabilitation and Enlargement (see Idaho)				
Muddy Ridge Area, Riverton unit	Feas.-I	---	40,000	40,000
North Platte River Hydroelectric Study (Oregon Trail Div., P-SMBP)	Appr.-P	50,000	50,000	50,000
Seminoe Dam Modification (Kendrick Project)	Feas.-I,M&I,P	170,000	170,000	170,000
Sublette	Feas.-I,M&I	186,000	186,000	186,000
Total Water Mangement Study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota)				
Upper Snake River, Oakley Fan Division, Reformulation (see Idaho)				
Upper Snake River Water Management Study (see Idaho)				
VARIOUS STATES				
Colorado River Water Quality Improvement Program	Feas.	1,950,000	1,950,000	1,950,000
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Studies		554,000	554,000	554,000
General Engineering and Research:				
Atmospheric Water Resources Management Program		4,650,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
General Planning Studies		250,000	200,000	250,000

Special Investigations:			
Environmental and Interagency Coordination Activities	1,508,000	1,508,000	1,508,000
Minor Work in Connection with Completed Project Investigations	862,000	862,000	862,000
Investigations of Existing Projects	128,000	128,000	128,000
Print Reports	35,000	35,000	35,000
Projects Not Yet Identified	25,000	25,000	25,000
Total	9,962,000	11,662,000	11,712,000
Classified Pay Raise (E.O. 11883)	506,000	506,000	506,000
Distributive Charges for Service Facilities, Unliquidated Obligations, etc	-123,678	-123,678	-123,678
General Reduction due to Slippage, Savings, and Carryover Balances	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000
Total, Appropriation	21,030,000	24,487,000	24,762,000

Lake Roosevelt, Washington

The Colville and Spokane Indians recommended initiation in fiscal year 1977 of a 5-year, $5 million study of the fish, wildlife, and recreational potential of Lake Roosevelt. The Committee believes several technical, economic, and legal issues need to be examined first. For example: What consideration must be given to the Lake's role in energy production in assessing its potential for fisheries, etc.? Would $5 million be better spent on immediate fisheries and wildlife enhancement elsewhere on the Columbia system? Who would control the fishery if one were established? What would be the participation in the "study of the Tribes and the Federal and State agencies involved in managing the Columbia and fish and wildlife"? Thus, the Committee requests that the Bureau, with the Tribes and appropriate Federal and State agencies, examine the technical, economic, and legal issues and determine if a study is merited and, if so, its proper scope.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Appropriation, 1976	$327, 308, 000
Budget estimate, 1977	347, 017, 000
House allowance	351, 386, 000
Committee recommendation	347, 811, 000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+794, 000
House allowance	−3, 575, 000

The Committee recommends an amount of $347,811,000 for fiscal year 1977, an increase of $794,000 over the budget request and a reduction of $3,575,000 below the House allowance.

A $200,000,000 appropriation is also provided under this heading for the payment of claims related to the failure of the Teton Dam. This amount is not included in the tables or in the total amounts shown. The $200,000,000 is a fiscal year 1976/transition quarter amount inasmuch as it will become available immediately upon enactment of the bill. This is anticipated to occur during the transition quarter.

The following table shows the allocation of funds recommended for projects and activities under this account. Committee comments appear after the table.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION								
ARIZONA								
Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie	272,462,092	71,621,420	810,000	—	810,000	—	810,000	—
CALIFORNIA								
Central Valley Project:								
Sacramento River division	246,638,000	121,335,368	32,000,000	—	32,000,000	—	32,000,000	—
San Luis unit:								
Westlands distribution and drainage system	362,357,550	143,488,639	14,090,000	—	16,000,000	—	16,000,000	—
San Luis drain	131,400,000	40,270,059	4,050,000	—	4,050,000	—	4,050,000	—
All other San Luis unit facilities	255,720,680	218,834,325	5,472,000	—	5,472,000	—	5,472,000	—
Subtotal, San Luis unit	749,478,230	402,593,023	23,612,000	—	25,522,000	—	25,522,000	—
Auburn-Folsom South unit:								
Auburn Dam and Reservoir	766,290,000	136,085,553	40,914,000	—	40,914,000	—	40,914,000	—
Folsom South Canal	178,205,000	38,793,232	266,000	—	500,000	—	500,000	—
All other Auburn-Folsom South unit facilities	39,087,000	12,140,412	325,000	—	325,000	—	325,000	—
Subtotal, Auburn-Folsom South unit	983,582,000	187,019,197	41,505,000	—	41,739,000	—	41,739,000	—
Miscellaneous project programs	819,224,000	781,916,204	11,750,000	—	11,865,000	—	11,865,000	—
San Felipe division	174,869,000	9,460,015	12,725,000	—	12,725,000	—	9,725,000	—
Total, Central Valley Project	2,973,791,230	1,502,323,807	121,592,000	—	123,851,000	—	120,851,000	—
Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie (see Arizona)								
COLORADO								
Fryingpan-Arkansas project	539,978,000	251,635,795	39,000,000	—	39,000,000	—	39,000,000	—
San Luis Valley project, Closed Basin division	25,370,000	125,000	—	375,000	—	375,000	—	375,000
IDAHO								
Teton Basin project, Lower Teton division	102,410,000	69,455,817	5,300,000	—	5,300,000	—	5,300,000	—
Upper Snake River project, Salmon Falls division	82,950,000	699,141	—	400,000	—	400,000	—	400,000
NEW MEXICO								
Brantley project	78,155,000	3,674,482	5,600,000	—	5,600,000	—	5,600,000	—
NEVADA								
Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie (see Arizona)								
Southern Nevada Water project	137,076,444	51,808,444	—	200,000	1,200,000	—	1,200,000	—
OKLAHOMA								
Mountain Park project	40,833,000	34,075,360	6,500,000	—	6,500,000	—	6,500,000	—
OREGON								
Rogue River Basin project, Merlin division	48,764,000	733,664	—	300,000	—	300,000	—	300,000
Tualatin project	52,112,000	39,643,693	9,000,000	—	9,000,000	—	9,000,000	—
TEXAS								
Palmetto Bend project	73,926,000	36,777,612	16,400,000	—	16,400,000	—	16,400,000	—
Nueces River project	60,650,000	—	—	—	4,500,000	—	2,500,000	—
WASHINGTON								
Columbia Basin project:								
Irrigation facilities	2,106,844,560	702,380,996	16,400,000	—	16,400,000	—	16,400,000	—
Bacon Siphon and Tunnel #2	48,800,000	6,205,663	—	—	—	—	2,000,000	—
Third powerplant	520,000,000	440,736,056	44,900,000	—	44,900,000	—	44,900,000	—
Total, Columbia Basin Project	2,675,644,560	1,149,322,715	61,300,000	—	61,300,000	—	63,300,000	—
Walla Walla project, Touchet division	39,526,000	928,691	—	300,000	—	300,000	—	300,000
Yakima project, Kennewick division	12,594,000	—	—	—	—	25,000	—	25,000
VARIOUS								
Drainage and minor construction program:								
All-American Canal System, California	64,514,596	64,469,145	5,000	—	5,000	—	5,000	—
Belle Fourche project, South Dakota	3,700,000	900,000	2,800,000	—	2,800,000	—	2,800,000	—
Boise project, Payette division, Idaho	25,429,742	21,879,742	1,500,000	—	1,500,000	—	1,500,000	—
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada	178,647,871	170,287,586	1,000,000	—	—	—	—	—
Gila project, Arizona	77,820,000	71,563,201	120,000	—	120,000	—	120,000	—
Kendrick project, Wyoming	34,805,000	33,959,141	510,000	—	510,000	—	510,000	—
Klamath project, Oregon-California	27,884,000	23,286,969	1,070,000	—	1,070,000	—	1,070,000	—
Lower Rio Grande project, Mercedes division, Texas	11,781,657	11,139,116	300,000	—	300,000	—	300,000	—
Miscellaneous engineering services, Colorado	359,000	305,889	10,000	—	10,000	—	10,000	—
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	161,645,000	150,079,798	2,415,000	—	2,415,000	—	2,415,000	—
Recreation facilities at existing reservoirs, various states	4,270,994	2,167,232	405,000	—	405,000	—	405,000	—
Rogue River Basin project - Savage Rapids Dam	1,054,000	120,000	780,000	—	780,000	—	780,000	—
Fishway modifications, Oregon	26,159,231	25,052,529	50,000	—	50,000	—	50,000	—
San Angelo project, Texas	3,382,000	—	900,000	—	900,000	—	900,000	—
Solano project - Lake Berryessa recreational facilities, California	1,300,000	—	—	—	150,000	—	150,000	—
Umatilla project, McKay Dam spillway modification	10,000,000	1,875,000	1,200,000	—	1,800,000	—	1,800,000	—
Ventura River project - Casitas Reservoir open space, California	104,528,000	30,056,882	330,000	—	330,000	—	330,000	—
Washoe project, Nevada-California	737,281,091	607,142,230	13,395,000	—	13,145,000	—	13,145,000	—
Total								
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects:								
Crooked River project, Ochoco Irrigation District, Oregon	596,000	120,000	100,000	—	100,000	—	100,000	—
Frenchman - Cambridge Division, Nebraska	4,180,000	—	—	—	—	—	275,000	—
Hyrum project, Utah	285,000	50,000	—	—	235,000	—	235,000	—
Minidoka project, Burley Irrigation Dist., Idaho	1,383,000	100,000	500,000	—	500,000	—	500,000	—
Newlands Project, Nevada	2,196,000	—	400,000	—	400,000	—	400,000	—
Rio Grande project, El Paso County Improvement District No. 1, Texas	5,441,200	3,694,700	1,000,000	—	1,000,000	—	1,000,000	—

S. Rept. 94-980 --- 6

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION--CONTINUED

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION--CONTINUED

State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
Rogue River Basin project, Medford and Rogue River Valley Irrigation District, Oregon	350,000	121,994	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
Salt River project, Arizona	27,000,000	23,058,037	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
Shoshone project, Garland division, Wyoming	6,000,000	2,487,900	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
Solano County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, California	1,077,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
Tucumcari project, New Mexico	3,136,000	2,338,005	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
Uncompahgre project, Colorado	2,486,000	1,877,988	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
Yakima project, Snipes Mountain Irrigation District, Washington	550,000	100,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
Total	54,395,200	33,898,624	4,175,000	---	4,910,000	---	4,950,000	---
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM								
COLORADO								
Narrows unit	137,000,000	2,113,148	3,995,000	---	3,995,000	---	3,995,000	---
MONTANA								
Canyon Ferry unit (dust abatement)	13,000,000	6,780,734	2,300,000	---	2,300,000	---	2,300,000	---
Lower Marias unit, Tiber Dam modifications	47,093,000	26,662,975	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
NEBRASKA								
North Loup division	111,720,000	890,194	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
O'Neill unit	159,090,000	1,823,093	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
NORTH DAKOTA								
Dickinson unit	4,000,000	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000
Garrison diversion unit	495,792,034	102,196,687	23,500,000	---	23,500,000	---	23,500,000	---
SOUTH DAKOTA								
Oahe unit	410,000,000	22,117,716	16,600,000	---	16,600,000	---	16,600,000	---
Pollock-Herreid unit	26,000,000	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000
WYOMING								
Polecat Bench unit	46,000,000	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	50,000
Riverton unit	19,500,000	5,064,508	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
VARIOUS								
Transmission division	374,403,000	346,092,740	16,620,000	---	16,620,000	---	16,620,000	---
Drainage and minor construction program:								
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas	55,807,000	48,505,347	1,380,000	---	1,380,000	---	1,380,000	---
East Bench unit, Montana	24,230,000	22,775,695	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
Farwell unit, Nebraska	36,984,000	35,749,699	730,000	---	730,000	---	730,000	---
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	82,709,000	82,117,322	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming	6,440,428	6,350,428	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	94,700,000	93,226,798	1,160,000	---	1,160,000	---	1,160,000	---
Total, Drainage and minor construction program	300,870,428	288,725,289	3,795,000	---	3,795,000	---	3,795,000	---
Total, Pick-Sloan Missouri basin program	2,144,468,462	802,467,084	76,610,000	---	76,610,000	250,000	76,610,000	250,000
Subtotal, Construction & Rehabilitation	10,152,207,079	4,662,539,242	359,682,000	1,575,000	368,126,000	1,650,000	365,401,000	1,650,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	---	---	-14,240,000	---	-18,390,000	---	-19,240,000	---
Total	10,152,672,079	4,656,383,579	345,442,000	1,575,000	349,736,000	1,650,000	346,161,000	1,650,000

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Appropriation, 1976	$41,152,000
Budget estimate, 1977	61,231,000
House allowance	59,331,000
Committee recommendation	59,331,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	−1,900,000
House allowance	----------

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $59,331,000, which is $1,900,000 below the budget request.

The following table shows the recommendation for each project or activity for which funds are recommended:

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT--UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND

State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT								
COLORADO								
Curecanti unit	131,022,623	127,139,169	3,280,000	----	3,280,000	----	3,280,000	----
VARIOUS								
Transmission Division	208,449,605	140,734,330	13,200,000	----	13,200,000	----	13,200,000	----
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS								
COLORADO								
Animas-La Plata project	114,081,800	2,047,672	----	200,000	----	200,000	----	200,000
Dallas Creek project	81,041,000	2,865,183	4,500,000	----	4,500,000	----	4,500,000	----
Dolores project	129,704,000	----	----	----	850,000	----	850,000	----
Fruitland Mesa project	60,981,323	2,711,014	3,000,000	----	3,000,000	----	3,000,000	----
San Juan-Chama project	108,617,000	74,490,544	800,000	----	800,000	----	800,000	----
San Miguel project	71,183,000	958,045	----	480,000	----	480,000	----	480,000
Savery-Pot Hook project	68,716,000	2,746,306	----	----	----	----	----	----
West Divide project	105,538,000	580,998	1,200,000	230,000	1,200,000	230,000	1,200,000	230,000
NEW MEXICO								
Animas-La Plata project (see Colorado)								
San Juan-Chama project (see Colorado)								
UTAH								
Central Utah project, Bonneville unit	688,716,072	122,297,292	20,300,000	----	21,100,000	----	21,100,000	----
Central Utah project, Jensen unit	27,424,000	4,287,920	6,300,000	----	6,300,000	----	6,300,000	----
Central Utah project, Uintah unit	68,666,000	225,000	----	860,000	----	860,000	----	860,000
Central Utah project, Upalco unit	31,414,000	1,556,346	----	800,000	----	800,000	----	800,000
Lyman project (see Wyoming)								
WYOMING								
Lyman project	21,282,240	13,662,283	3,600,000	----	3,600,000	----	3,600,000	----
Savery-Pot Hook project (see Colorado)								

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT--UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND--CONTINUED

State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
VARIOUS								
Drainage and minor construction programs:								
Participating projects:								
Central Utah project, Vernal unit, Utah	10,267,686	9,707,686	560,000	----	560,000	----	560,000	----
Central Utah project, Utah	14,932,781	14,747,781	140,000	----	140,000	----	140,000	----
Emery County project, Utah	----	----	-2,350,000	----	-5,900,000	----	-5,900,000	----
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	----	----	-1,650,000	----	-5,200,000	----	-5,200,000	----
Subtotal	25,200,467	24,455,467	54,530,000	2,570,000	52,630,000	2,570,000	52,630,000	2,570,000
Total	1,942,031,130	520,757,569						
Recreational and Fish and Wildlife facilities:								
Recreational facilities	89,393,480	24,041,131	925,000	----	925,000	----	925,000	----
Fish and wildlife facilities	58,424,758	15,068,932	3,206,000	----	3,206,000	----	3,206,000	----
Total	147,818,238	39,110,063	4,131,000	----	4,131,000	----	4,131,000	----
Total	2,089,849,368	559,867,632	58,661,000	2,570,000	56,761,000	2,570,000	56,761,000	2,570,000

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Appropriation, 1976	$29,205,000
Budget estimate, 1977	73,420,000
House allowance	73,420,000
Committee recommendation	73,420,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	----------
House allowance	----------

An amount of $73,420,000 is recommended by the Committee, the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The funds provide for continued construction of the Central Arizona project. Included in the amount recommended is $60,622,000 for the Granite Reef Division, $2,750,000 for the Salt-Gila Division, and $5,398,000 for transmission facilities. Also included is $1,050,000 for preconstruction planning and data collection for the Orme Division.

APPROPRIATION TO LIQUIDATE CONTRACT AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 1976	$22,440,000
Budget estimate, 1977	20,600,000
House allowance	20,600,000
Committee recommendation	20,600,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	----------
House allowance	----------

The Committee concurs with the House allowance, which is the same as the budget request.

The appropriation is required to liquidate contract authority for the thermal powerplant of the Central Arizona Project under the Navajo project participating agreement.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS

Appropriation, 1976	$19,670,000
Budget estimate, 1977	43,120,000
House allowance	44,700,000
Committee recommendation	44,680,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+1,560,000
House allowance	−20,000

The Committee recommends $44,680,000 which is an increase of $1,560,000 over the budget request and a reduction of $20,000 below the House allowance, for enhancement and protection of the water quality of the Colorado River for use in the United States and Mexico.

The appropriation provides for the continued construction of the desalting complex under title I and the initiation of construction on three of the salinity control projects under title II of the authorizing legislation.

Funds recommended are allocated as shown on the following table:

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS
FISCAL YEAR 1977

State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate construction	Budget estimate planning	House allowance construction	House allowance planning	Committee recommendation construction	Committee recommendation planning
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION								
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS								
TITLE II								
COLORADO								
Grand Valley Systems Improvement and Management unit	76,270,000	1,559,508	----	150,000	730,000	----	730,000	----
Paradox Valley unit	18,981,000	1,265,838	----	50,000	550,000	----	550,000	----
NEVADA								
Las Vegas Wash unit	49,600,000	508,521	----	300,000	800,000	----	800,000	----
UTAH								
Crystal Geyser unit	2,690,000	161,133	----	20,000	----	20,000	----	----
Total, Title II	147,541,000	3,495,000	----	520,000	2,080,000	20,000	2,080,000	----
TITLE I								
VARIOUS								
Measures below Imperial Dam	269,116,000	50,955,000	42,600,000	----	42,600,000	----	42,600,000	----
Total	416,657,000	54,450,000	42,600,000	520,000	44,680,000	20,000	44,680,000	----
Grand total			43,120,000		44,700,000		44,680,000	

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1976	$132, 162, 000
Budget estimate, 1977	143, 000, 000
House allowance	143, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	143, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	----------
House allowance	----------

The Committee recommendation provides $143,000,000, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

This appropriation is required to protect the Federal investment and insure continued efficient operations of the Bureau of Reclamation's irrigation, power, municipal and industrial water supply projects through proper operation and maintenance. 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 this responsibility.

The recommended allowance over the appropriation for fiscal year 1976 is due primarily to inflationary increases, including wages, materials and supplies, the increased requirements on completed projects, new projects, and the purchase of power and wheeling.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1976	$22, 665, 000
Budget estimate, 1977	10, 773, 000
House allowance	22, 209, 000
Committee recommendation	28, 495, 000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+17, 722, 000
House allowance	+6, 286, 000

The Committee recommends $28,495,000, an increase of $6,286,000 over the House allowance and $17,722,000 over the budget request, for the Bureau of Reclamation loan program.

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

The funds are allocated as shown in the following table:

LOAN PROGRAM

State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM					
ARIZONA					
Gila River Farms	9,920,000	---	---	500,000	500,000
Graham-Curtis Canal Companies	2,000,000	---	---	---	2,000,000
CALIFORNIA					
Buttonwillow Improvement District, Supplemental	2,995,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
DeLuz Heights Municipal Water District	5,357,000	---	---	300,000	300,000
Kanawha Water District, Phase II	3,764,000	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
LaBranza Water District	2,990,500	2,242,000	---	722,000	722,000
Pioneer Water Company, Supplemental	414,000	---	---	414,000	---
Pond-Poso Improvement District, Supplemental	5,200,000	---	---	2,000,000	5,000,000
Pond-Poso Improvement District	8,983,462	8,719,462	264,000	264,000	264,000
Redwood Valley Water District	4,800,000	2,700,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
San Luis Water District, Supplemental	5,411,000	500,000	1,500,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Valley Center Water District, Supplemental	3,500,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
MONTANA					
Buffalo Rapids Irrigation District	815,000	600,000	215,000	215,000	215,000
NEBRASKA					
Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District	10,000,000	6,660,985	2,660,000	2,660,000	2,660,000
Mitchell Irrigation District	2,209,000	1,619,000	---	---	200,000
TEXAS					
Cameron County Water Control and Impr. District No. 19	2,089,000	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
Hidalgo County Water Improvement District No. 5	3,850,000	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
Hidalgo and Willacy Counties Water Control and Improvement District No. 1	5,097,024	4,564,024	533,000	533,000	533,000
UTAH					
Roy Water Conservancy Subdistrict, Supplemental	3,000,000	---	---	1,500,000	3,000,000
WASHINGTON					
Wenatchee Heights Reclamation District	895,000	700,000	195,000	195,000	195,000
Administration of loan program	5,136,310	3,440,911	338,000	338,000	338,000
Subtotal	88,426,296	34,746,382	10,805,000	22,241,000	28,527,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	---	---	-32,000	-32,000	-32,000
Total	88,426,296	34,746,382	10,773,000	22,209,000	28,495,000

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriation, 1976	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1977	1,000,000
House allowance	400,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+600,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,000,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $600,000 over the House allowance.

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.

The Committee believes that the full budget request will be required during the fiscal year in light of the average annual requirements of the past few years.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1976	$21,840,000
Budget estimate, 1977	22,600,000
House allowance	22,600,000
Committee recommendation	22,600,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	
House allowance	

The Committee recommendation provides $22,600,000, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

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

ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1976	$652,000
Budget estimate, 1977	763,000
House allowance	749,000
Committee recommendation	749,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	-14,000
House allowance	

The amount of $749,000 is recommended by the Committee, the same as the House allowance and $14,000 below the budget request.

Funds are provided for investigations, surveys, and comprehensive studies for the development and utilization of water and related land resources to assure adequate and economical power supplies to Alaska.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1976	$1,007,500
Budget estimate, 1977	1,164,000
House allowance	1,141,000
Committee recommendation	1,141,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	-23,000
House allowance	

The Committee concurs with the House allowance of $1,141,000, a decrease of $23,000 from the budget request.

The appropriation covers the expenses of the Alaska Power Administration in the operation and maintenance of the Eklutna project which supplies power to the greater Anchorage area and the operation of the Snettisham project which supplies power to the Juneau area.

Bonneville Power Administration

Appropriation, 1976	0
Budget estimate, 1977	0
House allowance	0
Committee recommendation	0
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	-----
House allowance	-----

Public Law 93–454 created the Bonneville Power Administration Fund in order that the agency and its programs be financed from power revenues and sale of bonds; therefore, direct appropriations are no longer required. Fiscal year 1976 was the first under which BPA operated without appropriations, and this is to be continued in fiscal year 1977.

The Committee has reviewed the proposed budget of the Bonneville Power Administration for fiscal year 1977, which provides for a total program of $347,870,000.

The total program consists of two major categories, direct and reimbursable programs. Direct program requirements for operating costs and capital outlays for the transmission system are almost $300 million for fiscal year 1977. The total includes the $46.7 million for operation and maintenance of the transmission system, $151.8 million for the construction of transmission system facilities, $65 million for acquiring power and wheeling, and $36.2 million for certain power costs of the Federal hydro projects in the Northwest. BPA will make a capital transfer of $108.6 million to the Treasury to pay for interest on the Federal investment in the power system. Reimbursable program requirements during fiscal year 1977 are estimated at $48.2 million and will cover costs for acquisition of energy and other services that BPA provides to various utilities. The direct program will be financed from operating receipts and borrowing authority as provided by the "Self-financing" legislation (Public Law 93–454), and reimbursable program requirements will be financed by receipts from other entities.

About half of the approximately $300 million direct program proposed for fiscal year 1977 is for the construction of transmission system facilities. Eighty-three percent of the proposed construction program is for continued construction of facilities begun in prior years; 13 percent is to initiate construction of proposed additions to the transmission system; the remainder of about 4 percent is for acquisition of tools and equipment. Only one major transmission system facility requires specific approval by Congress in accordance with the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act; that facility is the Lost River-Salmon River Area Service which will provide improved service to BPA loads in Southeastern Idaho. Approval of this facility and approval for the purchase of one aircraft for replacement only is specifically included in the appropriation bill language.

This Committee concurs with the House Committee that the Congress holds BPA accountable for its costs affecting rates including the cost components of power plants from which BPA is acquiring power by net billing or by purchase and such things as purchase of aircraft.

Also, this Committee agrees with the House Committee that when participating in research projects such as the ERDA/NASA integrated wind generation research project, Bonneville Power Administration should fund its portion of the research costs consistent with what other utilities would fund in a joint effort.

Southeastern Power Administration

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1976	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1977	1,106,000
House allowance	1,076,000
Committee recommendation	1,076,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	−30,000
House allowance	----------

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $1,076,000, which is $30,000 below the budget request.

The increase over the amount provide for the current fiscal year is required as a result of inflationary costs and increased purchase power and wheeling charges.

The Southeastern Power Administration markets power from 21 Corps of Engineers multipurpose power projects in a 10 State area of the Southeast. Power deliveries are made by means of transmission facilities owned by others.

Southwestern Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1976	$680,000
Budget estimate, 1977	960,000
House allowance	896,000
Committee recommendation	896,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	−64,000
House allowance	--------

The Committee recommends an amount of $896,000, the same as the House allowance, which is a reduction of $64,000 below the budget request.

The Southwestern Power Administration is responsible for marketing power produced at Corps of Engineers hydroelectric generating plants in the Southwest. The construction appropriation is required primarily to continue minor modifications, make additions to existing facilities, and expand and modernize communications and control systems.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1976	$6,080,000
Budget estimate, 1977	7,821,000
House allowance	7,707,000
Committee recommendation	7,707,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	−114,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $7,707,000, which is a reduction of $114,000 below the budget request.

The funds provide for operation and maintenance, purchase of power and wheeling charges, and general administration associated with the power transmission and interconnection system.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1976	$1,870,000
Budget estimate, 1977	1,897,000
House allowance	1,897,000
Committee recommendation	1,897,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $1,897,000 for fiscal year 1977 for salaries and expenses, which is the same as the budget request.

These funds provide for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his immediate staff, and the contribution by the Federal Government of 50 percent of the administrative expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

(Funds appropriated to the President)

Appropriation, 1976	$288,200,000
Budget estimate, 1977	298,500,000
House allowance	300,500,000
Committee recommendation	306,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+7,500,000
House allowance	+5,500,000

The Committee recommends $306,000,000, an increase of $7,500,000 over the budget request and $5,500,000 over the House allowance for Appalachian Regional Development Programs.

The Committee has restored the $500,000 House reduction for research and local development districts. An increase of $5,000,000 is recommended over the House allowance for area development programs to partially offset the funding reductions recommended by the Administration in the fiscal year 1977 budget.

The funds recommended under this head are allocated as shown in the following table:

Program	1976	1977 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Area development	$117,500,000	$104,500,000	$107,000,000	$112,000,000
Research and local development districts	8,500,000	9,000,000	8,500,000	9,000,000
Highways	162,200,000	185,000,000	185,000,000	185,000,000
Total	288,200,000	298,500,000	300,500,000	306,000,000

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1976	$81,000
Budget estimate, 1977	83,000
House allowance	83,000
Committee recommendation	83,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+2,000
House allowance	-------

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $83,000, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

This appropriation provides for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff in representing the interests of the Federal government in the Delaware River Basin Commission. The Delaware River Basin Commission was created by a compact between the Federal government and the States of Delaware, New York, New Jersey, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to enable joint participation in the development of water and related resources in the Delaware River Basin region.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1976	$215,000
Budget estimate, 1977	198,000
House allowance	198,000
Committee recommendation	198,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	--------
House allowance	--------

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $198,000, which is the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides the Federal share of the operating costs of the Delaware River Basin Commission as provided in the legislation establishing the Commission.

Federal Power Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1976	$36,560,000
Budget estimate, 1977	41,582,000
House allowance	41,582,000
Committee recommendation	41,582,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	----------
House allowance	----------

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $41,582,000, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Federal Power Commission administers the 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 recommended by the Committee are allocated as follows:

Hydroelectric regulation	$6,472,000
Electric power industry systems evaluation	3,768,000
Electric power utilities regulation	5,453,000
Natural gas pipeline regulation	13,677,000
Natural gas producers regulation	5,613,000
Natural gas industry systems evaluation	616,000
Services to other agencies and public	2,592,000
Energy utilization	438,000
Administration	2,953,000
Total	41,582,000

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriation, 1976	$52,000
Budget estimate, 1977	--------
House allowance	52,000
Committee recommendation	52,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+52-000
House allowance	--------

An appropriation of $52,000 is recommended, which is the same as the House allowance. The President's budget for fiscal year 1977 did not contain funds for continuation of this contribution.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1949 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 Basinwide water quality planning coordination and assistance, and is the only interstate coordinating body covering the entire Potomac River Basin.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1976	$217,423,000
Budget estimate, 1977	249,430,000
House allowance	244,430,000
Committee recommendation	244,430,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	-5,000,000
House allowance	----------

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $244,430,000, which is $5,000,000 below the budget request for the salaries and expenses of the Commission.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is responsible for the review and licensing involved with applications to construct and operate nuclear power plants, the licensing of various non-civilian power nuclear facilities, research in nuclear safety, the development of standards, the inspection of operating nuclear plants, the development of safeguards systems and various studies.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—Continued

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
EXPENSES			
Water resources development:			
Navigation operations	$1,220,000	$1,220,000	$1,220,000
Flood control operations	1,092,000	1,092,000	1,092,000
Regional water quality management	1,104,000	1,104,000	1,104,000
Recreation development	1,097,000	1,097,000	1,097,000
Fisheries and waterfowl resources development	757,000	757,000	757,000
Preliminary surveys and engineering	200,000	200,000	200,000
Multipurpose reservoir operations	7,378,000	7,378,000	7,378,000
General resources development:			
Agricultural projects	1,681,000	1,681,000	1,681,000
Waste heat utilization	555,000	300,000	300,000
Forest resources development	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,650,000
Strip mine reclamation demonstrations	3,200,000	3,200,000	5,900,000
Minerals resources projects	257,000	257,000	257,000
Environmental quality projects	483,000	483,000	483,000
Development of tributary areas	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
Human resources development	992,000	992,000	992,000
Regional economic studies	750,000	750,000	750,000
Townlift community improvement	705,000	705,000	705,000
Interagency health service demonstrations	202,000	202,000	202,000
Multipurpose reservoir operations	169,000	169,000	169,000
Land between the lakes	2,983,000	2,983,000	2,983,000
Fertilizer development:			
Fertilizer research and development	8,008,000	8,008,000	9,508,000
Fertilizer introduction	12,477,000	12,477,000	12,477,000
General service activities:			
Valley mapping and remote sensing	534,000	534,000	534,000
Joint Bicentennial demonstration caravan	125,000	125,000	125,000
Scientific and technical cooperation	20,000	20,000	20,000
Other expenses	275,000	275,000	275,000
Total expense	50,014,000	49,759,000	53,959,000
Total program	121,185,000	123,930,000	131,130,000
Slippage and unobligated balance		3,000,000	4,000,000
Total appropriations	121,185,000	120,930,000	127,130,000

TELLICO PROJECT

The bill, as reported, contains the full $9.7 million budget request for the Tellico project. During subcommittee hearings, TVA was questioned about the relationship between the Tellico project's completion and the November 1975 listing of the snail darter (a small 3-inch fish which was discovered in 1973) as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act. TVA informed the Committee that it was continuing its efforts to preserve the darter, while working towards the scheduled 1977 completion date. TVA repeated its view that the Endangered Species Act did not prevent the completion of the Tellico project, which has been under construction for nearly a decade. The subcommittee brought this matter, as well as the recent U.S. District Court's decision upholding TVA's decision to complete the project, to the attention of the full Committee. The Committee does not view the Endangered Species Act as prohibiting the completion of the Tellico project at its advanced stage and directs that this project be completed as promptly as possible in the public interest.

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

Appropriation, 1976	$10,722,000
Budget estimate, 1977	9,465,000
House allowance	11,965,000
Committee recommendation	14,665,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate, 1977	+5,200,000
House allowance	+2,700,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $14,665,000, an increase of $2,700,000 over the House allowance and $5,200,000 over the budget request.

The following table shows the allocation of the recommended appropriation for the Water Resources Council.

Program	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Administration and coordination	$1,748,000	$1,524,000	$1,648,000
River basin commissions	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Planning grants to States	0	2,500,000	5,000,000
Comprehensive planning	5,217,000	5,441,000	5,517,000

In making the above recommendations, the Committee has restored $124,000 of the House reduction for administration and coordination, which will enable the WRC to maintain current coordination activities with the Federal and state river basin commissions of which $75,000 is to initiate a special study in the Connecticut River Basin to seek means to implement Section 73 of the 1974 Water Resources Act. A total of $5,000,000, the full authorization, is also recommended for title III grants to states program.

The recommended increase for comprehensive planning provides a total of $300,000 for the Hudson River Level B study. The Council should apply, from within available resources, any additional funds needed to continue the Hudson study in fiscal year 1977.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF H.R. 14236[1]
(Dollars in millions)

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
I. Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1977:				
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY RESEARCH	$9,800	$9,695 (under target)	[2]$8,900	[2]$8,679 (under target)
II. Summary by functional category of 1977 budget amounts recommended in the bill:				
050 - National Defense		1,958		[2]1,833
250 - General Science, Space, and Technology		496		[2]443
300 - Natural Resources, Environment, and Energy		6,932		[2]6,074
450 - Community and Regional Development		308		[2]329
800 - General Government		1		*
III. Financial assistance to state and local governments for 1977 in the bill		312		[3]24
IV. Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1977				[3]5,555
1978				3,547
1979				477
1980				71
1981				33
Future year				12

[1] Prepared by the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to Section 308a, Public Law 93-344.
[2] Includes outlays from prior year budget authority.
[3] Excludes outlays from prior year budget authority.
* Less than $500 thousand.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1976 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1977

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—FEDERAL 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 (obligational) authority, 1976 (2)	Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, 1977 (3)	Increase (+) or decrease (−) (4)
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$4,500,000	$4,548,000	+$48,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation:			
Miscellaneous appropriations	3,000,000	3,000,000	
Colorado River Basin Project (contract authority)	19,500,000		−19,500,000
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act	85,000	85,000	
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	27,085,000	7,633,000	−19,452,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1976 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1977

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	New budget (obligational) authority, 1976	Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, 1977	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Trust Funds	$22, 000, 000	$28, 000, 000	+$6, 000, 000
Department of the Interior:			
Reclamation trust funds	12, 285, 000	29, 000, 000	+16, 715, 000
Energy Research and Development Administration: Advance for cooperative work	235, 000	235, 000	
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust fund accounts	3, 370, 000	3, 421, 000	+51, 000
Water Resources Council: River Basin Commissions	4, 552, 000	6, 692, 000	+2, 140, 000
Total permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds	42, 442, 000	67, 348, 000	+24, 906, 000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977

Item	1976 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with— 1976 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
TITLE I—ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION (EXCEPT FOSSIL FUELS RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT)							
Operating expenses	$3,149,015,000	$4,137,571,000	$4,172,783,000	$4,096,586,000	+$947,571,000	−$40,985,000	−$76,197,000
Plant and capital equipment	907,642,000	1,579,399,000	1,525,500,000	1,608,185,000	+700,543,000	+28,786,000	+82,685,000
Geothermal Resources Development Fund	----	50,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	+30,000,000	−20,000,000	----
TOTAL, TITLE I	4,056,657,000	5,766,970,000	5,728,283,000	5,734,771,000	+1,678,114,000	−32,199,000	+6,488,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
Department of the Army Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	66,836,000	64,255,000	70,110,000	72,180,000	+5,344,000	+7,925,000	+2,070,000
Construction, general	1,228,648,000	1,266,332,000	1,416,477,000	1,436,559,000	+207,911,000	+170,227,000	+20,082,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	163,250,000	191,220,000	227,667,000	231,497,000	+68,247,000	+40,277,000	+3,830,000
Operation and maintenance, general	582,073,000	583,900,000	648,900,000	648,900,000	+66,827,000	+65,000,000	----
Revolving fund	700,000	----	----	6,600,000	+5,900,000	+6,600,000	+6,600,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	90,400,000	18,140,000	30,000,000	22,140,000	−68,260,000	+4,000,000	−7,860,000
General expenses	43,700,000	47,400,000	47,200,000	47,200,000	+3,500,000	−200,000	----
Special recreation use fees	1,200,000	3,100,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+800,000	−1,100,000	----
TOTAL, TITLE II	2,176,807,000	2,174,347,000	2,442,354,000	2,467,076,000	+290,269,000	+292,729,000	+24,722,000
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Reclamation							
General Investigations	20,892,000	21,030,000	24,487,000	24,762,000	+3,870,000	+3,732,000	+275,000
Construction and Rehabilitation	327,308,000	347,017,000	351,386,000	347,811,000	+20,503,000	+794,000	−3,575,000
Upper Colorado River Storage Project	41,152,000	61,231,000	59,331,000	59,331,000	+18,179,000	−1,900,000	----
Colorado River Basin project	29,205,000	73,420,000	73,420,000	73,420,000	+44,215,000	----	----
Colorado River Basin project (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(22,440,000)	(20,600,000)	(20,600,000)	(20,600,000)	(−1,840,000)	----	----
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control project	19,670,000	43,120,000	44,700,000	44,680,000	+25,010,000	+1,560,000	−20,000
Operation and maintenance	132,162,000	143,000,000	143,000,000	143,000,000	+10,838,000	----	----
Loan program	22,665,000	10,773,000	22,209,000	28,495,000	+5,830,000	+17,722,000	+6,286,000
Emergency Fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	400,000	1,000,000	----	----	+600,000
General Administrative Expenses	21,840,000	22,600,000	22,600,000	22,600,000	+760,000	----	----
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	615,894,000	723,191,000	741,533,000	745,099,000	+129,205,000	+21,908,000	+3,566,000
Alaska Power Administration							
General Investigations	652,000	763,000	749,000	749,000	+97,000	−14,000	----
Operation and Maintenance	1,007,500	1,164,000	1,141,000	1,141,000	+133,500	−23,000	----
Total, Alaska Power Administration	1,659,500	1,927,000	1,890,000	1,890,000	+230,500	−37,000	----
Southeastern Power Administration							
Operation and maintenance	1,000,000	1,106,000	1,076,000	1,076,000	+76,000	−30,000	----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977—Continued

Item	1976 Appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with—		
				1976 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Southwestern Power Administration						
Construction	$680,000	$960,000	$896,000	+$216,000	−$64,000	----
Operation and maintenance	6,080,000	7,821,000	7,707,000	+1,627,000	−114,000	----
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	6,760,000	8,781,000	8,603,000	+1,843,000	−178,000	----
TOTAL, TITLE III	625,313,500	735,005,000	753,102,000	+131,354,500	+21,663,000	+$3,566,000
TITLE IV-INDEPENDENT OFFICES (excluding ERDA)						
Appalachian Region Commission: Salaries and expenses	1,870,000	1,897,000	1,897,000	+27,000	----	----
Appalachian regional development programs (funds Appropriated to the President)	288,200,000	298,500,000	300,500,000	+17,800,000	+7,500,000	+5,500,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:						
Salaries and expenses	81,000	83,000	83,000	+2,000	----	----
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	215,000	198,000	198,000	−17,000	----	----
Total, DRBC	296,000	281,000	281,000	−15,000	----	----
Federal Power Commission	36,560,000	41,582,000	41,582,000	+5,022,000	----	----
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin: Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	52,000	----	52,000	----	+52,000	----
Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Salaries and Expenses	217,423,000	249,430,000	244,430,000	+27,007,000	−5,000,000	----
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:						
Salaries and expenses	81,000	83,000	83,000	+2,000	----	----
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	150,000	150,000	150,000	----	----	----
Total, SRBC	231,000	233,000	233,000	+2,000	----	----
Tennessee Valley Authority: Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority fund	100,025,000	121,185,000	120,930,000	+27,105,000	+5,945,000	+6,200,000
Water Resources Council: Water resources planning	10,722,000	9,465,000	11,965,000	+3,943,000	+5,200,000	+2,700,000
TOTAL, TITLE IV	655,379,000	722,573,000	721,870,000	+80,891,000	+13,697,000	+14,400,000
RECAPITULATION						
Total, New Budget (Obligational) Authority Titles II, III, and IV (excluding ERDA)	3,457,499,500	3,631,925,000	3,917,326,000	+502,514,500	+328,089,000	+42,688,000
Total, New Budget (Obligational) Authority Titles I, II, III, and IV	7,514,156,500	9,398,895,000	9,645,609,000	+2,180,628,500	+295,890,000	+49,176,000
Memoranda:						
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations	22,440,000	20,600,000	20,600,000	−1,840,000	----	----
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS, INCLUDING APPROPRIATIONS TO LIQUIDATE CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS	7,536,596,500	9,419,495,000	9,666,209,000	+2,178,788,500	+295,890,000	+49,176,000

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

NOTICE.—This report is given out subject to release when consideration of the bill which it accompanies has been completed by the whole committee. Please check on such action before release in order to be advised of any changes.

94TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 94–

PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY RESEARCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1977

MAY 25, 1976.—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

[To accompany H.R. ——]

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, 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 September 30, 1977, and for other purposes.

BILL SUMMARY BY MAJOR PROGRAM CATEGORIES

	1976 enacted to date [1]	1977 estimate	1977 bill	1977 bill compared with—	
				1976 enacted	1977 estimates
(Title I) Energy Research and Development Administration	$4,056,657,000	$5,588,170,000	$5,633,283,000	+$1,576,626,000	+$45,113,000
(Titles II and III) Water and Power Development: Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and Power Agencies of the Department of the Interior:					
Planning and construction	1,904,678,000	2,013,213,000	2,227,086,000	+322,408,000	+213,873,000
Investigations	88,380,000	86,048,000	95,346,000	+6,966,000	+9,298,000
Operation and maintenance	722,322,500	736,991,000	801,824,000	+79,501,500	+64,833,000
Other	66,740,000	73,100,000	71,800,000	+5,060,000	−1,300,000
Total, titles II and III	2,782,120,500	2,909,352,000	3,196,056,000	+413,935,500	+286,704,000
(Title IV) Independent Offices:					
Appalachian programs	290,070,000	300,397,000	302,397,000	+12,327,000	+2,000,000
Federal Power Commission	36,560,000	41,582,000	41,582,000	+5,022,000	
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	217,423,000	249,430,000	244,430,000	+27,007,000	−5,000,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	100,025,000	121,185,000	120,930,000	+20,905,000	−255,000
Other	11,301,000	9,979,000	12,531,000	+1,230,000	+2,552,000
Total, title IV	655,379,000	722,573,000	721,870,000	+66,491,000	−703,000
Grand total	7,494,156,500	9,220,095,000	9,551,209,000	+2,057,052,500	+331,114,000

[1] Includes amounts contained in Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1976 as passed House.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Bill page	Report page
Energy Research and Development Administration:		
Geothermal Resources Development Fund	4	34
Operating expenses	2	11
Plant and capital equipment	3	29
Department of Defense—Civil:		
Department of the Army:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
Construction, general	6	41
Flood control and coastal emergencies	8	59
General expenses	8	59
General investigations	5	34
Mississippi River and tributaries	6	56
Operation and maintenance, general	7	58
Special Recreation use fees	8	60
Department of the Interior:		
Alaska Power Administration:		
General investigations	18	77
Operation and maintenance	18	77
Bonneville Power Administration Fund	18	77
Bureau of Reclamation:		
Colorado River Basin project	12	73
Colorado River basin salinity control projects	12	73
Construction and rehabilitation	10	65
Emergency fund	14	77
General administrative expenses	14	77
General investigations	10	60
Loan program	13	75
Operation and maintenance	12	75
Upper Colorado River storage project	11	70
Southeastern Power Administration	18	78
Southwestern Power Administration:		
Construction	19	78
Operation and maintenance	19	79
Independent Offices:		
Appalachian program	21	79
Delaware River Basin Commission	22	80
Federal Power Commission	22	80
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	22	81
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	23	81
Susquehanna River Basin Commission	24	82
Tennessee Valley Authority	24	82
Water Resources Council	25	84

The Public Works for Water and Power Development and Energy Research Appropriation Bill, 1977, is a vital and important bill that reaches broadly across the Nation, affects every state and region and touches the lives of virtually all Americans.

The bill recommends appropriations for planning or construction of 535 projects by the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation and Tennessee Valley Authority. These projects 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. Appropriations for these projects provide a substantial investment in the future of our Nation, an investment that will pay rich dividends in services and economic benefits to the American people.

Also recommended in the bill are appropriations 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.

Funds are also included for programs which will strengthen America through research and development for defense and related missions.

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 balanced bill with recommended appropriations slightly over the amount requested in the Administration's budget.

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, Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Federal Power Commission, Water Resources Council, Tennessee Valley Authority, Delaware and Susquehanna River Basin Commissions, 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 Commission.

Water Resource Development

Water is one of our Nation's most precious and valuable resources, and development of our water resources has been and will continue to be vital to the continued growth and prosperity of America.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system, providing clean, efficient and economical transport of fuels for energy generation, agricultural produce, and supplies and materials needed for industry.

Flood control projects protect our communities from the devastation of floods, open up vast areas for vital agricultural production, and make possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

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

When projects are completed they make an enormous contribution to America. The present value to the Nation of all completed projects for water supply, power generation, flood control, navigation, reclamation and recreation is evident from the following table:

Project benefits

Annual water supply benefits:	
Gallons of water furnished	12. 2 billion.
Number of people served	23. 5 million.
Annual power benefits:	
Installed generating capacity (kilowatts)	50. 9 million.
Net generation (kilowatt hours)	226. 1 billion.
Gross revenues	$1. 55 billion.
Flood control benefits to date:	
Estimated value of flood damage prevented	$50. 6 billion.
Expenditures for flood control facilities	$8. 4 billion.
Annual navigation benefits: Annual traffic tonnage	2. 3 billion.
Reclamation benefits:	
Acres irrigated	9. 4 million.
Annual value of crops produced	$4. 6 billion.
Recreation benefits: Annual visitor days	490. 8 million.

Although the value to the Nation of water resource projects as shown in the above table is evident and overwhelming, the budget request submitted by the Administration included no new construction starts, only three projects were proposed for initiation of preconstruction planning, and only 12 survey starts were proposed. Funding for the small projects programs was recommended to be discontinued. Further, the funding level of projects under construction would be held down under the budget proposals. This would result in longer construction times and substantial cost increases. In addition, sufficient funds were not included to reduce the backlog of critical operation and maintenance of existing projects.

Testimony before the Committee clearly and decisively shows that if the proposed approach to these projects and programs is allowed to stand and become a trend, development of the Nation's vital water resources will suffer disastrous consequences. For example, the Corps of Engineers now has 235 projects under construction. With no new construction starts in the next five years, and funding continued at the present level, only 68 projects would be under construction in 1982. With full funding of these projects, that number would drop to only 51 construction projects in the Nation.

Therefore, responsibility has been placed on the Congress to take the first necessary steps to preserve the vitality of the Federal water resources program. The importance of new construction starts becomes very evident if we are to meet our Nation's water resources needs. But construction starts alone are not the entire answer—there must be initiation of preconstruction planning on projects and commencement of survey studies. The continuation of work on vital and essential small projects is necessary. These actions are needed because there are serious water resource needs that require attention. The studying and planning of additional projects will enable the Congress to better identify these needs and to effectively assign priorities for the expenditure of the limited funds which will be available.

In order to meet this responsibility, appropriations are recommended in the bill for 23 new construction starts, 18 new planning starts and 35 new studies. In addition, funding is recommended for six small projects programs that were not included in the budget request. The small projects program is a particularly vital and important program which the Corps of Engineers can implement relatively quickly without specific authorization in response to local or emergency needs, in the public interest.

Benefits of Proposed Projects

Appropriations for projects and programs recommended in the bill are "capital investments" 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 capital investment made by the Nation in public works projects decades ago are still benefiting the American people by providing power on line, protection from floods, reclamation and irrigation of parched lands for crop production, navigation and transportation of goods, among others. Likewise, the appropriations for projects in 1977 will benefit the Nation for decades in the future.

The investment of Federal funds in the development of water resources has a far greater impact on the Nation than the direct benefits mentioned above. It must be recognized that, in addition, these projects have an important indirect impact on community and regional development by contributing to economic growth through private investment. Flood damage prevention, hydroelectric power projects, and navigation projects, for example, provide a base for expanded industrial growth and development.

In addition to providing a base on which private investment can build, water resources expenditures stimulate local and regional employment—particularly important in this period of high unemployment. The impact of the employment created by these projects differ for different activities. For construction and major rehabilitation projects, the employment effects are concentrated primarily in the construction industry. Other kinds of expenditures such as operation and maintenance at recreation sites provide employment for a variety of unskilled and semiskilled workers. It should be kept in mind that these are productive jobs resulting in tangible benefits for the American people, such as power on line, improved harbors, flood control facilities and expanded irrigation, unlike temporary public service jobs from which little permanent benefits are derived.

The private sector of the economy also benefits enormously from appropriations for these projects. Indeed, the overwhelming percentage of Federal funds for public works projects in the bill are expended in the private sector. For example, the turbines, steel, cement and other materials used to build these projects are manufactured and marketed by private industry. The actual construction of the projects is contracted to private industry through Government contracts.

The value of the projects recommended in the bill for planning or construction under the programs of the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation is evidenced by the following breakdown which shows the estimated annual benefits expected to accrue over the life of the projects:

Estimated average annual benefits for projects funded for planning and construction

Flood control	$2, 661, 660, 000
Water supply	428, 866, 000
Power	1, 631, 300, 000
Recreation	321, 201, 000
Irrigation	1, 021, 230, 000
Water quality	120, 085, 000
Navigation	963, 363, 000
Fish and wildlife	80, 609, 000
Erosion control	54, 678, 000
Area redevelopment	104, 607, 000
Total estimate	$7, 387, 599, 000

Environment

The projects and programs recommended in the bill reflect the Committee's concern and careful attention to those activities which will continue to promote development of the Nation's water resources consistent with environmental quality considerations. The result is a balanced approach which will contribute to economic growth and progress in America while also providing for the preservation, promotion and protection of our environment.

The Committee shares the widespread concern for the environment and it should be emphasized that the several agencies involved in water resources development are increasingly aware of environmental considerations. Indeed, testimony shows that considerable progress has been made toward a full integration of environmental factors into the Nation's public works programs. Extensive changes, both in the planning process and in actual construction, have been made to minimize adverse environmental impacts. New projects are being carefully designed and planned to accomplish minimal environmental impact and, at the same time, enhance environmental, conservation and recreational objectives. Increasing emphasis on the environmental quality objective will undoubtedly result in further changes in which water resources needs are met in the future.

The Committee believes that the bill fulfills the 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 hydropower, provide water supplies for municipal and industrial use, irrigation for millions of acres, and recreational facilities for millions of Americans. Beautification and enhancement of the environment is significant to the Nation as a result of fulfillment of the objectives of this Bill and the declared goals of the Congress.

Energy

During the oil embargo, there was widespread urgency concerning the energy crisis. The return of ample gasoline supplies and the

passage of time has evidently abated the concerns felt by many with regard to energy.

This is most unfortunate because two and a half years after the oil embargo, one and a half years after the consolidation of the Federal government's energy research effort into a single agency (ERDA), after the appearance of untold numbers of articles, speeches, and conferences on energy, after the expenditure of tremendous amounts of funds and scientific manpower on the energy problem the following facts are a depressing reality:

It is estimated that the United States will import about 40% of its oil in 1976;

It is estimated that America will spend $31,000,000,000 to import oil in 1976;

With regard to natural gas, the ratio of proven reserves to consumption is at a critical low;

The original goal of attaining Energy Independence by 1980 is not even remotely feasible;

While energy consumption has leveled off in the past two years, it should be kept in mind that America has been going through the most severe economic downturn since the depression and as the economy revives, the consumption of energy has been accelerating.

Testimony before the Committee indicates that 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 approaching 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 and hopefully the return of low cost electricity to the American consumer.

This bill is an important step toward meeting that goal. Funds are included in this bill for a wide variety of energy research, development and demonstration projects—solar, geothermal, nuclear, fusion and conservation. The Committee has recommended significant increases for many of these programs.

However, we must keep in mind the fact that additional funding is not the total solution to solving the energy problem. Technology must be developed, new materials must be found, new skills must be learned, among other things. It will take time, patience and effort as well as money.

Solar Energy and Fusion

America and the world are rapidly consuming fossil energy supplies which are, of course, finite. The impact of future population growth and rising living standards makes it inevitable that tremendous strain will be placed on the supply of finite fossil fuels. Thus it is highly important that we proceed rapidly toward developing inexhaustible supplies of energy for mankind. Two promising technologies which hopefully will offer abundant inexhaustible sources of energy are solar power and fusion power. Fusion power will utilize a derivative from seawater as a fuel source. The Committee and the Congress have vigorously supported these programs as evidenced in the following table:

APPROPRIATION—OPERATING EXPENSES, PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT (BUDGET AUTHORITY)

Fiscal year	Solar	Percent growth fm, previous year	Fusion [1]	Percent growth fm, previous year
1973	$4,000,000	100	$79,000,000	46
1974	15,000,000	275	111,500,000	41
1975	43,000,000	186	183,000,000	64
1976 (estimate)	115,000,000	167	250,400,000	37
1977 (recommended)	214,000,000	86	436,000,000	74

[1] Includes funds for magnetic fusion and laser fusion.

The Committee offers a word of caution with regard to these technologies. Neither technology offers a quick or near term answer to our energy problems. Also, attaining the goals of a reasonable level of energy self-sufficiency is not just a matter of pouring money into technology. It must be recognized that there are practical limits to the pace at which a research program can be expanded. Theories and concepts must be translated into laboratory research, new materials must be developed, scientific and highly skilled technicians must be hired and trained, pilot plants must be designed, built and proven out so that demonstration plants can be built. Finally, an economically viable, environmentally acceptable, workable technology must be introduced into the marketplace.

The funds provided in the bill will provide for strong, viable research, development and demonstration programs to develop these technologies.

Conservation

Conservation of energy must be developed among the American people if the broad energy goals of America are to be reached. As one witness testified before the Committee, "We must think conservation. We must talk conservation. We must practice conservation. We must teach our children conservation. We must make conservation a way of life."

Every American can contribute to energy conservation in numerous ways—keeping down the thermostat in the winter, using less lighting in offices and homes, better insulated homes, etc. While the amount of energy saved per individual or per family by these means may be modest, the aggregate savings on a nationwide scale could be enormous.

ERDA has an extensive and rapidly expanding program in the second way to approach conservation—the improvement of the efficiency of producing, transmitting and consuming energy through the development of new and improved technology. ERDA's subprograms in this area include advanced automotive systems, improving electric energy systems, energy storage, end-use efficiency in homes and businesses and improved conversion efficiency.

Details on the Committee's recommendations for those conservation programs under its jurisdiction occur later in the report.

Following is an excerpt from a recent ERDA publication entitled "A National Plan for Energy Research, Development and Demonstration: Creating Energy Choices for the Future."

"It must also be recognized that conservation technologies provide a potential cost-effective alternative to development of more supply

technologies—i.e., in many instances, it will cost less to save a barrel of oil through more energy efficient home heating than it will to develop a new barrel of supply. This conclusion was suggested by the conservation scenarios of ERDA which indicated that national energy needs could be met at lowest cost by employing improved efficiencies in end-use . . .

"Finally, these technologies generally will help meet energy needs with the least adverse impact on the environment. Specifically, as conservation actions reduce energy consumption levels, pollutant emissions and disruptions will be decreased because of reduced energy extraction and transportation activity, reduced fossil-fuel combustion, and the lessened need for disposal of waste heat and other materials. In addition, reduced energy consumption will extend the availability of fossil energy resources and allow time to develop technologies that use inexhaustible energy sources, for example, solar, fusion, and breeder reactors among others."

Nuclear Energy

After years of research and development, the commitment of many years of scientific and technical personnel and the investment of billions of dollars, the long held promise of abundant amounts of electricity from nuclear power is reaching fruition. The Committee is informed that presently there are 58 nuclear plants operational in the United States and 178 under construction, ordered or planned for a total of 236 nuclear plants for America.

By 1980, the capacity of operating nuclear plants is projected to be equal to that of the entire U.S. electrical generating capacity in 1950. When all 236 plants are operational, their total capacity will be equal to that of all power plants in America in 1965.

Nuclear power is absolutely essential if America is to attain energy independence. A 1,000 megawatt nuclear plant operating for 1 year at 70% capacity would produce 611,300,000 megawatt hours of electricity. The equivalent fossil fuel requirements for 1 year are as follows:

Oil (barrels)	11,000,000
Natural gas (cubic feet)	62,000,000,000
Coal (tons)	2,000,000

Critics of nuclear power who call for a moratorium on nuclear power plants never mention the impact their actions would have on the consumer and the Nation. A moratorium would mean significantly higher power rates to the consumer, a massive drain on our balance of payments and a severe and detrimental impact on attaining the goal of energy independence and self sufficiency.

The following table shows the impact if nuclear power plants were shut down by a moratorium and the power they could no longer generate had to be generated by oil, which of course, would have to be imported.

1976:	
Oil equivalents, barrels per year	404,000,000
Cost at $12 per barrel	$4,800,000,000
1980:	
Oil equivalent, barrels per year	705,000,000
Cost at $14 per barrel	$9,900,000,000
1985:	
Oil equivalent, barrels per year	1,600,000,000
Cost at $14 per barrel	$22,400,000,000

70-814 O - 76 - 2

The message from those statistics is loud and clear—nuclear power is indispensable to the economic well being of America and the attainment of energy independence.

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)

The Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR) is an advanced nuclear reactor which is estimated to utilize uranium in the range of sixty times more efficiently than existing reactors. The importance and potential of this technology is evidenced by the fact that in addition to the United States, literally every industrialized country in the world is aggressively proceeding with an LMFBR program.

West Germany has one LMFBR presently built and being modified and a second plant under construction.

France has two LMFBR's operating and a third being designed.

Japan has one with construction well along and a second with construction underway.

The United Kingdom has two in operation.

LMFBR efforts are underway in India and Italy.

Witnesses testified before the the Committee that no uranium mining would be required for the LMFBR for at least a century. The non-fissionable uranium which is now accumulating in government stockpiles as a byproduct of the fuel cycle for present day reactors can be utilized as fuel by LMFBR's. Thus the potential energy content and value of these stockpiled resources is massive.

The precise impact of the LMFBR technology is not known at this time. However, the overwhelming evidence received by the Committee strongly supports the urgency and importance of proceeding with at least one LMFBR demonstration plant for this Nation. Our Country has long been a leader in nuclear technology, and it is essential that the United States maintains that leadership.

Energy Related Data Collection

The Committee is concerned about the proliferation of studies related to energy that are occuring in various Federal agencies. A study by the Investigative staff of the Appropriations Committee on this issue concluded in part that:

"The large volume of data collected by the government must be on a more selective and coordinated basis to reduce the collection of duplicative and overlapping data. While there is a continuing need for meaningful data, there is an equal need to slow down the proliferation of mounting data accumulation."

In commenting specifically on ERDA the report read in part:

"Although ERDA has not yet reported any costs for the gathering of energy related data to OMB, the potential cost of meeting future requirements, if not coordinated with existing Federal efforts could be significant.

"Agencies must make maximum use of primary data prepared by the agencies now involved in gathering energy data."

Status of Authorizations

Legislative authorization for the programs of the Energy Research and Development Administration has been considered by the House and is proceeding through the Congress. 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.

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 second 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.

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1976	$3,149,015,000
Budget estimate, 1977	4,128,896,000
Recommended, 1977	4,077,783,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+928,768,000
Budget estimate, 1977	−51,113,000

The following table outlines the increases and decreases by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison with the current year and the budget estimate.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES—BUDGET AUTHORITY

Item	Fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget
OPERATING EXPENSES—BUDGET AUTHORITY				
Solar energy development	$108,650,000	$141,800,000	$191,800,000	+$50,000,000
Geothermal energy development	30,770,000	48,500,000	52,100,000	+3,500,000
Conservation research and development: Electric energy systems and energy storage	33,498,000	41,800,000	51,960,000	+10,160,000
Fusion power research and development:				
Magnetic fusion	131,650,000	168,000,000	204,500,000	+36,500,000
Laser fusion	65,500,000	71,400,000	80,000,000	+8,600,000
Total fusion power research and development	197,150,000	239,400,000	284,500,000	+45,100,000
Fuel cycle research and development	65,293,000	163,035,000	178,035,000	+15,000,000
Fission power reactor development	445,394,000	630,260,000	630,260,000	
Environmental research and safety:				
Scientific and technical education	0	0	3,000,000	+3,000,000
Biomedical and environmental research	174,647,000	182,916,000	197,316,000	+14,400,000
Operational safety	6,886,000	7,707,000	8,307,000	+600,000
Environmental control technology	12,567,000	15,577,000	19,077,000	+3,500,000
Reactor safety facilities	0	33,300,000	28,300,000	−5,000,000
Total environmental research and safety	194,100,000	239,500,000	256,000,000	+16,500,000
High energy physics	152,820,000	167,500,000	170,000,000	+2,500,000
Basic energy sciences	173,980,000	182,800,000	198,175,000	+15,375,000
Nuclear materials security and safeguards	13,619,000	25,740,000	29,100,000	+3,360,000
Naval reactor development	221,180,000	191,500,000	191,500,000	
Space nuclear systems	31,500,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	
Nuclear explosives applications	0	1,300,000	1,300,000	
Uranium enrichment activities:				
Uranium enrichment	693,804,000	882,345,000	882,345,000	
Advanced isotope separation technology	29,450,000	36,830,000	36,830,000	
Total uranium enrichment activities	723,254,000	919,175,000	919,175,000	
National security:				
Weapons activities	859,011,000	1,012,005,000	987,005,000	−25,000,000
Weapons materials production	279,511,000	354,635,000	362,735,000	+8,100,000
Total national security	1,138,522,000	1,366,640,000	1,349,740,000	−16,900,000
Program support:				
Program direction	180,833,000	212,185,000	212,185,000	
Supporting activities:				
Community operations	9,085,000	6,415,000	10,507,000	+4,092,000
Security investigations	11,475,000	10,050,000	10,050,000	
Information services	9,610,000	10,905,000	10,905,000	
General systems studies	9,200,000	11,000,000	10,000,000	−1,000,000
General technology transfer	1,800,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Manpower development	0	700,000	700,000	
EEO assigned facilities	2,039,000	2,075,000	2,075,000	
Total supporting activities	43,209,000	43,145,000	46,237,000	+3,092,000
Cost of work for others	12,983,000	20,100,000	20,100,000	
Total program support	237,025,000	275,430,000	278,522,000	+3,092,000
Change in working capital and inventories	66,760,000	78,016,000	78,016,000	
Subtotal budge authority	3,833,515,000	4,743,496,000	4,891,183,000	+147,687,000
Revenues applied:				
Enrichment revenues	−591,510,000	−539,100,000	−661,900,000	−122,800,000
Miscellaneous revenues	−78,490,000	−76,000,000	−76,000,000	
Total revenues applied	−670,000,000	−615,100,000	−737,900,000	−122,800,000
Net budget authority	3,163,515,000	4,128,396,000	4,153,283,000	+24,887,000
Appropriation transfer	500,000	500,000	500,000	
Change in unobligated balances	−15,000,000	0	−76,000,000	−76,000,000
Total operating budget authority	3,149,015,000	4,128,896,000	4,077,783,000	−51,113,000

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations in comparison to the current year and the budget estimate on a cost basis:

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—FISCAL YEAR 1977 BUDGET—PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION

OPERATING EXPENSES—COST BASIS

Item	Fiscal year 1976	Budget estimate	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget
OPERATING EXPENSES BUDGET OUTLAYS				
Solar energy development	$80,530,000	$110,500,000	$148,000,000	+$37,500,000
Geothermal energy development	31,170,000	44,300,000	47,200,000	+2,900,000
Conservation research and development: Electric energy systems and energy storage	25,830,000	35,840,000	43,940,000	+8,100,000
Fusion power research and development:				
Magnetic fusion	120,000,000	156,000,000	183,300,000	+27,300,000
Laser fusion	59,500,000	69,300,000	75,800,000	+6,500,000
Total Fusion Power Research and development	179,500,000	225,300,000	259,100,000	+33,800,000
Fuel cycle research and development	57,025,000	138,770,000	149,970,000	+11,200,000
Fission power reactor development	385,515,000	544,960,000	544,960,000	
Environmental research and safety:				
Science and technical education			2,200,000	+2,200,000
Biomedical and environmental research	164,465,000	174,734,000	185,534,000	+10,800,000
Operational safety	6,310,000	5,058,000	5,558,000	+500,000
Environmental control technology	11,455,000	14,155,000	16,755,000	+2,600,000
Reactor safety facilities	0	24,700,000	21,000,000	−3,700,000
Total environmental research and safety	182,230,000	218,647,000	231,047,000	+12,400,000
High energy physics	148,300,000	162,900,000	164,800,000	+1,900,000
Basic energy sciences	167,200,000	174,000,000	185,500,000	+11,500,000
Nuclear materials security and safeguards	11,975,000	22,340,000	24,940,000	+2,600,000
Naval reactor development	186,200,000	202,600,000	202,600,000	
Space nuclear systems	28,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	
Nuclear explosives applications	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Uranium enrichment activities:				
Uranium enrichment	682,958,000	873,095,000	873,095,000	
Advanced isotope separation technology	25,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	
Total uranium enrichment activities	707,958,000	907,095,000	907,095,000	
National security:				
Weapons activities	849,304,000	971,605,000	952,805,000	−18,800,000
Weapons materials production	267,692,000	334,405,000	340,505,000	+6,100,000
Total National Security	1,116,996,000	1,306,010,000	1,293,310,000	−12,700,000
Program support:				
Program direction	180,833,000	212,185,000	212,185,000	
Supporting activities:				
Community operations	9,085,000	6,415,000	10,507,000	+4,092,000
Security investigations	11,475,000	10,050,000	10,050,000	
Information services	9,610,000	10,905,000	10,905,000	
General systems studies	9,200,000	11,000,000	10,000,000	−1,000,000
General technology transfer	1,800,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Manpower development	0	700,000	700,000	
EEO assigned facilities	2,039,000	2,075,000	2,075,000	
Total supporting activities	43,209,000	43,145,000	46,237,000	+3,092,000
Cost of work for others	12,660,000	18,240,000	18,240,000	
Total program support	236,702,000	273,570,000	276,662,000	+3,092,000
Total program	3,545,131,000	4,397,832,000	4,510,124,000	+112,292,000
Increase or decrease in selected resources:				
Goods and services on order	254,458,000	267,648,000	303,043,000	+35,395,000
Change in inventories and working capital	66,760,000	78,016,000	78,016,000	
Total increase or decrease in selected resources	321,218,000	345,664,000	381,059,000	+35,395,000
Total gross obligations	3,866,349,000	4,743,496,000	4,891,183,000	+147,687,000

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—FISCAL YEAR 1977 BUDGET—PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION—Continued

OPERATING EXPENSES—COST BASIS—Continued

Item	Fiscal year 1976	Budget estimate	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget
Revenues applied:				
Enrichment revenues	−$591,510,000	−$539,100,000	−$661,100,000	−$122,800,000
Miscellaneous revenues	−78,490,000	−76,000,000	−76,000,000	
Total revenues applied	−670,000,000	−615,100,000	−737,900,000	−122,800,000
Total net obligations	3,196,349,000	4,128,396,000	4,153,283,000	+24,887,000
Appropriation transfers	500,000	500,000	500,000	
Unobligated balance brought forward	−47,834,000	0	−76,000,000	−76,000,000
Total operating budget authority	3,149,015,000	4,128,896,000	4,077,783,000	−51,113,000

I. Solar Energy

The Committee recommends a total of $191,800,000, an increase of $50,000,000 over the budget estimate, for Solar Energy Research and Development operating expenses. The purpose of this program is to significantly expand the Nation's energy supply through the development and demonstration of solar energy systems that are economically attractive and environmentally acceptable.

The Committee's and the Congress' commitment to this program is evidenced in the following table which shows the total level of funding for the Solar program for the last five years for both "operating expenses" and "plant and capital equipment."

Solar energy R. & D. (budget authority)

Fiscal year:	
1973	$4,000,000
1974	15,000,000
1975	43,000,000
1976 (estimate)	115,000,000
1977 (recommended)	214,000,000

An ERDA report on solar energy predicted that it can provide up to 7 percent of America's energy needs by the turn of the century and up to 25 percent by the year 2020. Thus if the technology can be developed, and made economically attractive, solar energy will play an invaluable role in America's long range needs to become energy independent.

In making the recommended increases noted below, the Committee has significantly accelerated those solar subprograms which can have a near term impact. The significant increases for commercial and residential demonstrations will enable ERDA to expand the number of demonstrations, thus testing various technologies under a wide variety of geographical conditions. A higher number of demonstrations will also accelerate the commercialization of these technologies since the publicity and interest generated by the demonstrations will enhance the overall appeal of solar energy as an energy source.

The Committee is enthusiastic over the prospects for solar power and strongly supports the program as evidenced by the significant increases above the budget recommended in the bill. However a word

of caution should be noted. Witnesses testified that at the present stage of development, solar systems for houses and buildings are not cost competitive with existing energy sources. Also, the advanced solar systems, which hopefully will provide significant amounts of electricity to the Nation, are in the embryonic stage of development. An optimistic timetable shows that solar energy will not make a significant contribution to the energy supply until far into the future. Thus the near and intermediate term outlook is for solar energy to produce a small amount of energy relative to the overall energy demand.

The following table lists the Committee's recommendations for the various subprograms within solar energy.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES BY SUBPROGRAM

	Fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977 budget	Committee bill
Direct thermal applications:			
A. Solar heating and cooling of buildings:			
1. Commercial demonstrations	$18,200,000	$16,700,000	$30,200,000
2. Residential demonstrations	5,900,000	8,100,000	25,400,000
3. Research and development	5,000,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
4. Development in support of demonstrations	6,000,000	10,000,000	12,000,000
B. Agricultural process heat applications	4,750,000	3,900,000	5,400,000
Technology support and utilization:			
A. Solar energy resource assessment	1,000,000	1,500,000	5,500,000
B. Solar Energy Research Institute	2,200,000	1,500,000	2,500,000
C. Technology utilization and information dissemination	600,000	1,000,000	3,000,000
D. Solar storage	1,600,000	0	0
Solar electric applications:			
A. Solar thermal electric conversion	14,300,000	30,900,000	34,000,000
B. Photovoltaic energy conversion	21,600,000	28,200,000	30,100,000
C. Wind energy conversion	14,900,000	16,000,000	16,000,000
D. Ocean thermal energy conversion	8,100,000	9,200,000	11,900,000
Fuels from biomass	4,500,000	4,300,000	5,300,000

A description of the solar energy subprograms follows:

A. DIRECT THERMAL APPLICATIONS

(1) Solar Heating and Cooling of Buildings.—This program involves demonstration programs to provide for residential and commercial solar heating and hot water demonstrations in several cycles by the end of 1977 and combined solar heating and cooling by the end of 1979. A cycle includes construction of a set of demonstration projects, followed by data collection and analysis, and development of improved systems based on the data. The results will lead to recommendations of possible changes in procedure and legislation needed to win broad acceptance of solar energy.

(2) Agricultural and Process Heat Applications.—The objective in this area is to investigate and develop technologies which will permit the economical and competitive use of solar energy in grain drying, crop curing, animal shelters, greenhouses, agricultural food processing and to supply a significant fraction of the energy requirements of industry.

B. TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT AND UTILIZATION

This subprogram supports the technical subprograms included in the solar energy program. Activities in Technology Support and Utilization include the assessment, promotion, marketing and communicating

all aspects of solar R. & D., its resources and its potential economic viability in the energy marketplace.

Included in this subprogram are funds for the Solar Energy Research Institute (SERI). The Committee recommends a $1,000,000 increase for SERI to a level of $2,500,000. SERI will perform research, development and related functions to support the National Solar Energy Program. The FY 1977 request for SERI provides for costs associated with start-up activities and partial conceptual design of facilities that may be required as a part of an accepted SERI proposal. The programmatic costs of the SERI are included under the technical subprograms.

The increase is to help insure that further delays in the implementation of SERI will not occur.

C. SOLAR ELECTRIC APPLICATIONS

The objective of this program is to develop and demonstrate the conversion of solar energy to electric energy, with a possible initial energy contribution by 1985, and a moderate contribution by 2000.

Different apporaches to achieve these objectives include:

(1) Photovoltaic Energy Conversion.—The overall objective of the Photovoltaic Energy Conversion program is to develop economically viable electric power systems suitable for a variety of applications and capable of significantly contributing to the Nation's energy requirements.

(2) 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.

(3) Ocean Thermal Energy 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.

(4) Solar Thermal Electric Conversion.—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.

D. FUELS FROM BIOMASS

This subprogram involves the photosynthetic production, collection, storage, and conversion of organic matter (biomass) into useful clean fuels. The Biomass sources which are being considered include terrestrial crops produced from agriculture and forestry operations, marine crops, agricultural and animal wastes and forestry residues.

II. Geothermal Energy Development

The Committee recommends a total of $52,100,000 for operating expenses for Geothermal Energy Development. The potentially usable

geothermal resources of the United States are quite substantial. ERDA has a number of subprograms underway which have the common goal of providing America with the option to exploit those resources. ERDA's interest in geothermal energy can be broken down into two broad categories—acceleration of the development of geothermal energy through the use of existing technology and research and development leading towards eventual development of plants which can exploit geopressured and hot dry rock geothermal systems.

ERDA's major effort in expanding the use of geothermal energy for the intermediate term is the Geothermal Resources Development Fund. The purpose of this program is to stimulate the development of commercial development of geothermal energy by minimizing a lender's financial risk associated with the introduction of new technology. An additional goal is to "develop normal borrower-lender relationships which will in time encourage the flow of credit without the need of Federal assistance." (Further comments on the Geothermal Resource Development Fund occur in another portion of the report.)

ERDA also is making a substantial effort to develop the technologies for exploiting the substantial geothermal resources which are in the form of hot dry rock and geopressured areas. The following table lists the various subprograms within the Geothermal Development Program.

	Fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977 budget	Committee bill
Engineering R. & D	$10,620,000	$11,500,000	$13,500,000
Resource exploration and assessment	3,650,000	10,000,000	[1] 4,000,000
Hydrothermal technology applications	5,700,000	12,200,000	12,200,000
Advanced technology applications	6,900,000	10,100,000	13,800,000
Utilization experiments	0	0	3,000,000
Environmental control and institutional studies	3,900,000	4,800,000	5,600,000
Total	30,770,000	48,600,000	52,100,000

[1] The ERDA budget request proposed that $6,000,000 for the "Resource exploration and assessment" program be passed through to the Geological Survey. The committee feels that these funds should be appropriated directly to the Geological Survey as has been done in the past, and thus has reduced the ERDA budget request by $6,000,000.

A brief description of the various subprograms along with comments on the Committees recommendations follows:

A. ENGINEERING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The objective is to bring the technologies required for geothermal development to the point of readiness for practical application, thereby establishing the technical foundation for growth and development.

B. RESOURCE EXPLORATION AND ASSESSMENT

Objectives are to improve existing exploration and assessment technology for use by the United States Geological Survey and by industry, to accelerate the identification of geothermal resources, to verify the potential usefulness of these resources for geothermal energy applications and to apply such technology to the confirmation of candidate geothermal sites.

70-814 O - 76 - 3

C. HYDROTHERMAL TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS

Objective is to establish the technical feasibility of using liquid-dominated geothermal resources for both electric power generation and nonelectric uses.

D. ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS

The objective of this subprogram is to prove the technical feasibility of using geothermal resources that require technologies which will be able to eventually use the widely distributed conductive heat of the earth's crust.

E. UTILIZATION EXPERIMENTS

The objective of this subprogram is to provide verifiable evidence of the practical utilizability of geothermal resources, combining technical and economic measure.

F. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL AND INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES

Studies conducted under this program will assess the environmental impact of geothermal activities and the development of improved environmental control technologies.

III. Fusion Power Research and Development

The Committee recommends a total of $284,500,000 for Fusion Power Research and Development, including $204,500,000 for the Magnetic Fusion program. This is $45,100,000 above the budget request, $239,400,000.

The essential fuel material which would be used in 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.

There are two approaches to attain the production of electricity through the fusion process—magnetic fusion and laser fusion. Magnetic fusion utilizes powerful magnets to hold the fuel in mid-air as the thermonuclear burn occurs. In laser fusion, powerful lasers will implode the fuel to attain a thermonuclear burn.

A. MAGNETIC FUSION

The Committee is encouraged by the various scientific advances made within the past year in the magnetic fusion program. The Committee recommends an increase of $36,500,000 over the budget request for this program. The recommended increase will provide for expanded research in a number of subprograms including $7,400,000 in budget authority, and $4,000,000 in budget outlays for research at the University of Texas and increased funding for the Doublet III experiment at San Diego.

B. LASER FUSION

The Committee recommends a total of $80,000,000, an increase of $8,600,000, for the Laser Fusion program. This program has the same objective as the magnetic fusion program but utilizes lasers to initiate the thermonuclear burn. The research and development conducted in this program also has relevance in weapons research.

IV. Fuel Cycle Research and Development

The Committee recommends a total of $178,035,000, an increase of $15,000,000, for Fuel Cycle Research and Development. This program is concerned with all portions of the nuclear fuel cycle. The three major subprograms are (1) Uranium Resource Assessment (2) Support of Nuclear Fuel Cycle and (3) Waste Management (Commercial). The following table shows the Committee's recommendations for these three subprograms.

Program	Fiscal year 1976	Budget	Committee bill
Uranium resource assessment	$16,767,000	$31,335,000	$31,335,000
Support of nuclear fuel cycle	35,475,000	56,700,000	56,700,000
Waste management (commercial)	13,051,000	75,000,000	90,000,000
Total	65,293,000	163,035,000	178,035,000

A. URANIUM RESOURCE ASSESSMENT

This subparagraph consists of (a) evaluation and analysis of domestic uranium ore reserves and potential resources, (b) identifying areas favorable for the occurrence of uranium and (c) R & D on improved techniques for assessment, discovery and production of the resources.

Ample supplies of uranium are essential for the long term health of nuclear energy and the attainment of Energy Independence. Witnesses testified that although there are enough supplies for the intermediate term, it is important that new discoveries be made for the long term needs. The Committee recommends the full budget request of $31,335,000 for this program.

B. SUPPORT OF NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE

The purpose of this program is to develop, on a commercially applicable basis, the technology for reprocessing spent reactor fuels and the recycling of the used products and to improve the operability and maintainability of large integrated reprocessing and recycle facilities.

The availability of a reprocessing and recycle capability will significantly reduce the demand for natural uranium and the associated mining, milling and enrichment capacity. The Committee supports the full budget request of $56,700,000.

C. WASTE MANAGEMENT (COMMERCIAL)

This program provides for the long term management of radioactive waste. Subprograms include (a) terminal storage R & D, (b) waste processing R & D and (c) supporting studies and evaluations.

The increase of $15,000,000 for Waste Management (commercial) is to:

1. Expand the number of sites to be investigated as possible locations for terminal storage facilities.
2. Expand efforts in commercial waste processing R. & D.
3. Conduct additional and expanded safety and environmental studies and analyses of alternative methods for waste management.

V. Fission Power Reactor Development

The Committee recommends a total of $630,260,000, as proposed in the budget request, for the Fission Power Reactor Development Program. This program includes research on a number of advanced reactor concepts—the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor, the High Temperature Gas Reactor, Gas Cooled Reactors and Light Water Reactor Technology.

The major portion of these funds is for the continued research and development of the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR). The LMFBR is projected to utilize uranium in the range of 60 times more efficiently than existing reactors. The impact of that fact should not be underestimated. The LMFBR technology may make an enormous contribution someday to America's energy supply. As mentioned earlier in the report, almost every industrialized country is proceeding rapidly with the development of LMFBR's and some countries have demonstration plants actually operating.

Funds are included in the bill to proceed with a demonstration plant to prove out the technology. Under the present timetable this plant would become operable around 1983. Critics who oppose the breeder would foreclose the possibility of developing a demonstration plant which, as witnesses testified to the Committee, 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.

Also included is the Light Water Reactor Technology subprogram which has the objective of increasing the productivity and on line availability of light water reactors and reducing the cost of light water reactors to be committed in the next 5–10 years.

The following table lists the recommended totals for the various subprograms of the Fission Power Reactor Development Program.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES BY SUBPROGRAM

	Fiscal year 1977 budget	Committee bill
Liquid metal fast breeder reactor	$534,760,000	$534,760,000
Water cooled breeder reactor	37,000,000	37,000,000
Gas cooled reactors	28,700,000	28,700,000
Light water reactor technology	12,500,000	12,500,000
Supporting activities	17,300,000	17,300,000
Total	630,260,000	630,260,000

VI. Environmental Research and Safety

The Committee recommends a total of $256,000,000 for Environmental Research and Safety, which is an increase of $16,500,000 over the budget request. The Environmental Safety and Research Program is divided into five subprograms. The budget request and suggested allowance for each subprogram is shown in the following table.

Program	Fiscal year— 1976	1977 budget	Committee bill
Biomedical and environmental research	$174,647,000	$182,916,000	$197,316,000
Operational safety	6,886,000	7,707,000	8,307,000
Environmental control technology	12,567,000	15,577,000	19,077,000
Reactor safety facilities	0	33,300,000	28,300,000
Scientific and technical education	0	0	3,000,000
Total	194,100,009	239,500,000	256,000,000

A brief explanation of each subprogram and description of Committee recommendations follows.

A. BIOMEDICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Program provides data and conducts research on the health and environmental effects of pollutants released to the environment by existing and developing energy technologies and conducts various research programs. A wide variety of research programs are conducted in health studies, biological studies, environmental studies, physical and technological studies, analysis and assessment and education and training.

The recommended increase provides funds for the artificial heart, expanded research in nuclear medicine and increased research on the health and environmental impact of generating energy.

B. OPERATIONAL SAFETY

The objective of this program is to: (1) Provide ERDA with a quick response capability for performing aerial radiological measure-cleaning up the structures which were partially built by using uranium mill tailings in the construction material; and (3) Safety Studies and Development of Operations guidelines.

Safety studies and Development of Operations guidelines.

The increase over the budget is for safety studies and the development of operational guidelines primarily in fossil fuel facilities.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

The program provides for assessing all ongoing and planned energy technology development activities to ensure that the proper emphasis is given to environmental control research, development, and demonstration.

The increase recommended in the bill will accelerate ERDA's efforts to assess the technology being developed to minimize the environmental impact of generating energy.

D. REACTOR SAFETY FACILITIES

The primary responsibility for nuclear safety research rests with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). However Section 205 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 stipulates that ERDA should provide research services and facilities to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the purpose of conducting NRC sponsored safety research.

One of the experiments anticipated to be conducted by the NRC is the Plenum Fill Experiment. ERDA is responsible for budgeting for facility construction while NRC will be responsible for budgeting for the test specification preparation and analysis associated with the experimental program.

The Committee is concerned about the dramatic increase in the cost for the Plenum Fill Experimental Facility. The estimated cost has risen from about $2,000,000 to $27,400,000.

This significant increase in the estimated total cost shows that the planning, research and conceptual design and engineering have not, at this time, been well conceived for this facility.

The Committee has included $2,300,000 in budget authority for the development of detailed engineering and design and cost estimates. The Committee will review this project when the final design and cost data are available.

E. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

The energy goals of America necessitate having a tremendous number of skilled technicians and scientific personnel in all areas of energy research and development and the construction and maintenance of new energy producing facilities.

Funds included in this bill for Scientific and Technical Education will be used for traineeships, fellowships, visiting lecturers, topical conferences and new curricula developments. Emphasis should be given to meeting the special training needs of ERDA and its contractors in areas related to energy R & D and new energy technologies.

VII. High Energy Physics

The Committee recommends a total of $170,000,000, an increase of $2,500,000, for High Energy Physics. The goal of this program is the exploration and understanding of energy and matter in their most basic form. The majority of the funds are for the operation of various accelerators involved in research. Numerous experimental and theoretical research programs are involved in basic research about the structure and behavior of matter and its manifestation as and relationship to energy.

The increase of $2,500,000 is to expedite design, development and component procurement for the Energy Doubler/Saver at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory. This project will allow the accelerator to be run at a higher energy level, thereby opening a new field of research, while simultaneously lowering electricity costs to operate the accelerator.

VIII. Basic Energy Sciences

The Committee recommends a total of $198,175,000 for Basic Energy Sciences. This is an increase of $15,375,000 over the budget request.

The Basic Energy Science program is made up of three subprograms:

Subprogram	Fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977 budget	Committee bill
Nuclear science	82,390,000	81,200,000	87,200,000
Material sciences	46,275,000	51,100,000	56,275,000
Molecular, mathematical and geosciences	45,315,000	50,500,000	54,700,000

A. NUCLEAR SCIENCE

The major objective of this subprogram is improving our understanding of nuclear processes and phenomena through basic experimental and theoretical studies carried out primarily at ERDA laboratories and at universities. Most of this research is carried out at smaller reactors and research reactors.

The increase of $6,000,000 is for fuller utilization of accelerators and other research facilities.

B. MATERIAL SCIENCES

This research effort is to expand the base of knowledge of materials properties and behavior. Improved or new materials and expanded knowledge of the properties of conventional materials are required in all aspects of energy generation, conversion, transmission, storage utilization and conservation.

The increase is to accelerate materials research because of the important role materials will play in the development of various future energy technologies.

C. MOLECULAR, MATHEMATICAL AND GEOSCIENCES

The research efforts in this subprogram include research in radiation science, chemical physics, basic research in geothermal energy, and study to improve the efficiency with which computers are applied.

The increase is to expand the research in a number of subprograms.

IX. Nuclear Materials Security and Safeguards

The Committee recommends a total of $29,100,000 for operating expenses for the Nuclear Materials Security and Safeguards program. This is an increase of $3,360,000 from the budget request.

The objective of the program is to protect the public against death, injury or property damage from nuclear events which could potentially be produced by malevolent use of nuclear materials or sabotage of nuclear facilities.

The program designs safeguards systems for both civilian and ERDA facilities. The increased operating funds will be used primarily for designing safeguards systems using physical protection and

materials control and accountability elements and testing these systems in operating plant environments. The recommended increase restores the reduction made by the Office of Management and Budget.

X. Naval Reactor Development

The Committee recommends the full budget request of $191,500,000 for operating expenses of the Naval Reactors Development program. This program provides for the design and development of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores to meet the military requirements of the Department of Defense. Efforts continue on the development of an advanced reactor core with longer life for application to nuclear powered guided-missile cruisers and on the development of advanced reactors for submarines.

XI. Space Nuclear Systems

The Committee recommends the full budget request of $31,000,000 for operating expenses of the Space Nuclear Systems program.

This program provides nuclear power systems for the civilian space program, the Department of Defense which utilizes satellites for communication, surveillance and command and control of the Nation's strategic and tactical forces.

Improved power systems utilizing nuclear isotopes are also needed in underseas research, advanced anti-submarine warfare detection systems and potentially for an unmanned defense radar system.

Additionally, a terrestrial power development subprogram is involved in the potential application of space technology to energy programs on earth.

XII. Nuclear Explosive Application Program

The full budget estimate of $1,300,000 is recommended for the Nuclear Explosive Application Program. These funds would provide for the initiation of laboratory studies of radioactive waste disposal activities. ERDA would investigate the feasibility of utilizing a very deep (20,000–30,000 ft.) underground cavity for permanent disposal of nuclear fuel reprocessing wastes.

A subprogram will provide the support base for the U.S. government during Peaceful Nuclear Explosive-related treaty negotiations.

There are no funds included in this bill for underground nuclear tests, other than those for the National Security program.

XIII. Uranium Enrichment Activities

A. URANIUM ENRICHMENT

The Committee recommends $882,345,000, same as the budget estimate for uranium enrichment. The major portion of these funds—$803,265,000—is for the operation of the three uranium enrichment facilities which produce fuel for America's and many of the world's nuclear plants. These costs are fully recovered through the sale of enriched uranium.

Additional programs within Uranium Enrichment include conceptual design studies related to additional uranium enrichemnt capacity and the program which allows private industry to assess uranium enrichment technology.

B. ADVANCED ISOTOPE SEPARATION TECHNOLOGY

The Committee recommends $36,830,000, same as the budget estimate, for the Advanced Isotope Separation Technology program. This program is involved in the development of a technology to produce enriched uranium more efficiently and less expensively. If successfully developed, this technology will enable enriched uranium to be produced at a much lower price than today's since the technology utilizes a significantly lower amount of electricity than present methods. Lasers are utilized in this system. The Committee recommends the full budget estimate of $36,830,000 for this program.

XIV. National Security

A. WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommends $987,005,000, a reduction of $25,000,000 from the budget estimate, for Weapons Activities.

The Weapons program provides for the research, development, testing and production of nuclear weapons to meet national defense needs. The weapons complex within ERDA is a national resource that for over 25 years has fulfilled the Nation's nuclear weapons needs.

The Committee is advised that the actual size of the nuclear stockpile is declining in number. However, many weapons in the stockpile are extremely old and must be replaced. The production of new nuclear weapons is needed to maintain an adequate defense posture and to incorporate new technology into new warheads which will be compatible with the new weapons systems being developed by the Department of Defense. It should be noted that the cost of the warheads is relatively small when compared to the total cost of the weapons systems being developed by the Department of Defense. Both ERDA and DOD are involved in judgements affecting safety, security, control and performance features of nuclear weapons.

At times the weapons complex does undertake missions in the civilian energy field. Because of the nature of its research effort it is especially qualified in the area of laser fusion research which will hopefully make a significant contribution towards supplying energy for the Nation.

The Committee has disagreed with ERDA and the DOD on the overall funding level of certain items in the Weapons budget. However, this does not detract from the Committee's recognition of the necessary and important contribution that the weapons program of ERDA makes to the National defense effort.

The following table lists the committee recommendations for the various subprograms within the Weapons program.

70-814 O - 76 - 4

Subprogram	Fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977 budget	Committee bill
Production and surveillance	$361,873,000	$429,185,000	$421,185,000
Research and development	287,985,000	335,420,000	335,420,000
Testing	201,782,000	232,500,000	232,500,000
Special test detection	7,697,000	14,900,000	14,900,000
Subtotal	859,337,000	1,012,005,000	1,004,005,000
General reduction			−17,000,000
Total	859,337,000	1,012,005,000	987,005,000

Note: The committee's recommended reductions are in the following areas:

B61–4 Bomb	−$3,000,000
Stockpile maintenance and reliability for Sprint and Spartan warheads	−2,000,000
Process development	−2,000,000
Stockpile maintenance	−1,000,000
General reduction	−17,000,000
Total	−25,000,000

B61–4 BOMB

No funds are included for the production of the B61–4 bomb.

SPRINT AND SPARTAN WARHEADS

In FY 1976, the Congress directed that DOD close America's one anti-ballistic missile (ABM) site located in Grand Forks, North Dakota.

The Committee recommends a reduction of $2,000,000 in stockpile reliability and maintenance costs for Sprint and Spartan warheads associated with the ABM system in view of the closing of the ABM site.

B77 FULL FUZING OPTION BOMB (FUFO)

The Committee recognizes and supports the development of the B77 FUFO bomb, which will replace many of the aging and less capable weapons in the nuclear stockpile.

The Committee is informed that although ERDA has been directed by DOD to incorporate certain classified features into this weapon system, the Air Force may not be able to effectively use this capability in the strategic role envisioned for the B77. The incorporation of these features into the B77 would cost an estimated $50,000,000 in future years.

The Committee strongly supports the incorporation of these classified features in all weapons systems if the features can be used. Prior to additional requests for appropriations for this system, the Department of Defense and ERDA should reevaluate this program to ascertain whether or not the Air Force will be able to utilize the features ERDA has been directed to include in the system.

ARTILLERY FIRED PROJECTILES

The Committee supports the fielding of the improved 8-inch nuclear projectiles as a replacement for the existing 8-inch projectile in the stockpile. However, the Committee is not convinced of the requirement for a new 155 MM nuclear projectile which is currently under advanced development. A low level of funding for continued R & D is included in the budget estimate.

The Committee directs that ERDA and DOD jointly reassess the requirement for a new 155 MM nuclear projectile in view of the planned production of the improved 8-inch nuclear projectile. This study should consider other alternatives such as improving the 8-inch howitzer capability of the United States and Allied countries as well as planned improvement to the Lance system as opposed to the development of a new 155 MM nuclear projectile.

The Committee directs that ERDA not proceed with Phase 3 development until the study has been completed and submitted for the Committee's analysis and comment.

B. WEAPONS MATERIAL PRODUCTION

The Committee recommends $362,735,000, an increase of $8,100,000, for Weapons Material Production.

The primary objectives of this program are the production of special nuclear materials for weapons, the reprocessing of naval fuels for nuclear submarines and the management of ERDA radioactive waste products.

The Committee increase of $8,100,000 is for extending the operation of the Hanford Reactor in Washington beyond FY 1977. This is a dual purpose reactor which produces both nuclear material for ERDA and steam for producing electricity.

The following table outlines the Committee's recommendations for the subprograms within the Weapons Materials Production program.

Subprogram	Fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977 budget	Committee bill
Production	$198,050,000	$244,805,000	$252,905,000
Process development	8,545,000	10,615,000	10,615,000
Waste management (ERDA)	72,916,000	99,215,000	99,215,000
Total	279,511,000	354,635,000	362,735,000

XV. Program Direction

The Committee recommends a total of $212,185,000, same as the budget request, for Program Direction. This program covers the salaries, travel and other costs associated with program direction and administration of ERDA. The major portion of these funds are for the salaries of personnel directly employed by ERDA.

There seems to be a substantial duplication of staff functions at the program level, assistant administrator level and central staff. For example, the data submitted to the Committee during the recent hearings indicates a substantial duplication in planning, budget, administrative services and other staff functions. There also appears to exist a significant proliferation of personnel in management information systems and studies.

ERDA should review the organization with a view toward identifying these non-programmatic positions, and eliminating overlap and duplication.

XVI. Supporting Activities

The Committee recommends a total of $46,237,000 for Supporting Activities, an increase of $3,092,000 from the budget request.

Supporting Activities is made up of the following subprograms:

A. COMMUNITY OPERATIONS

This program provides Federal payments to communities where large ERDA facilities cause an excessive tax burden on localities.

B. SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

Funds are for the investigation of individuals requiring security clearances and for selective reinvestigations of previously cleared personnel.

C. INFORMATION SERVICES

This program is divided into (1) Public Awareness which creates and encourages the development of general information to the public on all energy conservation technologies and energy sources and (2) "Technical Information Services" which acquires analyzes, organizes and disseminates scientific, technical and practical information on energy.

D. GENERAL SYSTEMS STUDIES

The objective of general systems studies is to develop and apply systems analysis techniques to aid in planning, management and decision-making for the allocation of resources and evaluation of performance in implementing the energy R & D plan.

E. GENERAL TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS PROGRAM

The program consists of R & D commercialization studies, technology transfer of ERDA produced technology and an energy-related inventions evaluation program which takes ideas provided to ERDA from the private sector into further development.

F. MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT

The goal for manpower development is to assure the availability of trained manpower in the right numbers and in the right time-frame to meet the needs of the energy related segments of the economy.

G. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

The Equal Employment Opportunity program provides for staffing and related costs required by ERDA to carry out its responsibilities for the EEO contract compliance.

The following table details the recommended amounts for the various subprograms.

Subprogram	Fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977 budget	Committee bill
Community operations [1]	$9,085,000	$6,415,000	$10,507,000
Security investigations	11,475,000	10,050,000	10,050,000
Information services	9,610,000	10,905,000	10,905,000
General system studies	9,200,000	11,000,000	10,000,000
General technology transfers	1,800,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Manpower development	0	700,000	700,000
EEO assigned facilities	2,039,000	2,075,000	2,075,000
Total	43,209,000	43,145,000	46,237,000

[1] Increase is for assistance payments of $483,000 to Anderson County, $350,000 to Roane County, $150,000 to Los Alamos County, $235,000 for the Los Alamos school district, $850,000 for the Espanola and Pojoaque school districts which border Los Alamos, $372,000 for Richland, Washington, and $1,652,000 for school aid.

XVII. Unobligated Balances

The Committee recommends a total reduction of $76,000,000 for unobligated balances. $56,000,000 of this reduction is for the purchase of power to enrich uranium for civilian nuclear reactors. ERDA's anticipated purchases of electrical power for the gaseous diffusion plants were lower than anticipated for FY 1976 and the transition quarter. The incident at Brown's Ferry nuclear plant caused TVA to deliver less power to ERDA than anticipated for FY 1976. Therefore, an unobligated balance of $56,000,000 should be available in 1976 and the transition quarter and can be carried forward into 1977.

The Committee also recommends a general reduction of $20,000,000 for other anticipated unobligated balances which will be carried forward into 1977.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation, 1976	$907,642,000
Budget estimate, 1977	1,409,274,000
Recommended, 1977	1,525,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation 1976	+617,858,000
Budget estimate, 1977	+116,226,000

The following tables detail the recommended changes from the budget estimate.

Project No.	Project title	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget estimate
	Fusion power research and development:			
77-2-a	Magnetic fusion: Computer building, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, Livermore, California	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	----------
77-3-a	Laser fusion: Electron beam fusion facilities, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, N. Mex	9,100,000	9,100,000	----------
	Fission power reactor development:			
77-4-a	Modifications to reactors	5,000,000	5,000,000	----------
77-4-b	Breeding nondestructive assay facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho	9,500,000	9,500,000	----------
77-4-c	High performance Fuel Laboratory, Richland, Wash	0	1,500,000	+$1,500,000
77-4-d	Fuel storage facility, Richland, Wash	0	7,000,000	+7,000,000
77-5-a	Computer building acquisition, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho Falls, Idaho	950,000	950,000	----------
77-6-a	Environmental research and safety: Modifications and additions to biomedical and environmental research facilities, various locations	4,200,000	3,200,000	−1,000,000
77-7-a	High-energy physics: Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations	3,600,000	3,600,000	----------

Project No.	Project title	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget estimate
	Basic energy sciences.			
77-8-a	Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	$1,300,000	$1,300,000	
77-8-b	Expanded experimental capabilities, Bates Linear Accelerator, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Massachusetts	5,000,000	5,000,000	
77-8-c	Increased flux, high flux beam reactor, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York	2,500,000	2,500,000	
77-8-d	Conversion of steam plant facilities, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee	12,200,000	10,200,000	−$2,000,000
	Uranium enrichment activities:			
77-9-a	Expansion of feed vaporization and sampling facilities, gaseous diffusion plants, multiple sites	9,000,000	8,000,000	−1,000,000
77-9-b	Air and nitrogen system uprating, gaseous diffusion plant, Oak Ridge, Tenn	5,200,000	5,200,000	
77-9-c	Upgrade ventilation systems, technical services building, gaseous diffusion plant, Portsmouth, Ohio	3,000,000	3,000,000	
77-9-d	Centrifuge plant demonstration facility, Oak Ridge, Tenn	30,000,000	25,000,000	−5,000,000
77-10-a	Fire protection upgrading, gaseous diffusion plants, multiple sites	8,300,000	8,300,000	
77-10-b	Modifications to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act, gaseous diffusion plants, and Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio	8,200,000	8,200,000	
	National security:			
	Weapons activities:			
77-11-a	Safeguards and research and development laboratory facility, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, N. Mex	3,000,000	3,000,000	
77-11-b	Safeguards and site security improvements, various locations	5,700,000	5,700,000	
77-11-c	8-inch artillery fired atomic projectile production facilities, various locations	12,000,000	10,000,000	−2,000,000
77-11-d	Tritium confinement system, Savannah River, S.C	3,500,000	3,500,000	
77-12-a	Fire and safety project, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, California	2,300,000	2,300,000	
77-12-b	Life safety corridor modifications, Bendix Plant, Kansas City, Mo	3,100,000	3,100,000	
77-12-c	Modifications to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee	6,400,000	6,400,000	
77-12-d	Upgrade reliability of fire protection, Bendix Plant, Kansas City, Missouri	7,800,000	7,800,000	
77-12-e	Sludge disposal facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee	3,000,000	3,000,000	
	Weapons Materials Production:			
77-13-a	Fluorinel dissolution process and fuel receiving improvements, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, (A-E and long-lead procurement)	10,000,000	10,000,000	
77-13-b	Improved confinement of radioactive releases, reactor areas, Savannah River, South Carolina	6,000,000	6,000,000	
77-13-c	Seismic protection, reactor areas, Savannah River, South Carolina	3,000,000	3,000,000	
77-13-d	High level waste storage and waste management facilities, Savannah River, South Carolina	25,000,000	25,000,000	
77-13-e	High level waste storage and handling facilities, Richland, Washington	18,000,000	18,000,000	
77-13-f	Waste isolation pilot plant, site undesignated, (A-E, land acquisition, and long-lead procurement)	6,000,000	6,000,000	
77-13-g	Safeguards and security upgrading, production facilities, multiple sites	7,700,000	7,700,000	
77-13-h	Personnel protection and support facility, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho	10,500,000	10,500,000	
77-14	General plant projects	74,610,000	70,000,000	−4,610,000
77-15	Construction planning and design	7,200,000	7,200,000	

Project No.	Project title	Fiscal year 1977 budget estimate	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget estimate
	Increase in Prior Year Projects			
	Solar energy development:			
76-2-a	5-megawatt solar thermal test facility	$10,000,000	$12,000,000	+$2,000,000
76-2-b	10-megawatt central receiver solar thermal powerplant, (A-E and long-lead procurement)	2,500,000	2,500,000	
	Fusion power research and development:			
	Magnetic fusion:			
76-5-a	Tokamak fusion test reactor, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Plainsboro, N.J	80,000,000	75,000,000	−5,000,000
76-5-b	14-Mev intense neutron source facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico	14,400,000	14,400,000	
76-5-c	14-Mev high-intensity neutron facility, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, California	2,500,000	2,500,000	
75-3-b	Laser fusion: High-energy laser facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico	9,700,000	9,700,000	
67-3-a	Fission power reactor development: Fast flux test facility	80,000,000	75,000,000	−5,000,000
75-6-c	High-energy physics: Position-electron joint project, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory and Stanford Linear Accelerator Center	25,000,000	25,000,000	
	Uranium enrichment activities:			
76-8-e	Conversion of existing steam plants to coal capability, gaseous diffusion plants and Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio	5,300,000	5,300,000	
76-8-g	Enriched uranium production facilities, Portsmouth, Ohio	0	150,000,000	+150,000,000
76-14	Safeguards and security upgrading Portsmouth	5,350,000	5,350,000	
74-1-g	Cascade uprating program, gaseous diffusion plants	161,000,000	161,000,000	
71-1-f	Process equipment modifications, gaseous diffusion plans	267,800,000	267,800,000	
	National security:			
	Weapons activities:			
76-10-c	Phermex enhancement, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico	4,150,000	4,150,000	
76-14	Safeguards and security upgrading	7,800,000	7,800,000	
71-9(1)	New Pu recovery facility, Rocky Flats, Colo	25,300,000	23,300,000	−2,000,000
71-9(5)	DP site plutonium processing facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico	13,400,000	13,400,000	
	Weapons materials production:			
76-8-a	Additional facilities, high level waste storage, Savannah Rivr, S.C	26,000,000	26,000,000	
76-8-b	Additional high level waste storage facilities, Richland, Wash	9,900,000	9,900,000	
76-5-1-c	New waste calcining facility, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho	29,000,000	29,000,000	
	General reduction, anticipated slippage	0	−23,350,000	−23,350,000
	Total, fiscal year 1977 construction budget authority	1,115,960,000	1,225,500,000	+109,540,000

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT NOT RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION

Item	Fiscal year 1977 Committee bill	Bill compared to budget
Capital equipment—Obligations:		
Solar Energy Development	$7,400,000	[1] +$1,700,000
Geothermal energy development	1,500,000	
Conservation research and development electric energy systems and energy storage	6,000,000	[2] +1,000,000
Fusion power research and development:		
Magnetic fusion	23,000,000	+3,200,000
Laser fusion	12,800,000	+2,000,000
Total fusion power research and development	35,800,000	+5,200,000
Fuel cycle research and development	14,000,000	−1,600,000
Fission power reactor development	49,002,000	
Environmental research and safety:		
Biomedical and environmental research	11,418,000	+1,000,000
Operational safety	1,100,000	+100,000
Environmental control technology	560,000	
Total environmental research and safety	13,078,000	+1,100,000

See footnotes at end of table.

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT NOT RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION—Continued

Item	Fiscal year 1977 Committee bill	Bill compared to budget
High energy physics	$21,800,000	+$1,000,000
Basic energy sciences	16,400,000	[3] +1,000,000
Nuclear materials security and safeguards	3,932,000	+1,532,000
Naval reactor development	6,000,000	----------
Space nuclear systems	3,200,000	----------
Uranium enrichment activities:		
Uranium enrichment	17,000,000	−243,000
Advanced isotopes separation technology	7,000,000	----------
Total uranium enrichment activities	24,000,000	−243,000
National security:		
Weapons activities	70,000,000	−3,100,000
Weapons materials production	29,691,000	+6,000,000
Total national security	99,691,000	+2,900,000
Program support:		
Program direction	4,200,000	----------
Supporting activities: Information services	900,000	----------
Total program support	5,100,000	----------
Total program obligations	306,903,000	+13,589,000
Unobligated balance brought forward	−6,903,000	−6,903,000
Total capital equipment budget authority	300,000,000	+6,686,000

[1] Increase is for heating and cooling demonstrations.
[2] Increase is for electrical energy storage program.
[3] Increase includes $500,000 for materials science and $500,000 for molecular, mathematical and geo-sciences.

Recommended increases from budget estimate:

1. 77–4–c High Performance Fuel Laboratory (Architect-Engineering only) +$1,500,000

The High Performance Fuel Laboratory (HPFL) will be a pilot-scale fuel fabrication facility design to demonstrate an economic system for making high quality LMFBR fuels at high production rates. It will be a demonstration model for the large scale commercial fuel production plants which will be built to provide the fuel requirements of future fast breeder plants. The facility will be carefully designed to meet and demonstrate all nuclear safeguards and safety requirements, environmental requirements, and other licensing criteria for such facilities. The fuel for a reactor obviously represents one of the key elements of a reactor concept, and thus this facility will play an important role in the overall breeder program.

2. 77–4–d Fuel Storage Facility, Richland, Washington (Architect Engineering and long leadtime procurement) +$7,000,000

This facility will be utilized to store fuel discharged from the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF). The fuel storage capacity of the FFTF itself is limited, and thus an additional facility will be required if FFTF is to effectively carry out its mission. ERDA estimates that it will need to initiate fuel movements from the FFTF to the storage facility in 1981. Since it will take about five years to complete the fuel storage facility, it is important that work be initiated in the coming fiscal year.

3. 76–8–g, Enriched Uranium Production Facilities, Portsmouth, Ohio, +$150,000,000

ERDA presently operates three uranium enrichment plants which produce nuclear fuel for civilian nuclear power plants. Additional capacity is essential to meet future demands for nuclear fuel. The general consensus is that by about 1983, additional capacity will have to be on line.

The funds recommended in the bill will initiate the construction of add-on enrichment capacity at ERDA's Portsmouth, Ohio location. It should be noted that the full costs of this facility would be recovered through the sale of enriched uranium produced at the facility.

4. 76–2–a, Five Megawatt Solar Thermal Facility, +$2,000,000

Increase of $2 million brings total appropriations for this facility for FY 1977 to $12,000,000. Increase is to accelerate construction of this facility.

This project is to provide a solar thermal test facility having approximately 5 megawatts thermal of solar energy. It will have capabilities for testing solar energy components and subsystems.

Recommended decreases from budget estimate are:

1. 77–8–d, Conversion of steam plant facilities, Oak Ridge National Lab., Oak Ridge, Tennessee—$2,000,000

Decrease of $2,000,000 leaves $10,000,000 for this project. This should be sufficient to move forward aggressively with this project.

2. 77–9–d, Centrifuge plant demonstration facility, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, −$5,000,000

This project continues development of centrifuge technology. A recent reprogramming letter cited cost overruns in the present demonstration facility. $5,000,000 reduction still allows $25,000,000 for his facility in FY 1977.

3. 77–6–a, Modifications and additions to biomedical and environmental research, various locations, −$1,000,000

Decrease leaves $3,200,000 for this project which consists of modifying or adding to existing facilities at various locations.

4. 77–9–a, Expansion of feed vaporization and sampling facilities, gaseous diffusion plants, multiple sites, −$1,000,000

Decrease leaves $8,000,000 to proceed with this project.

5. 77–11–c, 8-inch artillery fired atomic projectile production facilities, various locations, −$2,000,000

Decrease leaves $10,000,000 to proceed with this project. This level of funding will be adequate for FY 1977.

6. 76–5–a, Tokamak fusion test reactor, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Plainsboro, New Jersey, −$5,000,000

Decrease leaves $75,000,000 to proceed with this project.

7. 67–3–a, Fast Flux Test Facility, −$5,000,000

Decrease leaves $75,000,000 to proceed with this project which is a research program for the LMFBR.

8. 71–9 (1), New Pu recovery facility, Rocky Flats, Colorado, −$2,000,000

Decreases leaves $23,300,000 to proceed with this project.

70-814 O - 76 - 5

9. 77–14, General Plant Projects, —$4,610,000

General Plant Projects consist of numerous minor projects at ERDA facilities. Budget estimate for FY 1977 for General Plant Projects was $74,610,000. The Committee recommends a reduction of $4,610,000.

10. Unobligated balances, —$23,350,000

Reduction is for anticipated slippage in construction of various programs.

The Committee directs that within available funds for capital equipment, the computer requested to support ERDA's nonnuclear programs be purchased rather than leased.

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

Fiscal year 1976	0
Budget estimate	$50,000,000
Recommended, 1977	30,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+30,000,000
Budget estimate, 1977	−20,000,000

The objectives of the Geothermal Resources Development Fund are to encourage and assist the private sector to accelerate development of geothermal resources and to develop normal borrower-lender relationships which will in time encourage the flow of credit without the need for Federal assistance.

A total of $30 million in budget authority will allow ERDA to guarantee approximately $200 million worth of loans as proposed in the budget. Testimony did not support the necessity of a $50 million appropriation to support a $200 million loan guarantee level.

The Committee recommends the full budget request for budget outlays of $4,400,000 for this fund.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1976	$66,836,000
Budget estimate, 1977	64,255,000
Recommended, 1977	70,110,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+3,274,000
Budget estimate, 1977	+5,855,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	Budget Est. FY 1977	House Approved FY 1977
ALABAMA		
(FC) BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON	$ ---	$ 50,000
(N) MOBILE HARBOR	92,000	92,000
(FC) TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY URBAN STUDY	---	150,000
(FC) VILLAGE CREEK	50,000	50,000
(N) WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE RIVERS	---	100,000
ALASKA		
(N) COOK INLET SHOALS, ALAS	41,000	41,000
(FC) METROPOLITAN ANCHORAGE	349,000	349,000
(FC) RIVERS AND HARBORS IN ALASKA (HYDRO INTERIM)	210,000	210,000
(FC) SOUTHCENTRAL RAILBELT AREA	60,000	60,000
AMERICAN SAMOA		
(N) HARBORS & RIVERS IN AMERICAN SAMOA	50,000	50,000
ARIZONA		
(FC) GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES (GILA DRAIN), ARIZ. & N.M.	40,000	40,000
(FC) PHOENIX METROPOLITAN AREA	465,000	465,000
ARKANSAS		
(FC) LITTLE ROCK METROPOLITAN AREA	470,000	470,000
(FC) OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, ARK	100,000	100,000
(FC) PINE BLUFF METROPOLITAN AREA	242,000	242,000
(COMP) RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM (AUTH. RPT)ARK LA OKLA TEX	55,000	55,000
(C) WHITE RIVER BASIN ARK & MO (AUTH RPT)	75,000	75,000
(FC) WHITE RIVER BASIN RESERVOIRS	125,000	125,000
CALIFORNIA		
(FC) ALAMEDA CREEK UPPER BASIN	160,000	160,000
(FC) ANTELOPE VALLEY	40,000	200,000
(N) COAST OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	30,000	30,000
(FC) EEL RIVER	50,000	50,000
(FC) GUADALUPE RIVER	80,000	80,000
(N) HUMBOLDT HARBOR & BAY, CALIF	60,000	60,000
(FC) LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW	100,000	100,000
(N) LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBORS (INC. SAN PEDRO BAY MODEL STUDY)	365,000	725,000
(N) NORTH COAST OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF	15,000	15,000
(FC) NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS	220,000	220,000
(N) OCEANSIDE HARBOR	75,000	75,000
(FC) SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS-BANK PROTECTION AND EROSION CONTROL	---	75,000
(N) SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL	150,000	150,000
(FC) SACRAMENTO RIVER-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA	200,000	250,000
(N) SACRAMENTO VALLEY NAV, CALIF	40,000	100,000
(FC) SALINAS RIVER INCL. PART OF SALINAS-MONTEREY METROPOLITAN AREA	420,000	420,000
(FC) SAN DIEGO COUNTY STREAMS FLOWING INTO THE PACIFIC OCEAN	50,000	200,000
(BE) SAN DIEGO COUNTY, VICINITY OF OCEANSIDE	70,000	125,000
(N) SAN DIEGO HARBOR & SWEETWATER RIVER, CALIF	15,000	15,000
(FC) SAN FRAN BAY & SAC.-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, WATER QUAL & WASTE DISPOSAL	80,000	135,000
(N) SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA (IN-DEPTH STUDY)	270,000	270,000
(N) SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR & BAY (COLL & DISP DEBRIS), CALIF	25,000	25,000
(FC) SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN	200,000	320,000
(FC) SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	50,000	50,000
(FC) SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN & ORANGE COUNTY	300,000	300,000
(FC) SANTA CLARA RIVER	45,000	125,000
(N) SUNSET HARBOR	30,000	30,000
(BE) VENTURA COUNTY	75,000	75,000
(FC) VENTURA RIVER	---	50,000
(FC) WALNUT CREEK BASIN	20,000	20,000
COLORADO		
(FC) METRO DENVER & SOUTH PLATTE RIVER & TRIBS, COLO., NEBR., & WYO	385,000	385,000

	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	Budget Est. FY 1977	House Approved FY 1977
	CONNECTICUT		
(COMP)	CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT CONN.,MASS.,N.H.,&VT	75,000	175,000
(N)	NEW HAVEN HARBOR	89,000	89,000
(FC)	RIPPOWAM RIVER, CONN	40,000	100,000
(BE)	SHERWOOD ISLAND STATE PARK	30,000	30,000
	DELAWARE		
(FC)	CHRISTINA RIVER BASIN	50,000	50,000
	DIST OF COLUMBIA		
(SPEC)	METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON, D.C. WATER SUPPLY	600,000	600,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	APALACHICOLA RIVER BELOW JIM WOODRUFF LOCK & DAM	59,000	59,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS	377,000	377,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR (MILL COVE)	40,000	40,000
(FC)	JACKSONVILLE METROPOLITAN AREA	390,000	390,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FLA	25,000	62,000
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY	---	25,000
(BE)	MONROE COUNTY	50,000	50,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY (ST LUCIE CANAL)	75,000	75,000
(N)	PENSACOLA HARBOR	---	50,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA-TALLAHASSEE METROPOLITAN & OTHER URBAN AREAS	235,000	375,000
(BE)	SAINT JOHNS COUNTY	88,000	88,000
(BE)	SHORES OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA	90,000	150,000
(BE)	VOLUSIA COUNTY SHORES	50,000	100,000
	GEORGIA		
(FC)	METRO SAVANNAH AREA, GA	100,000	100,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN ATLANTA AREA	350,000	350,000
(FC)	SATILLA RIVER BASIN	75,000	75,000
(FC)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA,NC, & SC	104,000	104,000
	GUAM		
(N)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN THE TERRITORY OF GUAM	100,000	230,000
	HAWAII		
(FC)	HARBORS AND RIVERS IN HAWAII	240,000	240,000
(N)	KANEOHE BAY AND PART OF METROPOLITAN HONOLULU	360,000	360,000
(N)	KAUNAKAKAI DEEP DRAFT HARBOR	---	70,000
(FC)	KIHEI DISTRICT	---	75,000
(FC)	LAVA FLOW CONTROL, ISL. OF HAWAII	---	40,000
	IDAHO		
(FC)	BIG WOOD RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	142,000	142,000
(FC)	COLUMBIA RIVER & TRIBS, IDAHO, MONT., ORE., WASH., & WYO	950,000	950,000
(COMP)	PACIFIC NORTHWEST RIVER BASIN, IDAHO, MONT., ORE., & WASH	30,000	30,000
	ILLINOIS		
(FC)	CHICAGO-SOUTH END OF LAKE MICHIGAN, ILL. & IND.	280,000	280,000
(FC)	DECOGNIA & FOUNTAIN BLUFF DRAIN & LEVEE DIST & GRAND TOWER, IL	86,000	86,000
(FC)	E.C.GIRARDEAU, CLR.CR.,N. ALEX., PRESTON, & MILLER POND D&L DIST	75,000	100,000
(FC)	FOX RIVER, ILL. & WISC	300,000	300,000
(N)	MISS RIVER YR-RND NAV, IL, MO, IA, WI, MN (FUNDS IN R.I.)	40,000	40,000
(FC)	MISS. RIVER, CASSVILLE, WISC. TO MI 300, ILL., IOWA, MO., & WISC	53,000	53,000
(FC)	MISS. RIVER, COON RAPIDS DAM TO OHIO RIVER, ILL., IOWA, & MO	124,000	124,000
(FC)	QUAD CITIES URBAN STUDY	---	150,000
(FC)	ROCK RIVER AT ROCKFORD	150,000	150,000
(N)	SALINE RIVER NAVIGATION	---	60,000
(FC)	SILVER CREEK, IL	135,000	135,000
	INDIANA		
(FC)	COLUMBUS	85,000	85,000

	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	Budget Est. FY 1977	House Approved FY 1977
(FC)	FORT WAYNE, INDIANA METROPOLITAN AREA	80,000	80,000
(BE)	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, LAKE MICHIGAN	50,000	50,000
(COMP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT, IND. & ILL	100,000	100,000
(N)	WABASH RIVER NAVIGATION, IND. & ILL	150,000	150,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	DES MOINES RIVER BANK EROSION, IOWA	110,000	200,000
(FC)	IOWA & CEDAR RIVERS, IOWA & MINN	150,000	150,000
(FC)	LAKE MANAWA	---	5,000
(FC)	METRO SIOUX CITY & MO. RIV, SD, NB, IA	100,000	100,000
	KANSAS		
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER, GREAT BEND, KANS. TO JOHN MARTIN DAM, COLO	170,000	170,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER, GREAT BEND, KANS. TO TULSA, OKLA	260,000	330,000
(FC)	KANSAS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	290,000	290,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE, KANSAS	40,000	40,000
(FC)	VERDIGRIS RIVER, KANS. & OKLA	225,000	225,000
	KENTUCKY		
(FC)	CLARKS RIVER BASIN	---	30,000
(N)	GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY	112,000	112,000
(N)	LOUISVILLE HARBOR, KY	30,000	30,000
(N)	LOWER CUMBERLAND & TENN RIVERS BELOW BARKLEY CANAL, KY. & TENN	180,000	180,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LEXINGTON REGION	153,000	153,000
(FC)	UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN	80,000	80,000
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY (DUPRE CUT)	50,000	50,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, ENTRANCE CHANNEL	50,000	50,000
(N)	BAYOU MANCHAC AND AMITE	---	10,000
(N)	GULF IWW-LA. SECTION, HIGH LEVEL HIGHWAY CROSSINGS	65,000	65,000
(N)	GULF IWW-TEX. SECTION, LA. & TEX	150,000	150,000
(FC)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA	160,000	160,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS-BATON ROUGE METROPOLITAN AREA	421,000	421,000
(FC)	WEST BANK MISS RIV IN VIC OF NEW ORLEANS, LA	50,000	50,000
	MAINE		
(N)	FORE RIVER CHNL, PORTLAND HBR, ME	76,000	76,000
(SPEC)	PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL STUDY	50,000	500,000
(FC)	ST. JOHN RIVER	90,000	150,000
	MARYLAND		
(FC)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN STREAMS	200,000	200,000
(FC)	BEAVER DAM CREEK AND CABIN BRANCH	---	20,000
(SPEC)	CHESAPEAKE BAY STUDY, MD. & VA	1,840,000	1,840,000
(N)	CHESAPEAKE CITY BRIDGE	---	40,000
(FC)	MONONGAHELA YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, MD PA WV.	50,000	50,000
(N)	SMITH ISLAND	---	25,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR (DEBRIS)	52,000	102,000
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR (35 FT CHANNEL)	---	50,000
(BE)	CAPE COD EASTERLY SHORES	40,000	80,000
(FC)	HOOSIC RIVER, MASS., N.Y., & VT	40,000	40,000
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR	42,000	42,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR & RIVER (SMALL BOAT)	25,000	25,000
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS & HARBORS, MICH	80,000	80,000
(FC)	GRT LAKES,ONTARIO & ERIE,(METRO DULUTH-SUPERIOR),MI,MN,NY,OH,PA&WI	427,000	427,000
(SPEC)	GRT LAKES-ST LAWRENCE SWY. NAV SSN. EST., MI,IL,IN,MN,NY,OH,PA,WI	650,000	760,000
(N)	LITTLE GIRL'S POINT	---	70,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MICH	30,000	100,000
(SPEC)	WATER LVLS OF THE GRT LAKES, MI,IL,IN,MN,NY,OH,PA,&WI	220,000	880,000

	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	Budget Est. FY 1977	House Approved FY 1977
	MINNESOTA		
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT THE HEADWATERS OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER	100,000	150,000
(N)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI (SMALL CRAFT LOCKS), MINN. IOWA, MO., & WISC	140,000	140,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR	60,000	60,000
(FC)	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN	100,000	100,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER	40,000	40,000
	MISSOURI		
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU JACKSON METRO AREA	100,000	100,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF KANSAS CITY, MO. & KANS.	414,000	414,000
(FC)	MISS. RIVER, OLD CHANNEL MILE 111-117	---	100,000
(FC)	PLATTIN CREEK	50,000	50,000
(FC)	ST. GENEVIEVE	50,000	50,000
(N)	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO. & ILL	50,000	50,000
(FC)	ST. LOUIS METROPOLITAN AREA, MO. & ILL	165,000	165,000
	MONTANA		
(FC)	FLATHEAD AND CLARK FORK RIVER BASINS	75,000	220,000
	NEBRASKA		
(FC)	PLATTE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	75,000	75,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS	30,000	30,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	CONN. RIV. STRBK. EROS. (WILDER LK.,NH&VT TO TURNERS FALLS DAM,MA)	80,000	110,000
(BE)	NORTH AND FOSS BEACHES	40,000	40,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(FC)	CAMDEN METROPOLITAN AREA	285,000	285,000
(FC)	DELAWARE BAY, SHORE OF NEW JERSEY	40,000	40,000
(FC)	HACKENSACK RIVER, N.J. & N.Y.	115,000	115,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL CHANNEL, NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, N.J. & N.Y.	35,000	35,000
(FC)	RAHWAY RIVER	146,000	146,000
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN	174,000	174,000
(FC)	THIRD RIVER	---	70,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	PECOS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES AT CARLSBAD	60,000	60,000
(FC)	PUERCO RIVER AT GALLUP	50,000	50,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE & TRIBUTARIES, N.M. & COLO	565,000	565,000
	NEW YORK		
(N)	BIG SANDY CREEK MEXICO BAY	50,000	50,000
(FC)	DELAWARE RIVER TRIBUTARIES IN NEW YORK STATE	50,000	50,000
(N)	GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, NY	40,000	40,000
(N)	GREAT LAKES TO HUDSON RIVER WATERWAY	50,000	50,000
(FC)	IRONDEQUOIT CREEK, NY	40,000	40,000
(FC)	MORRISONVILLE AND VICINITY, NY	30,000	30,000
(N)	OGDENSBURG HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
(FC)	OSWEGO RIVER BASIN	464,000	464,000
(N)	ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY, ADDITIONAL LOCKS	200,000	250,000
(COMP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT, N.Y., PA., & MD	400,000	400,000
(FC)	UPPER ALLEGHENY RIVER BASIN, NY & PA	50,000	50,000
(FC)	WALLKILL RIVER, N.Y. & N.J.	50,000	50,000
(FC)	WESTCHESTER COUNTY STREAMS, NY AND BYRAM RIVER, CT	160,000	180,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(BE)	BOGUE INLET, NC	60,000	60,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET	48,000	48,000
(FC)	LUMBER RIVER, NC & SC	35,000	35,000
(FC)	NEUSE RIVER	75,000	75,000

	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	Budget Est. FY 1977	House Approved FY 1977
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER (SOUTH BOSTON & VICINITY), N.C. & VA	85,000	85,000
(FC)	SUGAR CREEK BASIN, N.C. & S.C.	230,000	230,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, N.D. & MINN	335,000	335,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY	110,000	110,000
(FC)	CUYAHOGA RIVER BASIN	130,000	130,000
(SPEC)	LAKE ERIE-WASTEWATER MGMT. (SEC. 108A,PL 92-500),OH,MICH.,N.Y.,PA	770,000	770,000
(FC)	MIAMI RIVER, LITTLE MIAMI RIVER & MILL CR, OHIO	100,000	100,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER BASIN	50,000	50,000
(N)	OHIO PORT DEVELOPMENT, OHIO	50,000	50,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	CANADIAN RIVER & TRIBUTARIES OK TX NM	100,000	100,000
(FC)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE	45,000	45,000
(FC)	TULSA URBAN STUDY	170,000	400,000
	OREGON		
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, ORE & WASH	82,000	82,000
(FC)	PORTLAND-VANCOUVER METROPOLITAN AREA	358,000	620,000
(FC)	SILVIES RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	131,000	131,000
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR	10,000	10,000
(COMP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT, OREGON	92,000	92,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(FC)	BEAVER RIVER BASIN, PA. & OH	250,000	250,000
(FC)	CHESTER CREEK WATERSHED	70,000	70,000
(FC)	POTOMAC RIVER, NORTH BRANCH (MINE DRAINAGE),PA., MD., & W. VA	250,000	250,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE-HYDRO STUDY	138,000	138,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER REVIEW	50,000	50,000
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, MINE DRAINAGE, PA., MD., & N.Y	137,000	137,000
	RHODE ISLAND		
(FC)	PAWCATUCK RIV & NARRAGANSETT BAY DRAIN' BASIN,. R.I.,MASS.&CONN	599,000	800,000
(N)	PROVIDENCE HARBOR (DEBRIS)	39,000	39,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(BE)	FOLLY BEACH	25,000	25,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR	42,000	42,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER, S.D., MONT., NEBR. & N.D.	81,000	81,000
(FC)	UPPER BIG SIOUX RIVER & EASTERN SD WATER SUPPLY, SD & IA	140,000	140,000
	TENNESSEE		
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF MEMPHIS	196,000	196,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE	300,000	300,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK AND TRIBS	---	75,000
(FC)	BRAZOS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	236,000	236,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	70,000	110,000
(FC)	COLORADO RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	180,000	200,000
(N)	COLORADO RIVER CHANNEL TO BAY CITY	50,000	100,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, HARBOR ISLAND	150,000	150,000
(N)	GALVESTON BAY AREA NAV. STUDY	105,000	150,000
(BE)	GALVESTON COUNTY SHORE EROSION	100,000	315,000
(FC)	JOHNSON CREEK	154,000	154,000
(FC)	LINNVILLE BAYOU & CANEY CREEK, TRES PALACIOS	65,000	65,000
(FC)	LOWER SABINE RIVER, TEX	100,000	250,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL	---	40,000
(FC)	NUECES RIVER AND TRIBS	---	50,000
(FC)	PALO BLANCO CREEK AMD CIBOLO CREEK IN VICINITY OF FALFURRIAS	---	50,000

	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	Budget Est. FY 1977	House Approved FY 1977
(N)	SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY	95,000	95,000
(FC)	SAN DIEGO CREEK	45,000	45,000
(FC)	SAN JACINTO RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	75,000	100,000
(SPEC)	TEXAS COAST HURRICANE, TEX	310,000	400,000
	UTAH		
(FC)	COLO. RIV & TRIBS, ABOVE LEE FERRY, UTAH,ARIZ.,COL.,N.M.&WY	30,000	30,000
(FC)	JORDAN RIVER BASIN	50,000	50,000
	VIRGIN ISLANDS		
(FC)	VIRGIN ISLANDS (CROWN BAY)	60,000	60,000
	VIRGINIA		
(FC)	CHOWAN RIVER, VA. & N.C.	200,000	200,000
(N)	HAMPTON ROADS DRIFT REMOVAL	---	50,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR & CHANNELS (ANCHORAGES)	50,000	50,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER, UPPER BASIN	90,000	90,000
	WASHINGTON		
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	100,000	100,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN SPOKANE & SPOKANE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, WASH. & IDAHO	55,000	55,000
(FC)	OKANOGAN RIVER & TRIBS	80,000	80,000
(COMP)	PUGET SOUND & ADJACENT WATERS AUTH REPORT, WASH	150,000	150,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, ELLIOTT BAY, WASH	63,000	63,000
(N)	SNOHOMISH RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	142,000	142,000
(FC)	YAKIMA VALLEY, REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT	80,000	150,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	CAULEY RIVER	280,000	280,000
(COMP)	KANAWHA RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT,W.VA., N.C., & VA	200,000	200,000
(FC)	METRO REGION OF HUNTINGTON, W.VA.(ASHLAND, KY., PORTSMOUTH, OHIO)	450,000	450,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF WHEELING, W.VA. & OHIO	220,000	220,000
	WISCONSIN		
(FC)	CHIPPEWA RIVER	100,000	100,000
(N)	HARBORS BETWEEN KENOSHA & KEWAUNEE	120,000	120,000
(FC)	WISCONSIN RIVER PORTAGE	---	40,000
	Total, ALL STATES	33,625,000	40,230,000
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	3,100,000	2,900,000
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS:		
	RESTUDIES OF DEFERRED PROJECTS	75,000	75,000
	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECTS (SEC. 216, PL 91-611)	720,000	720,000
	REVIEW FOR DEAUTHORIZTION (SEC. 12, PL 93-251)	375,000	375,000
	Total	1,170,000	1,170,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA:		
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	465,000	465,000
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	280,000	280,000
	FISH AND WILDLIFE STUDIES (USF & WS)	2,000,000	1,800,000
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	300,000	300,000
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	10,000,000	10,000,000
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	290,000	290,000
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	125,000	125,000
	COASTAL DATA COLLECTION	400,000	300,000
	Total	13,860,000	13,560,000
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	12,500,000	12,250,000
	Total, GEN INVESTIGATIONS	64,255,000	70,110,000

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.

Connecticut River Basin.—Funds are included in the bill to accelerate studies of Glastonbury, East Hartford, Rocky Hill, and Weathersfield, Conn.; Northampton, Mass., and Keene, New Hampshire. In addition, funds are provided under Section 216 for the study of Springfield and West Springfield, Mass.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1976	$1,228,648,000
Budget estimate, 1977	1,266,332,000
Recommended, 1977	1,417,077,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+188,429,000
Budget estimate, 1977	+150,745,000

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.

	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	Budget Est. FY 1977 Planning	House Approved FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Planning
	ALABAMA				
(N)	JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD LOCK & DAM (REHAB).....	$ 591,000	$ ---	$ 591,000	$ ---
(MP)	JONES BLUFF LOCK AND DAM.....	1,700,000	---	4,000,000	---
(N)	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, ALA. & MISS.....	84,000,000	---	100,000,000	---
	ALASKA				
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, FAIRBANKS.....	24,000,000	---	25,000,000	---
(MP)	SNETTISHAM.....	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
	ARIZONA				
(FC)	INDIAN BEND WASH.....	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---
(FC)	PHOENIX AND VICINITY (INCLUDING NEW RIVER) STAGE 1.....	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	PHOENIX AND VICINITY (INCLUDING NEW RIVER) STAGE 2.....	---	394,000	---	394,000
	ARKANSAS				
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE.....	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE.....	896,000	---	896,000	---
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE.....	682,000	---	682,000	---
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK. RIVER NAV SYSTEM, LOCKS & DAMS,ARK. AND OKLA.....	2,247,000	---	2,247,000	---
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE - HIGHWAY BRIDGE.....	---	625,000	---	625,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE - UNITS 3 & 4.....	---	470,000	---	470,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, ARK. & LA.....	3,700,000	---	7,000,000	---
(FC)	PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE.....	---	365,000	---	365,000
(FC)	POSTEN BAYOU.....	---	75,000	---	75,000
(FC)	RED RIVER LEVEES AND BANK STAB BELOW DENISON DAM, ARK., LA. & TEX.....	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK, JACKSON AND LAWRENCE COUNTIES...	---	100,000	---	100,000
	CALIFORNIA				
(N)	BODEGA BAY.....	---	115,000	---	115,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM-H.V. EASTMAN LAKE.....	2,060,000	---	2,760,000	---
(FC)	COTTONWOOD CREEK.....	---	---	---	370,000
(FC)	BUTLER VALLEY DAM-BLUE LAKE.....	---	---	351,000	---
(FC)	CUCAMONGA CREEK.....	5,100,000	---	7,000,000	---
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL.....	3,300,000	---	3,300,000	---
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM-HENSLEY LAKE.....	1,901,000	---	2,101,000	---
(N)	HUMBOLT HARBOR AND BAY.....	---	---	500,000	---
(BE)	IMPERIAL BEACH.....	90,000	---	90,000	---

(FC)	LYTLE AND WARM CREEKS.....	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	---
(MP)	MARYSVILLE LAKE.....	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS.....	---	650,000	---	650,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER BASIN.....	6,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE.....	59,000,000	---	64,000,000	---
(N)	PORT SAN LUIS.....	---	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION.....	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
(BE)	SAN DIEGO (SUNSET CLIFFS) (SEG. A).....	---	75,000	---	100,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR.....	9,030,000	---	7,480,000	---
(N)	SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY.....	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FC)	SAN DIEGO RIVER(MISSION VALLEY).....	---	240,000	---	300,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON (J.F. BALDWIN & STOCKTON SHIP CHANS).....	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER.....	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK.....	---	---	400,000	---
(BE)	SURFSIDE-SUNSET AND NEWPORT BEACH.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER.....	200,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK.....	5,800,000	---	5,800,000	---
	COLORADO				
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ABOVE JOHN MARTIN DAM (PHASE I).....	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE.....	12,500,000	---	12,500,000	---
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE.....	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---
(FC)	LAS ANIMAS.....	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE.....	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---
	CONNECTICUT				
(FC)	DANBURY.....	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---
(FC)	NEW LONDON HURRICANE BARRIER.....	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	PARK RIVER.....	9,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
	DELAWARE				
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION.....	---	---	500,000	---
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
	POTOMAC ESTUARY PILOT WATER TREATMENT PLANT....	---	---	1,000,000	---
	FLORIDA				
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA.....	6,000,000	---	6,500,000	---
(FC)	DADE COUNTY.....	---	---	2,800,000	---
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY.....	---	---	3,900,000	---
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS.....	5,000,000	---	8,000,000	---
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR (1965 ACT).....	7,868,000	---	5,368,000	---

	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	Budget Est. FY 1977 Planning	House Approved FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Planning
(BE)	MANATEE COUNTY	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR	600,000	---	600,000	---
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	SAINT LUCIE INLET	---	45,000	---	45,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR (MAIN CHANNEL)	5,000,000	---	8,500,000	---
	GEORGIA				
(MP)	CARTERS LAKE	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE (FIFTH UNIT)GA & SC	---	210,000	---	210,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA. & S.C.	10,300,000	---	10,300,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR (WIDENING AND DEEPENING)	1,986,000	---	1,986,000	---
(MP)	WEST POINT LAKE, GA. & ALA	5,000,000	---	6,500,000	---
	HAWAII				
(N)	BARBERS POINT (DEEP DRAFT) HARBOR, OAHU	---	36,000	---	36,000
(N)	HANALEI SMALL BOAT HARBOR	---	---	---	50,000
(FC)	IAO STREAM	---	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	KANEOHE-KAILUA AREA	8,200,000	---	8,200,000	---
(N)	WAIANAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR	---	---	1,000,000	---
	IDAHO				
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR	5,500,000	---	5,500,000	---
(FC)	RIRIE LAKE	6,800,000	---	6,800,000	---
	ILLINOIS				
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE	1,020,000	---	1,020,000	---
(FC)	COLUMBIA DRAINAGE & LEVEE DIST. NO. 3	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FC)	EAST MOLINE	---	---	400,000	---
(FC)	ELDRED & SPANKEY DRAINAGE & LEVEE DIST.	---	---	---	100,000
(FC)	FREEPORT	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	FULTON	---	---	400,000	---
(FC)	HARRISONVILLE & IVY LANDING DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT NO. 2	2,189,000	---	2,189,000	---
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, CALUMET-SAG MODIFICATION PART I, ILL. & IND.	2,259,000	---	2,259,000	---
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, DUPLICATE LOCKS, ILL. AND IND.	---	130,000	---	130,000
(FC)	KASKASKIA ISLAND DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION	5,000,000	---	5,800,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 53 (TEMPORARY LOCK), ILL. & KY.	8,800,000	---	8,800,000	---

(FC)	LOUISVILLE LAKE	---	150,000	---	150,000
(N)	MISS. RIVER, CHAIN OF ROCKS, ILL & MO.	---	---	500,000	---
(N)	MISS RI BTWN THE OHIO & MO RIVERS (REGULATING WORKS), ILL. & MO.	3,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
(FC)	MOLINE	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	ROCK ISLAND	220,000	---	220,000	---
(FC)	ROCKFORD	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---
(N)	SMITHLAND LOCKS AND DAM, ILL., IND. & KY.	34,000,000	---	39,000,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH BELOIT	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT	---	100,000	---	100,000
	INDIANA				
(FC)	BIG BLUE LAKE	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	BIG WALNUT LAKE (LAND ACQUISITION)	1,400,000	---	900,000	---
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE	1,740,000	---	1,740,000	---
(N)	CANNELTON LOCKS AND DAMS, IND. & KY.	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	EVANSVILLE	1,400,000	---	1,200,000	---
(FC)	LAFAYETTE LAKE	1,300,000	---	---	---
(FC)	LEVEE UNIT NO. 5	750,000	---	750,000	---
(FC)	MARION	---	175,000	---	175,000
(FC)	MASON J. NIBLACK LEVEE (PUMPING FACILITIES)	103,000	---	103,000	---
(N)	NEWBURGH LOCKS & DAM, IND. & KY.	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE	11,300,000	---	10,000,000	---
(N)	UNIONTOWN LOCKS AND DAM, IND. & KY.	2,200,000	---	1,700,000	---
	IOWA				
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER AT SIOUX CITY, IOWA AND S.D.	1,700,000	---	1,700,000	---
(FC)	CLINTON	7,400,000	---	7,400,000	---
(FC)	DAVENPORT	---	139,000	---	139,000
(FC)	MARSHALLTOWN	1,639,000	---	1,359,000	---
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IOWA, KANSAS, MISSOURI, AND NEBRASKA	3,200,000	---	3,200,000	---
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER, SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IOWA, KANS., MO., & NEB.	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---
(FC)	OTTUMWA	101,000	---	101,000	---
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE	3,500,000	---	4,600,000	---
(FC)	WATERLOO	6,100,000	---	6,100,000	---
	KANSAS				
(FC)	BIG HILL LAKE	500,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE	6,550,000	---	6,550,000	---
(FC)	DODGE CITY	2,380,000	---	974,000	---
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE	15,800,000	---	15,800,000	---
(FC)	GREAT BEND	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	GROVE LAKE	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE	8,000,000	---	9,000,000	---

	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	Budget Est. FY 1977 Planning	House Approved FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Planning
(FC)	KANSAS CITY 1962 MODIFICATION	3,800,000	---	3,800,000	---
(N)	KANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION	---	140,000	---	140,000
(FC)	LAWRENCE	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---
(FC)	MARION	1,300,000	---	2,168,000	---
(FC)	ONAGA LAKE	---	137,000	---	137,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE AREA (ROAD IMPROVEMENTS)	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	TOWANDA LAKE	---	---	---	100,000
	KENTUCKY				
(FC)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY	---	---	1,463,000	---
(FC)	BIG SOUTH FORK NATIONAL RIVER AND RECREATION AREA, KY. & TENN	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE	1,900,000	---	2,900,000	---
(FC)	KEHOE LAKE	3,000,000	---	3,375,000	---
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE	3,200,000	---	3,200,000	---
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE	6,500,000	---	6,500,000	---
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE	3,300,000	---	3,300,000	---
(FC)	SOUTHWESTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY	4,800,000	---	6,300,000	---
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE	5,300,000	---	5,300,000	---
(FC)	TUG FORK VALLEY (PHASE I)	---	150,000	---	150,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND (REHAB)	22,000,000	---	26,000,000	---
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE	3,800,000	---	3,800,000	---
	LOUISIANA				
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU AND TRIBUTARIES	400,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY	12,000,000	---	12,000,000	---
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS, VENICE,LA	2,810,000	---	2,810,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE	5,600,000	---	5,600,000	---
(N)	OVERTON-RED RIVER WATERWAY (LOWER 31 MILES ONLY)	1,645,000	---	1,645,000	---
(N)	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, LA., ARK., OKLA., & TEX	2,326,000	---	5,000,000	---
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, LA	11,200,000	---	11,200,000	---
	MAINE				
(MP)	DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL LAKES	---	500,000	---	2,000,000
	MARYLAND				
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS	---	280,000	---	280,000
(FC)	BLOOMINGTON LAKE, MD. & W.VA	11,800,000	---	12,000,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER DAM	9,930,000	---	10,500,000	---
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATL STORAGE AREAS (LA)	---	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	NORTH NASHUA RIVER	---	160,000	---	160,000
(FC)	SAXONVILLE	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(N)	WEYMOUTH-FORE AND TOWN RIVERS	2,470,000	---	2,470,000	---
	MICHIGAN				
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS	---	---	281,000	---
(N)	LEXINGTON HARBOR	403,000	---	403,000	---
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR	---	---	800,000	---
(N)	OTTAWA RIVER HARBOR, MICH. & OHIO	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	RED RUN DRAIN AND LOWER CLINTON RIVER	---	650,000	---	650,000
(FC)	RIVER ROUGE 1962 ACT	2,959,000	---	2,959,000	---
(FC)	SAGINAW RIVER 1958 ACT	4,050,000	---	4,050,000	---
(N)	TAWAS BAY HARBOR	800,000	---	800,000	---
	MINNESOTA				
(FC)	BIG STONE LAKE - WHETSTONE RIVER, MINN. & S.D.	1,900,000	---	1,900,000	---
(FC)	MANKATO AND NORTH MANKATO	7,200,000	---	7,200,000	---
(FC)	ROCHESTER (PHASE I)	---	200,000	---	300,000
(FC)	ROSEAU RIVER	3,600,000	---	3,600,000	---
(FC)	TWIN VALLEY LAKE	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	WINONA	---	364,000	---	364,000
	MISSISSIPPI				
(FC)	EDINBURG LAKE (PHASE I)	---	75,000	---	75,000
(FC)	TALLAHALA CREEK LAKE	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MISS. & ALA	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL,KANSAS CITY	---	500,000	---	500,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND RESERVOIR	40,000,000	---	44,000,000	---
(MP)	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	73,500,000	---	79,000,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER CHANNEL	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES (LA)	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE	3,880,000	---	3,880,000	---
(FC)	MERAMEC PARK LAKE	4,500,000	---	9,500,000	---
(FC)	PERRY COUNTY D&LD NO.1,2&3	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	PINE FORD LAKE	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	PROSPERITY LAKE	---	---	---	75,000

	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	Budget Est. FY 1977 Planning	House Approved FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Planning
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE	15,700,000	---	16,700,000	---
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FC)	UNION LAKE, STATE HIGHWAY 185 (ADVANCE PARTICIPATION)	700,000	---	700,000	---
	MONTANA				
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA	6,000,000	---	9,000,000	---
(MP)	LIBBY REREGULATING DAM POWER UNITS	---	260,000	---	260,000
(MP)	LIBBY ADDTL UNITS & REREG DAM	---	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	MILES CITY	---	85,000	---	85,000
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
	NEVADA				
(FC)	GLEASON CREEK DAM (CHANNEL ALTERNATIVE)	---	75,000	---	75,000
	NEW JERSEY				
(N)	CORSON INLET-LUDLAM BEACH	---	197,000	---	197,000
(FC)	ELIZABETH	1,780,000	---	1,780,000	---
(N)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH	---	142,000	---	142,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK, AND PASSAIC RIVERS	980,000	---	980,000	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE	3,300,000	---	3,900,000	---
(FC)	LOS ESTEROS LAKE	7,800,000	---	7,800,000	---
	NEW YORK				
(FC)	DANSVILLE AND VICINITY	---	100,000	---	100,000
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR	---	180,000	---	180,000
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY (PART I)	1,200,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	ELLICOTT CREEK	---	240,000	---	240,000
(FC)	ENDICOTT, JOHNSON CITY & VESTAL	---	---	1,000,000	---
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET	1,780,000	---	1,780,000	---
(N)	IRONDEQUOIT BAY	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	ITHACA	105,000	---	105,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT	790,000	---	2,500,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, ANCHORAGES	2,340,000	---	2,340,000	---
(N)	PORT ONTARIO HARBOR	---	150,000	---	240,000
(FC)	SCAJAQUADA CREEK	---	---	400,000	---
(FC)	WELLSVILLE	420,000	---	420,000	---
(FC)	YONKERS	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---

	NORTH CAROLINA				
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE	11,000,000	---	12,000,000	---
(FC)	FALLS LAKE	6,800,000	---	8,000,000	---
(FC)	HOWARDS MILL LAKE	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	MASONBORO INLET	---	---	250,000	---
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR (1970 ACT)	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	RANDLEMAN LAKE	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	REDDIES RIVER LAKE	---	125,000	---	125,000
(FC)	ROARING RIVER LAKE	---	185,000	---	185,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	BURLINGTON DAM	---	690,000	---	930,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM - LAKE SAKAKAWEA	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	KINDRED LAKE	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	MINOT	6,082,000	---	6,082,000	---
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER, GARRISON DAM TO LAKE OAHE	800,000	---	800,000	---
	OHIO				
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR	1,900,000	---	1,900,000	---
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE	6,100,000	---	6,100,000	---
(FC)	CHILLICOTHE	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	CUYAHOGA RIVER BASIN	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	EAST FORK LAKE	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	---
(N)	HURON HARBOR	---	---	2,000,000	---
(BE)	LAKEVIEW PARK	---	---	1,260,000	---
(FC)	MILL CREEK	1,400,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (REHAB)	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	POINT PLACE	---	90,000	---	90,000
(N)	WEST HARBOR	---	---	---	65,000
(N)	WILLOW ISLAND LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO & W. VA	900,000	---	900,000	---
	OKLAHOMA				
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE	---	428,000	---	428,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL, OKLA., KANS., & TEX	---	1,850,000	---	2,400,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE	1,900,000	---	2,850,000	---
(FC)	CANDY LAKE	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	CLAYTON LAKE	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	COPAN LAKE	7,000,000	---	9,000,000	---
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE - UNITS 5 & 6	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE	4,600,000	---	6,000,000	---
(FC)	LUKFATA LAKE	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	---
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE	2,500,000	---	4,000,000	---
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE	21,000,000	---	21,000,000	---

	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	Budget Est. FY 1977 Planning	House Approved FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Planning
	OREGON				
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	BEAVER DRAINAGE DISTRICT	1,399,000	---	1,399,000	---
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE - ORE. & WASH.	48,000,000	---	48,000,000	---
(N)	COOS BAY	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE	871,000	---	871,000	---
(FC)	DAYS CREEK LAKE (PHASE I)	---	100,000	---	500,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM - LAKE UMATILLA, ORE. & WASH.	3,100,000	---	3,100,000	---
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE	7,500,000	---	7,500,000	---
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BANK PROTECTION, ORE. & WASH.	300,000	---	300,000	---
(MP)	MC NARY LOCK AND DAM, LAKE WALLULA, ORE' & WASH	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	SCAPPOOSE DRAINAGE DISTRICT	2,880,000	---	2,880,000	---
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION	450,000	---	1,000,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FC)	BLUE MARSH	13,569,000	---	13,569,000	---
(FC)	CHARTIERS CREEK	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE	12,600,000	---	15,600,000	---
(N)	ELK CREEK HARBOR	---	---	---	185,000
(N)	GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM	---	170,000	---	170,000
(N)	POINT MARION LOCK	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	POTTSTOWN	---	150,000	---	150,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA	750,000	---	750,000	---
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE	2,400,000	---	2,400,000	---
(FC)	TAMAQUA	---	---	---	50,000
(FC)	TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES	35,500,000	---	40,000,000	---
(MP)	TOCKS ISLAND LAKE	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(MP)	TOCKS ISL. LAKE, ROUTE 209 RELOCATION ONLY	---	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	TYRONE	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS	6,250,000	---	6,250,000	---
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(FC)	BROADWAY LAKE	---	---	---	90,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
(BE)	HUNTING ISLAND BEACH	1,194,000	---	1,194,000	---
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, S.C. & N.C.	---	227,000	---	227,000

	TENNESSEE				
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR	1,761,000	---	1,761,000	---
	TEXAS				
(FC)	ALPINE	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL, AREA VIII	3,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
(FC)	AUBREY LAKE	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	BIG PINE LAKE	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	BIG SPRING	---	110,000	---	110,000
(FC)	CARL L. ESTES DAM AND LAKE	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK	---	140,000	---	200,000
(FC)	CLOPTON CROSSING LAKE (PHASE I)	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS	1,260,000	---	1,260,000	---
(BE)	CORPUS CHRISTI BEACH	700,000	---	1,179,000	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	3,100,000	---	3,100,000	---
(FC)	EL PASO	2,300,000	---	2,300,000	---
(FC)	FREEPORT AND VICINITY, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR	---	121,000	---	121,000
(N)	GIWW-HARBOR OF REFUGE AT SEADRIFT	---	38,000	---	38,000
(N)	GIWW-TEXAS SECTION - RELOCATION IN MATAGORDA BAY	---	75,000	---	75,000
(FC)	HIGHLAND BAYOU	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
(FC)	LAKEVIEW LAKE	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	LAVON LAKE MOD, & EAST FORK CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	1,900,000	---	4,100,000	---
(FC)	LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN (PHASE I)	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	MILLICAN LAKE	---	435,000	---	435,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER	---	60,000	---	100,000
(FC)	PLAINVIEW	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	PORT ARTHUR & VICINITY (HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION)	4,300,000	---	4,300,000	---
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	3,500,000	---	3,500,000	---
(FC)	SAN GABRIEL RIVER	10,500,000	---	10,500,000	---
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	TENNESSEE COLONY LAKE (LAND AQUISITION)	---	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL INDUSTRIAL CANAL	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	TEXAS CITY & VICINITY (HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION)	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	THREE RIVERS	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	TRINITY RIVER PROJECT	---	800,000	---	800,000
(FC)	VINCE AND LITTLE VINCE BAYOUS	945,000	---	945,000	---

	CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	Budget Est. FY 1977 Planning	House Approved FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Planning
	VIRGINIA				
(FC)	BUENA VISTA (PHASE I)	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	FOURMILE RUN, CITY OF ALEXANDRIA AND ARLINGTON COUNTY	8,300,000	---	10,000,000	---
(FC)	GATHRIGHT LAKE	11,500,000	---	11,500,000	---
(FC)	VERONA LAKE (PHASE I)	---	240,000	---	240,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH (REIMB)	260,000	---	260,000	---
	WASHINGTON				
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM ADDITIONAL UNITS	78,000,000	---	78,000,000	---
(BE)	EDIZ HOOK	---	---	1,100,000	---
(MP)	ICE HARBOR ADDITIONAL UNITS	2,100,000	---	2,100,000	---
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE ADDITIONAL UNITS	24,600,000	---	24,600,000	---
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE ADDITIONAL UNITS	21,900,000	---	21,900,000	---
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM	11,000,000	---	11,000,000	---
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL ADDITINAL UNITS	19,900,000	---	19,900,000	---
(FC)	SKAGIT RIVER LEVEE	---	---	---	100,000
(MP)	THE DALLES ADDITIONAL UNITS	300,000	---	1,800,000	---
(FC)	WAHKIAKUM COUNTY CONSOLIDATED DIKING DISTRICT NO. 1	600,000	---	600,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE	2,700,000	---	2,700,000	---
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE	6,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	R.D. BAILEY LAKE	7,500,000	---	10,300,000	---
(FC)	ROWLESBURG LAKE	---	145,000	---	145,000
	WISCONSIN				
(FC)	LAFARGE LAKE AND CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	NORTHPORT HARBOR	---	125,000	---	125,000
(FC)	PRAIRIE DU CHIEN	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES	---	300,000	---	300,000
	MISCELLANEOUS				
(N)	SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION COSTING UP TO $1,000,000 (SEC. 107)	---	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND RELATED PURPOSES NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION COSTING UP TO $1,000,000 (SEC. 205)	---	---	10,000,000	---
(BE)	SMALL BEACH EROSION PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION COSTING UP TO $1,000,000 (SEC 103)	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	---	---	1,500,000	---
	RECREATION FACILITIES AT COMPLETED PROJECTS	22,000,000	---	22,000,000	---
	SMALL SNAGGING AND CLEARING (SEC. 208)	---	---	200,000	---
	FISH AND WILDLIFE STUDIES (U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE)	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES ATTRIBUTIBLE TO NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SEC. 111)	---	---	600,000	---
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT)	1,600,000	---	2,300,000	---
	EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION	2,108,000	---	2,108,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGES	-79,640,000	---	-79,640,000	---
	Total,	1,244,049,000	22,283,000	1,390,544,000	26,533,000
	Total, CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL	(1,266,332,000)		(1,417,077,000)	

As indicated in the foregoing table, the Committee has reduced the budget request for some projects for the reasons shown below:

Project	Decrease	Reason
Dodge City, Kans	−$1,406,000	Funds transferred to project in fiscal year 1976 reduce requirement in fiscal year 1977.
Marshalltown, Iowa	−280,000	Do.
Patoka Lake, Ind	−1,300,000	Do.
Uniontown lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky.	−500,000	Do.
San Diego Harbor, Calif	−1,550,000	Funds transferred in fiscal year 1976 to accelerate project completion. Funds provided in the bill will complete the project.
Jacksonville Harbor, Fla	−2,500,000	Low bid on contract.
Big Walnut Lake, Ind	−500,000	Delay in completing sec. 221 agreement.
Lafayette Lake, Ind	−1,300,000	Project not supported.
Evansville, Ind	−200,000	Delay in design of pumping plant.
Mill Creek, Ohio	−800,000	Delay in obtaining rights-of-way from local interests.

The FY 1977 Budget contains no funds to continue the 6 small project programs of the Corps for which the Congress has authorized and appropriated funds in prior years. It is further understood that the projects funded in the FY 1976 Bill will be discontinued unless they can be completed with funds currently available. The Report accompanying the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1976, directs the Corps to proceed with these programs as provided in the 1976 Public Works Appropriation Act.

The Committee has approved the following specific amounts under the various small project programs which are included in the total amount available:

SECTION 205—SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	COMMITTEE ALLOWANCE
1. Arkansas and Walnut Rivers, Kans	$100,000
2. Brush Bayou, La	800,000
3. Hayward Creek, Mass	1,000,000
4. Paw Paw Lake, Mich	50,000
5. Lead Bayou, Miss	125,000
6. Drinkwater Sewer Project, Mo	450,000
7. Chappaqua, N.Y	937,000
8. Lake Neahtahwantia and Tannery Creek, N.Y	50,000
9. Ten Mile Creek at Marianna and vicinity, Pennsylvania	1,100,000
10. Brookside, Wilkes-Barre, Pa	50,000
11. Redbank Creek, Pa	5,000
12. Scotts Creek, S.C	750,000
13. Rapid City, S. Dak	300,000
14. Sturgis, S. Dak	200,000
15. Walnut Creek, Tex	125,000
16. New London, Wis	50,000
SECTION 107—SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	
Islais Creek, Calif	880,000
San Leandro Marina, Calif	230,000
Rock Hall Harbor, Md	50,000
Rosedale Harbor, Miss	50,000
Caruthersville Harbor, Mo	54,000
Port Washington, Wis	142,000
SECTION 103—SMALL BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS	
Santa Rosa Island, Fla	60,000
SECTION 208—SMALL SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECTS	
Kankakee River, Ind	5,000

SECTION 14—EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION	COMMITTEE ALLOWANCE
Wastewater treatment plant, Pensacola Beach, Fla	$93,000
Cottonwood River, Chase and Lyons Counties, Kans	100,000

New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift Project, N.Y.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000, an increase of $1,710,000 over the $790,000 budgeted for this vital and important project. The purpose of this project is the removal of sources of drift, such as derelict vessels, deteriorated shore structures and debris along the shoreline of New York Harbor. The Committee continues to support this project, which is so important to the health and vitality of the 16 million people living in the area.

The total commerce for the port, which ranks first in the U.S. in total tonnage, has increased from 153,800,000 tons in 1965 to 195,095,000 in 1974. About 15 percent of the total waterborne and 13 percent of foreign commerce of the United States are handled by the port of New York. It is not in the national interest to allow this national asset to deteriorate.

Millican Lake, Tex.—The President's budget included $435,000 for Advance Engineering and Design for this project. The Committee in reporting the FY 1976 bill made the statement that "prior to any additional appropriations for construction purposes, the Corps should attempt to determine the extent of the lignite deposits in the area which would be inundated by such construction. . . ."

The Corps testified to the effect during the hearings on the present budget, that preliminary reports from the Bureau of Mines indicated the presence of lignite deposits "sufficient for us to believe that we must expand our study of alternatives on this project to look at possible locations for a structure other than the one which is authorized." They further stated that final reports from the Bureau of Mines would not be forthcoming until approximately July of 1976.

In view of these facts, while the Committee approves of the recommendations of the Administration, it feels rather strongly that it is incumbent upon the Corps to report back to the Committee the final findings of the Bureau of Mines in line with the request of the Committee in the FY 1976 report, prior to the expenditure of any of the monies contained in this Bill for any item except those expenses incurred in developing the aforementioned report.

East Fork and Caesar Creek Lakes, Ohio.—The Committee has been advised of a potential water quality problem at East Fork and Caesar Creek Lakes, Ohio. The Corps of Engineers is directed to provide the Committee with a report addressing the potential water quality problems at these projects.

Trinity River project, Texas.—The Committee directs that Environmental Impact Statement studies be conducted which will define the effects of the project upon the estuaries and their marine life. The studies should be conducted in sufficient detail to provide information upon which design of the project can avoid or minimize any damage to the natural resources. These studies should be coordinated with the National Marine Fishery Service, the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Texas Shrimp Association who are concerned with the marine life in the Trinity Bay.

Wallisville Lake, Tex.—Funds previously appropriated for the Wallisville Lake, Texas project are to be made available for the project as the project proceeds.

Gallipolis Lock and Dam, Ohio and West Virginia.—Early improvement of the existing navigation facilities at Gallipolis Lock and Dam, Ohio and West Virginia is of particular concern to the Committee. The Committee is advised that the inadequacies of the existing facilities burden essential commodity movements with excessive costs and shutdowns and delays disrupt supply schedules to the detriment of the economy of the Ohio and Mississippi Valley. Accordingly, the Committee wishes to express its interest in expeditious submission of the project report to the appropriate committees of Congress with a view to authorization this year.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton (J. F. Baldwin & Stockton Ship Channels), California.—Within available funds, model testing should be conducted as part of the ongoing studies for the 45 ft. portion of the San Francisco Bay to Stockton project to determine the feasibility of modifying releases from federally constructed or subsidized projects affecting Delta water quality and of breakwater salinity barrier use to reduce ocean salinity intrusion.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Appropriation, 1976	$163,250,000
Budget Estimate, 1977	191,220,000
Recommended, 1977	227,667,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+64,417,000
Budget Estimate, 1977	+36,447,000

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

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

	Budget fiscal year 1977	Committee recommendation
1. General investigations:		
(a) Surveys:		
Helena and vicinity, Arkansas		$75,000
Laconia Circle area, Desha County, Ark	$94,000	94,000
Lake Neark, Ark	100,000	100,000
St. Francis River Basin below Wappapello Lake, Ark. and Mo	145,000	145,000
West Memphis, Ark	110,000	110,000
Bayou du Chien, Ky	25,000	25,000
Atchafalaya Basin (water and land resources), Louisiana	475,000	475,000
Berwick lock—Atchafalaya Basin, La	25,000	25,000
Lake Providence, La	25,000	25,000
Louisiana State Penitentiary levee, Louisiana	25,000	25,000
Yazoo River Basin, Miss	450,000	600,000
Mississippi River—East Bank levees, Kentucky and Tennessee	130,000	130,000
Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and tributaries, Tennessee and Kentucky	150,000	150,000
Wolf and Loosahatchie Rivers and Nonconnah Creek, Tenn. and Miss	150,000	150,000
Mississippi River, Cairo, Ill., to Baton Rouge, La		50,000
(b) Collection and study of basic data	156,000	156,000
Subtotal, general investigations	2,060,000	2,335,000
2. Construction and planning:		
Mississippi River levees	29,725,000	30,225,000
Channel improvement	36,225,000	40,000,000
Old River, La	2,500,000	2,500,000
Lower Red River, South Bank levees, Louisiana	825,000	1,700,000
Atchafalaya Basin, La	31,665,000	35,000,000
Lower White River:		
Augusta-Clarendon levee		420,000
Clarendon levee		100,000
Cache Basin, Arkansas	1,000,000	1,500,000
St. Francis Basin, Ark. and Mo	9,750,000	12,500,000

See footnote at end of table.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

	Budget fiscal year 1977	Committee recommendation
2. Construction and planning—Continued		
Tensas Basin, Ark. and La.:		
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, except Lake Chicot pumping plant	$600,000	$1,380,000
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, Lake Chicot pumping plant	760,000	1,760,000
Red River Backwater Area, La., Except Tensas Cocodrie Pumping Plant	4,290,000	6,000,000
Red River Backwater area, Louisiana, Tensas Cocodrie pumping plant	860,000	2,860,000
Reelfoot Lake—Lake No. 9, Tennessee and Kentucky	1,500,000	2,100,000
West Kentucky tributaries	480,000	480,000
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries, Louisiana	280,000	330,000
Teche-Vermilion Basins, La	1,700,000	1,700,000
Yazoo Basin, Miss.:		
Sardis Lake	300,000	1,000,000
Arkabutla Lake	540,000	1,100,000
Enid Lake	300,000	1,000,000
Grenada Lake	870,000	1,700,000
Greenwood	80,000	100,000
Upper auxiliary channels	3,820,000	7,000,000
Main stem	500,000	1,000,000
Tributaries:		
Except Ascalmore-Tippo and Opossum Bayous	225,000	700,000
Ascalmore-Tippo and Opossum Bayous	275,000	1,075,000
Big Sunflower River, etc. (including Steele Bayou)	940,000	1,800,000
Yazoo Backwater:		
Except Muddy Bayou control structure	4,538,000	6,000,000
Muddy Bayou control structure	962,000	962,000
Streambank erosion control		2,000,000
West Tennessee tributaries	2,710,000	3,200,000
Bushley Bayou, La	[1] 300,000	[1] 300,000
Eastern Rapides and South Central Avoyelles Parishes, La	[1] 100,000	[1] 100,000
Greenville Harbor, Miss	[1] 400,000	[1] 400,000
Mississippi River, East Bank, Natchez area, Mississippi	[1] 200,000	[1] 200,000
Mississippi River, East Bank, Vicksburg-Yazoo area, Mississippi	[1] 140,000	[1] 140,000
Subtotal, construction and planning	139,360,000	170,332,000
3. Maintenance	49,800,000	55,000,000
Total	191,220,000	227,667,000

[1] Planning.

St. Francis Basin.—The Committee allowance includes the following increases over the budget: $75,000 for the County Bridges, Ditch 19, Item 1, Missouri; $325,000 for St. Francis below Marked Tree, Arkansas; $375,000 for Rivervale Outlet Ditch; and $1,305,000 for Cockleburr Slough Ditch.

Mississippi River Levees.—The Committee allowance includes $500,000 for the Madrid Bend Levee.

Mississippi River, Cairo, Ill. to Baton Rouge, La. (N).—The funds provided are for study of the economic justification of a deep-water channel on the Mississippi River from Baton Rouge to Ohio River. Particular attention should be given to the accommodation of mini-ship and LASH-type intermoded carriers downstream from Osceola, Arkansas, and Memphis, Tennessee.

Yazoo Basin.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for initiation of construction on the Big Sand Creek Levee extension.

Special attention is to be given to the cleanout and roads problems associated with Sardis, Enid, Arkabutla and Grenada Lakes in Mississippi, within the funds reimbursed through the Emergency Fund and included in this appropriation.

Tensas Basin-Larto Lake to Jonesville area, Louisiana.—The Committee recommends $927,000 for the Larto Lake to Jonesville area, Louisiana. The funds provided in the bill are sufficient to complete the work in this area.

Nonconnah Creek, Tennessee and Mississippi.—The Committee calls on the Corps of Engineers to submit the Nonconnah Creek,

Tennessee and Mississippi study to the appropriate Congressional Committees so that it may be considered for project authorization. The flood control and other benefits which could be derived from this project are vitally important to the entire area.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1976	$582,073,000
Budget estimate, 1977	583,900,000
Recommended, 1977	648,900,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+66,827,000
Budget estimate, 1977	+65,000,000

Cecil M. Harden Lake, Ind.—The Committee is informed that at a number of locations along the project fee boundary line the project seasonal or summer pool extends beyond the fee and easement boundaries on to privately-owned properties. The Corps is directed to reexamine the fee boundary line established for this project and take such action as appropriate to solve these problems.

Within the total increase allowed, following are specific projects in the operation and maintenance category which have been increased:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

	Budget	Allowance	Increase
Alabama Coosa Rivers, Ala	$1,550,000	$1,820,000	+$270,000
Black Warrior, Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala	4,700,000	6,000,000	+1,300,000
GIWW-Mobile District, Alabama, Florida and Mississippi	1,244,000	2,044,000	+800,000
Millers Ferry lock and dam, Alabama	1,360,000	1,789,000	+429,000
Mobile Harbor, Ala	2,350,000	3,708,000	+1,358,000
Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama	1,800,000	2,000,000	+200,000
Osceola Harbor, Ark	125,000	165,000	+40,000
Humboldt Harbor and Bay, Calif	670,000	835,000	+165,000
New Hogan Lake, Calif	520,000	825,000	+305,000
San Francisco Bay-Delta Model structure, California	340,000	565,000	+225,000
San Leandro Marina, Calif		330,000	+330,000
San Rafael Creek, Calif		530,000	+530,000
Yuba River, Calif	50,000	90,000	+40,000
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Fla	2,900,000	3,482,000	+582,000
Cross Florida Barge Canal, Fla	957,000	1,367,000	+410,000
East Pass Channel, Fla	149,000	399,000	+250,000
Fernandina Harbor, Fla	265,000	505,000	+240,000
IWW-Jacksonville to Miami, Fla	2,010,000	2,820,000	+810,000
Jacksonville Harbor, Fla	580,000	1,300,000	+720,000
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida	1,800,000	2,405,000	+605,000
Calumet Harbor and River diked disposal, Illinois	50,000	148,000	+98,000
Carlyle Lake, Ill	1,445,000	2,000,000	+555,000
Chicago Harbor, diked disposal, Illinois		80,000	+80,000
Kaskaskia River navigation, Illinois	1,220,000	1,260,000	+40,000
Chicago River diked disposal, Illinois		90,000	+90,000
Shelbyville Lake, Ill	1,550,000	2,100,000	+550,000
Ohio River open channel work, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia and Kentucky	2,107,000	3,860,000	+1,753,000
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin and Iowa (environmental resources study	200,000	1,127,000	+927,000
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill	5,900,000	8,900,000	+3,000,000
Cecil M. Harden Lake, Mansfield Lake, Ind	266,000	318,000	+52,000
Red Rock Dam-Lake Red Rock, Iowa	875,000	1,227,000	+352,000
Buckhorn Lake, Ky	299,000	339,000	+40,000
Kentucky River, Ky	2,197,000	3,857,000	+1,660,000
Wolf Creek Dam-Lake Cumberland, Ky	1,777,000	2,776,000	+999,000
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf, Louisiana	15,400,000	17,000,000	+1,600,000
Mississippi River, gulf outlet, Louisiana	3,680,000	5,680,000	+2,000,000
Portland Harbor, Maine	593,000	890,000	+297,000
Cape Cod Canal, Mass	3,320,000	3,575,000	+255,000
Newburyport Harbor, Mass		502,000	+502,000
Detroit River, diked disposal, Michigan	1,789,000	4,000,000	+2,211,000
Rouge River, diked disposal, Michigan	900,000	2,000,000	+1,100,000
Saginaw River, diked disposal, Michigan	5,068,000	6,100,000	+1,032,000
St. Mary's River, Mich	5,415,000	6,000,000	+585,000
Duluth-Superior, diked disposal, Minnesota		1,000,000	+1,000,000
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, diked disposal, New York	175,000	285,000	+110,000
Buffalo Harbor, diked disposal, New York	1,615,000	2,000,000	+385,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

	Budget	Allowance	Increase
New York Harbor, removal of drift, New York	$1,954,000	$2,085,000	$+131,000
Cleveland Harbor, diked disposal, Ohio	6,634,000	8,000,000	+1,366,000
Lorain Harbor, diked disposal, Ohio	2,000,000	4,000,000	+2,000,000
Coos Bay, Oreg	1,035,000	1,235,000	+200,000
Channel to Port Bolivar, Tex	50,000	100,000	+50,000
Clear Creek and Clear Lake, Tex		100,000	+100,000
Corpus Christi ship channel, Texas	3,255,000	5,500,000	+2,245,000
Double Bayou, Tex		135,000	+135,000
Gulf IWW, Rockport portion, Texas		70,000	+70,000
Gulf IWW, Texas	6,895,000	8,700,000	+1,805,000
Houston ship channel, Texas	1,190,000	2,590,000	+1,400,000
Little Bay, Fulton portion, Texas		100,000	+100,000
Matagorda ship channel, Texas	765,000	1,000,000	+235,000
Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex	2,143,000	4,000,000	+1,857,000
Texas City Channel, Tex		700,000	+700,000
Norfolk Harbor, Va	1,650,000	2,000,000	+350,000
Kenosha Harbor, Wis	139,000	189,000	+50,000

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 1976	$70,400,000
Budget estimate, 1977	18,140,000
Recommended, 1977	30,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	−40,400,000
Budget estimate, 1977	+11,860,000

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.

The Committee recommends a total of $30,000,000 for flood control and coastal emergencies which is $11,860,000 above the budget request.

Section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, as amended (33 USC 701 n), established this fund. This legislation provides the authority to utilize certain sums to meet emergency work by transfer to the emergency fund subject to reimbursement and reads, in part, as follows: "Provided that pending the appropriation of said sum, the Secretary of the Army may allot, from existing flood-control appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized. Such appropriation to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made."

It is clearly the intent of this legislation that funds diverted from other appropriations to meet the urgent flood emergencies through this fund are to be reimbursed.

The Committee directs that in the future all transfers made from projects in other Corps accounts to the Emergency Fund be reported in advance to the appropriate congressional committees. The Committee expects to be kept fully advised of any such transfers and deviation from this directive will not be tolerated.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1976	$43,700,000
Budget estimate, 1977	47,400,000
Recommended, 1977	47,200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+3,500,000
Budget estimate, 1977	−200,000

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.

The reduction of $200,000 is applied to travel, rent, communications and utilities and other services.

SPECIAL RECREATION USE FEES

Appropriation, 1976	$1,200,000
Budget estimate, 1977	3,100,000
Recommended, 1977	2,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+800,000
Budget estimate, 1977	−1,100,000

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 $285,000,000 for 1977 on the total capital of the revolving fund, the same as the budget request.

In order to enable the Corps of Engineers to determine the feasibility of a new sand bypassing and other experimental techniques in shallow draft inlets, the Corps is directed to proceed immediately with the design and modification of the *Currituck* to provide a self-loading capability. This modification, which is estimated to cost $300,000, will be accomplished within available funds and without exceeding the Corpus amount authorized by the Congress.

This action is not intended to impact on the private sector should they further develop this dredging demonstration technique.

The Committee is advised that the Corps of Engineers popular Bicentennial exhibit towboat the *Sergeant Floyd* has appeared in over 150 communities along the Inland and Intracoastal Waterways, and by year's end visitors to this exhibit are expected to total 1,000,000.

The Committee feels it is desirable to preserve this unique symbol of the past and encourages the Chief of Engineers to give consideration to making this vessel available to an interested riverside or coastal community which would establish the vessel as a permanent exhibit or museum in the national historical interest.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1976	$20,892,000
Budget estimate, 1977	21,030,000
Recommended, 1977	24,487,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+3,595,000
Budget estimate, 1977	+3,457,000

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	Type of Project	Budget Est. FY 1977	House Approved FY 1977
		$ 75,000	$ 75,000
ARIZONA			
Boulder Canyon, Hoover Powerplant Modifications	Feas.-P		
CALIFORNIA			
Central Valley:			
Calaveras County division	Appr.-I,M&I,P	---	50,000
Delta Support Studies	Sp. Inv.	340,000	340,000
East Side division, Mid-Valley Canal	Feas.-I,M&I	65,000	65,000
Total Water Management Study	Sp. Inv.	330,000	330,000
Energy Research and Development (Geothermal)		300,000	300,000
Geothermal Resources Investigations		1,200,000	2,520,000
Klamath, Butte Valley Division (see Oregon)			
Lahontan Basin Total Water Management Study (see Nevada)			
Lake-Yolo Counties Study	Appr.-I	37,000	37,000
Mendocino County Study	Appr.-I,M&I	37,000	37,000
Mojave-Coachella, Reformulation	Feas.	30,000	30,000
Napa County Study	Appr.-I	37,000	37,000
Sacramento River Drainage and Seepage Utilization	Appr.-I	100,000	100,000
San Joaquin Valley Drainage	Appr.	105,000	105,000
Solano County Water	Feas.	115,000	115,000
Suisun Marsh Management Study	Appr.	38,000	38,000
Susanville geothermal investigations	Feas.	---	267,000
Ventura County Water Management	Feas.-I,M&I	46,000	46,000
COLORADO			
CRSP Power Peaking Capacity	Feas.-P	102,848	102,848
Dominguez Reservoir	Feas.-M&I,P	150,000	150,000
Energy Research and Development (Pumped Storage)		200,000	200,000
Front Range Unit (Long's Peak Division, P-SMBP)	Feas.-M&I	90,000	90,000
Grand Mesa, Reformulation	Feas.-I,M&I	58,000	58,000
Uncompahgre Improvement	Feas.	73,830	73,830
Upper Colorado Resource Study	Feas.-I,M&I	285,000	285,000
Water Resources Planning and Engineering Research		2,600,000	2,450,000
IDAHO			
Minidoka, Minidoka Powerplant Rehabilitation & Enlargement	Feas.-P	75,000	75,000
Southwest Idaho Water Management Study	Sp. Inv.	205,000	205,000
Upper Snake River, Oakley Fan Division, Reformulation	Feas.	150,000	150,000
Upper Snake River Water Management Study	Sp. Inv.	204,000	204,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	Type of Project	Budget Est. FY 1977	House Approved FY 1977
KANSAS			
Chikaskia	Feas.-M&I	101,000	101,000
Kansas State Water Plan--Phase II	Appr.	167,000	167,000
Solomon River Basin Water Management Study (P-SMBP)	Sp. Inv.	53,000	53,000
MONTANA			
Eastern Montana Basins	Appr.	25,000	25,000
Hardin Unit, Reformulation	Feas.	75,000	75,000
Total Water Management Study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota)			
NEBRASKA			
Crofton unit	Appr.-I	---	50,000
Highland Unit (Elkhorn Division, P-SMBP)	Feas.-I	40,000	40,000
NEVADA			
Lahontan Basin Total Water Management Study	Sp. Inv.	80,000	80,000
NEW MEXICO			
Boulder Canyon, Hoover Powerplant Modifications (see Arizona)	Sp. Inv.	168,000	168,000
Elephant Butte Reservoir - Ft. Quitman	Feas.-M&I	120,000	120,000
Gallup	Sp. Inv.	100,000	150,000
Llano-Estacado Total Water Management Study	Appr.-M&I	50,000	100,000
Raton Water Supply	Feas.-I	40,000	40,000
Tucumcari			
NORTH DAKOTA			
Apple Creek	Feas.-I,M&I	260,000	260,000
Garrison Diversion Unit, M&I Facilities (P-SMBP)	Feas.-M&I	50,000	50,000
Total Water Management Study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota)		---	30,000
Versippi Alternative, Dickinson unit, Heart Division	Feas.-M&I		
OKLAHOMA			
Cache Creek	Feas.-M&I	44,000	44,000
Criner Hills	Appr.-M&I	4,000	4,000
McGee Creek	Feas.-M&I	100,000	100,000
Oklahoma State Water Plan	Appr.	120,000	120,000
Seward	Feas.-M&I	100,000	150,000

OREGON			
Klamath, Butte Valley Division	Feas.-I	120,000	120,000
Rogue River Basin, Grants Pass Division	Feas.	100,000	100,000
Rogue River Basin, Medford Division, Reformulation	Feas.	50,000	50,000
Umatilla Basin	Feas.-I,M&I	69,000	69,000
Walla Walla, Reformulation (see Washington)			
Willamette River, Molalla Division	Feas.-I,M&I	55,000	55,000
SOUTH DAKOTA			
Oahe Unit, M&I Water Facilities (James Division, P-SMBP)	Feas.-M&I	50,000	50,000
Total Water Management Study, Missouri River Upstream of Gavins Point (P-SMBP)	Sp. Inv.	120,000	120,000
TEXAS			
Elephant Butte Reservoir - Ft. Quitman (see New Mexico)			
Lake Meredith Salinity Study	Appr.	60,000	60,000
Llano-Estacado Total Water Management Study (see New Mexico)			
Texas Basins	Feas.-I,M&I	114,000	114,000
UTAH			
Central Utah, Ute Indian Unit	Feas.-I,M&I,P	653,000	653,000
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	12,000	12,000
Columbia Basin, Grand Coulee Dam Third Powerplant Extension	Feas.-P	101,000	101,000
Walla Walla Reformulation	Feas.-M&I	120,000	120,000
Yakima, Yakima Indian Reservation	Feas.	75,000	75,000
Yakima, Bumping Lake Enlargement, Reformulation	Feas.-I	25,000	25,000
Yakima Valley Water Management Study	Sp. Inv.	210,000	210,000
WYOMING			
CRSP Power Peaking Capacity (see Colorado)			
Minidoka, Minidoka Powerplant Rehabilitation and Enlargement (see Idaho)			
Muddy Ridge Area, Riverton unit	Feas.-I	---	40,000
North Platte River Hydroelectric Study (Oregon Trail Div., P-SMBP)	Appr.-P	50,000	50,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	Type of Project	Budget Est. FY 1977	House Approved FY 1977
Seminoe Dam Modification (Kendrick Project)	Feas.-I,M&I,P	170,000	170,000
Sublette	Feas.-I,M&I	186,000	186,000
Total Water Mangement Study (P-SMBP) (see South Dakota)			
Upper Snake River, Oakley Fan Division, Reformulation (see Idaho)			
Upper Snake River Water Management Study (see Idaho)			
VARIOUS STATES			
Colorado River Water Quality Improvement Program	Feas.	1,950,000	1,950,000
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Studies		554,000	554,000
General Engineering and Research:			
Atmospheric Water Resources Management Program		4,650,000	6,400,000
General Planning Studies		250,000	200,000
Special Investigations:			
Environmental and Interagency Coordination Activities		1,508,000	1,508,000
Minor Work in Connection with Completed Project Investigations		862,000	862,000
Investigations of Existing Projects		128,000	128,000
Print Reports		35,000	35,000
Projects Not Yet Identified		25,000	25,000
Total		9,962,000	11,662,000
Classified Pay Raise (E.O. 11883)		506,000	506,000
Distributive Charges for Service Facilities, Unliquidated Obligations, etc		-123,678	-123,678
General Reduction due to Slippage, Savings, and Carryover Balances		-400,000	-400,000
Total, General Investigations		21,030,000	24,487,000

The Committee recommends the following decreases from the budget request:

Water resources planning and engineering research: Engineering Works	-$150,000
General planning studies	-50,000

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Appropriation, 1976	$327,308,000
Budget estimate, 1977	347,017,000
Recommended, 1977	351,386,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+24,078,000
Budget estimate, 1977	+4,369,000

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	Budget Est. FY 1977 Planning	House Approved FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Planning
ARIZONA				
Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie.....	$ 810,000	$ ---	$ 810,000	$ ---
CALIFORNIA				
Central Valley Project:				
Sacramento River division.....	32,000,000	---	32,000,000	---
San Luis unit:				
Westlands distribution and drainage system.....	14,090,000	---	16,000,000	---
San Luis drain.....	4,050,000	---	4,050,000	---
All other San Luis unit facilities.....	5,472,000	---	5,472,000	---
Subtotal, San Luis unit.....	23,612,000	---	25,522,000	---
Auburn-Folsom South unit:				
Auburn Dam and Reservoir.....	40,914,000	---	40,914,000	---
Folsom South Canal.....	266,000	---	500,000	---
All other Auburn-Folsom South unit facilities.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
Subtotal, Auburn-Folsom South unit.....	41,505,000	---	41,739,000	---
Miscellaneous project programs.....	11,750,000	---	11,865,000	---
San Felipe division.....	12,725,000	---	12,725,000	---
Total, Central Valley Project.....	121,592,000	---	123,851,000	---
Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie (see Arizona)				
COLORADO				
Dolores project.....	---	---	850,000	---
Fryingpan-Arkansas project.....	39,000,000	---	39,000,000	---
San Luis Valley project, Closed Basin division.....	---	375,000	---	375,000
IDAHO				
Teton Basin project, Lower Teton division.....	5,300,000	---	5,300,000	---
Upper Snake River project, Salmon Falls division.....	---	400,000	---	400,000
NEW MEXICO				
Brantley project.....	5,600,000	---	5,600,000	---
NEVADA				
Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie (see Arizona)				
Southern Nevada Water project.....	---	200,000	1,200,000	---
OKLAHOMA				
Mountain Park project.....	6,500,000	---	6,500,000	---
OREGON				
Rogue River Basin project, Merlin division.....	---	300,000	---	300,000
Tualatin project.....	9,000,000	---	9,000,000	---
TEXAS				
Palmetto Bend project.....	16,400,000	---	16,400,000	---
Nueces River project.....	---	---	4,500,000	---
WASHINGTON				
Columbia Basin project:				
Irrigation facilities.....	16,400,000	---	16,400,000	---
Third powerplant.....	44,900,000	---	44,900,000	---
Total, Columbia Basin Project.....	61,300,000	---	61,300,000	---
Walla Walla project, Touchet division.....	---	300,000	---	300,000
Yakima project, Kennewick division.....	---	---	---	25,000
VARIOUS				
Drainage and minor construction program:				
All-American Canal System, California	5,000	---	5,000	---
Belle Fourche project, South Dakota.....	2,800,000	---	2,800,000	---
Boise project, Payette division, Idaho.....	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada.....	1,000,000	---	---	---
Gila project, Arizona.....	120,000	---	120,000	---
Kendrick project, Wyoming.....	510,000	---	510,000	---
Klamath project, Oregon-California.....	1,070,000	---	1,070,000	---
Lower Rio Grande project, Mercedes division, Texas.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
Miscellaneous engineering services, Colorado.....	10,000	---	10,000	---
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada.....	2,415,000	---	2,415,000	---
Recreation facilities at existing reservoirs, various states.....	405,000	---	405,000	---
Rogue River Basin project - Savage Rapids Dam Fishway modifications, Oregon.....	780,000	---	780,000	---
San Angelo project, Texas.....	50,000	---	50,000	---
Solano project - Lake Berryessa recreational facilities, California.....	900,000	---	900,000	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	Budget Est. FY 1977 Planning	House Approved FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Planning
Umatilla project, McKay Dam spillway modification...	----	----	150,000	----
Ventura River project - Casitas Reservoir open space, California.....	1,200,000	----	1,800,000	----
Washoe project, Nevada-California.....	330,000	----	330,000	----
Total.....	13,395,000	----	13,145,000	----
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects:				
Crooked River project, Ochoco Irrigation District, Oregon.....	100,000	----	100,000	----
Hyrum project, Utah.....	----	----	235,000	----
Minidoka project, Burley Irrigation Dist., Idaho....	500,000	----	500,000	----
Newlands project, Nevada.....	400,000	----	400,000	----
Rio Grande project, El Paso County Improvement District No. 1, Texas.....	1,000,000	----	1,000,000	----
Rogue River Basin project, Medford and Rogue River Valley Irrigation District, Oregon.....	125,000	----	125,000	----
Salt River project, Arizona.....	1,000,000	----	1,000,000	----
Shoshone project, Garland division, Wyoming.....	550,000	----	550,000	----
Solano County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, California.....	----	----	500,000	----
Tucumcari project, New Mexico.....	100,000	----	100,000	----
Uncompahgre project, Colorado.....	200,000	----	200,000	----
Yakima project, Snipes Mountain Irrigation District, Washington.....	200,000	----	200,000	----
Total.....	4,175,000	----	4,910,000	----
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM				
COLORADO				
Narrows unit.....	3,995,000	----	3,995,000	----
MONTANA				
Canyon Ferry unit (dust abatement).....	2,300,000	----	2,300,000	----
Lower Marias unit, Tiber Dam modifications.....	4,500,000	----	4,500,000	----
NEBRASKA				
North Loup division.....	1,000,000	----	1,000,000	
O'Neill unit.....	1,300,000	----	1,300,000	

NORTH DAKOTA				
Dickinson unit.....	----	----	----	100,000
Garrison diversion unit.....	23,500,000	----	23,500,000	----
SOUTH DAKOTA				
Oahe unit.....	16,600,000	---	16,600,000	---
Pollock-Herreid unit.....	---	---	---	100,000
WYOMING				
Polecat Bench unit.....	---	---	---	50,000
Riverton unit.....	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
VARIOUS				
Transmission division.....	16,620,000	---	16,620,000	---
Drainage and minor construction program:				
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas.....	1,380,000	---	1,380,000	---
East Bench unit, Montana.....	210,000	---	210,000	---
Farwell unit, Nebraska.....	730,000	---	730,000	---
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska.....	225,000	---	225,000	---
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming.....	90,000	---	90,000	---
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming.....	1,160,000	---	1,160,000	---
Total, Drainage and minor construction program.....	3,795,000	---	3,795,000	---
Total, Pick-Sloan Missouri basin program.....	76,610,000	---	76,610,000	250,000
Subtotal, Construction & Rehabilitation...	359,682,000	1,575,000	368,976,000	1,650,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays.....	-14,240,000	---	-19,240,000	---
Total, Construction & Rehabilitation	347,017,000		351,386,000	

The Committee recommends the following decreases from the budget:

(1) Boulder Canyon Project, Nevada and Arizona (Drainage and Minor Construction) Budgeted funds are not authorized.	−$1, 000, 000
(2) San Luis Unit, California, Central Valley Project (Integration gravity and ground water pumping) Department of Interior Solicitor determined that major change in the plans for ground water integration facilities require additional authorization.	−1, 800, 000
(3) Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−5, 000, 000

Garrison Diversion Unit, N.D.—The Committee recommends that funds available for wildlife mitigation, after coordination with the appropriate state agencies, shall be used for carrying out the updated wildlife plan for the Garrison Diversion Unit.

Miscellaneous Project Programs, Central Valley Project.—The Committee allowance includes $115,000 for the Sly Park Dam and Reservoir, California.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Appropriation, 1976	$41, 152, 000
Budget estimate, 1977	[1] 61, 231, 000
Recommended, 1977	59, 331, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+18, 179, 000
Budget estimate, 1977	−1, 900, 000

[1] Reflects decrease of $4,800,000 contained in House Doc. 94–478.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT - BASIN FUND	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	Budget Est. FY 1977 Planning	House Approved FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Planning
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT				
COLORADO				
Curecanti unit	$ 3,280,000	$ ---	$ 3,280,000	$ ---
VARIOUS				
Transmission Division	13,200,000	---	13,200,000	---
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS				
COLORADO				
Animas-La Plata project	---	200,000	---	200,000
Dallas Creek project	4,500,000	---	4,500,000	---
Fruitland Mesa project	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
San Juan-Chama project	800,000 1/	---	800,000	---
San Miguel project	---	480,000	---	480,000
Savery-Pot Hook project	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
West Divide project	---	230,000	---	230,000
NEW MEXICO				
Animas-La Plata project (see Colorado)				
San Juan-Chama project (see Colorado)				
UTAH				
Central Utah project, Bonneville unit	20,300,000	---	21,100,000	---
Central Utah project, Jensen unit	6,300,000	---	6,300,000	---
Central Utah project, Uintah unit	---	860,000	---	860,000
Central Utah project, Upalco unit	---	800,000	---	800,000
Lyman project (see Wyoming)				
WYOMING				
Lyman project	3,600,000	---	3,600,000	---
Savery-Pot Hook project (see Colorado)				
VARIOUS				
Drainage and minor construction program:				
Participating projects:				
Central Utah project, Vernal unit, Utah	560,000	---	560,000	---
Emery County project, Utah	140,000	---	140,000	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT - BASIN FUND	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	Budget Est. FY 1977 Planning	House Approved FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Planning
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	-2,350,000	---	-5,050,000	---
Subtotal	-1,650,000	---	-4,350,000	---
Total	54,530,000	2,570,000	52,630,000	2,570,000
Recreational and Fish and Wildlife facilities:				
Recreational facilities	925,000	---	925,000	---
Fish and wildlife facilities	3,206,000	---	3,206,000	---
Total	4,131,000	---	4,131,000	---
Total,	58,661,000	2,570,000	56,761,000	2,570,000
Total, Upper Colorado River Storage Project	61,231,000		59,331,000	

1/ Includes reduction of $4,800,000 contained in House Doc. 94-478.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Appropriation, 1976	$29,205,000
Budget estimate, 1977	73,420,000
Recommended, 1977	73,420,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+44,215,000
Budget estimate, 1977	

Included in the estimate are the following:

Granite Reef Division	$60,622,000
Orme Division	1,050,000
Salt-Gila Division	2,750,000
Gila River Division	2,100,000
Tucson Division	20,000
Transmission Facilities	5,398,000
Miscellaneous items	1,480,000
Total	73,420,000

The Committee understands that a 6-mile segment of the Liberty-Parker 230 Kv transmission line of the Central Arizona Project will parallel a proposed transmission line of the Arizona Public Service Company. The Siting Committee of Arizona has suggested joint construction of this segment of the transmission line because of environmental considerations. Joint construction will also create a cost savings to the Federal Government estimated at $200,000. The Committee recommends that the Bureau of Reclamation participate in the joint construction and that fiscal year 1977 funds be made available for this purpose.

APPROPRIATION TO LIQUIDATE CONTRACT AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 1976	$22,440,000
Budget estimate, 1977	20,600,000
Recommended, 1977	20,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	−1,840,000
Budget estimate, 1977	

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

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS

Appropriation, 1976	$19,670,000
Budget estimate, 1977	43,120,000
Recommended, 1977	44,700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+25,030,000
Budget estimate, 1977	+1,580,000

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 United States and Mexico.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	Budget Est. FY 1977 Planning	House Approved FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Planning
TITLE II				
COLORADO				
Grand Valley Systems Improvement and Management unit	$ ---	$ 150,000	$ 730,000	$ ---
Paradox Valley unit	---	50,000	550,000	---
NEVADA				
Las Vegas Wash unit	---	300,000	800,000	---
UTAH				
Crystal Geyser unit	---	20,000	---	20,000
Total	---	520,000	2,080,000	20,000
TITLE I				
VARIOUS				
Measures below Imperial Dam	42,600,000	---	42,600,000	---
Total,	42,600,000	520,000	44,680,000	20,000
Total, Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Projects	43,120,000		44,700,000	

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1976	$132,162,000
Budget estimate, 1977	143,000,000
Recommended, 1977	143,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+10,838,000
Budget estimate, 1977	

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.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1976	$22,665,000
Budget estimate 1977	10,773,000
Recommended, 1977	22,209,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	−456,000
Budget estimate 1977	+11,436,000

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:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM	Budget Est. FY 1977 Construction	House Approved FY 1977 Construction
ARIZONA		
Gila River Farms	$ —	$ 500,000
Valley Center Water District, Supplemental	1,500,000	1,500,000
CALIFORNIA		
Buttonwillow Improvement District, Supplemental	1,500,000	2,000,000
DeLuz Heights Municipal Water District	—	300,000
Kanawha Water District, Phase II	—	1,000,000
LaBranza Water District	—	722,000
Pioneer Water Company, Supplemental	—	414,000
Pond-Poso Improvement District, Supplemental	—	2,000,000
Pond-Poso Improvement District	264,000	264,000
Redwood Valley Water District	2,100,000	2,100,000
San Luis Water District, Supplemental	1,500,000	4,000,000
MONTANA		
Buffalo Rapids Irrigation District	215,000	215,000
NEBRASKA		
Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District	2,660,000	2,660,000
TEXAS		
Cameron County Water Control and Impr. District No. 19	—	1,000,000
Hidalgo County Water Improvement District No. 5	—	1,000,000
Hidalgo and Willacy Counties Water Control and Improvement District No. 1	533,000	533,000
UTAH		
Roy Water Conservancy Subdistrict, supplemental	—	1,500,000
WASHINGTON		
Wenatchee Heights Reclamation District	195,000	195,000
Administration of loan program	338,000	338,000
Subtotal	10,805,000	22,241,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	-32,000	-32,000
Total, Loan Program	10,773,000	22,209,000

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriation, 1976	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1977	1,000,000
Recommended, 1977	400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	−600,000
Budget estimate, 1977	−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

Appropriation, 1976	$21,840,000
Budget estimate, 1977	22,600,000
Recommended, 1977	22,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+760,000
Budget estimate, 1977	

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

Appropriation, 1976	$652,000
Budget estimate, 1977	763,000
Recommended, 1977	749,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+97,000
Budget estimate, 1977	−14,000

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.

It is recommended that reductions be made as follows: −$5,000 for travel and transportation of persons, −$2,000 for printing and reproduction, −$5,000 for other services, and −$2,000 for supplies and materials.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1976	$1,007,500
Budget estimate, 1977	1,164,000
Recommended, 1977	1,141,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+133,500
Budget estimate, 1977	−23,000

This appropriation item covers the expenses of the Alaska Power Administration in the operation and maintenance of the Eklutna project and the Snettisham project.

It is recommended that reductions be made as follows: −$2,000 for travel and transportation of persons, −$20,000 for other services, and −$1,000 for supplies and materials.

Bonneville Power Administration

Appropriation, 1976	0
Budget estimate, 1977	0

Public Law 93–454 creates the Bonneville Power Administration Fund in order that the agency and its programs be financed from power revenues and sale of bonds; direct appropriations are no longer required. FY 1976 was the first under which BPA operated without appropriations and this is to be continued in FY 1977.

The Committee is pleased with the evidence of BPA operating in a businesslike manner and being concerned with keeping control of its costs; the Committee holds BPA accountable for the financial integrity of its operation.

The Committee recognizes that the Bonneville Power Administration transmission system covers a large land area. The area covers a wide range of wind characteristics. In its participation with the Energy Research and Development Administration and National Aeronautics and Space Administration on an integrated wind generation research project, the Committee expects the Bonneville Power Administration to fund its portion of the research costs consistent with what other utilities would fund in such a joint effort.

Southeastern Power Administration

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1976	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1977	1,106,000
Recommended, 1977	1,076,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+76,000
Budget estimate, 1977	−30,000

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 totaling $30,000 because the testimony did not adequately justify requested increases.

Southwestern Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1976	$680,000
Budget estimate, 1977	960,000
Recommended, 1977	896,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+216,000
Budget estimate, 1977	−64,000

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 $4,000 for transportation of things and $60,000 for equipment. Testimony received by the

Committee does not adequately justify full requested increases in these items.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1976	$6,080,000
Budget estimate, 1977	7,821,000
Recommended, 1977	7,707,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+1,627,000
Budget estimate, 1977	−114,000

This appropriation is required for system operation and maintenance, purchase of power and wheeling charges and general administration.

The Committee recommends reductions of $114,000 for travel and transportation of persons and things, communications, supplies and materials, equipment and other services.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Appalachian Regional Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1976	$1,870,000
Budget estimate, 1977	1,897,000
Recommended, 1977	1,897,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+27,000
Budget estimate, 1977	----------

The appropriation for salaries and expenses provides for the full cost of the Federal Cochairman and his immediate staff and the contribution by the Federal Government of 50 percent of the Administrative expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission. The requested budget increase is primarily for wage increases.

Appalachian Regional Development Programs

(FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PRESIDENT)

Appropriation, 1976	$288,200,000
Budget estimate, 1977	298,500,000
Recommended, 1977	300,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+12,300,000
Budget estimate, 1977	+2,000,000

The budget program and proposed allowance follow:

Program	1976	1977	Allowance
Area development	$115,000,000	$104,500,000	$104,500,000
Research and local development districts	8,500,000	9,000,000	8,500,000
Highways	162,200,000	185,000,000	185,000,000
Appalachian Craft Center	2,500,000	0	2,500,000
Total	288,200,000	298,500,000	300,500,000

The Committee recommends a total of $300,500,000 for the Appalachian Regional Development Program.

The budget increase of $500,000 for local development districts has not been allowed by the Committee because testimony was unclear as to the specific purpose of these funds.

The Committee has added $2,500,000 for completion of the craft center in mid-Appalachia.

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1976	$81,000
Budget estimate, 1977	83,000
Recommended, 1977	83,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+2,000
Budget estimate, 1977	

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

Appropriation, 1976	$215,000
Budget estimate, 1977	198,000
Recommended, 1977	198,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	−17,000
Budget estimate, 1977	

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

Appropriation, 1976	$36,560,000
Budget estimate, 1977	41,582,000
Recommended, 1977	41,582,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+5,022,000
Budget estimate, 1977	

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.

Although the requested budget represents a substantial increase over the current year funding level, the Committee allows the request in view of the energy crisis and recommendations made by the General Accounting Office in regards to FPC.

In a recent report, GAO found that FPC has a substantial backlog of hydroelectric power license applications and, under current conditions, this backlog is expected to increase. Testimony before the Committee by FPC officials indicated that the budget request was sufficient to provide funding and staff to expedite and reduce the backlog of hydroelectric applications.

Further, the Committee recognizes the importance of FPC's role in the regulation of hydroelectric power and interstate natural gas and the impact this regulation may have on helping to relieve the energy crisis.

The proposed budget program is as follows:

Program	Fiscal year 1976	Fiscal year 1977	Change
Hydroelectric regulation	$5,536,000	$6,472,000	+$936,000
Electric power industry systems evaluation	3,750,000	3,768,000	+18,000
Electric power utilities regulation	4,887,000	5,453,000	+566,000
Natural gas pipeline regulation	11,372,000	13,677,000	+2,305,000
Natural gas producers regulation	5,081,000	5,613,000	+532,000
Natural gas industry systems evaluation	388,000	616,000	+228,000
Services to other agencies and public	2,386,000	2,592,000	+206,000
Energy utilization	541,000	438,000	−103,000
Administration	2,619,000	2,953,000	+334,000
Total	36,560,000	41,582,000	+5,022,000

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriation, 1976	$52,000
Budget estimate, 1977	
Recommended, 1977	52,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	
Budget estimate, 1977	+52,000

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1949 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.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1976	$217,423,000
Budget estimate, 1977	249,430,000
Recommended, 1977	244,430,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+27,007,000
Budget estimate, 1977	−5,000,000

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is responsible for the review and licensing involved with applications to construct and operate nuclear power plants, the licensing of various non-civilian power nuclear facilities, research in nuclear safety, the development of standards, the inspection of operating nuclear plants, the development of safeguards systems and various studies.

The Committee recommends a total of $244,430,000 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. This is a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget estimate.

Section 205 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 indicates that the Energy Research and Development Administration should provide research services and facilities to NRC for the purpose of conducting NRC sponsored safety research.

The Committee is concerned about the dramatic increase in cost of the Plenum Fill Experimental Facility. The original estimate for this

facility was about $2,000,000, the current estimate is $27,400,000. While this facility may be needed, the Committee feels that the Congress should be given an opportunity to review the experiment. A total of $2,300,000 has been provided in the Energy Research and Development Administration's appropriation to develop the detailed engineering and design and detailed cost estimates for this facility. The Committee recommends a reduction of $1,500,000 for this program in the budget of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Other reductions include $300,000 in Program Direction and Administration and $3,200,000 for anticipated unobligated balances.

The funds included in the bill will provide for a total of 2,529 permanent positions which is an increase of 240 positions over the current year.

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

Susquehanna River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1976	$81,000
Budget estimate, 1977	83,000
Recommended, 1977	83,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+2,000
Budget estimate, 1977	

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

Appropriation, 1976	$150,000
Budget estimate, 1977	150,000
Recommended, 1977	150,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	
Budget estimate, 1977	

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

Appropriation, 1976	$100,025,000
Budget estimate, 1977	121,185,000
Recommended, 1977	120,930,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+20,905,000
Budget estimate, 1977	−255,000

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

	Budget estimate	Allowance	Change
CAPITAL OUTLAY			
Water resources development:			
Multipurpose facilities:			
Columbia Dam and Reservoir	$17,000,000	$20,000,000	+3,000,000
Bear Creek water control system	16,049,000	16,049,000	0
Tellico Dam and Reservoir	9,700,000	9,700,000	0
Additions and improvements at multipurpose dams	1,002,000	1,002,0000	0
Navigation facilities:			
Railway bridge alterations at Decatur, Ala	2,455,000	2,455,000	0
Additions and improvements at navigation facilities	386,000	386,000	0
Flood control facilities:			
South Chicamauga Creek	3,650,000	3,650,000	0
Other local flood damage prevention projects	891,000	891,000	0
Recreation facilities	803,000	803,000	0
Investigations for future facilities	45,000	45,000	0
General resources development: Lower Elk Town	2,700,000	2,700,000	0
Land between the lakes	1,833,000	1,833,000	0
Fertilizer development: Chemical facilities	12,724,000	12,724,000	0
General service activities: General facilities	1,933,000	1,933,000	0
Total capital outlay	71,171,000	74,171,000	+3,000,000
EXPENSES			
Water resources development:			
Navigation operations	1,220,000	1,220,000	0
Flood control operations	1,092,000	1,092,000	0
Regional water quality management	1,104,000	1,104,000	0
Recreation development	1,097,000	1,097,000	0
Fisheries and waterfowl resources development	757,000	757,000	0
Preliminary surveys and engineering	200,000	200,000	0
Multipurpose reservoir operations	7,378,000	7,378,000	0
General resources development:			
Agricultural projects	1,681,000	1,681,000	0
Waste heat utilization	555,000	300,000	−255,000
Forest resources development	1,650,000	1,650,000	0
Strip mine reclamation demonstrations	3,200,000	3,200,000	0
Minerals resources projects	257,000	257,000	0
Environmental quality projects	483,000	483,000	0
Development of tribuatary areas	2,100,000	2,100,000	0
Human resources development	992,000	992,000	0
Regional economic studies	750,000	750,000	0
Townlift community improvement	705,000	705,000	0
Interagency health service demonstrations	202,000	202,000	0
Multipurpose reservoir operations	169,000	169,000	0
Land between the lakes	2,983,000	2,983,000	0
Fertilizer development:			
Fertilizer research and development	8,008,000	8,008,000	0
Fertilizer introduction	12,477,000	12,477,000	0
General service activities:			
Valley mapping and remote sensing	534,000	534,000	0
Joint Bicentennial demonstration caravan	125,000	125,000	0
Scientific and technical cooperation	20,000	20,000	0
Other expenses	275,000	275,000	0
Total expense	50,014,000	49,759,000	−255,000
Total program	121,185,000	123,930,000	+2,745,000
Slippage and unobligated balance	0	3,000,000	−3,000,000
Total appropriations	121,185,000	120,930,000	−255,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $120,930,000 in Fiscal Year 1977 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, a decrease of $255,000 from the budget estimate but an increase of $20,905,000 over the current year funding level.

Waste heat utilization is reduced by $255,000. The budget estimate for Fiscal Year 1977 for this item is more than double the current year funding, and testimony before the Committee did not adequately explain the need for this increase. Even with the recommended reduction, however, funding for waste heat utilization will be increased over the current level.

The Committee further recommends a reduction of $3,000,000 for slippage and unobligated balances. The Committee notes that TVA had a carry-over of $3,344,000 in FY 1974 and a carry-over of $6,882,000 from FY 1975 to FY 1976. The Committee feels that this recommended reduction is reasonable and in line with unobligated balances of previous years.

The Committee is deeply concerned about the large purchase of equipment that TVA has made from abroad rather than from manufacturers in the United States. The Committee strongly urges the TVA to review its purchasing procedures to make sure that every effort is made to purchase equipment and other supplies from domestic sources. To maintain a strong economy in the United States and to assist in the fight against high unemployment, every effort must be made to purchase domestic products.

Water Resources Council

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

Appropriations, 1976	$10,722,000
Budget estimate, 1977	9,465,000
Recommended, 1977	11,965,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1976	+1,243,000
Budget estimate, 1977	+2,500,000

The proposed budget and the suggested allowance follow:

	Budget estimate	Allowance	Change
Administration and coordination	$1,748,000	$1,524,000	−$224,000
River basin commissions	2,500,000	2,500,000	0
Planning grants to States	0	2,500,000	+2,500,000
Comprehensive planning	5,217,000	5,441,000	+224,000
Total	9,465,000	11,965,000	+2,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $11,965,000 in Fiscal Year 1977 for the Water Resources Council, an increase of $2,500,000 over the budget request of $9,465,000.

It is recommended by the Committee that the budget be increased $2,500,000 for Title III planning grants to states. The budget request included no funds for this program

The Committee recommends a reduction of $224,000 for administration and coordination. Testimony before the Subcommittee did not support an increase for this item.

An increase of $224,000 is recommended for regional or river basin planning for continuation of the Hudson Level B study. It is the understanding of the Committee that previous administrative problems associated with this study have been resolved.

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 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. These items have been carried in previous appropriation bills.

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

3. 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.

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

5. 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.

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

7. 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.

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

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

10. 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.

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

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

13. 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 total amount proposed for appropriation in this bill is $9,551,209,000, an increase of 3% over the budget estimate. This total is below the target recommended in the first concurrent budget resolution.

Unemployment, while lowered from its recent highs, is still a severe problem. A significant portion of the funds in this bill will be spent to construct and maintain dams, water supply facilities, dikes, irrigation facilities, navigation facilities and hydro-electric facilities, among others. Increased funding for these projects will help to alleviate the unemployment problem of the many skilled workers and craftsmen employed in the construction industry where the unemployment rate is 16%. Increased funding for public works projects will provide for an expansion of productive jobs.

Further, the funds recommended in the bill for energy research, development and demonstration programs will not only provide meaningful employment opportunities but will also accelerate America's goal of reaching a reasonable level of energy independence, thus making our nation less vulnerable to the inflationary impact of the constantly rising oil prices forced on America by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.

Hence the expenditures proposed in this bill, clearly, will strengthen the economy of this Nation.

Bill Compared With the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget

In accordance with Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (P.L. 93–344), the following table provides comparisons between the new budget authority targets set forth in the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, as allocated by the Committee on Appropriations under Section 302 of the Act, and the budget authority contained in the accompanying bill.

Category	New budget authority		
	Target	Committee Bill	Difference
National defense	$1,918,291,000	$1,908,991,000	−$9,300,000
General science, space and technology	481,000,000	492,775,000	+11,775,000
Natural resources, environment and energy	7,436,907,000	6,846,546,000	−590,361,000
Community and regional development	300,397,000	302,397,000	+2,000,000
General government	500,000	500,000	
Total	10,137,095,000	9,551,209,000	−585,886,000

Five Year Outlay Projection

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(B) of P.L. 93–344 there follows the five year outlay projection associated with budget authority provided in the bill.

Budget authority, $9,551,209,000.

Outlays:	
1977	$5,743,712,000
1978	3,507,546,000
1979	456,924,000
1980	68,867,000
1981	32,400,000

Financial Assistance to State and Local Governments

In accordance with Section 308 (a)(1)(C) of P.L. 93–344, the financial assistance to state and local governments provided in the bill totals $306,769,000 in new budget (obligational) authority and $23,869,000 in budget outlays.

Limitations and Legislative Provisions

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

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

* * *, *not to exceed $738,000,000,* * * *

On page 18, in connection with Bonneville Power Administration Fund:

* * * *facilities to provide system support to the Lost River-Salmon River area in southeast Idaho*

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1976 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1977

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—FEDERAL 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 (obligational) authority, 1976 (2)	Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, 1977 (3)	Increase (+) or decrease (−) (4)
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$4, 500, 000	$4, 548, 000	+$48, 000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation:			
Miscellaneous appropriations	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	----------
Colorado River Basin Project (contract authority)	19, 500, 000	----------	−19, 500, 000
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act	85, 000	85, 000	----------
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	27, 085, 000	7, 633, 000	−19, 452, 000

88

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1976 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1977

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 (obligational) authority, 1976 (2)	Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, 1977 (3)	Increase (+) or decrease (−) (4)
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Trust Funds	$22, 000, 000	$28, 000, 000	+$6, 000, 000
Department of the Interior:			
Reclamation trust funds	12, 285, 000	29, 000, 000	+16, 715, 000
Energy Research and Development Administration: Advance for cooperative work	235, 000	235, 000	----------
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust fund accounts	3, 370, 000	3, 421, 000	+51, 000
Water Resources Council: River Basin Commissions	4, 552, 000	6, 692, 000	+2, 140, 000
Total permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds	42, 442, 000	67, 348, 000	+24, 906, 000

89

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977

[Note—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976 [1]	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1977	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1977
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
TITLE I—ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION					
Operating expenses	$3,149,015,000	$4,128,896,000	$4,077,783,000	$928,768,000	$-51,113,000
Plant and capital equipment	907,642,000	1,409,274,000	1,525,500,000	617,858,000	116,226,000
Geothermal Resources Development Fund	---	50,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	-20,000,000
Total, TITLE I	4,056,657,000	5,588,170,000	5,633,283,000	1,576,626,000	45,113,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
Department of the Army					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	66,836,000	64,255,000	70,110,000	3,274,000	5,855,000
Construction, general	1,228,648,000	1,266,332,000	1,417,077,000	188,429,000	150,745,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	163,250,000	191,220,000	227,667,000	64,417,000	36,447,000
Operation and maintenance, general	582,073,000	583,900,000	648,900,000	66,827,000	65,000,000
Revolving fund	700,000	---	---	-700,000	---
Flood control and coastal emergencies	70,400,000	18,140,000	30,000,000	-40,400,000	11,860,000
General expenses	43,700,000	47,400,000	47,200,000	3,500,000	-200,000
Special recreation use fees	1,200,000	3,100,000	2,000,000	800,000	-1,100,000
Total, TITLE II	2,156,807,000	2,174,347,000	2,442,954,000	286,147,000	268,607,000
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Reclamation					
General Investigations	20,892,000	21,030,000	24,487,000	3,595,000	3,457,000
Construction and Rehabilitation	327,308,000	347,017,000	351,386,000	24,078,000	4,369,000
Upper Colorado River Storage Project	41,152,000	61,231,000 [2]	59,331,000	18,179,000	-1,900,000
Colorado River Basin project	29,205,000	73,420,000	73,420,000	44,215,000	---
Colorado River Basin project (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(22,440,000)	(20,600,000)	(20,600,000)	(-1,840,000)	(---)
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control project	19,670,000	43,120,000	44,700,000	25,030,000	1,580,000
Operation and maintenance	132,162,000	143,000,000	143,000,000	10,838,000	---
Loan program	22,665,000	10,773,000	22,209,000	-456,000	11,436,000
Emergency Fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	400,000	-600,000	-600,000
General Administrative Expenses	21,840,000	22,600,000	22,600,000	760,000	---
Total	615,894,000	723,191,000	741,533,000	125,639,000	18,342,000
Alaska Power Administration					
General Investigations	652,000	763,000	749,000	97,000	-14,000
Operation and Maintenance	1,007,500	1,164,000	1,141,000	133,500	-23,000
Total	1,659,500	1,927,000	1,890,000	230,500	-37,000
Southeastern Power Administration					
Operation and maintenance	1,000,000	1,106,000	1,076,000	76,000	-30,000
Southwestern Power Administration					
Construction	680,000	960,000	896,000	216,000	-64,000
Operation and maintenance	6,080,000	7,821,000	7,707,000	1,627,000	-114,000
Total	6,760,000	8,781,000	8,603,000	1,843,000	-178,000
Total, TITLE III	625,313,500	735,005,000	753,102,000	127,788,500	18,097,000
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES (excluding ERDA)					
Appalachian Region Commission: Salaries and expenses	1,870,000	1,897,000	1,897,000	27,000	---
Appalachian regional development programs (funds Appropriated to the President)	288,200,000	298,500,000	300,500,000	12,300,000	2,000,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977

[Note—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976 [1]	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1977	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1976	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1977
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Delaware River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	81,000	83,000	83,000	2,000	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	215,000	198,000	198,000	-17,000	---
Total	296,000	281,000	281,000	-15,000	---
Federal Power Commission	36,560,000	41,582,000	41,582,000	5,022,000	---
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin: Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	52,000	---	52,000	---	52,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Salaries and Expenses	217,423,000	249,430,000	244,430,000	27,007,000	-5,000,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	81,000	83,000	83,000	2,000	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	150,000	150,000	150,000	---	---
Total	231,000	233,000	233,000	2,000	---
Tennessee Valley Authority: Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority fund	100,025,000	121,185,000	120,930,000	20,905,000	-255,000
Water Resources Council: Water resources planning	10,722,000	9,465,000	11,965,000	1,243,000	2,500,000
Total, TITLE IV	655,379,000	722,573,000	721,870,000	66,491,000	-703,000

92

RECAPITULATION

Total, New budget (obligational) authority Titles II, III, and IV (excluding ERDA)	3,437,499,500	3,631,925,000	3,917,926,000	480,426,500	286,001,000
Total, New budget (obligational) authority Titles I, II, III, and IV	7,494,156,500	9,220,095,000	9,551,209,000	2,057,052,500	331,114,000
Memoranda:					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations	22,440,000	20,600,000	20,600,000	-1,840,000	---
Total appropriations, including appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations	7,516,596,500	9,240,695,000	9,571,809,000	2,055,212,500	331,114,000

93

1/ Includes amounts contained in Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1976 as passed House.

2/ Includes reduction of $4,800,000 contained in House Doc. 94-478

○

H. R. 14236

Ninety-fourth Congress of the United States of America

AT THE SECOND SESSION

Begun and held at the City of Washington on Monday, the nineteenth day of January, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-six

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 September 30, 1977, 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 September 30, 1977, 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; $4,147,563,000 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 September 30, 1977, shall be merged, without limitation, with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation.

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-eight for replacement only, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of not to exceed two, and hire of aircraft; $1,572,410,000, 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 September 30, 1977, shall be merged, without limitation, with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation.

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

For carrying out the Loan Guarantee and Interest Assistance Program as authorized by the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the indebtedness guaranteed or committed to be guaranteed shall not exceed the aggregate of $200,000,000: *Provided further*, That after September 2, 1984, no part of this or any other appropriation for the purposes of the Loan Guarantee and Interest Assistance Program shall be available for obligation.

GENERAL PROVISION

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, $71,920,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $2,000,000 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.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by laws; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction): $1,436,745,000, 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 $2,000,000 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.

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), $231,497,000, 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.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; 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; $648,900,000, to remain available until expended.

REVOLVING FUND

For the design and construction of hopper dredges, $6,600,000, 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, $22,140,000, 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; $47,200,000.

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, $2,000,000, 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 one hundred and sixty-nine of which one hundred and sixty-seven shall be for replacement only), and hire of passenger motor vehicles: *Provided*, That the total capital of the revolving fund shall not exceed $291,000,000.

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, $24,762,000: *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 $554,000 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.

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, $348,811,000, of which $214,000,000 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 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.

For an additional amount for "Construction and rehabilitation", to become available immediately upon enactment of this Act, to remain available until expended, $200,000,000: *Provided*, That this additional amount may be made available without reimbursement: *Provided further*, That this appropriation is for the payment of claims for damages to or loss of property, personal injury, or death proximately resulting from the failure on June 5, 1976, of the Teton River Dam, in accordance with such rules and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of administering such claims and of determining the amounts to be allowed pursuant to this appropriation and the persons entitled to receive the same: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to impose any liability on the United States or to allow for payment of claims that are paid or payable from any other source, public or private: *Provided further*, That of funds available to the Bureau of Reclamation pursuant to Public Law 94–180 under this appropriation title, not to exceed $300,000, to remain available until expended, may be transferred without reimbursement, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to "Salaries and Expenses", Office of the Secretary, to provide for expenses related to investigations of the structure failure, the expenditure of which funds shall not be subject to the limitation on services as authorized by title 5, United States Code, section 3109, as contained in section 104 of Public Law 94–165.

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, $59,331,000, of which $55,200,000 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of April 11, 1956, and $4,131,000 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.

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, $94,020,000, of which $20,600,000 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, $44,680,000.

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, $143,000,000, of which $116,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $5,172,000 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.

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 Act of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a–421d), and August 6, 1956, as amended (43 U.S.C. 422a–422k), including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, $27,495,000, 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).

EMERGENCY FUND

For an additional amount for the "Emergency fund", as authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (42 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.

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, $22,600,000, 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.

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 forty-four passenger motor vehicles of which twenty-one shall be for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft for replacement only; 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, $749,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $20,000 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).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of projects in Alaska and of marketing electric power and energy, $1,141,000.

Bonneville Power Administration Fund

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93–454, are hereby specifically approved for purchase of one aircraft for replacement only and construction of the following major transmission facilities: facilities to provide system support to the Lost River-Salmon River area in southeast Idaho.

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, $1,076,000.

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, $896,000, 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 three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $7,707,000.

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 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, $1,897,000.

Funds Appropriated to the President

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, 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, $303,000,000, of which $185,000,000 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.

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), $83,000.

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), $198,000.

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, hire of aircraft, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $41,582,000.

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.

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 $10,000); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; $244,430,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That from this appropriation, transfer 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*, Moneys received by the Commission for the cooperative nuclear safety research programs may be retained and used for salaries and expenses associated with those programs, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), and shall remain available until expended.

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), $83,000.

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.

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, $125,930,000, 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 three aircraft of which one is for replacement only, and the purchase of not to exceed two hundred passenger motor vehicles for replacement only.

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), as amended, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 42 U.S.C. 1962a–4(5), and hire of passenger motor vehicles (42 U.S.C.

1962a–4(6)), $12,665,000, to remain available until expended, including $1,648,000 for expenses in administering the Act (42 U.S.C. 1962d (b)), $3,248,000 for preparation of assessments and plans (42 U.S.C. 1962d(c)), $2,269,000 for preparation of plans (33 U.S.C. 1289), $2,500,000 for expenses of river basin commissions under title II of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1962d(a)), and $3,000,000 for grants to States under title III of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1962c(a)).

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISION

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.

This Act may be cited as the "Public Works for Water and Power Development and Energy Research Appropriation Act, 1977".

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Vice President of the United States and
President of the Senate.