Calendar No. 96

114TH CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
114–54

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016

MAY 21, 2015.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2028]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, reports the same with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

New obligational authority

Total of bill as reported to the Senate	$36,118,168,000
Amount of 2015 appropriations	34,780,277,000
Amount of 2016 budget estimate	36,646,014,000
Amount of House allowance	36,010,658,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2015 appropriations	+1,337,891,000
2016 budget estimate	−527,846,000
House allowance	+107,510,000

94–673 PDF

CONTENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for fiscal year 2016, beginning October 1, 2015, and ending September 30, 2016, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Corps of Engineers' civil works program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities, including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in title III; and for independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, Delta Regional Authority, Denali Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 2016 budget estimates for the bill total $36,646,014,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $36,118,168,000. This is $527,846,000 below the budget estimates and $1,337,891,000 above the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development held four sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2016 appropriations bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

The recommendations for fiscal year 2016, therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of —— to —— the Committee on ————, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

INTRODUCTION

The Committee recommends $35,368,000,000 for the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 2016, including adjustments, an increase of $1,165,723,000 over fiscal year 2015. Within the amount recommended, $19,002,000,000 is classified as defense and $16,366,000,000 is classified as non-defense spending. The Committee recommendation complies with the Budget Control Act of 2011, as amended.

The Committee's constitutional responsibility to oversee the Federal Government's expenditure of taxpayer dollars requires setting priorities and ensuring these funds are executed as Congress has

directed. To develop this recommendation, the Committee held four budget hearings in March and April 2015 to examine the budget requests for the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The hearings provided officials from the agencies an opportunity to present their most pressing priorities to the Committee. The Committee also invited and received recommendations from Senators.

The Committee's recommendation reflects that process, and includes funding for the highest priority activities across several Federal agencies. The recommendation includes funds for critical water infrastructure, including our Nation's inland waterways, ports, and harbors; agricultural water supply and drought relief in the West; groundbreaking scientific research and development, including world-class supercomputing; support for the Nation's nuclear weapons, non-proliferation, and nuclear Navy programs; and critical economic development. The Committee did not recommend funding for low-priority programs, and rescinded unused funds from prior years.

OVERSIGHT

To ensure appropriate oversight of taxpayer dollars, the Committee's recommendation includes financial reporting requirements in each title of the bill, and provides additional Congressional control points in the recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Committee describes these new requirements in detail in the relevant sections.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $5,499,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers, an increase of $767,500,000 from the budget request. The Committee also recommends rescinding $128,000,000 of unobligated prior year balances, for a net appropriation of $5,371,500,000.

The Committee recommendation sets priorities by supporting our Nation's infrastructure. Specifically, the Committee recommendation provides adequate appropriations to utilize all of the estimated fiscal year 2016 revenues from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and meets the target prescribed in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act [WRRDA] of 2014 for projects eligible for Harbor Maintenance Trust Funds. This level of funding will help modernize our Nation's ports and waterways as we prepare for completion of the Panama Canal expansion.

INTRODUCTION

The Corps of Engineers' civil works mission is to provide quality, responsive engineering services to the Nation in peace and war. Approximately 23,000 civilians and about 290 military officers are responsible for executing the civil works mission. This bill only funds the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers.

The Corps of Engineers maintains our inland waterways, keeps our ports open, manages a portion of our drinking water supply, provides emission free electricity from dams, looks after many of our recreational waters, helps manage the river levels during flooding, provides environmental stewardship, and emergency response to natural disasters. The annual net economic benefit generated by the Corps of Engineers' civil works mission is estimated to be $87,000,000,000, which equates to a return of about $16 for every $1 expended.

The Corps of Engineers' responsibilities include:

—navigation systems, including 13,000 miles of deep draft channels, 12,000 miles of inland waterways, 236 lock chambers, and 926 harbors which handle over 2.3 billion tons of cargo annually;

—flood risk management infrastructure, including 707 dams, 14,700 miles of levees, and multiple hurricane and storm damage risk reduction projects along the coast;

—municipal and industrial water supply storage at 136 projects spread across 25 States;
—environmental stewardship, infrastructure, and ecosystem restoration;
—recreation for approximately 370 million recreation visits per year to Corps of Engineers' projects;
—regulation of waters under Federal statutes; and
—maintaining hydropower capacity of nearly 24,000 megawatts at 75 projects.

PROGRAM COORDINATION AND EXECUTION

The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to execute the civil works program in accordance with congressional direction included in this report and the accompanying act. This includes moving individual projects forward in accordance with the funds annually appropriated. However, the Committee realizes that many factors outside the Corps of Engineers' control may dictate the progress of any given project or study. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to notify the Committee of any major deviations as soon as practicable, including a detailed justification and updates of cost, schedule, or scope for the project or study. A major deviation is defined as any reprogramming action that requires Committee notification as identified in the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015, or a schedule change that causes completions, as identified in the fiscal year 2015 or fiscal year 2016 budget requests to be delayed beyond the fiscal year stated.

FISCAL YEAR 2016 WORK PLAN

The Committee has recommended funding above the budget request for Investigations, Construction, Operations and Maintenance, and Mississippi River and Tributaries. The Corps of Engineers is directed to submit a work plan, not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this act, to the Committee proposing its allocation of these additional funds. The Corps of Engineers is directed not to obligate any funding above the budget request for studies or projects until the Committee has approved the work plan for fiscal year 2016. The work plan shall be consistent with the following general guidance, as well as the specific direction the Committee provides within each account.

—None of the funds may be used for any item for which the Committee has specifically denied funding.
—Except for funds proposed for new starts, the additional funds are provided for ongoing studies or projects that were either not included in the budget request or for which the budget request was inadequate.
—The work plan shall include a single group of new starts for Investigations and Construction.
—Funding associated with a category may be allocated to eligible studies or projects within that category.
—Funding associated with a subcategory may be allocated only to eligible studies or projects within that subcategory.

—The Corps of Engineers may not withhold funding from a study or project because it is inconsistent with the administration's policy.
—The Committee notes that these funds are in excess of the administration's budget request, and that administration budget metrics should not disqualify a study or project from being funded.

PROCUREMENT

The Committee remains concerned about the high unemployment rate of the Nation's construction industry. Despite the efforts of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy to increase communication between procurement officers and industry, the Committee believes that local contractors very often do not know about nor have the opportunity to compete for local construction projects funded in this act. Therefore, the Committee directs the Secretary to ensure that regional/district offices responsible for construction projects inform and engage local construction industry contractors, especially small businesses, minority-owned businesses, and women-owned businesses, about Federal procurement opportunities and the bidding process. The Committee requests a clear outreach plan from the Secretary no later than 90 days after enactment of this act. This plan should modernize traditional outreach methods to reach a broader group of local contractors.

REPROGRAMMING

The Committee is retaining the reprogramming legislation provided in the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015.

NEW STARTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The Committee recommends new starts in both the Investigations and Construction accounts for fiscal year 2016. The Committee decision is based, in part, on the budget request providing funding to complete 11 feasibility studies, 2 preconstruction engineering design [PED] studies, and 9 construction projects.

Investments in our infrastructure are investments in our economy. These investments should be continued even during constrained budgets, as the benefits continue to accrue for decades. The Committee recommends up to 10 new feasibility study starts, and 6 new construction starts, including the following 4 proposed in the administration's budget request for fiscal year 2016: Port Lions Harbor, Alaska; Coyote & Berryessa Creeks, California; Ohio River Shoreline, Paducah, Kentucky; and, Marsh Lake, Minnesota.

The Corps of Engineers is directed to propose, not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this act, a single group of new starts to the Committee as a part of the work plan, under the direction included above under the heading "Fiscal Year 2016 Work Plan".

SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE

Savings and slippage [S&S] is a budgetary term that recognizes that nothing ever goes completely as planned. The Committee rec-

ognizes that many changes may occur between the Corps of Engineers' budget formulation—beginning 22 months before it is submitted to the Committee—and when funds are actually appropriated. Although the Committee has attempted to identify and address changes through coordination with the Corps of Engineers, the Committee realizes that actual appropriations may not be enacted until later in the year. Accordingly, the Committee has included, as in prior years, a reasonable percentage of S&S within Investigations, Construction, and Operations and Maintenance as a way to accommodate additional project needs, even if funding is insufficient. Upon applying the S&S amounts, normal reprogramming procedures should be undertaken to account for schedule slippages, accelerations, or other unforeseen conditions.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING

The Committee did not accept or include Congressionally Directed Spending, as defined in section 5(a) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. However, the Committee has recommended additional programmatic funds for Investigations, Construction, Operations and Maintenance, and Mississippi River and Tributaries to address deficiencies in the budget request. In some cases, these additional funds have been included within defined categories, as in prior years, and are described in more detail in their respective sections, below.

ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY

The Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office is directed to study the cumulative economic impact of all the shallow draft ports on the Mississippi River between St. Louis, Missouri, and Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The study should include the revenue and jobs created locally and nationally, the importance of these ports to inland waterways shippers, the economic effects that would result from any single port closing down, the economic effects that would result from all ports closing down, the increase in barge traffic that these ports may see with the expansion of the Panama Canal, and the ability or inability of these ports to meet that expansion under the current funding environment. Finally, the study shall make a recommendation regarding the establishment of one funding stream for dredging these small inland ports as compared to historical funding mechanisms.

INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2015	$122,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016	97,000,000
House allowance	113,000,000
Committee recommendation	109,000,000

The Committee recommends $109,000,000 for Investigations, an increase of $12,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee's recommendation allows the Corps of Engineers to begin up to 10 new feasibility study starts.

INTRODUCTION

Funding in this account is used to develop feasibility and PED studies to address the Nation's water infrastructure needs, in support of project authorization. The Committee is very concerned that only one-third of the budget request for Investigations is directed to specifically authorized studies, with the remainder directed to nationwide programs that will not result in construction recommendations. Further, the budget request proposes funding for only 51 specifically authorized feasibility studies, as compared to over 100 studies receiving appropriations in fiscal year 2015. Additional funding recommended for Investigations will allow a more balanced planning program.

The Committee is also concerned about the administration's failure to efficiently fund ongoing studies to completion, with completion being defined as the end of the PED phase. The budget request does not include funding to move any of the 34 feasibility studies that were completed in the prior fiscal year into the PED study phase. If the Committee were to adopt the budget request without modification, a backlog of at least 40 studies would be created from just the past 2 fiscal years. The Committee recognizes that the administration's budget does not provide adequate Investigations, and specifically PED funding to allow many of America's most important waterways to move efficiently from planning to construction. The Committee therefore recommends additional funding to be used to seamlessly continue feasibility studies into the PED study phase.

NEW STARTS

The Committee's recommendation includes funding for up to 10 new feasibility study starts. Each new feasibility study shall be selected based on the Corps of Engineers' prioritization process and included as a part of the Investigations work plan. Not less than 50 percent of the additional funds recommended for Investigations shall be used to seamlessly continue studies into the PED phase, which have a Chief's Report dated prior to October 1, 2015.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The table below displays the budget request and the Committee's recommendation for Investigations. Funding is classified as either for feasibility or PED studies, as indicated in the columns, to provide greater transparency in the study phases.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—INVESTIGATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	FEAS	PED	FEAS	PED	FEAS	PED
ALABAMA						
MOBILE HARBOR DEEPENING AND WIDENING, AL	400		400		400	
ALASKA						
CRAIG HARBOR, AK	535		535		535	
KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	700		700		700	
PERRYVILLE HARBOR, AK	700		700		700	
SAINT GEORGE HARBOR IMPROVEMENT, AK	700		700		700	
ARIZONA						
LITTLE COLORADO RIVER (WINSLOW), AZ	100		100		100	
LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ	700		700		700	
ARKANSAS						
THREE RIVERS, AR	700		700		700	
CALIFORNIA						
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED COMMON FEATURES, NATOMAS BASIN, CA		3,500		3,500		3,500
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) RESTORATION, CA	700		700		700	
LOWER CACHE CRK, YOLO CNTY, WOODLAND & VIC, CA	570		570		570	
PORT OF LONG BEACH NAV IMP, CA	700		700		700	
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION (PHASE 3) (GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORT), CA	500		500		500	
SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK, CA	331		331		331	
YUBA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	700		700		700	
COLORADO						
ADAMS AND DENVER COUNTIES, CO	700		700		700	
COMMONWEALTH NORTHERN MARIANAS						
ROTA HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI	700		700		700	
TINIAN HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI	700		700		700	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	FEAS	PED	FEAS	PED	FEAS	PED
CONNECTICUT						
FAIRFIELD AND NEW HAVEN COUNTIES (FLOODING), CT	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
NEW HAVEN HARBOR DEEPENING, CT	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
FLORIDA						
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
GEORGIA						
PROCTOR CREEK, GA	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
SATILLA RIVER BASIN WATERSHED, GA	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
IDAHO						
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	275	.....	275	.....	275	.....
ILLINOIS						
DU PAGE RIVER, IL	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	400	.....	400	.....	400	.....
INTERBASIN CONTROL OF GREAT LAKES–MISSISSIPPI RIVER AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES, IL, IN, OH & WI	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
KASKASKIA RIVER BASIN, IL	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
IOWA						
DES MOINES LEVEE SYSTEM, DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
LOUISIANA						
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA (GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORT)	1,400	.....	1,400	.....	1,400	.....
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, LA	550	.....	550	.....	550	.....
MARYLAND						
CHESAPEAKE BAY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD, PA & VA	250	.....	250	.....	250	.....

MASSACHUSETTS						
BOSTON HARBOR DEEP DRAFT INVESTIGATION, MA	.....	1,835	.....	1,835	.....	1,835
MICHIGAN						
SAGINAW RIVER DEEPENING, SAGINAW, MI (GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORT)	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
MINNESOTA						
MINNESOTA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, MN & SD (MINNESOTA RIVER AUTHORITY)	600	.....	600	.....	600	.....
MISSOURI						
ST LOUIS RIVERFRONT, MO & IL	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
NEW JERSEY						
NEW JERSEY BACKBAY, NJ	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	.....
PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ (GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORT)	982	.....	982	.....	982	.....
RAHWAY RIVR BASIN (UPPER BASIN), NJ	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
NEW YORK						
NEW YORK—NEW JERSEY HARBOR & TRIBUTARIES, NY & NJ	.....	.....	400	.....	.....	.....
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, NY	600	.....	600	.....	600	.....
WESTCHESTER COUNTY STREAMS, BYRAM RIVER BASIN, NY & CT	703	.....	703	.....	703	.....
NORTH DAKOTA						
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, ND, MN, SD & MANITOBA, CANADA	786	.....	786	.....	786	.....
OKLAHOMA						
ARKANSAS RIVER CORRIDOR, OK	815	.....	815	.....	815	.....
PENNSYLVANIA						
DELAWARE RIVER DREDGE MATERIAL UTILIZATION, PA	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
PUERTO RICO						
SAN JUAN HARBOR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT STUDY, PR	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
TEXAS						
COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY, TX	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	600	.....	600	.....	600	.....
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
SULPHUR RIVER BASIN, TX	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	FEAS	PED	FEAS	PED	FEAS	PED
VIRGINIA						
CITY OF NORFOLK, VA	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	.....
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (55-FOOT), VA (GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORT)	800	.....	800	.....	800	.....
WASHINGTON						
DUNGENESS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION STUDY, WA	700	.....	700	.....	700	.....
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
SUBTOTAL, ITEMS UNDER STATES	30,847	5,335	31,847	5,335	30,847	5,335
REMAINING ITEMS						
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:						
FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION	.....	.....	6,500	.....	1,000	1,000
FLOOD CONTROL	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000
SHORE PROTECTION	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
NAVIGATION	.....	.....	4,000	.....	.....	1,000
COASTAL AND DEEP-DRAFT	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,031
INLAND	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	500
SMALL, REMOTE, OR SUBSISTENCE	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,158
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES	.....	.....	2,000	.....	1,000	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR COMPLIANCE	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	.....
REMOTE, COASTAL, OR SMALL WATERSHED	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES:						
ACCESS TO WATER DATA	750	.....	750	.....	750	.....
COMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS:						
CALFED	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM	75	.....	75	.....	75	.....
COORDINATION WITH OTHER WATER RESOURCE AGENCIES	398	.....	398	.....	398	.....
GULF OF MEXICO	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	400	.....	400	.....	400	.....
INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	721	.....	721	.....	721	.....

INVENTORY OF DAMS	400	.....	400	.....	400	.....
LAKE TAHOE	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
PACIFIC NW FOREST CASE	10	.....	10	.....	10	.....
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS	1,350	.....	1,350	.....	1,350	.....
FERC LICENSING	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	5,500	.....	6,000	.....	6,000	.....
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA:						
AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUPPORT TRI–CADD	251	.....	251	.....	251	.....
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	1,000	.....	1,000	.....	1,000	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	75	.....	75	.....	75	.....
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	220	.....	220	.....	220	.....
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	15,000	.....	15,000	.....	15,000	.....
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	1,743	.....	1,743	.....	1,743	.....
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	150	.....	150	.....	150	.....
PRECIPITATION STUDIES	225	.....	225	.....	225	.....
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	75	.....	75	.....	75	.....
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	47	.....	47	.....	47	.....
STREAM GAGING	550	.....	550	.....	550	.....
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	385	.....	385	.....	385	.....
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	18,143	.....	18,143	.....	22,000	.....
OTHER—MISC:						
DISPOSITION OF COMPLETED PROJECTS	800	.....	800	.....	800	.....
NORTH ATLANTIC COAST COMPREHENSIVE STUDY FOCUS AREA	1,000	.....	.....	.....	1,800	.....
NATIONAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	6,000	.....	6,000	.....	6,000	.....
NATIONAL SHORELINE	400	.....	400	.....	400	.....
PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM	3,100	.....	3,100	.....	3,100	.....
TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	1,500	.....	1,500	.....	1,500	.....
HOUSE FLOOR AMENDMENTS	.....	.....	3,500	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL	60,818	.....	76,318	.....	68,975	9,689
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	.....	.....	−5,081	−765
TOTAL	91,665	5,335	108,165	5,335	94,741	14,259
GRAND TOTAL	.....	97,000	.....	113,500	.....	109,000

Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan.—The Committee understands that during the 2011 flooding on the Mississippi River, much of the damage was concentrated on the Upper Mississippi River Basin, where there is no final flood risk management plan. An appropriate Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan would help work toward flood risk management goals. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to provide, not later than 60 days after the enactment of this act, a comprehensive survey of the authorization and funding requirements necessary for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan, including work on alternative scenarios for the 500 year flood (included in the current plan, Plan H). The report shall also outline the perceived challenges to, and recommendations for, working toward the creation of an overall flood risk management plan for the entire main stem of the Mississippi River.

Mobile Harbor, Alabama Limited Reevaluation Report.—The Committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works [Secretary] to budget for this project at the rate indicated in Section 110 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015. In future budget submissions, the Secretary shall adhere to Congressional direction included in statute regarding this project. The Committee expects the Secretary to allocate funds provided in this act in a manner that is consistent with statutory cost sharing requirements.

Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway System.—The Committee recognizes that the bipartisan support for the Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program [NESP], spanning almost a decade, has not resulted in NESP's implementation. The Committee recognizes that NESP is now so delayed that new economic and cost-benefit analyses must be performed before it can move forward. The Committee also recognizes that although the Corps of Engineers has reprogrammed funding into NESP, this funding has not been used to deliver updated analysis.

Consequently, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this act, to provide a report detailing the scope, schedule, and budget for delivering the updated economic analysis and cost recertification so the Corps of Engineers can begin implementing NESP.

Mud Mountain Dam.—The Committee commends the Corps of Engineers and the National Marine Fisheries Service for reaching agreement on a biological opinion [BiOp] to mitigate the impact of the ongoing operation of Mud Mountain Dam on species listed under the Endangered Species Act [ESA] by replacing the barrier structure and building a new fish trap facility. The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers is scheduled to complete the decision document in May 2015, which will inform design and construction work. The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to uphold its ESA and Tribal treaty responsibilities by requesting sufficient funding in future budgets to implement the BiOp requirements and complete construction by 2020.

Puget Sound Nearshore Study.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers completed public review on the draft Puget Sound Nearshore Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement [Report] in December 2014. If the final Report does not

identify an implementable Federal project, the Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to identify other existing authorities and resources that could assist with timely construction of alternatives included in the Report. The Committee further encourages the Corps of Engineers to acknowledge early action restoration efforts by the State of Washington as part of the overall plan, including cost share obligations when a project cost share agreement is executed.

Tribal Communities Located in Remote Areas.—The Committee recognizes that Tribal communities located in remote areas that experience severe, weather-related conditions that jeopardize public health and safety, face a significant disadvantage in the Corps of Engineers' utilization of benefit-cost ratios in the budgeting process. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to consider Federal trust and treaty obligations and the need to protect public health and safety in severe weather situations in determining future budget priorities.

National Mall and Federal Triangle Flood Protection.—The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to provide information and cooperate with other Federal agencies, the District of Columbia government, and nonprofit interests, including the National Coalition to Save Our Mall and Federal City Council, to address ongoing flood risks facing the Federal Triangle/National Mall area. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to provide unclassified information to the aforementioned interests for the purposes of developing a report on a proposed cost-neutral, public-private partnership approach to combine flood protection with underground visitor amenities and parking in order to address flood risks to the Federal Triangle/National Mall area, as well as the need to improve visitor access to National Mall museums, monuments, and activities.

Aquatic Nuisance Species.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers is capable of utilizing funding beyond what was in the administration's fiscal year 2016 budget request to further ongoing studies, including ongoing projects to address the threat of aquatic nuisance species in the Great Lakes Basin. The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to consider funding the program to address the threat of aquatic nuisance species in the Great Lakes Basin to its full capability in the fiscal year 2016 work plan.

The Committee further understands that under the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study, the Corps of Engineers has initiated a feasibility study to investigate near-term options and technologies to prevent the one-way transfer of aquatic nuisance species from the Mississippi River Basin into the Great Lakes Basin. Considering the pressing and potentially devastating harm aquatic nuisance species pose to the Great Lakes fishery and economy, the Committee is concerned that the Corps issued a waiver from the 3x3x3 rule to allow the feasibility study to take more than 3 years. The Committee believes that the Brandon Road Lock and Dam offers great promise as a single point to control the upstream transfer of aquatic nuisance species and that delays would be a major setback. Therefore, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to consider alternative ways to accelerate the feasibility study and to complete it within 3 years.

Research and Development, Additional Topic—Urban Flood Damage Reduction and Stream Restoration in Arid Regions.—The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers' research and development [R&D] program to focus on the management of water resources projects that promote public safety; reduce risk; improve operational efficiencies; reduce flood damage in arid and semi-arid regions; sustain the environment; and position our water resource systems to be managed as systems and adaptable due to the implications of a changing climate. The R&D program should also continue its focus on science and technology efforts to address needs for resilient water resources infrastructure.

Export Terminals.—The Committee strongly encourages the Corps of Engineers to complete environmental review for export terminal projects as expeditiously as possible, in a transparent manner, and in a reasonable timeframe. In addition, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to thoroughly consult with the Secretary of the Interior, and all affected Tribal nations regarding the environmental and economic impacts as well as treaty rights of all Tribes affected by export terminal projects undergoing environmental review.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000 in additional funds for Investigations. From these additional funds, the Corps of Engineers is authorized to begin up to 10 new feasibility studies. The Corps of Engineers is directed to allocate these additional funds in accordance with the direction in the front matter under the heading "Fiscal Year 2016 Work Plan". Additionally, the Corps of Engineers shall comply with the following direction in allocating funds made available for Investigations:

—Allocating funds for PED and new feasibility studies shall take priority over allocating funds for ongoing feasibility studies.

—The Corps of Engineers shall not apply new start criteria to studies moving from the feasibility phase to the PED phase.

—The Corps of Engineers shall consider PED phase work as a continuation of the investigations and by definition, a study is not completed until PED is completed.

—When evaluating proposals for new feasibility studies, the Corps of Engineers should give higher priority to those studies that have an identifiable sponsor with the ability to provide any necessary cost share for the study phase, and are regional in scope, have the potential to provide greater national benefits; address endangered species concerns; or provide protection to large numbers of our citizens.

—When evaluating ongoing studies to propose for funding, the Corps of Engineers shall consider completing or accelerating ongoing studies which will enhance the Nation's economic development, job growth, and international competitiveness; studies located in areas that have suffered recent natural disasters; or studies for areas where revisions to flood frequency flow lines may result in existing infrastructure failing to meet the requirements under the National Flood Insurance Program.

—The Corps of Engineers shall include appropriate requests for funding in future budget submissions for PED and new feasibility studies initiated in fiscal year 2016.
—Funding shall be available for existing studies, including studies in the PED phase, that were either not included in the budget request or for which the recommendation in the budget request was inadequate. Ongoing studies that are actively progressing and can utilize the funding in a timely manner are eligible for these additional funds.
—The Corps of Engineers, in future fiscal years, shall prepare the budget to reflect study completions, defined as completion of PED.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriations, 2015	$1,639,489,000
Budget estimate, 2016	1,172,000,000
House allowance	1,635,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,641,000,000

The Committee recommends $1,641,000,000 for Construction, an increase of $469,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee's recommendation allows the Corps of Engineers to select up to 6 new construction starts to begin in fiscal year 2016.

INTRODUCTION

Funding in this account is used for construction, major rehabilitation, and related activities for water resources development projects having navigation, flood and storm damage reduction, water supply, hydroelectric, environmental restoration, and other attendant benefits to the Nation. Funds to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund will be applied to cover the Federal share of the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities Program.

The Committee is concerned that the budget request is inadequate to meet the needs of projects that depend on funding from this account. Consequently, the recommendation includes $469,000,000 in additional funding for ongoing work.

NEW STARTS

The Committee recommends up to 6 new construction starts, including the 4 proposed in the budget request.

INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND

The Committee recognizes the administration has not had adequate time to react to the Inland Waterways Trust Fund [IWTF] revenues that were expanded by the passage of the Able Act and expanded authority received in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 [WRRDA]. Therefore, the Committee recommends an additional $108,600,000 for inland waterway projects to continue with construction on the priority projects as designated in the Inland Marine Transportation Systems [IMTS] Capital Projects Business Model Final Report, dated April 13, 2010. The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers is developing a new report describing a 20-year program for making capital investments on the inland and intracoastal waterways, pursuant to

WRRDA section 2002(d). This report is due to be submitted to Congress in June 2015. The Committee requires an opportunity to review any new report prior to the Corps of Engineers incorporating any part of the report into funding decisions. Therefore, when allocating the fiscal year 2016 additional funding provided in the Remaining Items—Inland Waterways Trust Fund Projects account, the Corps of Engineers shall not use the report being developed pursuant to WRRDA. The Corps of Engineers shall continue to use, as appropriate, the IMTS report as the applicable 20-year plan.

With the exception of the Olmsted Locks and Dam project on the Ohio River between Kentucky and Illinois [Olmsted project], the construction and major rehabilitation of designated projects for inland and coastal waterways derives one-half of the funding from the IWTF and one-half of the funding from the General Treasury. All funds are appropriated in the Construction account. The cost sharing for the Olmsted project has been modified from the traditional 50/50 cost share to 85 percent from the General Treasury and 15 percent from the IWTF. The net effect of this change allows additional investments on other inland waterways projects that are cost shared with the IWTF. The Committee expects the administration to address these increased investment opportunities for the inland waterways system in future budget submissions.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The table below displays the budget request and Committee's recommendation for Construction:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ALASKA			
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK (DEEPENING AND BREAKWATER)	7,928	.....	7,928
CALIFORNIA			
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), CA	56,024	56,024	56,024
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM RAISE), CA	18,641	18,641	18,641
COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEK, CA	12,739	.....	12,739
HAMILTON CITY, CA	15,000	15,000	15,000
ISABELLA LAKE, CA (DAM SAFETY)	49,900	49,900	49,900
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	1,200	1,200	1,200
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	6,000	6,000	6,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	21,500	21,500	21,500
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	7,361	7,361	7,361
FLORIDA			
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	64,141	64,141	64,141
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	123,742	123,742	123,742
GEORGIA			
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	770	770	770
SAVANNAH HARBOR DISPOSAL AREAS, DREDGED MATERIAL CONTAINMENT AREA 13A, GA & SC (DMDF)	8,663	8,663	8,663
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	21,050	21,050	21,050
ILLINOIS			
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	1,100	1,100	1,100
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	28,000	28,000	28,000
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	50	50	50

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	9,000	9,000	9,000
MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	2,000	2,000	2,000
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	180,000	180,000	180,000
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	19,787	19,787	19,787
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, DEFICIENCY CORRECTION, IL	50	50	50
IOWA			
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND & SD	47,127	47,127	47,127
KANSAS			
TOPEKA, KS	7,000	7,000	7,000
KENTUCKY			
OHIO RIVER SHORELINE, PADUCAH, KY	5,500	.....	5,500
LOUISIANA			
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	10,000	10,000	10,000
MARYLAND			
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	600	600	600
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	1,970	1,970	1,970
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	26,500	26,500	26,500
MINNESOTA			
MARSH LAKE, MN (MINNESOTA RIVER AUTHORITY)	2,700	.....	2,700
MISSOURI			
KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS	1,815	1,815	1,815
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	50	50	50
MONARCH—CHESTERFIELD, MO	1,275	1,275	1,275
NEW JERSEY			
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	7,500	7,500	7,500
OHIO			
BOLIVAR DAM, OH (DAM SAFETY)	3,500	3,500	3,500
OKLAHOMA			
CANTON LAKE, OK	3,632	3,632	3,632
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,957	1,957	1,957
OREGON			
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	11,000	11,000	11,000
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	13,300	13,300	13,300
PENNSYLVANIA			
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	59,000	59,000	59,000
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	52,000	52,000	52,000
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	1,000	1,000	1,000
PUERTO RICO			
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	1,700	1,700	1,700
SOUTH CAROLINA			
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	2,893	2,893	2,893
TENNESSEE			
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	30,000	30,000	30,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
TEXAS			
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	36,410	36,410	36,410
GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	13,913	13,913	13,913
GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	16,287	16,287	16,287
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN (WHARTON/ONION), TX	10,000	10,000	10,000
WASHINGTON			
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	85,300	85,300	85,300
GRAYS HARBOR (38-FOOT DEEPENING), WA	7,000	7,000	7,000
WEST VIRGINIA			
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	9,400	9,400	9,400
SUBTOTAL, ITEMS UNDER STATES	1,124,975	1,096,108	1,124,975
REMAINING ITEMS			
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION		136,117	60,000
FLOOD CONTROL		105,000	50,000
SHORE PROTECTION		45,000	
NAVIGATION		49,500	112,305
INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND PROJECTS		108,000	108,600
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES		10,000	25,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR COMPLIANCE			40,000
ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCURE PROJECTS		10,000	60,000
HYDROPOWER PROJECTS			
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM		4,000	4,000
CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION:			
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14)		3,000	1,000
SHORE PROTECTION (SECTION 103)		1,250	
NAVIGATION PROGRAM (SECTION 107)		2,500	5,000
NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)		750	500
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204, 207, 933)	2,000	2,750	500
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	500	8,000	500
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	500	2,500	10,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 1135)	500	3,000	3,000
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	24,200	24,200	24,200
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	19,000	19,000	19,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE	50	50	50
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE	275	275	275
RESTORATION OF ABANDONED MINES			2,000
HOUSE FLOOR AMENDMENTS		4,000	
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	47,025	538,892	525,930
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE			−9,905
TOTAL	1,172,000	1,635,000	1,641,000

Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier, Illinois.—The issue of hydrologic separation should be fully studied by the Corps of Engineers and vetted by the appropriate congressional authorizing committees and specifically enacted into law. No funds provided in this act may be used for construction of hydrologic separation measures.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for this program, which is the only nationwide R&D program to address invasive aquatic plants. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to continue to support cost shared aquatic plant management programs.

Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge.—The Corps of Engineers has completed the final cabin sale at the Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge. The Committee instructs the Secretary to reconcile all remaining funds in accordance with the Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge Enhancement Act of 2000. The Committee requests final accounting of the proceeds and administrative costs reimbursed to the Corps of Engineers under 808(b) within 1 year of enactment of this act.

Continuing Authorities Program.—The Committee recommends $20,500,000 for the Continuing Authorities Program [CAP], an increase of $17,000,000 from the budget request. CAP is a useful tool for the Corps of Engineers to undertake small localized projects without being encumbered by the lengthy study and authorization phases typical of most Corps of Engineers projects. The standing CAP authorities are: flood control (section 205), emergency streambank and shoreline protection (section 14), beach erosion control (section 103), mitigation of shore damages (section 111), navigation projects (section 107), snagging and clearing (section 208), aquatic ecosystem restoration (section 206), beneficial uses of dredged material (section 204), and project modifications for improvement of the environment (section 1135). The Committee has chosen to fund seven of the nine sections rather than only the four sections proposed in the budget request. The Committee has not recommended funding for section 208, as these projects can be accommodated under the authority of section 205. The Committee has not recommended funding for section 103 because the Corps of Engineers is projecting an $8,000,000 carryover of unobligated balances from prior appropriations.

The Committee urges the administration to execute the CAP program laid out by the Committee and include sufficient funding for this program in future budget requests. The Corps of Engineers shall continue the ongoing processes for initiating, suspending, and terminating projects. Suspended projects shall not be reactivated or funded unless the sponsor reaffirms in writing its support for the project and establishes its willingness and capability to execute its project responsibilities. The Chief of Engineers shall provide an annual report within 60 days of the end of each fiscal year detailing the progress made on the backlog of projects. The report shall include the completions and terminations as well as progress of ongoing work.

Restoration of Abandoned Mines.—The Corps of Engineers is directed to continue working closely with Federal land management agencies, western States, and Tribes with abandoned non-coal mine sites to cost-effectively address the greatest number of those sites presenting threats to public health and safety.

Public-Private Partnerships.—The Committee notes that the Secretary and the Chief of Engineers expressed strong support for a public-private partnerships [Partnership] as a method to reduce the Federal cost of future construction projects. The acronyms P3, P4,

etcetera are interchangeable and represent the number of public and/or private entities that comprise the Partnership. The Committee believes the Corps of Engineers should demonstrate the value of projects that use a Partnership model and directs that, of the six new construction starts, at least one shall be either a navigation or flood risk management project that utilizes such a Partnership. The Committee further directs that the selected Partnership project should have a Chief's Report showing a benefit-cost ratio greater than one for the Federal investment only, but shall not be subject to any other restrictions applicable to traditional construction new starts to ensure that multiple projects qualify for selection as a Partnership project.

Reimbursements.—The Committee directs the Secretary to prioritize the Corps of Engineers' reimbursement obligations based on projects with signed project cooperation agreements. The Secretary shall demonstrate plans for the additional funding provided by Congress to meet the project cooperation agreement and Federal Government's fiscal responsibilities.

Metro East Saint Louis, Illinois.—This levee rehabilitation project will help protect communities in the Metro East region from rising waters on the Mississippi River. The non-Federal sponsors remain very interested in continuing implementation of the project, have raised sufficient cost share, and should be given heightened cooperation by the Corps of Engineers. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to enter a cost share agreement with the non-Federal sponsors.

Melvin Price Lock and Dam, Illinois and Missouri.—The length of time it is taking the Corps of Engineers to rectify the seepage problems that the impoundment of the navigation pool is causing to the Wood River Levee, as well as escalating cost estimates, continues to be troublesome. The Corps of Engineers is encouraged to ensure that the Independent External Peer Review and oversight of this project continues and is conducted in a manner that will not lengthen an already long schedule.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Committee recommendation includes $469,000,000 in additional funds for Construction. The Corps of Engineers is directed to allocate these additional funds in accordance with the direction in the front matter under the heading "Fiscal Year 2016 Work Plan". Additionally, the Corps of Engineers shall comply with the following direction in allocating funds made available for Construction:

—Additional considerations include whether the project is positioned to permit award of significant items of construction, achieve necessary milestones, or otherwise realize notable construction progress in fiscal year 2016; and the project sponsor expended funds under an existing Project Partnership Agreement for creditable work, including acquisition of rights-of-way.

—None of these funds shall be used for projects in the Continuing Authorities Program.

—Funding may be for all categories including periodic beach renourishments and reimbursements.

—Funding may be made available to projects for which the sponsor is awaiting reimbursement from the Federal Government

to continue with construction of remaining authorized project features.

In prioritizing projects for environmental infrastructure assistance, the Committee recognizes that these authorities were originally created to assist communities that were unable to compete well in the Statewide revolving fund authorities under the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency. While the Committee believes it is appropriate to prioritize those projects with the greater economic impact, it recognizes that such rigid criteria may exclude rural underserved communities with greater needs and projects located in towns, cities, and municipalities experiencing compliance difficulties with Federal environmental regulations. When allocating these funds, the Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to consider counties or parishes where the average family income is below the national poverty level.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Appropriations, 2015	$302,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016	225,000,000
House allowance	275,000,000
Committee recommendation	330,000,000

The Committee recommends $330,000,000 for Mississippi River and Tributaries, an increase of $105,000,000 over the budget request. Funds recommended in this account are for planning, construction, and operations and maintenance activities associated with water resource projects located in the lower Mississippi River Valley from Cape Girardeau, Missouri to the Gulf of Mexico.

The table below displays the budget request and Committee's recommendation:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
CONSTRUCTION					
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	43,231	43,231	43,231		
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	15,909	15,909	15,909		
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	2,709	2,709	2,709		
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	758	758	758		
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	62,607	62,607	62,607		
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	65,124	65,124	65,124		
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	15	15	15		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	250	250	250		
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	294	294	294		
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	198	198	198		
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	9,175	9,175	9,175		
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	5,900	5,900	5,900		
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	2,589	2,589	2,589		
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	1,000	1,000	1,000		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	170	170	170		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	100	100	100		
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	12,085	12,085	12,085		
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	1,889	1,889	1,889		
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	53	53	53		
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	48	48	48		
BONNET CARRE, LA	2,909	2,909	2,909		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,399	1,399	1,399		
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	498	498	498		
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	567	567	567		
OLD RIVER, LA	9,246	9,246	9,246		
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	3,345	3,345	3,345		
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	24	24	24		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	130	130	130		

VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	42	42	42	.....	.....
YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	5,483	5,483	5,483	.....	.....
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	185	185	185	.....	.....
YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS	4,924	4,924	4,924	.....	.....
YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS	807	807	807	.....	.....
YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS	5,487	5,487	5,487	.....	.....
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	1,344	1,344	1,344	.....	.....
YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS	6,640	6,640	6,640	.....	.....
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	967	967	967	.....	.....
YAZOO BASIN, WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	384	384	384	.....	.....
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	544	544	544	.....	.....
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS	731	731	731	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	220	220	220	.....	.....
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	4,512	4,512	4,512	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	80	80	80	.....	.....
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	2,107	2,107	2,107	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	151,465	151,465	151,465	.....	.....
REMAINING ITEMS					
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:					
DREDGING	.....	6,000	10,090	+10,090	+4,090
FLOOD CONTROL	.....	39,090	60,000	+60,000	+20,910
WATER SUPPLY AND RELATED AUTHORIZED PURPOSES	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
OTHER AUTHORIZED PURPOSES	.....	5,000	35,000	+35,000	+30,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	9,700	9,700	9,700	.....	.....
MAPPING	1,138	1,138	1,138	.....	.....
MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION	90	.....	.....	−90	.....
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	10,928	60,928	115,928	+105,000	+55,000
REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	225,000	275,000	330,000	+105,000	+55,000

The Committee's recommendation includes not less than $1,000,000 for the competitive procurement of modern land surveying equipment for Corps of Engineers districts.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work—Flood Control.—Within the amounts available for flood control, the Committee recommendation provides not less than $25,000,000 for ongoing construction projects outside of the Lower Mississippi River main stem that were not included in the administration's request, and which provide benefits and value to the Nation.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work—Other Authorized Purposes.—Within the amounts available for other authorized purposes, the Committee recommendation provides not less than $3,000,000 for maintenance projects with recreational or environmental stewardship components. Funding associated with this category should be used to perform routine and non-routine operations and maintenance of facilities that are both recreational and educational, or to continue management of mitigation features in order to meet requirements set forth under the Corps of Engineers' plans.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work—Dredging.—In considering dredging projects for funding, the Corps of Engineers shall give priority to annual tonnage and the total work capability that can be completed in fiscal year 2016.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 2015	$2,908,511,000
Budget estimate, 2016	2,710,000,000
House allowance	3,094,306,000
Committee recommendation	2,909,000,000

The Committee recommends $2,909,000,000 for Operations and Maintenance, an increase of $199,000,000 over the budget request.

INTRODUCTION

Funding in this account is used to fund operations, maintenance, and related activities at water resource projects that the Corps of Engineers operates and maintains. These activities include dredging, repair, and operation of structures and other facilities, as authorized in the various river and harbor, flood control, and water resources development acts. Related activities include aquatic plant control, monitoring of completed projects where appropriate, removal of sunken vessels, and the collection of domestic waterborne commerce statistics.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The table below displays the budget request and Committee's recommendation for Operations and Maintenance.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA			
ALABAMA—COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	158	158	158
ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL	21,238	21,238	21,238

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	43,295	43,295	43,295
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,869	5,869	5,869
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	65	65	65
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	23,230	23,230	23,230
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	148	148	148
TENNESSEE—TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL & MS	1,700	1,700	1,700
TENNESSEE—TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	24,725	24,725	24,725
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	10,644	10,644	10,644
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, AL	25	25	25
ALASKA			
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	11,904	11,904	11,904
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	3,615	3,615	3,615
CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	400	400	400
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	1,231	1,231	1,231
HOMER HARBOR, AK	462	462	462
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	180	180	180
KETCHIKAN, THOMAS BASIN, AK	334	334	334
LOWELL CREEK TUNNELL (SEWARD) AK	2,286	2,286	2,286
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	345	345	345
NOME HARBOR, AK	1,550	1,550	1,550
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	700	700	700
ST. PAUL HARBOR, AK	4,000	4,000	4,000
ARIZONA			
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,472	1,472	1,472
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	71	71	71
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,024	1,024	1,024
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	133	133	133
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	367	367	367
ARKANSAS			
BEAVER LAKE, AR	7,632	7,632	7,632
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	7,513	7,513	7,513
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	2,496	2,496	2,496
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	9,646	9,646	9,646
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	8,183	8,183	8,183
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	6,121	6,121	6,121
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,754	1,754	1,754
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,702	1,702	1,702
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,519	1,519	1,519
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	9,474	9,474	9,474
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	15	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	538	538	538
MCCLELLAN–KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	30,554	30,554	30,554
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,946	2,946	2,946
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	8,975	8,975	8,975
NIMROD LAKE, AR	2,520	2,520	2,520
NORFORK LAKE, AR	5,172	5,172	5,172
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	15	15	15
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	8,076	8,076	8,076
OZARK—JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	6,611	6,611	6,611
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	2	2	2
WHITE RIVER, AR	25	25	25
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	3	3	3
CALIFORNIA			
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	2,777	2,777	2,777
BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	2,001	2,001	2,001
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	4,001	4,001	4,001
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	6,411	6,411	6,411
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	431	431	431

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	2,180	2,180	2,180
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	3,106	3,106	3,106
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	4,198	4,198	4,198
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,550	1,550	1,550
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	7,327	7,327	7,327
MARINA DEL REY, CA	3,846	3,846	3,846
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	387	387	387
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	389	389	389
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	3,070	3,070	3,070
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,993	2,993	2,993
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,998	1,998	1,998
NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR, CA	2,365	2,365	2,365
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	15,000	15,000	15,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	2,285	2,285	2,285
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	3,409	3,409	3,409
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,794	1,794	1,794
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	4,500	4,500	4,500
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	12,243	12,243	12,243
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	1,100	1,100	1,100
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	2,042	2,042	2,042
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	160	160	160
SAN FRANCISCO BAY DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,001	1,001	1,001
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	500	500	500
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	4,240	4,240	4,240
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	3,220	3,220	3,220
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	4,442	4,442	4,442
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,180	1,180	1,180
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	4,521	4,521	4,521
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	2,760	2,760	2,760
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,310	1,310	1,310
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	2,423	2,423	2,423
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	3,250	3,250	3,250
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA (DAM SAFETY)	2,212	2,212	2,212
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	4,830	4,830	4,830
YUBA RIVER, CA	1,450	1,450	1,450
COLORADO			
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	883	883	883
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,919	1,919	1,919
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	1,677	1,677	1,677
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	364	364	364
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,865	2,865	2,865
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	529	529	529
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,449	1,449	1,449
CONNECTICUT			
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	603	603	603
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	708	708	708
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	686	686	686
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	1,113	1,113	1,113
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CT	10	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	260	260	260
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	647	647	647
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	743	743	743
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	850	850	850
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	566	566	566
THOMASTON DAM, CT	1,026	1,026	1,026
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	1,753	1,753	1,753
DELAWARE			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DE	40	40	40

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD	13,429	13,429	13,429
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	200	200	200
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,845	3,845	3,845
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	142	142	142
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL)	875	875	875
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	25	25	25
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	25	25	25
FLORIDA			
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	4,430	4,430	4,430
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	14,683	14,683	14,683
ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL & AL	1,123	1,123	1,123
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	1,450	1,450	1,450
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	700	700	700
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	6,100	6,100	6,100
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	7,269	7,269	7,269
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	400	400	400
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	250	250	250
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,750	2,750	2,750
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	3,200	3,200	3,200
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	1,840	1,840	1,840
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	300	300	300
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	1,425	1,425	1,425
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,200	3,200	3,200
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	33	33	33
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	7,181	7,181	7,181
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	9,500	9,500	9,500
WATER / ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, FL	40	40	40
GEORGIA			
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	7,406	7,406	7,406
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	1,525	1,525	1,525
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	176	176	176
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	5,808	5,808	5,808
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	12,141	12,141	12,141
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	7,584	7,584	7,584
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	11,175	11,175	11,175
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, GA	12	12	12
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	190	190	190
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	9,887	9,887	9,887
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA	125	125	125
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	8,065	8,065	8,065
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	17,321	17,321	17,321
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	105	105	105
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	7,000	7,000	7,000
HAWAII			
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	317	317	317
HONOLULU HARBOR, HI	5,600	5,600	5,600
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	725	725	725
KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	5,000	5,000	5,000
PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	773	773	773
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	798	798	798
IDAHO			
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,337	1,337	1,337
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,983	2,983	2,983
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	377	377	377
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	2,806	2,806	2,806

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	623	623	623
ILLINOIS			
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	4,506	4,506	4,506
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	5,837	5,837	5,837
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	3,735	3,735	3,735
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	560	560	560
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	296	296	296
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	48,709	48,709	48,709
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,826	1,826	1,826
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, IL	50	50	50
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	2,393	2,393	2,393
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	3,648	3,648	3,648
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	784	784	784
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	6,208	6,208	6,208
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION), IL	82,208	82,208	82,208
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION), IL	22,226	22,226	22,226
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	104	104	104
REND LAKE, IL	5,606	5,606	5,606
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	741	741	741
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	1,439	1,439	1,439
INDIANA			
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	1,128	1,128	1,128
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,852	1,852	1,852
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	1,628	1,628	1,628
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	1,656	1,656	1,656
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	11,339	11,339	11,339
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	1,124	1,124	1,124
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	1,950	1,950	1,950
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,235	1,235	1,235
MONROE LAKE, IN	1,226	1,226	1,226
PATOKA LAKE, IN	1,222	1,222	1,222
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	185	185	185
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	1,154	1,154	1,154
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	141	141	141
IOWA			
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	4,204	4,204	4,204
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	762	762	762
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA, KS, MO & NE	9,143	9,143	9,143
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND & SD	5,436	5,436	5,436
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,913	2,913	2,913
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	4,725	4,725	4,725
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	5,266	5,266	5,266
KANSAS			
CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,441	2,441	2,441
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,502	1,502	1,502
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	2,701	2,701	2,701
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	951	951	951
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,136	1,136	1,136
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	976	976	976
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	944	944	944
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,549	1,549	1,549
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	2,915	2,915	2,915
MARION LAKE, KS	3,207	3,207	3,207
MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,444	2,444	2,444
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,376	2,376	2,376

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
PEARSON—SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	1,552	1,552	1,552
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,485	2,485	2,485
POMONA LAKE, KS	2,259	2,259	2,259
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	290	290	290
TORONTO LAKE, KS	724	724	724
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	3,142	3,142	3,142
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,911	1,911	1,911
KENTUCKY			
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	11,554	11,554	11,554
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,993	2,993	2,993
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,904	1,904	1,904
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,725	1,725	1,725
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,969	1,969	1,969
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	1,038	1,038	1,038
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,853	1,853	1,853
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	15	15	15
FALLS OF THE OHIO NATIONAL WILDLIFE, KY & IN	19	19	19
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	2,075	2,075	2,075
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,526	1,526	1,526
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	2,139	2,139	2,139
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,709	2,709	2,709
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	975	975	975
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	10	10	10
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	2,042	2,042	2,042
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	1,091	1,091	1,091
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	264	264	264
NOLIN LAKE, KY	2,743	2,743	2,743
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	31,219	31,219	31,219
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	5,600	5,600	5,600
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,430	1,430	1,430
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	2	2	2
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,826	2,826	2,826
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,444	1,444	1,444
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	9,189	9,189	9,189
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,215	1,215	1,215
LOUISIANA			
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK, LA	7,051	7,051	7,051
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	108	108	108
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	1,221	1,221	1,221
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	956	956	956
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	23	23	23
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	15	15	15
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	5	5	5
BAYOU TECHE, LA	72	72	72
CADDO LAKE, LA	209	209	209
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	20,386	20,386	20,386
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,547	1,547	1,547
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	19,681	19,681	19,681
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	1,276	1,276	1,276
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	961	961	961
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	8,782	8,782	8,782
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	14	14	14
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	4	4	4
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,374	1,374	1,374
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,575	1,575	1,575
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LA	85,866	85,866	85,866
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	49	49	49
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	384	384	384
WALLACE LAKE, LA	226	226	226
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	6	6	6

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	15	15	15
MAINE			
DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME	1,050	1,050	1,050
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, ME	5	5	5
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	111	111	111
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,100	1,100	1,100
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	25	25	25
MARYLAND			
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	18,925	18,925	18,925
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)	325	325	325
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	150	150	150
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	162	162	162
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,905	1,905	1,905
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	450	450	450
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	61	61	61
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	1,500	1,500	1,500
MASSACHUSETTS			
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	718	718	718
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	933	933	933
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	609	609	609
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	9,665	9,665	9,665
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	388	388	388
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	609	609	609
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	772	772	772
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	620	620	620
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, MA	20	20	20
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	331	331	331
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	841	841	841
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	790	790	790
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, MA	806	806	806
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	900	900	900
TULLY LAKE, MA	721	721	721
WEST HILL DAM, MA	831	831	831
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	603	603	603
WEYMOUTH–FORE RIVER, MA	500	500	500
MICHIGAN			
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	180	180	180
DETROIT RIVER, MI	5,475	5,475	5,475
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,015	1,015	1,015
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	750	750	750
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	210	210	210
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	28	28	28
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	590	590	590
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	650	650	650
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	1,400	1,400	1,400
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	850	850	850
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	596	596	596
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	710	710	710
ROUGE RIVER, MI	900	900	900
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	2,775	2,775	2,775
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	40	40	40
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	665	665	665
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,590	1,590	1,590
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	31,160	31,160	31,160
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,788	2,788	2,788
MINNESOTA			
BIGSTONE LAKE—WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	257	257	257

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
DULUTH—SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	6,641	6,641	6,641
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	332	332	332
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	1,805	1,805	1,805
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	262	262	262
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION), MN	58,644	58,644	58,644
ORWELL LAKE, MN	468	468	468
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	88	88	88
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	184	184	184
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	4,240	4,240	4,240
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	490	490	490
TWO HARBORS, MN	1,000	1,000	1,000
MISSISSIPPI			
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	1	1	1
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	285	285	285
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	4,492	4,492	4,492
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	92	92	92
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	34	34	34
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,569	1,569	1,569
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	7,055	7,055	7,055
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	150	150	150
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	150	150	150
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	9	9	9
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, MS	15	15	15
YAZOO RIVER, MS	21	21	21
MISSOURI			
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	15	15	15
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	8,813	8,813	8,813
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	3,353	3,353	3,353
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	9,698	9,698	9,698
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	1,401	1,401	1,401
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	950	950	950
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	882	882	882
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	24,487	24,487	24,487
NEW MADRID COUNTY HARBOR, MO	10	10	10
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO (MILE 889)	15	15	15
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,739	2,739	2,739
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	2	2	2
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	90	90	90
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,620	1,620	1,620
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	1	1	1
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	4,960	4,960	4,960
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR	9,352	9,352	9,352
MONTANA			
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	5,271	5,271	5,271
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	206	206	206
LIBBY DAM, MT	2,088	2,088	2,088
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	125	125	125
NEBRASKA			
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	9,726	9,726	9,726
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	3,742	3,742	3,742
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	505	505	505
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	90	90	90
PAPILLION CREEK, NE	989	989	989
SALT CREEKS AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	1,089	1,089	1,089

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
NEVADA			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	75	75	75
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	1,163	1,163	1,163
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	353	353	353
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	674	674	674
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	863	863	863
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	1,007	1,007	1,007
HOPKINTON—EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,348	1,348	1,348
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	76	76	76
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	740	740	740
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	250	250	250
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	1,139	1,139	1,139
NEW JERSEY			
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	425	425	425
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	375	375	375
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	15	15	15
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	23,305	23,305	23,305
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	285	285	285
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	420	420	420
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	260	260	260
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	300	300	300
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	605	605	605
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	1,893	1,893	1,893
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT–OFF, NJ	150	150	150
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	150	150	150
SHARK RIVER, NJ	460	460	460
NEW MEXICO			
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	3,357	3,357	3,357
COCHITI LAKE, NM	3,172	3,172	3,172
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	2,616	2,616	2,616
GALISTEO DAM, NM	762	762	762
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NM	20	20	20
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	650	650	650
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	1,047	1,047	1,047
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM, NM	2,500	2,500	2,500
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,894	1,894	1,894
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	330	330	330
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	1,028	1,028	1,028
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM	1,300	1,300	1,300
NEW YORK			
ALMOND LAKE, NY	439	439	439
ARKPORT DAM, NY	307	307	307
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,735	1,735	1,735
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	320	320	320
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	100	100	100
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	220	220	220
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	906	906	906
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	50	50	50
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	50	50	50
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	3,640	3,640	3,640
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O & C)	4,250	4,250	4,250
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	1,220	1,220	1,220
JAMAICA BAY, NY	251	251	251
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	100	100	100
MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY	3,595	3,595	3,595

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	400	400	400
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	5,480	5,480	5,480
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	3,650	3,650	3,650
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	9,300	9,300	9,300
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	1,045	1,045	1,045
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	1,285	1,285	1,285
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	2,193	2,193	2,193
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	2,320	2,320	2,320
RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	250	250	250
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	587	587	587
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	616	616	616
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	1,120	1,120	1,120
NORTH CAROLINA			
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	2,600	2,600	2,600
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	2,049	2,049	2,049
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	772	772	772
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,776	1,776	1,776
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	270	270	270
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	2,000	2,000	2,000
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	50	50	50
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	8,796	8,796	8,796
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	700	700	700
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	300	300	300
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	300	300	300
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	3,363	3,363	3,363
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	15,019	15,019	15,019
NORTH DAKOTA			
BOWMAN HALEY, ND	186	186	186
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	13,290	13,290	13,290
HOMME LAKE, ND	284	284	284
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	332	332	332
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,533	1,533	1,533
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	518	518	518
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	127	127	127
SOURIS RIVER, ND	382	382	382
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	32	32	32
OHIO			
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	1,715	1,715	1,715
BERLIN LAKE, OH	2,360	2,360	2,360
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	2,035	2,035	2,035
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	1,251	1,251	1,251
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	9,540	9,540	9,540
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	2,665	2,665	2,665
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	1,398	1,398	1,398
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	1,773	1,773	1,773
DILLON LAKE, OH	1,333	1,333	1,333
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	190	190	190
HURON HARBOR, OH	3,200	3,200	3,200
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	697	697	697
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	66	66	66
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	1,201	1,201	1,201
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,429	1,429	1,429
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	10,584	10,584	10,584
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	400	400	400
OHIO–MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL, OH	1,792	1,792	1,792
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	1,396	1,396	1,396
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	305	305	305
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	36	36	36
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,700	1,700	1,700

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	258	258	258
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	7,165	7,165	7,165
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	780	780	780
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	959	959	959
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	1,595	1,595	1,595
OKLAHOMA			
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	472	472	472
BIRCH LAKE, OK	673	673	673
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	2,213	2,213	2,213
CANTON LAKE, OK	4,350	4,350	4,350
COPAN LAKE, OK	1,666	1,666	1,666
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	5,748	5,748	5,748
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	5,593	5,593	5,593
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	1,173	1,173	1,173
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	432	432	432
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	820	820	820
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,996	1,996	1,996
HULAH LAKE, OK	3,792	3,792	3,792
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	141	141	141
KAW LAKE, OK	1,967	1,967	1,967
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	3,891	3,891	3,891
MCCLELLAN–KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	5,662	5,662	5,662
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,573	2,573	2,573
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	36	36	36
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	148	148	148
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,366	1,366	1,366
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OK	6,360	6,360	6,360
SARDIS LAKE, OK	991	991	991
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	1,200	1,200	1,200
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,676	1,676	1,676
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	4,697	4,697	4,697
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,622	1,622	1,622
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	6,354	6,354	6,354
WISTER LAKE, OK	829	829	829
OREGON			
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	1,018	1,018	1,018
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	1,128	1,128	1,128
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	7,570	7,570	7,570
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	19,825	19,825	19,825
COOS BAY, OR	6,239	6,239	6,239
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	1,349	1,349	1,349
COUGAR LAKE, OR	5,466	5,466	5,466
DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,131	1,131	1,131
DORENA LAKE, OR	1,168	1,168	1,168
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	386	386	386
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	5,224	5,224	5,224
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	1,727	1,727	1,727
GREEN PETER—FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,161	2,161	2,161
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	1,381	1,381	1,381
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, OR	20	20	20
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	1,040	1,040	1,040
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,865	4,865	4,865
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	2,371	2,371	2,371
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	4,004	4,004	4,004
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	7,011	7,011	7,011
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	400	400	400
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	86	86	86
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	2,598	2,598	2,598
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	128	128	128
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	200	200	200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	909	909	909
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	3,002	3,002	3,002
PENNSYLVANIA			
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	5,317	5,317	5,317
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	740	740	740
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	345	345	345
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,290	1,290	1,290
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,774	2,774	2,774
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,347	1,347	1,347
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,896	1,896	1,896
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,731	1,731	1,731
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	851	851	851
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	5,460	5,460	5,460
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,205	1,205	1,205
ERIE HARBOR, PA	1,500	1,500	1,500
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	1,178	1,178	1,178
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	905	905	905
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	385	385	385
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	1,179	1,179	1,179
JOHNSTOWN, PA	62	62	62
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,191	1,191	1,191
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,682	1,682	1,682
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,308	1,308	1,308
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	15,986	15,986	15,986
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	47,965	47,965	47,965
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	800	800	800
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	170	170	170
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	585	585	585
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	27	27	27
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	5,357	5,357	5,357
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	45	45	45
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,031	2,031	2,031
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	570	570	570
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	106	106	106
TIOGA—HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,611	2,611	2,611
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	2,032	2,032	2,032
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	414	414	414
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	944	944	944
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	1,463	1,463	1,463
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	3,274	3,274	3,274
PUERTO RICO			
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	5,700	5,700	5,700
RHODE ISLAND			
BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI	350	350	350
FOX POINT BARRIER, NARRANGANSETT BAY, RI	2,636	2,636	2,636
GREAT SALT POND, BLOCK ISLAND, RI	350	350	350
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, RI	25	25	25
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	48	48	48
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	350	350	350
WOONSOCKET, RI	499	499	499
SOUTH CAROLINA			
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	100	100	100
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	17,059	17,059	17,059
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	6,930	6,930	6,930
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	65	65	65
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	875	875	875
TOWN CREEK, SC	530	530	530

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	10,363	10,363	10,363
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	355	355	355
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	313	313	313
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	11,253	11,253	11,253
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	169	169	169
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	594	594	594
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	12,222	12,222	12,222
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	143	143	143
TENNESSEE			
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,893	5,893	5,893
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	9,429	9,429	9,429
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	1,630	1,630	1,630
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	7,210	7,210	7,210
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	6,824	6,824	6,824
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	182	182	182
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	5,060	5,060	5,060
NORTHWEST TENNESSEE REGIONAL HARBOR, LAKE COUNTY, TN	10	10	10
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	10,416	10,416	10,416
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	2	2	2
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	23,759	23,759	23,759
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	250	250	250
TEXAS			
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	1,727	1,727	1,727
ARKANSAS—RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VIII, TX	1,660	1,660	1,660
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	2,621	2,621	2,621
BELTON LAKE, TX	4,654	4,654	4,654
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,612	2,612	2,612
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	2,700	2,700	2,700
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,612	2,612	2,612
CANYON LAKE, TX	3,897	3,897	3,897
CHANNEL TO HARLINGEN, TX	1,478	1,478	1,478
CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX	168	168	168
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	8,750	8,750	8,750
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	9,656	9,656	9,656
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	33	33	33
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	3,408	3,408	3,408
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	5,800	5,800	5,800
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	10,900	10,900	10,900
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	2,700	2,700	2,700
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,624	2,624	2,624
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	3,191	3,191	3,191
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	23,785	23,785	23,785
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,555	1,555	1,555
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	32,633	32,633	32,633
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	1,937	1,937	1,937
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,466	1,466	1,466
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	1,130	1,130	1,130
LAKE KEMP, TX	302	302	302
LAVON LAKE, TX	4,267	4,267	4,267
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	4,035	4,035	4,035
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,100	6,100	6,100
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	3,839	3,839	3,839
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	2,226	2,226	2,226
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	860	860	860
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,065	1,065	1,065
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	2,644	2,644	2,644
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	300	300	300
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	2,217	2,217	2,217

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
SABINE—NECHES WATERWAY, TX	14,100	14,100	14,100
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	7,613	7,613	7,613
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	271	271	271
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	3,075	3,075	3,075
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	2,413	2,413	2,413
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,000	1,000	1,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	3,894	3,894	3,894
WACO LAKE, TX	6,614	6,614	6,614
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,999	1,999	1,999
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	7,007	7,007	7,007
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	4,270	4,270	4,270
UTAH			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	40	40	40
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	655	655	655
VERMONT			
BALL MOUNTAIN, VT	930	930	930
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	46	46	46
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	40	40	40
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	1,067	1,067	1,067
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	1,038	1,038	1,038
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	1,026	1,026	1,026
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	811	811	811
VIRGINIA			
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA	2,525	2,525	2,525
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA	1,130	1,130	1,130
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	600	600	600
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,070	2,070	2,070
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HARBOR, VA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	1,500	1,500	1,500
HAMPTON ROADS, VA (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	114	114	114
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	297	297	297
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	4,006	4,006	4,006
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	10,976	10,976	10,976
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	2,347	2,347	2,347
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	500	500	500
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	12,543	12,543	12,543
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	685	685	685
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	5,023	5,023	5,023
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	1,298	1,298	1,298
RUDEE INLET, VA	400	400	400
WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATIONS, VA	135	135	135
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	50	50	50
WASHINGTON			
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	672	672	672
COLUMBIA AND LOWER WILLAMETTE RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLAND, OR	38,132	38,132	38,132
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR	1,001	1,001	1,001
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	3,498	3,498	3,498
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,358	1,358	1,358
GRAYS HARBOR(38–F00T DEEPENING), WA	12,018	12,018	12,018
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	3,347	3,347	3,347
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	9,172	9,172	9,172
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WA	70	70	70
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	1,087	1,087	1,087
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	8,872	8,872	8,872
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	7,267	7,267	7,267
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,222	3,222	3,222
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	6,695	6,695	6,695

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	2,255	2,255	2,255
MOUNT SAINT HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	268	268	268
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	9,548	9,548	9,548
NEAH BAY, WA	275	275	275
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	580	580	580
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,200	1,200	1,200
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	100	100	100
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	423	423	423
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	565	565	565
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	290	290	290
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	64	64	64
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	155	155	155
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	10,931	10,931	10,931
WEST VIRGINIA			
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,330	1,330	1,330
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	2,043	2,043	2,043
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,458	2,458	2,458
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	2,497	2,497	2,497
ELKINS, WV	55	55	55
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	424	424	424
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	8,258	8,258	8,258
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	38,310	38,310	38,310
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,977	2,977	2,977
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	2,266	2,266	2,266
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,160	1,160	1,160
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,432	2,432	2,432
SUTTON LAKE, WV	2,412	2,412	2,412
TYGART LAKE, WV	2,397	2,397	2,397
WISCONSIN			
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	808	808	808
FOX RIVER, WI	2,489	2,489	2,489
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	2,885	2,885	2,885
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	52	52	52
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	15	15	15
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	845	845	845
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	1,600	1,600	1,600
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	304	304	304
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	19	19	19
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	567	567	567
WYOMING			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WY	12	12	12
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	74	74	74
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	2,104	2,104	2,104
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	234	234	234
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	2,523,734	2,523,734	2,523,734
REMAINING ITEMS			
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK			
DONOR AND ENERGY PORTS	.....	.....	50,000
NAVIGATION MAINTENANCE	.....	.....	33,346
DEEP–DRAFT HARBOR AND CHANNEL	.....	234,000	135,000
INLAND WATERWAYS	.....	42,000	45,000
SMALL, REMOTE, OR SUBSISTENCE HARBORS AND CHANNELS	.....	42,500	50,000
OTHER AUTHORIZED PURPOSES	.....	35,100	20,000
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	675	675	675
ASSET MANAGEMENT/FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT (FEM)	3,250	3,250	3,250
CIVIL WORKS WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CWWMS)	15,000	5,000	15,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
BUDGET/MANAGEMENT SUPPORT FOR O&M BUSINESS PROGRAMS			
STEWARDSHIP SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,000	1,000	1,000
PERFORMANCE-BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	3,939	3,939	3,939
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,650	1,650	1,650
OPTIMIZATION TOOLS FOR NAVIGATION	322	322	322
COASTAL DATA INFORMATION PROGRAM (CDIP)	3,000	5,400	5,400
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,700	2,700	2,700
RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE AT CORPS PROJECTS	6,000	6,000	6,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	6,000	6,000	6,000
DREDGE MCFARLAND READY RESERVE	11,690	11,690	11,690
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	15,000	15,000	15,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,119	1,119	1,119
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	6,450	6,450	6,450
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)	2,820	2,820	2,820
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	270	270	270
FACILITY PROTECTION	4,000	4,000	4,000
FISH & WILDLIFE OPERATING FISH HATCHERY REIMBURSEMENT	4,700	4,700	5,400
GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODEL	600	600	600
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	4,500	4,500	4,500
INTERAGENCY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TASK FORCE/HURRICANE PROTECTION DECISION CHRONOLOGY (IPET/HPDC) LESSONS LEARNED IMPLEMENTATION	2,800	2,800	2,800
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED FEDERAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	28,000	28,000	28,000
MONITORING OF COMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS	3,300	3,300	4,000
NATIONAL (LEVEE) FLOOD INVENTORY	16,000	16,000	16,000
NATIONAL (MULTIPLE PROJECT) NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	6,000	6,000	6,000
NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING PROGRAM	6,300	6,300	6,300
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM (PORTFOLIO RISK ASSESSMENT)	10,000	10,000	10,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP)	4,500	4,500	4,500
NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR REALLOCATIONS	1,071	1,071	1,071
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT	1,481	1,481	1,481
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,669	4,669	4,669
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	795	795	795
RECREATIONONESTOP (R1S) NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVATION SERVICE	65	65	65
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,800	1,800	1,800
REVIEW OF NON–FEDERAL ALTERATIONS OF CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS (SECTION 408)	4,000	4,000	4,000
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHAB	300	300	300
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS)	500	2,500	5,500
HOUSE FLOOR AMENDMENTS	.....	36,306	.....
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	186,266	570,572	528,412
REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	−143,146
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	2,710,000	3,094,306	2,909,000

Lowell Creek Tunnel, Alaska.—The Committee recognizes the current problems with the existing Lowell Creek Tunnel and encourages the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study for an alternative method of flood diversion for Lowell Canyon. The Water Resources Development Act of 2007 transferred operations and maintenance to the Corps of Engineers until a new alternative was built, or for 15 years, whichever was earlier. This bill includes a general provision to extend the Corps of Engineers' operation and maintenance responsibility for this project for another 5 years. The Corps of Engineers has not progressed towards developing an alter-

native, and the City of Seward cannot afford the estimated $1,500,000 per year in operations and maintenance costs of the tunnel.

Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Recovery.—It has come to the Committee's attention that the Corps of Engineers has listed the Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Recovery program under the navigation business line. The Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Recovery program is associated with flood plain mitigation and compliance with endangered species protection requirements. The Committee seeks to understand how these activities relate to the promotion of navigation. The Corps of Engineers has recently classified the program under the navigation business line. The Committee directs that, within 60 days of the date of enactment of this act, the Corps of Engineers shall submit to the Committee the reasons for this classification. The Corps of Engineers shall describe its plans to ensure that it does not impact anticipated or needed work under the Bank Stabilization and Navigation Program.

WRRDA Section 1039—Invasive Species.—Funding is provided for watercraft inspection stations, as authorized by WRRDA section 1039. The Secretary, in consultation with the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, is required to establish watercraft inspection stations in the vicinity of reservoirs operated by the Corps of Engineers, including for boat inspection stations in the Columbia River Basin States. These inspection stations are the principal line of defense against the spread of aquatic species at reservoirs operated and maintained by the Secretary, such as entry of zebra and quagga mussels into the Flathead Basin in Montana.

Monitoring of Completed Navigation Projects.—The Committee recommends additional funding for the Corps of Engineers to monitor aging navigation infrastructure to ensure that it continues operating as planned.

Operations and Maintenance—Fisheries.—The Committee is concerned that a reduction in or elimination of navigational lock operations is having a negative impact on the ability of a number of endangered, threatened, and game fish species to migrate through waterways, particularly during critical spawning periods. The Committee is aware of preliminary research that indicates reduced lock operations on certain Corps of Engineers' designated low-use waterways is directly impacting migration and that there are effective means to mitigate the impacts. The Committee believes maximizing the ability of fish to use these locks to move past the dams has the potential to restore natural and historic long-distance river migrations that may well be critical to species survival. The Committee provides $2,000,000 to continue external fish behavior research to determine the appropriate time, frequency, and number of mitigation lockages; how to increase the numbers of fish entering locks during navigational and mitigation operations; and how to get fish to stay in locks for the optimal period of time. This research should be conducted in coordination with both the Corps of Engineers and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Levels of Service.—The Committee is aware of recent decisions to reduce service levels at locks across the country. The Committee notes that the Corps of Engineers is authorized to open locks independently of the established levels of service [LoS] for specific and

unique activities where such opening and closing will be advantageous to fostering economic and community development. The Committee remains concerned about limited budgetary resources for infrastructure improvements on the Nation's locks and dams, and encourages the Corps of Engineers to consider all options within its statutory authority to collect additional funds. Such efforts should include acceptance of contributed funds under existing authorities, to maintain robust lock operations. Such efforts should also include public-private partnerships, which include State agencies, to ensure locks are safe and operational for economic growth and community development. Local economies benefit from using locks and dams for commercial and recreational uses that are unrelated to commercial barge traffic. The Committee acknowledges that the Corps of Engineers has given local communities assurances that, within its current statutory authority, the Corps of Engineers will be sensitive to economic impacts on local economies.

Dam Optimization.—The Corps of Engineers is urged not to carry out any reservoir reoperation or reallocation for authorized purposes at Corps of Engineers' facilities with funds from any non-Federal entity other than the non-Federal sponsor until the Corps of Engineers has completed all public outreach and coordination, and submitted to the relevant authorizing and appropriations Committees, and the Congressional delegation representing such facility, a detailed analysis of the change in operations of the reservoir, and specific information on whether the activities would alter availability of water for existing authorized purposes at such facility, as well as compensation for lost water that would be necessary to make users whole if such activities were carried out.

Western Drought Contingency Plans.—The Committee notes that the Corps of Engineers carries out water control management activities for Corps of Engineers and non-Corps of Engineers projects as required by Federal laws and directives, and that these activities are governed by the establishment of water control plans. The Committee understands that many of these plans and manuals were developed decades ago and are required to be revised as necessary to conform to changing requirements. Continuous examination should be made of regulation schedules and possible need for storage reallocation within existing authority and constraints. Emphasis should be placed on evaluating current or anticipated conditions that could require deviation from normal release schedules as part of drought contingency plans.

Not later than 90 days after enactment of this act, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee a report including the following information for any western State under a gubernatorial drought declaration during water year 2015: (1) a list of Corps of Engineers and non-Corps of Engineers (section 7 of the 1944 Flood Control Act) projects that have a Corps of Engineers developed water control plan; (2) the year the original water control manual was approved; (3) the year for any subsequent revisions to the project's water control plan and manual; (4) a list of projects where operational deviations for drought contingency have been requested and the status of the request; (5) how water conservation and water quality improvements were addressed; (6) a list of projects where

permanent changes to storage allocations have been requested and the status of the request.

Disposal of Dredged Sediment.—No funds recommended in this act may be used for open lake disposal of dredged sediment unless such disposal meets water and environmental standards agreed to by the administrator of a State's water permitting agency and is consistent with a State's Coastal Zone Management Plan. If this standard is not met, the Corps of Engineers will maintain its long-standing funding obligations for dredged material management.

Bayport Flare—Houston Ship Channel, Texas.—The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to utilize previously appropriated funds to expeditiously complete necessary studies to address safety and efficiency issues in a timely manner to avoid property damage, injury, loss of life and economic impacts on nationally significant deep draft, high commercial use channels.

WRRDA Section 6002.—The Committee supports the Corps of Engineers performing a review of its inventory, in accordance with WRRDA section 6002.

WRRDA Section 4001.—The Committee urges the Secretary to follow through on the direction provided by Congress in WRRDA section 4001 to find and implement the means necessary to financially support the Susquehanna, Delaware, and Potomac River Basin Commissions. Congress has made clear its intent that the 3 River Basin Commissions be supported and expects the Corps of Engineers to act appropriately.

Donor Ports and Energy Transfer Ports.—The Committee provides $50,000,000 for eligible donor ports and energy transfer ports in accordance with WRRDA section 2106. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to issue implementation guidance for section 2106 within 30 days of enactment of this act. With respect to eligible donor ports, the Committee directs 50 percent of such funds be equally divided between the eligible donor ports; and the remaining 50 percent of such funds be divided between the eligible donor ports based on each eligible donor port's percentage of the total Harbor Maintenance Tax revenues generated at such ports, in accordance with WRRDA section 2101. Funds recommended for section 2106 shall be used at the discretion of each eligible donor port and energy transfer port in accordance with section 2106.

Monitoring Requirement.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to monitor the withdrawals for its existing water contracts in the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa [ACT] river basin. Upon determination of an exceedance of the contracted amounts, the Corps of Engineers shall make notifications as required in the contract and notify the Committee within 30 days of such determination.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The fiscal year 2016 budget request does not fund operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation of our Nation's aging infrastructure sufficiently to ensure continued competitiveness in a global marketplace. Federal navigation channels maintained at only a fraction of authorized dimensions, and navigation locks and hydropower facilities, well beyond their design life, result in economic inefficiencies. The Committee believes that investing in operations, maintenance, and rehabilita-

tion of infrastructure today will save taxpayers money in the future.

The Committee recommendation includes additional funds to continue ongoing projects and activities, including periodic dredging of ports and harbors.

The Committee directs that priority in allocating these funds be given to completing ongoing work to maintain authorized depths and widths of harbors and shipping channels, including where contaminated sediments are present, and for addressing critical maintenance backlog.

Particular emphasis should be placed on projects where there is a Coast Guard or other water safety or police force presence; that will enhance national, regional, or local economic development; or that will promote job growth or international competitiveness.

The Committee is concerned that the administration's criteria for navigation maintenance does not allow small, remote, or subsistence harbors and waterways to properly compete for scarce navigation maintenance funds. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to revise the criteria used for determining which navigation maintenance projects are funded in order to develop a reasonable and equitable allocation under this account. The criteria should include the economic impact that these projects provide to local and regional economies, in particular, those with national defense or public health and safety importance.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016	205,000,000
House allowance	199,576,000
Committee recommendation	200,000,000

The Committee recommends $200,000,000 for the Regulatory Program of the Corps of Engineers, a decrease of $5,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to continue to coordinate with the Department of the Interior to analyze the environmental impacts of the proposed marina development project in Coral Bay, St. John and provide input into the permitting process.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015	$101,500,000
Budget estimate, 2016	104,000,000
House allowance	104,000,000
Committee recommendation	101,500,000

The Committee recommends $101,500,000 for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program, a decrease of $2,500,000 from the budget request.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 2015	$28,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016	34,000,000
House allowance	34,000,000
Committee recommendation	28,000,000

The Committee recommends $28,000,000 for Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies, a decrease of $6,000,000 from the budget request.

EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2015	$178,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016	180,000,000
House allowance	179,000,000
Committee recommendation	178,000,000

The Committee recommends $178,000,000 for Expenses, a decrease of $2,000,000 from the budget request. This appropriation finances the expenses for the Office of the Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. No funding is recommended for creation of an Office of Congressional Affairs.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (CIVIL WORKS)

Appropriations, 2015	$3,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016	5,000,000
House allowance	4,750,000
Committee recommendation	3,000,000

The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), a decrease of $2,000,000 from the budget request.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Section 101. The bill includes language concerning reprogramming guidelines.

Section 102. The bill includes language rescinding prior year unobligated funding.

Section 103. The bill includes language concerning funding transfers requested by the administration related to fish hatcheries.

Section 104. The bill includes language concerning the definitions of "fill material" or "discharge of fill material" for purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Section 105. The bill contains language deauthorizing a project.

Section 106. The bill includes language regarding the Lowell Creek Tunnel project.

Section 107. The bill includes language regarding water allocations.