



DIVISION D—ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The following statement to the House of Representatives and the Senate is submitted in explanation of the agreed upon Act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

The language and allocations set forth in House Report 113–486 carry the same emphasis as the language included in this explanatory statement and should be complied with unless specifically addressed to the contrary herein. Report language included by the House which is not contradicted by the explanatory statement is approved. The explanatory statement, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein. In cases in which the House directed the submission of a report, such report is to be submitted to both the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Funds for the individual programs and activities within the accounts in this Act are displayed in the detailed table at the end of the explanatory statement for this Act. Funding levels that are not displayed in the detailed table are identified in this explanatory statement.

In fiscal year 2015, for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), the following information provides the definition of the term “program, project, or activity” for departments and agencies under the jurisdiction of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. The term “program, project, or activity” shall include the most specific level of budget items identified in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2015 and the explanatory statement accompanying the Act.

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The summary tables included in this title set forth the dispositions with respect to the individual appropriations, projects, and activities of the Corps of Engineers. Additional items of the Act are discussed below.

Concerns persist that the effort to update the Water Resources Principles and Guidelines is not proceeding consistent with the language or intent of section 2031 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007. No funds provided to the Corps of Engineers shall be used to develop or implement rules or guidance to support implementation of the final Principles and Requirements for Federal Investments in Water Resources released in March 2013. The Corps shall continue to use the document dated March 10, 1983, and entitled “Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies” during the fiscal year period covered by the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for 2015. If Interagency Guidelines for implementing the March 2013 Principles and Requirements are finalized, the Corps shall be ready to report to the appropriate committees of Congress not later than 120 days after finalization on the impacts of the revised Principles and Requirements and Interagency Guidelines. The Corps shall be prepared to explain the intent of each revision, how each revision is or is not consistent with section 2031 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, and the probable impact of each revision on water resources projects carried out by the Secretary including specific examples of application to at least one project from each main mission area of the Corps.

Concerns remain that the Corps has moved forward with its Levels of Service proposals at locks and dams without undertaking any analysis of whether this reduced service is in the best economic interests of the Nation. The Corps has provided no information showing the amount of additional maintenance funding made available or the economic activity foregone by this policy. Even in times of tight operation and maintenance budgets, changes in policy must be supported by factual information. The Corps is directed to report on the benefits and costs of its Levels of Service policy to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate as soon as practicable. In the meantime, the Corps is encouraged to continue to use all existing authorities to collect additional funds for the operation and maintenance of locks and dams, including the acceptance of contributed funds and the engagement in public-private partnerships.

Development of Ratings Systems.—The Corps again is directed to develop ratings systems for use in evaluating studies and projects for allocation of the additional funding provided in this title. These evaluation systems may be, but are not required to be, individualized for each account, category, or subcategory. Each study and project eligible for funding shall be evaluated under the applicable ratings system. A study or project may not be excluded from evaluation for being “inconsistent with

Administration policy.” The Corps retains complete control over the methodology of these ratings systems, and the executive branch retains complete discretion over project-specific allocation decisions within the additional funds provided.

The Administration’s responses to previous years’ directives to develop ratings systems for use in allocating additional funding have been woefully inadequate. It is not sufficient to simply list a few performance measures without explaining, in detail, how studies and projects are evaluated under each measure, how the performance measures interact, and the relative importance or emphasis given to each measure when comparing projects. Additionally, under a truly transparent and performance-based process, the methodology being used to evaluate studies and projects and to make allocation decisions should be available prior to, or at least in conjunction with, the list of final project-specific allocations, not two months after as in fiscal year 2014.

INVESTIGATIONS

The agreement includes \$122,000,000 for Investigations. The agreement includes legislative language regarding parameters for new study starts.

Planning Program.—The planning program is the entry point for federal involvement in solutions to the Nation’s water resources problems and needs. These studies are funded primarily through the Investigations account. Over the past few years, the Corps has attempted to improve the project development process by streamlining the planning phase, an ongoing process that should continue. This effort gave rise to so-called “smart planning” and has resulted in the “3X3X3” slogan, which translates to no more than 3 years for a feasibility study, without a waiver; no more than \$3 million for the feasibility study, without a waiver; and either three levels of review or a final report document no thicker than a three inch binder, depending on with whom one discusses this process.

While the 3X3X3 mantra has been embraced by the Corps and incorporated into law by the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) of 2014, it remains questionable as to whether this one-size-fits-all approach will provide for higher quality, quicker, or more economical recommendations from the Corps. While “better, faster, cheaper” sounds desirable, the reality seems to be that, all too often, only two out of these three items ultimately get delivered. The Corps is cautioned that the feasibility study is a critical document as it is the basis for the determination of the economic viability, technical soundness, and the environmental sustainability of the Corps’ recommendation. Giving short shrift to any of these bedrock principles will call the Corps’ recommendations into question.

The WRRDA 2014 removes the requirement for a reconnaissance study from the planning process. It is expected that the Corps will continue to limit federal participation in new studies until it is determined that the study has a definable federal interest and that there is a local sponsor willing to cost share in the study. How these needs relate to the 3X3X3 process outlined in the WRRDA bill is unclear.

Accelerating the feasibility phase will not have the intended effect of speeding up the project delivery process if required analyses or other activities are simply shifted to the preconstruction

engineering and design (PED) phase nor if the PED phase is not seamlessly funded immediately after the feasibility phase.

Finally, there is concern that the “smart planning” and 3X3X3 processes do not seem to match the Administration’s rhetoric for a comprehensive approach to planning. The new planning processes appear to narrow the options the Corps may examine, which is in direct contrast to a more comprehensive approach touted by the Administration.

The Corps should reexamine its planning program in light of the changes enacted from the WRRDA 2014 and the statements included here to ensure that the rhetoric of the planning program comports with the realities of the guidance being disseminated. In particular, the Corps is directed to report on the waiver process as detailed in House Report 113-486.

The allocation for projects and activities within the Investigations account is shown in the following table:

~~INSERT TABLE~~

Insert 5a-5h

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

BUDGET REQUEST

FINAL BILL

RECON FEASIBILITY PED RECON FEASIBILITY PED

ALASKA

ALASKA REGIONAL PORTS, AK	---	50	---	---	50	---
CRAIG HARBOR, AK	---	300	---	---	300	---
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	---	---	300	---	---	300

ARIZONA

LITTLE COLORADO RIVER (WINSLOW), AZ	---	751	---	---	651	---
LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ	---	200	---	---	200	---

ARKANSAS

WHITE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE - LOWER CACHE, AR	---	150	---	---	150	---
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

CALIFORNIA

ALISO CREEK, CA	---	717	---	---	717	---
ARROYO SECO, CA	---	450	---	---	450	---
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA	---	---	675	---	---	675
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA	---	449	---	---	449	---
COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	---	---	230	---	---	230
COYOTE VALLEY DAM RESTORATION, CA	---	200	---	---	---	---
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) RESTORATION, CA	---	200	---	---	200	---
N CA STREAMS, LOWER CACHE CRK, YOLO CNTY, WOODLAND & VIC, CA	---	800	---	---	800	---
PORT OF LONG BEACH NAV IMP, CA	---	200	---	---	200	---
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	---	579	---	---	579	---
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	---	500	---	---	200	---
SALTON SEA RESTORATION, CA	200	---	---	---	---	---
SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK, CA	---	900	---	---	900	---

53

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			FINAL BILL		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
WESTMINSTER (EAST GARDEN GROVE) WATERSHED, CA	---	452	---	---	452	---
YUBA RIVER FISH PASSAGE, CA (ENGLEBRIGHT & DAGUERRE POINT DAMS)	---	200	---	---	200	---
COLORADO						
ADAMS AND DENVER COUNTIES, CO	---	500	---	---	500	---
CONNECTICUT						
FAIRFIELD AND NEW HAVEN COUNTIES (FLOODING), CT	100	---	---	---	---	---
NEW HAVEN HARBOR DEEPENING, CT	100	---	---	---	---	---
FLORIDA						
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	---	---	3,150	---	---	3,150
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	100	---	---	---	---	---
GEORGIA						
SATILLA RIVER BASIN WATERSHED, GA	---	200	---	---	200	---
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	---	---	1,520	---	---	---
HAWAII						
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	---	120	---	---	120	---
HILO HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HI	---	469	---	---	469	---
WAIAKEA-PALAI, HI	---	153	---	---	153	---
WEST MAUI WATERSHED, MAUI, HI	---	1,040	---	---	1,040	---

59

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			FINAL BILL		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
IDAHO						
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	---	1,000	---	---	1,000	---
ILLINOIS						
DU PAGE RIVER, IL	150	---	---	---	---	---
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	---	400	---	---	400	---
INTERBASIN CONTROL OF GREAT LAKES-MISSISSIPPI RIVER AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES, IL, IN, OH & WI	---	500	---	---	500	---
KENTUCKY						
KENTUCKY RIVER LOCKS 1-4 DISP, KY	100	---	---	---	---	---
LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY	---	---	1,100	---	---	---
LOUISIANA						
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYS REST- MISS. RIVER HYDRO, LA	---	2,500	---	---	50	---
MARYLAND						
ANACOSTIA WATERSHED RESTORATION, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD	---	250	---	---	250	---
ANACOSTIA WATERSHED RESTORATION, PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MD	---	250	---	---	250	---
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	---	600	---	---	600	---
CHESAPEAKE BAY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD, PA & VA	---	100	---	---	100	---
MASSACHUSETTS						
BOSTON HARBOR DEEP DRAFT INVESTIGATION, MA	---	---	1,800	---	---	1,800

57

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			FINAL BILL		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
MINNESOTA						
MINNESOTA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, MN & SD (MINNESOTA RIVER AUTHORITY)	---	600	---	---	600	---
MISSOURI						
MISSOURI RIVER DEGRADATION, MO	---	593	---	---	593	---
MONTANA						
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	---	295	---	---	295	---
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
CONNECTICUT RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NH & VT	---	23	---	---	---	---
MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA	---	700	---	---	700	---
NEW JERSEY						
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	---	52	---	---	52	---
NEW MEXICO						
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	---	300	---	---	300	---
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELEN, NM	---	276	---	---	276	---
RIO GRANDE BASIN WATERSHED, NM, CO & TX	---	300	---	---	300	---
NEW YORK						
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	---	202	---	---	202	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			FINAL BILL		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
NORTH CAROLINA						
WILMINGTON HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, NC	---	298	---	---	25	---
NORTH DAKOTA						
JAMES RIVER, ND	---	400	---	---	---	---
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, ND, MN, SD & MANITOBA, CANADA	---	600	---	---	600	---
OHIO						
SHORT CREEK AND WHEELING CREEK, OH	150	---	---	---	---	---
OREGON						
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	---	283	---	---	---	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	---	---	550	---	---	---
PENNSYLVANIA						
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	100	---	---	---	---	---
DELAWARE RIVER DREDGE MATERIAL UTILIZATION, PA	---	200	---	---	200	---
PUERTO RICO						
SAN JUAN HARBOR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT STUDY, PR	100	---	---	---	---	---
SOUTH CAROLINA						
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	---	695	---	---	695	---

57

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

BUDGET REQUEST

FINAL BILL

RECON FEASIBILITY PED RECON FEASIBILITY PED

TEXAS

COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY, TX	---	200	---	---	200	---
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	---	---	1,200	---	---	1,200
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	---	200	---	---	200	---
NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	---	300	---	---	300	---
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	---	583	---	---	583	---
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX	---	600	---	---	600	---
SULPHUR RIVER BASIN REALLOCATION, TX	---	500	---	---	500	---

VIRGINIA

LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	---	---	600	---	---	600
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA (DEEPENING)	---	700	---	---	700	---

WASHINGTON

PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	---	500	---	---	500	---
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	---	200	---	---	200	---
SKAGIT R, WA/SKAGIT CO, WA	---	250	---	---	250	---
SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	---	550	---	---	250	---

SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	1,100	25,580	11,125	---	21,251	7,955
--	-------	--------	--------	-----	--------	-------

REMAINING ITEMS

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION	---	---	---	---	6,264	---
FLOOD CONTROL	---	---	---	---	7,800	---
SHORE PROTECTION	---	---	---	---	4,400	---

(54)

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			FINAL BILL		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
NAVIGATION	---	---	---	---	5,000	---
COASTAL AND DEEP-DRAFT	---	---	---	---	4,100	---
INLAND	---	---	---	---	4,000	---
SMALL, REMOTE, OR SUBSISTENCE	---	---	---	---	2,200	---
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES	---	---	---	---	4,100	---
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR COMPLIANCE	---	---	---	---	2,000	---
COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES						
ACCESS TO WATER DATA	---	750	---	---	750	---
COMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	---	100	---	---	100	---
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS						
CALFED	---	100	---	---	100	---
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM	---	75	---	---	75	---
COORDINATION WITH OTHER WATER RESOURCE AGENCIES	---	398	---	---	500	---
GULF OF MEXICO	---	100	---	---	100	---
INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	---	400	---	---	350	---
INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	---	721	---	---	955	---
INVENTORY OF DAMS	---	400	---	---	400	---
LAKE TAHOE	---	100	---	---	100	---
PACIFIC NW FOREST CASE	---	10	---	---	10	---
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS	---	1,350	---	---	1,350	---
FERC LICENSING	---	200	---	---	200	---
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	---	3,500	---	---	5,000	---
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA						
AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUPPORT TRI-CADD	---	251	---	---	251	---
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	---	1,000	---	---	1,000	---
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	---	75	---	---	75	---
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	---	220	---	---	220	---
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	---	8,000	---	---	8,000	---
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	---	243	---	---	243	---
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	---	150	---	---	150	---
PRECIPITATION STUDIES	---	225	---	---	225	---

59

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			FINAL BILL		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	---	75	---	---	75	---
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	---	47	---	---	47	---
STREAM GAGING	---	550	---	---	550	---
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	---	385	---	---	929	---
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	---	12,270	---	---	19,000	---
OTHER - MISCELLANEOUS						
NATIONAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	---	5,000	---	---	5,000	---
NATIONAL SHORELINE	---	400	---	---	675	---
PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM	---	3,100	---	---	4,000	---
TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	---	1,500	---	---	2,500	---
WATER RESOURCES PRIORITIES STUDY	---	500	---	---	---	---
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	---	42,195	---	---	92,794	---
TOTAL, INVESTIGATIONS	1,100	67,775	11,125	---	114,045	7,955

56

Updated Capability.—The agreement adjusts some project-specific allocations downward from the budget request based on updated information regarding the amount of work that could be accomplished in fiscal year 2015.

South San Francisco Bay Shoreline, California.—Progress on this study continues to be unacceptably slow. The Corps has been studying ways to prevent flooding in the Alviso, California, area and to restore the environment in the South San Francisco Bay area for 10 years, yet the most recent schedule does not show completion of a Chief's report until December 2015. The Corps must meet or exceed this schedule in order to be timely for the next water resources authorization bill.

Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans.—The Corps is encouraged to budget for these plans in future budget submissions, as they are an integral part of the overall Great Lakes ecosystem restoration efforts.

Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota.—The agreement includes neither support for nor a prohibition on funding for the study of the Missouri River Projects authorized in section 108 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 111-8).

Additional Funding.—The fiscal year 2015 budget request does not reflect the extent of need for project studies funding. The Corps has numerous continuing studies that will be suspended or slowed unnecessarily under the limits of the budget request. These studies could lead to projects with significant economic benefits, particularly by increasing national competitiveness through marine transportation improvements and by avoiding damages caused by flooding and coastal storms. It is important to note that non-federal sponsors have signed feasibility cost-share agreements and design agreements with the federal government, committing precious local resources that the budget request would leave stranded. The agreement includes additional funds for work that either was not included in the Administration's request or was inadequately budgeted. This funding is intended, in part, to honor commitments made by the federal government in signing agreements with non-federal sponsors. The direction that follows shall be the only direction used for additional funding provided in this account.

The Corps retains complete discretion over project-specific allocation decisions, but shall consider giving priority to completing or accelerating ongoing studies or to initiating new studies that will enhance the nation's economic development, job growth, and international competitiveness; are for projects located in areas that have suffered recent natural disasters; or are for projects to address legal requirements. It is expected that all of the funds provided in this account will be allocated to specific programs, projects, or activities. The focus of the allocation process should favor the obligation of funds for work in fiscal year 2015 rather than expenditures. With the significant backlog of work in the Corps' inventory, there is absolutely no reason for funds provided above the budget request to remain unallocated.

A study shall be eligible for this funding if: (1) it has received funding, other than through a reprogramming, in at least one of the previous three fiscal years; (2) it was previously funded and could reach a significant milestone or produce significant outputs in fiscal year 2015; or (3) it is selected as one of the new starts allowed in accordance with this Act and the additional direction provided below. None of

these funds may be used for any item where funding was specifically denied. A study may not be excluded on the basis of being “inconsistent with Administration policy.” The Corps is reminded that these funds are in addition to the Administration’s budget request. Administration budget request metrics shall not be a reason to disqualify a study from being funded.

While this additional funding is shown in the feasibility column, the Corps should use these funds in any applicable phase. Funding associated with each category may be allocated to any eligible study within that category; funding associated with each subcategory may be allocated only to eligible studies within that subcategory. The list of subcategories is not meant to be exhaustive. For example, the agreement does not include a specific subcategory for “Remote, Coastal, or Small Watershed” due to a lack of information on capability; the Corps should evaluate any studies under this subcategory with capability in fiscal year 2015 for funding under the “Other Authorized Project Purposes” category.

Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Corps shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a work plan including the following information: (1) a detailed description of the ratings system(s) developed and used to evaluate studies; (2) delineation of how these funds are to be allocated; (3) a summary of the work to be accomplished with each allocation, including phase of work; and (4) a list of all studies that were considered eligible for funding but did not receive funding, including an explanation of whether the study could have used funds in fiscal year 2015 and the specific reasons each study was considered as being less competitive for an allocation of funds.

New Starts.—The agreement includes up to ten new study starts to be distributed across the three main mission areas of the Corps (three navigation, three flood and storm damage reduction, one additional navigation or flood and storm damage reduction, and three environmental restoration). Each new start shall be funded from the appropriate additional funding line item. Consideration of the ten shall not be limited to only those proposed in the Administration’s budget request. In addition to the priority factors used to allocate all additional funding provided, the Corps should give careful consideration to out-year budget impacts of the studies chosen as new starts, as well as to whether there appears to be an identifiable local sponsor that will be ready and able to provide the necessary cost shares in a timely manner for the feasibility and preconstruction engineering and design (PED) phases.

As all of the studies are to be chosen by the Corps, it should be understood that all are considered of equal importance. The expectation is that future budget submissions will include funding appropriate to meet the goals of the 3X3X3 approach for the feasibility study, as well as seamlessly fund the feasibility and PED phases. No new start shall be required when moving from feasibility to PED. The Corps may not change or substitute the new study starts selected once the work plan has been provided to the Committees.

The Corps shall not select a “disposition study” as one or more of the ten new study starts allowed in fiscal year 2015. While there likely are instances where disposing of current assets makes sense, treating each individual analysis as a new start, comparable to a feasibility study for a new project, does not.

Instead, the Corps should consider including in future budget requests funding and justification for such efforts under a new or existing Remaining Item, as appropriate.

Lake Erie.—The Western Lake Erie basin watershed is the largest in the Great Lakes, and Lake Erie, being the shallowest lake, faces its freshwater supplies being particularly threatened. Our Great Lakes are the Nation’s largest source of freshwater, and these waters are threatened due to changes such as a 50 percent increase in rainfall, population and livestock increases across the watershed, and a quadrupling of fertilizer and land application of manure.

Under authorities provided for intergovernmental coordination, the Corps is directed to engage the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Western Lake Erie Basin Partnership, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and other instrumentalities essential to outline an approach to infrastructure and institutional challenges posed by existing conditions, which are exacerbating damages to existing infrastructure and contributing to non-point source runoff. These conditions contribute to increasing sediment loads to Lake Erie and nutrient pollution of Lake Erie’s Western Basin resulting in dangerous levels of algal blooms.

The Corps is directed to provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act a report on how existing federal authorities, including the Corps’ authorities, can be exercised to outline options for interagency cooperation; to the extent practicable, the estimated cost of a comprehensive solution to existing infrastructure and water quality challenges; and any identified interdepartmental authorities required to execute a comprehensive solution.

Water Resources Priority Study.—No funds shall be used for this new item.

CONSTRUCTION

The agreement includes \$1,639,489,000 for Construction. The agreement includes legislative language regarding parameters for new construction starts.

Inland Waterways Trust Fund.—The Corps shall continue to adhere to Section 102 of the bill prohibiting the use of funds to award or modify any contract that commits an amount in excess of the amount that remains unobligated. No change to existing policy regarding continuing contracts is authorized or contemplated in the bill.

The allocation for projects and activities within the Construction account is shown in the following table:

~~INSERT TABLE~~

Insert 9a - 9d

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

BUDGET REQUEST FINAL BILL

CALIFORNIA

AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), CA	92,600	92,600
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM RAISE), CA	1,200	1,200
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	1,300	1,300
HAMILTON CITY, CA	3,800	3,800
ISABELLA LAKE, CA (DAM SAFETY)	8,000	8,000
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	1,000	—
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	6,000	6,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	1,000	1,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	30,826	30,826
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	4,000	4,000

FLORIDA

HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	75,000	75,000
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	65,551	65,551

GEORGIA

LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA	80	80
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	850	750
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	---	1,520

ILLINOIS

CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	200	200
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	9,810	50
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	29,000	29,000
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	18,500	18,500
MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	3,800	3,600
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	160,000	160,000
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	33,170	33,170
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, DEFICIENCY CORRECTION, IL	8,650	50

IOWA

MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND & SD	48,771	48,771
--	--------	--------

KENTUCKY

ROUGH RIVER, MAJOR REHAB, KY (DAM SAFETY)	25,000	25,000
---	--------	--------

9a

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
LOUISIANA		
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	9,800	8,000
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	10,000	---
MARYLAND		
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	900	900
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	5,000	5,000
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	15,100	15,100
MASSACHUSETTS		
MUDDY RIVER, MA	1,798	1,798
MISSOURI		
KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS	1,600	1,600
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	50	50
MONARCH - CHESTERFIELD, MO	915	915
NEW JERSEY		
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	35,000	35,000
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	11,000	11,000
NEW YORK		
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	22,000	22,000
OHIO		
BOLIVAR DAM, OH (DAM SAFETY)	12,300	10,300
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	5,730	---
DOVER DAM, MUSKINGUM RIVER, OH (DAM SAFETY)	2,800	1,400
OKLAHOMA		
CANTON LAKE, OK	18,000	18,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	16,333	16,333
OREGON		
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	1,000	1,000
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	1,400	1,400

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
PENNSYLVANIA		
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	64,800	23,573
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	9,032	9,032
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	1,000	1,000
PUERTO RICO		
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	3,000	3,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	1,572	1,200
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	53,400	36,000
TEXAS		
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	1,800	1,800
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	18,993	18,993
GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	4,672	4,672
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN (WHARTON/ONION), TX	3,625	3,625
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX	4,825	4,825
VIRGINIA		
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	300	50
WASHINGTON		
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID		71,000
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	69,000	---
COLUMBIA RIVER ACCORDS, PACIFIC LAMPREY PASSAGE, WA	2,000	---
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	2,160	---
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	22,000	21,200
WISCONSIN		
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	127	---
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	1,061,140	959,734

9c

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

BUDGET REQUEST FINAL BILL

REMAINING ITEMS

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION	---	141,845
FLOOD CONTROL	---	95,000
SHORE PROTECTION	---	45,000
NAVIGATION	---	95,000
INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND PROJECTS	---	112,000
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES	---	25,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR COMPLIANCE	---	13,000
ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	---	50,000
HYDROPOWER PROJECTS	---	6,200

AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM

AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	3,000	8,000
BENEFICIAL USES DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	2,000	3,500
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14)	---	4,500
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	2,000	10,000
MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES (SECTION 111)	---	650
NAVIGATION PROGRAM (SECTION 107)	---	2,350
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 1135)	3,000	6,600
SHORE PROTECTION (SECTION 103)	---	1,250

DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE

INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE

RESTORATION OF ABANDONED MINES

34,000	34,000
19,000	19,000
60	60
800	800
---	2,000

SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS

63,860 679,755

TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION

1,125,000 1,639,489

92

Updated Capability.—The agreement adjusts some project-specific allocations downward from the budget request based on updated information regarding the amount of work that could be accomplished in fiscal year 2015.

Savannah Harbor Expansion, Georgia.—The budget request for this item that was proposed in the Investigations account has been moved to this account where it has been funded each year since it was designated a new construction start in fiscal year 2009. The Administration's persistence in treating this project as if it had not yet been approved as a new start is inexplicable, unjustifiable, and unnecessarily confusing. The Administration is reminded that the project's approval as a new start in fiscal year 2009 was agreed to by both branches of government involved in enacting laws – the Congress by passing the law and the President by signing it. As such, and to ensure that there is no doubt as to the status of the project, the Administration is directed to treat this project as an ongoing construction project for purposes of allocating additional fiscal year 2015 funding provided in this account and developing future budget requests. Once again, since the project already received a new construction start in fiscal year 2009, the Administration shall not use any funding in fiscal year 2015 or any fiscal year thereafter to evaluate whether to designate the project as a new start.

Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier, Illinois.—The threat of the dispersal of aquatic nuisance species, including Asian carp, between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River basins remains a serious concern. Funding is provided for the continued construction, operation, and maintenance of the electric barrier system. No funding is provided for construction of hydrologic separation measures. The issue of hydrologic separation would need to be fully analyzed by the Corps of Engineers and specifically authorized in law before funding could be used for such measures.

Melvin Price Lock and Dam, Illinois and Missouri.—The length of time it is taking the Corps 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, is troublesome. The Corps has indicated intent to have its alternatives and cost estimates reviewed by an Independent External Peer Review at the appropriate time. The Corps is encouraged to ensure this review is completed, but also that it is conducted in a manner that will not lengthen an already long schedule.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, Washington, Oregon and Idaho.—The agreement includes a single funding level for the Columbia River Fish Mitigation program as in previous years, rather than separate funding levels for Columbia River Fish Mitigation and Columbia River Accords, Pacific Lamprey Passage as in the budget request.

Additional Funding.—The Corps has ongoing, authorized construction projects that would cost tens of billions of dollars to complete, yet the Administration continues to request a mere fraction of the funding necessary to complete those projects. The agreement includes additional funds for projects and activities to enhance the Nation's economic growth and international competitiveness. The intent of these funds is for work that either was not included in the Administration's request or was inadequately

budgeted. The direction that follows shall be the only direction used for additional funding provided in this account.

A project shall be eligible for this funding if: (1) it has received funding, other than through a reprogramming, in at least one of the previous three fiscal years; (2) it was previously funded and could reach a significant milestone or produce significant outputs in fiscal year 2015; or (3) it is selected as one of the new starts allowed in accordance with this Act and the additional direction provided below. The first eligibility criterion above shall include eligibility to start to provide federal funding for construction work on any water resources project for which funds were made available in this account in fiscal year 2014, including funds made available for preconstruction engineering and design work.

None of these funds may be used for any item where funding was specifically denied, for projects in the Continuing Authorities Program, or to alter any existing cost-share requirements. A project may not be excluded on the basis of being "inconsistent with Administration policy." The Corps is reminded that these funds are in addition to the Administration's budget request. Administration budget request metrics shall not be a reason to disqualify a project from being funded.

Funding associated with each category may be allocated to any eligible project within that category; funding associated with each subcategory may be allocated only to eligible projects within that subcategory. The list of subcategories is not meant to be exhaustive. Of the additional funds provided in this account, the Corps shall allocate not less than \$12,450,000 to projects with riverfront development components. Of the additional funds provided in this account for flood and storm damage reduction and flood control, the Corps shall allocate not less than \$18,000,000 to additional nonstructural flood control projects.

The Corps retains complete control over project-specific allocation decisions, but shall consider giving priority to the following: the benefits of the funded work to the national economy; extent to which the work will enhance national, regional, or local economic development; number of jobs created directly by the funded activity; ability to obligate the funds allocated within the fiscal year, including consideration of the ability of the non-federal sponsor to provide any required cost-share; ability to complete the project, separable element, or project phase with the funds allocated; for flood and storm damage reduction projects (including authorized nonstructural measures and periodic beach renourishments), population, economic activity, or public infrastructure at risk, as appropriate; for flood and storm damage reduction projects (including authorized nonstructural measures and periodic beach renourishments), the severity of risk of flooding or the frequency with which an area has experienced flooding; for navigation projects, the number of jobs or level of economic activity to be supported by completion of the project, separable element, or project phase; for Inland Waterways Trust Fund projects, the economic impact on the local, regional, and national economy if the project is not funded, as well as discrete elements of work that can be completed within the funding provided in this line item; and for environmental infrastructure, projects with the greater economic impact, projects in rural communities, and projects in counties or parishes with high poverty rates. It is expected that all of the funds provided in this account will be allocated to specific programs,

projects, or activities. The focus of the allocation process should favor the obligation of funds for work in fiscal year 2015 rather than expenditures. With the significant backlog of work in the Corps' inventory, there is absolutely no reason for funds provided above the budget request to remain unallocated.

Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Corps shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a work plan including the following information: (1) a detailed description of the ratings system(s) developed and used to evaluate projects within this account; (2) delineation of how these funds are to be allocated; (3) a summary of the work to be accomplished with each allocation; and (4) a list of all projects that were considered eligible for funding but did not receive funding, including an explanation of whether each project could have used funds in fiscal year 2015 and the specific reasons each project was considered as being less competitive for an allocation of funds.

New Starts.—The agreement includes up to four new project starts, including one each from the navigation, flood and storm damage reduction, and environmental restoration mission areas (a second navigation or flood and storm damage reduction new project start also may be selected). Each new start shall be funded from the appropriate additional funding line item. Consideration of the four shall not be limited to only those new starts proposed in the Administration's budget request. When considering new starts, only those that can execute a project cost sharing agreement not later than August 31, 2015, shall be chosen.

In addition to the priority factors used to allocate all additional funding provided, factors that should be considered for all new starts include: the cost-sharing sponsor's ability and willingness to promptly provide the cash contribution (if any) as well as required lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and disposal areas; the technical and financial ability of the non-federal sponsor to implement the project without assistance from the Corps, including other sources of funding available for the project purpose; whether the project provides benefits from more than one benefit category; and the out-year budget impacts of the selected new starts.

To ensure that the new starts selected are affordable and will not unduly delay completion of any ongoing projects, the Secretary is required to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a realistic out-year budget scenario prior to issuing a work allowance for a new start. It is understood that specific budget decisions are made on an annual basis and that this scenario is neither a request for nor a guarantee of future funding for any project. Nonetheless, this scenario shall include an estimate of annual funding for each new start utilizing a realistic funding scenario through completion of the project, as well as the specific impacts of that estimated funding on the ability of the Corps to make continued progress on each previously funded construction project (including impacts to the optimum timeline and funding requirements of the ongoing projects) and on the ability to consider initiating new projects in the future. The scenario shall assume a Construction account funding level at the average of the past three budget requests.

The information submitted in response to this out-year funding scenario directive in fiscal year 2014 was unsatisfactory at best. Therefore, the Corps shall also provide a scenario showing average annual funding levels per new start selected and the number of years until project completion at that average annual funding level. In this scenario, the total average annual funding level for all selected new starts shall not exceed the funding level included in the fiscal year 2015 budget request for all project completions (\$37,163,798).

As all of these new starts are to be chosen by the Corps, it should be understood that all are considered of equal importance and the expectation is that future budget submissions will include appropriate funding for all new starts selected. The Corps may not change or substitute the new project starts selected once the work plan has been provided to the Committees. Any project for which the new start requirements are not met by the end of fiscal year 2015, or by the earlier date as specified, shall be treated as if the project had not been selected as a new start; such a project shall be required to compete again for new start funding in future years.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—The agreement recommends funding for this program, which is the only nationwide research and development program to address invasive aquatic plants, and urges the Corps to support cost-shared aquatic plant management programs.

Continuing Authorities Program.—The various sections of the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) provide a useful tool for the Corps to undertake small projects without the lengthy study and authorization process typical of most larger Corps projects. The agreement includes a total of \$36,850,000 spread over eight CAP sections, rather than \$10,000,000 spread over four CAP sections as proposed in the budget request. These funds should be expended for the purposes for which they were appropriated and should be executed as quickly as possible. Within the Continuing Authorities Program and to the extent already authorized by law, the Corps is encouraged to consider projects that enhance coastal and ocean ecosystem resiliency.

Continuing Authorities Program Direction.—Management of the Continuing Authorities Program should continue consistent with direction provided in previous fiscal years. The direction is restated here for convenience.

For each CAP section, available funds shall be allocated utilizing this sequence of steps until the funds are exhausted:

- capability-level funds for ongoing projects that have executed cost-sharing agreements for the applicable phase;

- capability-level funds for projects that are ready for execution of new cost-sharing agreements for the applicable phase and for which Corps headquarters authorizes execution of the agreements;

- funds, as permitted by Corps policies, for other projects previously funded for the applicable phase but not ready for execution of new cost-sharing agreements; and

- funds, as permitted by Corps policies, for projects not previously funded for the applicable phase.

Funds shall be allocated by headquarters to the appropriate Field Operating Agency (FOA) for projects requested by that FOA. If the FOA finds that the study/project for which funds were requested cannot go forward, the funds are to be returned to Corps headquarters to be reallocated based on the nationwide priority listing. In no case should the FOA retain these funds for use on a different project than the one for which the funds were requested without the explicit approval of the Corps' headquarters.

Within the step at which available funds are exhausted for each CAP section, funds shall be allocated to the projects in that section that rank high according to the following factors: high overall performance based on outputs; high percent fiscally complete; and high unobligated carry-in. Section 14 funds shall be allocated to the projects that address the most significant risks and adverse consequences, irrespective of phase or previous funding history.

The Corps shall continue the ongoing process for suspending and terminating inactive 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.

In order to provide a mix of studies, design, and construction within each CAP section, the Corps is directed to divide the funding generally 80/20 between the Design and Implementation and the Feasibility phases within each authority. The Chief of Engineers shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act a report detailing how funds will be distributed to the individual items in the various CAP sections for the fiscal year. The Chief shall also provide an annual report at the end of each fiscal year detailing the progress made on the backlog of projects. The report should include the completions and terminations as well as progress of ongoing work.

The Corps may initiate new continuing authorities projects in all sections as funding allows. New projects may be initiated after an assessment is made that such projects can be funded over time based on historical averages of the appropriation for that section and after prior approval by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Dam Safety and Seepage/Stability Correction Program.—The Corps is expected to continue to execute all funding available under this line item in fiscal year 2015. It is expected that no unobligated funds will be carried into fiscal year 2016 unless there were no additional activities that could have been conducted in fiscal year 2015.

Great Lakes Fisheries and Ecosystem Restoration Program.—The Corps is encouraged to budget for this aquatic habitat restoration program in future budget submissions, as it is important to the overall Great Lakes Restoration effort.

Restoration of Abandoned Mines.—The Corps is directed, within existing authority, to work 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.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

The agreement includes \$302,000,000 for Mississippi River and Tributaries.

The allocation for projects and activities within the Mississippi River and Tributaries account is shown in the following table:

~~[INSERT TABLE]~~

Insert 16a-16b

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
CONSTRUCTION		
BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	9,500	9,500
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	40,861	40,861
GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	9,300	9,300
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	18,947	18,947
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,325	2,325
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	2,505	2,505
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	65,739	65,739
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	33	33
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	250	250
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	294	294
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	198	198
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	8,890	8,890
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	5,900	5,900
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	2,485	2,485
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	1,340	1,340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	170	170
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	100	100
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	1,843	1,843
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	13,117	13,117
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	51	51
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	48	48
BONNET CARRE, LA	2,214	2,214
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,399	1,399
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	498	498
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	532	532
OLD RIVER, LA	8,388	8,388
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	3,262	3,262
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	24	24
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	130	130
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	42	42
YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	5,494	5,494
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	185	185
YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS	4,898	4,898
YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS	807	807
YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS	5,705	5,705
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	1,344	1,344
YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS	6,629	6,629
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	967	967

16a

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
YAZOO BASIN, WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	384	384
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	544	544
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS	731	731
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	200	200
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	4,296	4,296
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	80	80
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	1,642	1,642
 SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	 234,291	 234,291
 REMAINING ITEMS		
 ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK		
DREDGING	---	6,400
FLOOD CONTROL	---	29,600
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES	---	21,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA (INVESTIGATIONS)	9,646	9,646
MAPPING (MAINTENANCE)	1,063	1,063
 SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	 10,709	 67,709
 TOTAL	 245,000	 302,000

166

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work—The fiscal year 2015 budget request reflects neither the need nor the importance of the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project. Therefore, the agreement includes additional funds to continue ongoing studies, projects, and maintenance activities. These funds should be used for flood control, navigation, water supply, ground water protection, waterfowl management, bank stabilization, erosion and sedimentation control, and environmental restoration work. The intent of these funds is for ongoing work primarily along the Mississippi River tributaries that either was not included in the Administration's request or was inadequately budgeted. The direction that follows shall be the only direction used for additional funding provided in this account.

A project shall be eligible for this funding if: (1) it has received funding, other than through a reprogramming, in at least one of the previous three fiscal years; or (2) it was previously funded and could reach a significant milestone or produce significant outputs in fiscal year 2015. None of these funds may be used to start new studies, projects, or activities or for any item where funding was specifically denied. While this additional funding is shown under remaining items, the Corps should utilize these funds in any applicable phase of work. A study or project may not be excluded on the basis of being "inconsistent with Administration policy." The Corps is reminded that these funds are in addition to the Administration's budget request. Administration budget request metrics shall not be a reason to disqualify a study or project from being funded.

The Corps retains complete control over project-specific allocation decisions, but shall consider giving priority to completing or accelerating ongoing work that will enhance the Nation's economic development, job growth, and international competitiveness, or are for studies or projects located in areas that have suffered recent natural disasters. It is expected that all of the funds provided in this account will be allocated to specific programs, projects, or activities. The focus of the allocation process should favor the obligation of funds for work in fiscal year 2015 rather than expenditures. With the significant backlog of work in the Corps' inventory, there is absolutely no reason for funds provided above the budget request to remain unallocated.

Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Corps shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a work plan including the following information: (1) a detailed description of the ratings system(s) developed and used to evaluate studies and projects; (2) delineation of how these funds are to be allocated; (3) a summary of the work to be accomplished with each allocation, including phase of work; and (4) a list of all studies and projects that were considered eligible for funding but did not receive funding, including an explanation of whether each study or project could have used funds in fiscal year 2015 and the specific reasons each study or project was considered as being less competitive for an allocation of funds.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The agreement includes \$2,908,511,000 for Operation and Maintenance.

Not less than 180 days or as soon as practicable prior to any non-emergency scheduled Operation and Maintenance project navigation closure or outage, the Corps shall provide to the Inland Waterways Users Board, the Committees on Appropriations and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Appropriations and Environment and Public Works of the Senate written notice of the location, approximate schedule, and expected impacts of the closure or outage.

The allocation for projects and activities within the Operation and Maintenance account is shown in the following table:

~~INSERT TABLE~~

Insert 19a-19r

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	189	189
ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL	13,443	13,443
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOBIBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	21,661	21,661
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,493	5,493
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	50	50
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	26,633	26,633
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	148	148
TENNESSEE - TOBIBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL & MS	1,700	1,700
TENNESSEE - TOBIBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	24,191	24,191
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	8,101	8,101
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, AL	30	30
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	11,001	11,001
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	3,555	3,555
COOK INLET SHOALS, AK	2,616	816
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	1,140	540
HOMER HARBOR, AK	520	410
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	167	167
LOWELL CREEK TUNNELL (SEWARD) AK	300	300
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	319	269
NOME HARBOR, AK	1,451	1,451
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	921	921
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,859	1,859
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	105	105
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,280	1,280
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	48	48
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	405	405
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	8,000	8,000
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	7,558	7,558
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,927	1,927
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	7,523	7,523
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	9,162	9,162
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	5,652	5,652
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,912	1,912

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,631	1,631
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,509	1,509
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	7,272	7,272
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	16	16
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	539	539
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	27,553	27,553
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,691	2,691
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESEON, AR	5,639	5,639
NIMROD LAKE, AR	2,163	2,163
NORFORK LAKE, AR	6,137	6,137
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	15	15
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	9,234	9,234
OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	6,376	6,376
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	3	3
WHITE RIVER, AR	31	31
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	3	3

CALIFORNIA

BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	2,233	2,233
BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,976	1,976
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	5,249	5,249
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,106	3,106
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	5,085	5,085
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	558	558
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	2,059	2,059
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	1,800	1,800
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CA	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	4,329	4,329
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,560	1,560
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	7,740	7,740
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	5,884	5,884
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	394	394
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	383	383
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	2,060	2,060
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,639	2,639
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	2,255	2,255
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	21,970	21,970
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,700	1,700
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	3,259	3,259
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,647	1,647
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	1,900	1,900
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	7,900	7,900
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	1,300	1,300
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,394	1,394

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	200	200
SAN FRANCISCO BAY DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,187	1,187
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	275	275
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	3,360	3,360
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,900	1,900
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	4,952	4,952
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	2,400	2,400
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,942	3,942
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	2,380	2,380
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,538	1,538
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	2,272	2,272
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	2,400	2,400
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA (DAM SAFETY)	2,143	2,143
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	3,354	3,354
YUBA RIVER, CA	3,178	1,438

COLORADO

BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	696	696
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,475	1,475
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	1,036	1,036
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CO	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	441	441
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	3,057	3,057
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	646	646
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,762	1,762

CONNECTICUT

BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	548	548
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	675	675
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	431	431
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	1,158	1,158
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CT	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	334	334
LONG ISLAND SOUND DMMP, CT	329	—
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	771	771
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	476	476
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	850	850
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	1,066	1,066
THOMASTON DAM, CT	820	820
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	647	647

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
DELAWARE		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DE	40	40
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD	22,355	22,355
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	200	200
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,690	3,690
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	125	125
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL)	875	875
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	25	25
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	25	25
FLORIDA		
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	6,505	6,505
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	15,112	15,112
ESCAMBIA AND CONECHU RIVERS, FL & AL	130	130
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	1,300	1,300
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	600	600
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	6,450	6,450
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	7,615	7,615
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	2,645	2,645
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	100	---
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,159	2,159
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	3,300	3,300
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	2,084	2,084
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	500	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	1,306	1,306
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,200	3,200
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	33	33
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	9,031	4,477
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	10,000	10,000
WATER / ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, FL	100	100
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	7,927	7,927
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	2,541	2,541
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	176	176
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,862	3,862
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	9,547	9,547
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	8,593	8,593
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	11,052	11,052

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, GA	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	277	277
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	13,477	13,477
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA	125	125
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	8,759	8,759
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	16,420	16,420
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	109	109
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	7,823	7,823
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	1,412	1,412
HILO HARBOR, HI	1,900	1,900
HONOLULU HARBOR, HI	2,200	2,200
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	677	677
KAHULUI HARBOR, HI	2,200	2,200
NAWILIWILI HARBOR, HI	1,500	1,500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	861	861
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,160	1,160
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,732	2,732
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	355	355
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	2,618	2,618
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	578	578
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	2,523	2,523
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	5,680	5,680
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,675	2,675
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	560	560
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	370	370
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	39,389	39,389
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,826	1,826
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, IL	50	50
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	2,347	2,347
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,988	1,988
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	775	775
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,658	5,658
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION), IL	52,900	52,900
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION), IL	25,624	25,624
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	106	106

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
REND LAKE, IL	6,072	6,072
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	702	702
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	1,370	1,370
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,189	1,189
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	1,127	1,127
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	1,392	1,392
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	13,814	13,814
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	967	967
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	1,142	1,142
MISSISSINewa LAKE, IN	1,279	1,279
MONROE LAKE, IN	1,395	1,395
PATOKA LAKE, IN	1,168	1,168
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	185	185
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	1,129	1,129
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	139	139
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	4,084	4,084
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	695	695
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA, KS, MO & NE	10,624	10,624
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND & SD	7,700	7,700
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	3,313	3,313
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	4,576	4,576
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	6,266	6,266
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,544	2,544
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,765	1,765
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	950	950
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	1,083	1,083
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,064	1,064
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	970	970
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	1,004	1,004
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,873	1,873
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,828	1,828
MARION LAKE, KS	1,997	1,997
MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,660	2,660
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,174	2,174
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	3,653	3,653
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,394	2,394

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
POMONA LAKE, KS	2,155	2,155
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	312	312
TORONTO LAKE, KS	715	715
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,258	2,258
WILSON LAKE, KS	2,014	2,014

KENTUCKY

BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	9,933	9,933
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,578	2,578
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,885	1,885
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,644	1,644
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,873	1,873
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	1,048	1,048
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,763	1,763
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	15	15
FALLS OF THE OHIO NATIONAL WILDLIFE, KY & IN	19	19
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	2,079	2,079
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,467	1,467
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	2,085	2,085
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,452	2,452
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	1,028	1,028
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	10	10
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	2,587	2,587
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	1,048	1,048
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	257	257
NOLIN LAKE, KY	2,596	2,596
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	42,856	42,856
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	5,200	5,200
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,237	1,237
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	2	2
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,660	2,660
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,170	1,170
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	8,587	8,587
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,175	1,175

LOUISIANA

ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK, LA	7,759	7,759
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	131	131
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	1,277	1,277
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	1,119	1,119
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	23	23
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	25	25
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	15	15

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
BAYOU TECHE, LA	156	156
CADDO LAKE, LA	204	204
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	11,721	11,721
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,789	1,789
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	20,837	20,837
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	1,652	1,652
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,044	1,044
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	8,260	8,260
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	14	14
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	4	4
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,471	2,471
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,985	1,985
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LA	85,341	85,341
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	59	59
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	200	200
WALLACE LAKE, LA	217	217
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	16	16
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	36	36

MAINE

DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME	1,050	1,050
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, ME	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	127	127
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,100	1,100
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	25	25

MARYLAND

BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	23,725	23,725
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)	325	325
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	156	156
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	140	140
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,870	1,870
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	450	450
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	62	62
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	1,500	1,500

MASSACHUSETTS

BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	1,110	1,110
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	851	851
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	752	752
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	15,574	15,574
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	632	632

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	265	265
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	698	698
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	702	702
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, MA	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	344	344
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	589	589
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	629	629
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, MA	564	564
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	900	900
TULLY LAKE, MA	673	673
WEST HILL DAM, MA	642	642
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	659	659

MICHIGAN

CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	179	179
DETROIT RIVER, MI	5,969	5,969
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	522	522
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	219	219
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	28	28
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	500	500
MONROE HARBOR, MI	1,000	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	710	710
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	3,001	3,001
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	50	50
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,561	1,561
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	39,860	39,860
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,733	2,733

MINNESOTA

BIGSTONE LAKE - WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	278	278
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	5,600	5,600
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	461	461
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	657	657
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	259	259
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION), MN	54,472	54,472
ORWELL LAKE, MN	555	555
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	88	88
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	176	176
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,612	3,612
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	483	483

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	2,211	2,211
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	1	1
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	285	285
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	5,050	5,050
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	116	116
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	34	34
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,818	1,818
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	7,740	7,740
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	150	150
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	152	152
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	9	9
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, MS	115	115
YAZOO RIVER, MS	21	21
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	12	12
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	7,187	7,187
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	3,316	3,316
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	9,311	9,311
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	1,410	1,410
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	916	916
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	930	930
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	27,146	27,146
NEW MADRID COUNTY HARBOR, MO	23	23
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,461	2,461
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	3	3
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	112	112
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,473	1,473
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	1	1
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	4,675	4,675
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR	9,609	9,609
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	6,098	6,098
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	185	185
LIBBY DAM, MT	1,975	1,975
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	230	230

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	9,185	9,185
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	26,398	26,398
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	466	466
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	79	79
PAPILLION CREEK, NE	863	863
SALT CREEKS AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	1,038	1,038
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	67	67
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	1,462	1,462
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	407	407
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	672	672
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	897	897
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	798	798
HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,370	1,370
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	84	84
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	878	878
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	250	250
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	714	714
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	420	420
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	375	375
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	15	15
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	20,445	20,445
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NJ	5	5
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	355	355
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	370	370
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	260	260
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	300	300
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	617	617
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	1,844	1,844
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	100	100
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	40	40
SHARK RIVER, NJ	350	350

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	2,794	2,794
COCHITI LAKE, NM	3,587	3,587
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	2,794	2,794
GALISTEO DAM, NM	1,150	1,150
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NM	30	30
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	654	654
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	1,392	1,392
RIO GRANDE ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM, NM	2,492	2,492
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,594	1,594
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	330	330
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	797	797
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM	1,289	1,289
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	578	578
ARKPORT DAM, NY	502	502
BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	4,050	---
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,686	1,686
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,290	1,290
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	300	300
EAST RIVER, NY	250	250
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	220	220
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	697	697
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	100	100
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	50	50
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	20	20
GREAT KILLS HARBOR, NY	30	30
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	50	50
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	5,200	5,200
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O & C)	2,500	2,500
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NY	20	20
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	1,522	1,418
JAMAICA BAY, NY	220	220
MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY	3,842	3,842
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	450	450
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	100	100
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	7,413	780
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	9,300	9,300
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	1,045	1,045
NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	10	---
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	2,140	2,140
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	60	60

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	786	786
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	610	610
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	905	905
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	2,600	2,600
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,856	1,856
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	483	483
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,909	1,909
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	264	264
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	800	800
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	50	50
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	4,855	4,855
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	700	700
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	550	550
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	300	300
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	3,293	3,293
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	14,127	14,127
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN HALEY, ND	302	302
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	12,703	12,703
HOMME LAKE, ND	351	351
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	339	339
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,290	1,290
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	1,076	776
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	106	106
SOURIS RIVER, ND	366	366
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	32	32
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	1,483	1,483
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	2,280	2,280
BERLIN LAKE, OH	2,091	2,091
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,967	1,967
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	1,494	1,494
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	7,634	2,230
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	1,553	1,553
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	2,259	2,259
DILLON LAKE, OH	1,387	1,387
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	1,215	1,215
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	659	659

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	51	51
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	985	985
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	906	906
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	8,514	8,514
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	298	298
OHIO-MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL, OH	1,763	1,763
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	1,576	1,576
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	305	305
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	35	35
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,600	1,600
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	255	255
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	6,143	4,783
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	948	948
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	1,217	1,217
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	1,429	1,429

OKLAHOMA

ARCADIA LAKE, OK	409	409
BIRCH LAKE, OK	778	778
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	3,275	3,275
CANTON LAKE, OK	2,199	2,199
COPAN LAKE, OK	4,542	4,542
EUFULA LAKE, OK	5,761	5,761
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	6,066	6,066
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	896	896
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	340	340
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	673	673
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,828	1,828
HULAH LAKE, OK	734	734
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	141	141
KAW LAKE, OK	2,244	2,244
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	5,435	5,435
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	5,355	5,355
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,580	2,580
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	27	27
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	138	138
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,884	1,884
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OK	6,090	6,090
SARDIS LAKE, OK	1,039	1,039
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	1,100	1,100
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,680	1,680
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	4,865	4,865
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,173	1,173

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	5,023	5,023
WISTER LAKE, OK	1,133	1,133

OREGON

APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	972	972
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	5,770	5,770
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	7,493	7,493
CHETCO RIVER, OR	26	26
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	25,463	25,463
COOS BAY, OR	6,423	6,423
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	26	26
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	1,315	1,315
COUGAR LAKE, OR	2,590	2,590
DEPOE BAY, OR	7	7
DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,227	1,227
DORENA LAKE, OR	1,249	1,249
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	177	177
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	6,052	6,052
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	1,736	1,736
GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,299	2,299
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	5,249	5,249
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	592	592
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	5,234	5,234
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,729	1,729
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,237	3,237
M McNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	7,569	7,569
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	365	365
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	31	31
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	74	74
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	32	32
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	2,806	2,806
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	59	59
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	128	128
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	244	244
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	616	616
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	3,252	3,252

PENNSYLVANIA

ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	4,721	4,721
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	607	607
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	279	279
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,835	1,835
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,670	2,670

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,651	1,651
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,860	1,860
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,561	1,561
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	889	889
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	5,410	5,410
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,259	1,259
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	1,256	1,256
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	916	916
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	300	300
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, PA	5	5
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	1,222	1,222
JOHNSTOWN, PA	65	65
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,234	1,234
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,898	1,662
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,121	1,121
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	22,621	21,162
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	30,097	30,097
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	700	700
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	170	170
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	475	475
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	40	40
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,817	3,817
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	45	45
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	1,805	1,805
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	537	537
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	105	105
TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,292	2,292
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,875	1,875
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	400	400
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	957	957
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	965	965
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	2,232	2,232
PUERTO RICO		
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	800	800
RHODE ISLAND		
FOX POINT BARRIER, NARRAGANSETT BAY, RI	3,956	3,956
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, RI	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	48	48
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	350	350
WOONSOCKET, RI	1,088	1,088

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	500	500
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	13,149	13,149
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	5,930	5,930
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	67	67
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	875	875
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	10,409	10,409
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	412	412
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	291	291
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	11,252	11,252
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	153	153
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	609	609
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	12,256	12,256
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	121	121
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,568	5,568
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	8,945	8,945
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	7,587	7,587
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	6,818	6,818
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	94	94
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,896	4,896
NORTHWEST TENNESSEE REGIONAL HARBOR, LAKE COUNTY, TN	10	10
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	12,059	12,059
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	2	2
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	24,864	24,864
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	239	239
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	1,397	1,397
ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VIII, TX	1,827	1,827
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,966	1,966
BELTON LAKE, TX	3,164	3,164
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,242	2,242
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	6,300	6,300
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,655	2,655
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,677	2,677
CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX	200	200
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,900	6,900

199

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	11,224	11,224
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	40	40
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	3,432	3,432
FREEDPORT HARBOR, TX	10,600	10,600
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	8,900	8,900
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	2,700	2,700
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,002	2,002
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,476	2,476
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	25,761	25,761
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,433	1,433
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	31,840	31,840
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	1,878	1,878
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,957	1,957
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	1,729	1,729
LAKE KEMP, TX	260	260
LAVON LAKE, TX	3,046	3,046
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	4,339	4,339
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	8,000	8,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	2,621	2,621
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	2,242	2,242
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,169	1,169
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,393	1,393
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	2,319	2,319
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	300	300
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	2,097	2,097
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	11,500	11,500
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	9,235	9,235
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	278	278
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,893	2,893
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	2,656	2,656
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	350	350
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	4,975	4,975
WACO LAKE, TX	2,958	2,958
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	3,353	3,353
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	6,891	6,891
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	3,495	3,495
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	40	40
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	561	561

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN, VT	1,044	1,044
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	643	413
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	105	105
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	756	756
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	1,569	1,569
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	849	849
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	694	694
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA	2,390	2,390
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA	4,555	4,555
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	500	500
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,081	2,081
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HARBOR, VA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	1,540	1,540
HAMPTON ROADS, VA (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	104	104
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, VA	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	335	335
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,696	3,696
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	10,685	10,685
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,996	1,996
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	200	200
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	10,990	10,990
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	608	608
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	6,442	6,442
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	1,186	1,186
RUDEE INLET, VA	300	300
WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATIONS, VA	135	135
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	589	589
COLUMBIA AND LOWER WILLAMETTE RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLAND, OR	47,040	47,040
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR	1,199	1,199
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	4,115	4,115
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,192	1,192
GRAYS HARBOR, WA	10,256	10,256
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	3,520	3,520
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,989	4,989
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WA	49	49
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	840	840
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	12,404	12,404
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,576	2,576

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,840	3,840
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,646	2,646
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	2,913	2,913
MOUNT SAINT HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	260	260
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	4,122	4,122
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	746	746
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,100	1,100
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	1,470	200
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	381	381
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	1,498	1,498
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	274	274
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	64	64
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	159	159
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	4,911	4,911

WEST VIRGINIA

BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,338	1,338
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	2,304	2,304
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,505	2,505
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	2,824	2,824
ELKINS, WV	57	57
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	438	438
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	9,035	9,035
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	31,759	31,759
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,895	2,545
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	2,322	2,322
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,270	1,270
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,547	2,547
SUTTON LAKE, WV	2,519	2,519
TYGART LAKE, WV	1,305	1,305

WISCONSIN

EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	747	747
FOX RIVER, WI	2,972	2,972
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	2,881	2,881
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	55	55
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	10	10
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	2,110	2,110
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	304	304
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	21	21
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	556	556

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
WYOMING		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WY	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	67	67
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	2,007	2,007
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	90	90
 SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	 2,439,962	 2,409,273
REMAINING ITEMS		
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK		
NAVIGATION MAINTENANCE	---	45,000
DEEP-DRAFT HARBOR AND CHANNEL	---	165,000
INLAND WATERWAYS	---	42,000
SMALL, REMOTE, OR SUBSISTENCE NAVIGATION	---	42,500
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES	---	35,000
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	675	675
ASSET MANAGEMENT/FACILITIES AND EQUIP MAINT (FEM)	3,250	3,250
BUDGET/MANAGEMENT SUPPORT FOR O&M BUSINESS PROGRAMS:		
STEWARDSHIP SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,000	1,000
PERFORMANCE-BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	3,939	3,939
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,650	1,650
OPTIMIZATION TOOLS FOR NAVIGATION	322	322
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,700	2,700
COASTAL OCEAN DATA SYSTEM (CODS)	3,400	5,400
RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE AT CORPS PROJECTS	5,000	5,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	6,000	6,000
DREDGE MCFARLAND READY RESERVE	11,690	11,690
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	15,000	15,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,119	1,119
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	6,450	6,450
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)	2,820	2,820
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	270	270
FACILITY PROTECTION	3,500	3,500
FISH & WILDLIFE OPERATING FISH HATCHERY REIMBURSEMENT	4,700	4,700
GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODEL	600	600
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	3,000	3,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED FEDERAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	28,000	28,000
INTERAGENCY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TASK FORCE/HURRICANE PROTECTION DECISION-	5,800	5,800
MONITORING OF COMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS	2,300	8,000
NATIONAL (LEVEE) FLOOD INVENTORY	10,000	10,000
NATIONAL (MULTIPLE PROJECT) NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	6,800	6,800
NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING PROGRAM	6,072	6,072
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM (PORTFOLIO RISK ASSESSMENT)	10,000	10,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP)	4,500	4,500
NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR REALLOCATIONS	1,071	1,071
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT	281	281
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,669	4,669
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	795	795
RECREATIONONESTOP (R1S) NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVATION SERVICE	65	65
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,800	1,800
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHAB.	300	300
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS)	500	2,500
 SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	 160,038	 499,238
 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	 2,600,000	 2,908,511

Updated Capability.—The agreement adjusts some project-specific allocations downward from the budget request based on updated information regarding the amount of work that could be accomplished in fiscal year 2015.

Lowell Creek Tunnel, Alaska.—The Corps is encouraged to recognize in future budget submissions the current problems with the existing Lowell Creek Tunnel and the need for an alternative method of flood diversion for Lowell Canyon.

Mud Mountain Dam, Washington.—The Corps is encouraged to continue developing interim and long-term measures to maintain fish runs past Mud Mountain Dam, in accordance with existing legal responsibilities.

Great Lakes Navigation System.—The agreement includes funding for individual projects within this System that exceeds the funding level envisioned in section 210(d)(1)(B)(ii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The fiscal year 2015 budget request does not fund operation, 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 results in economic inefficiencies and risks infrastructure failure, which can cause substantial economic losses. Investing in operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of infrastructure today will save taxpayers money in the future.

The agreement includes additional funds to continue ongoing projects and activities. The intent of these funds is for ongoing work that either was not included in the Administration's request or was inadequately budgeted. The direction that follows shall be the only direction used for additional funding provided in this account.

None of these funds may be used for any item where funding was specifically denied, to initiate new projects or programs, or to alter any existing cost-share requirements. Funding associated with each category may be allocated to any eligible project within that category; funding associated with each subcategory may be allocated only to eligible projects within that subcategory. The list of subcategories is not meant to be exhaustive.

The Corps retains complete discretion over project-specific allocation decisions, but shall consider giving priority to the following: ability to complete ongoing work maintaining authorized depths and widths of harbors and shipping channels, including where contaminated sediments are present; ability to address critical maintenance backlog; presence of the U.S. Coast Guard; extent to which the work will enhance national, regional, or local economic development, including domestic manufacturing capacity; extent to which the work will promote job growth or international competitiveness; number of jobs created directly by the funded activity; ability to obligate the funds allocated within the fiscal year; ability to complete the project, separable element, or project phase within the funds allocated; the risk of imminent failure or closure of the facility; and for harbor maintenance activities, total tonnage handled, total exports,

total imports, dollar value of cargo handled, energy infrastructure and national security needs served, lack of alternative means of freight movement, and savings over alternative means of freight movement. It is expected that all of the funds provided in this account will be allocated to specific programs, projects, or activities. The focus of the allocation process should favor the obligation of funds for work in fiscal year 2015 rather than expenditures. With the significant backlog of work in the Corps' inventory, there is absolutely no reason for funds provided above the budget request to remain unallocated.

Concerns persist that the Administration's criteria for navigation maintenance do not allow small, remote, or subsistence harbors and waterways to properly compete for scarce navigation maintenance funds. The Corps is urged to revise the criteria used for determining which navigation 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.

Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Corps shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a work plan including the following information: (1) a detailed description of the ratings system(s) developed and used to evaluate projects; (2) delineation of how these funds are to be allocated; (3) a summary of the work to be accomplished with each allocation; and (4) a list of all projects that were considered eligible for funding but did not receive funding, including an explanation of whether each project could have used funds in fiscal year 2015 and the specific reasons each project was considered as being less competitive for an allocation of funds.

Monitoring of Completed Navigation Projects.—The agreement includes additional funding for this line item to restore the funding level to that of previous fiscal years.

Water Operations Technical Support.—Funding in addition to the budget request is included for research into atmospheric rivers in an effort to develop and demonstrate better prediction capabilities and apply the science to improve reservoir operations to optimize multi-purpose project objectives and to meet stakeholder water needs.

Movable Bridges at Navigation Projects.—The Corps has responsibility for maintenance of movable bridges that are features of existing Corps navigation projects. Concerns exist that maintenance of these bridges may be deferred given constraints on civil works funding and the fact that bridge maintenance may have substantial benefits but not necessarily to the three civil works missions of commercial navigation, flood mitigation, and aquatic ecosystem restoration. It is unclear if the Corps has a clear idea of the bridges in its national inventory and the magnitude of the maintenance, rehabilitation, and replacement needs. The Corps is directed to provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act a report on movable bridges where the Corps has primary maintenance responsibility. The report should include the number of movable bridges in the Corps inventory, as well as for each movable bridge the following information:

- the year built;
- the average daily traffic count;

- the feature for which the bridge serves as a crossing;
- the bridge's sufficiency rating;
- the bridge's current weight restriction, if any, due to maintenance issues;
- whether the bridge serves as part of an evacuation route;
- any notable impact on local traffic conditions caused by current state of maintenance, such as traffic bottlenecks or length of detour if the bridge is taken out of service;
- the annual cost incurred by the Corps on maintenance over the past 10 years;
- estimated replacement cost, if known; and
- local municipality cost-share of maintenance or replacement either provided over the past 10 years or offered currently, if any.

Zebra and Quagga Mussels.—The Corps has completed, is working on, and intends to initiate additional invasive mussel vulnerability assessments at numerous federal dams in the Pacific Northwest. The Corps is encouraged to continue these efforts.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

The agreement includes \$200,000,000 for the Regulatory Program.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

The agreement includes \$101,500,000 for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

The agreement includes \$28,000,000 for Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies.

EXPENSES

The agreement includes \$178,000,000 for Expenses.

WRRDA 2014.—The Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) of 2014 was enacted on June 10, 2014. It provides significant changes in the Corps' project development process, authorizes at least \$16,000,000,000 in new projects and authorities, and directs the deauthorization of \$18,000,000,000 of previously authorized projects.

Many of these new authorities will require specific appropriations prior to implementation, but as most of the funding decisions for fiscal year 2015 were made in the absence of the WRRDA, very few of the provisions have been incorporated into this Act. It is anticipated that the provisions from this WRRDA will be integrated more fully into the fiscal year 2016 budget request.

Implementation guidance will be developed by the Corps in the coming months. The Corps is directed to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate with

notification prior to obligating funds for any provision not requiring specific appropriations, as well as monthly updates on the status of implementation guidance documents in draft and final form, including implementation guidance for WRRDA section 5014 regarding a water infrastructure public-private partnership pilot program. Additionally, the Corps is directed to develop and submit to the Committees, in accordance with House Report 113-486, a detailed plan for how the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 provisions, if funded, would be implemented.

It should be noted that enactment of the WRRDA, while providing considerable opportunities for new water resources investments, does not make any additional funding available for water resources projects. Appropriations Acts remain tethered to the defense and non-defense spending caps specified in the Budget Control Acts.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR CIVIL WORKS

The agreement includes \$3,000,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

Executive Management and Direction.—There appears to have been a breakdown in the traditional roles and responsibilities between the White House, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (ASA(CW)), and the Corps headquarters over the past 18 months. Predictably, this recent confusion and dysfunction has exacerbated problems with program execution and responsiveness to Congress. Some of the execution challenges appear to be related to an idea that increased “oversight” and “quality control” over the Corps’ Civil Works program is necessary on the part of the ASA(CW). While the Administration retains the prerogative to determine the appropriate level of oversight between its political appointees and the career staff, changes to oversight and quality control should be expected to have a discernible positive impact on the quality of the Civil Works program executed, rather than the polar opposite. Beyond program execution, other problems recently have manifested themselves in budget submission documents, reports to Congress, reprogramming actions, and work plans required by appropriations Acts.

One of the most obvious and ongoing problems has been the delay in submitting the annual budget justifications. The Administration has this single opportunity to present its vision of the Corps of Engineers program, but continued delay in providing the details of the budget deprives Congress of adequate time to properly consider the proposals. Part of the delay seems to stem from “oversight” and “quality control” of the budget justification process. This oversight and quality control of a very few project justifications resulted in the entire budget justification being submitted to the Congress weeks after the budget was released. Unfortunately, there did not appear to be improvement in the Corps’ budget justifications. In fact, errors that had not been present in previous years were introduced in the way data was presented to the Congress.

Nearly every year, the Congress requests reports from the Administration to assist in congressional oversight. The timeliness of the submission of these reports is critical if the Congress is to be

able to use the information to fulfill its oversight responsibilities. Unfortunately, multiple sequential reviews have led to requested reports and analyses being weeks, months, and even years late. In some cases, by the time the Congress receives the report, the data is out of date.

With a nationwide program where circumstances can change significantly during the fiscal year, reprogramming of funds is critical to program execution. The Congress provides legislative language to describe reprogramming limits available to the Corps and when those reprogramming actions must be submitted to the Congress for review. While the Administration appears to generally be fulfilling the intent of the law concerning these reprogramming actions, extensive sequential reviews have led to extraordinarily long times between the initiation and the execution of a reprogramming. In most cases these long delays to program execution are unnecessary.

With the end of congressionally directed spending after fiscal year 2011, the Congress transferred to the Administration the task of developing work plans to delineate how funding amounts provided in addition to the Administration's budget request are allocated among programs, projects, and activities. While the Congress provides some guidance for the allocation of funds through the reports that accompany the Acts, the Administration ultimately makes the decisions about which items to fund. Again, it appears that "oversight" and "quality control" by the Administration are contributing to challenges with timeliness of the work plans and are resulting in the decline in quality of the work plans. With the sequential review process, it appears the Administration is attempting to ensure that the projects in the work plans adhere to the vision that the Administration expressed in the budget submission rather than the guidance provided by the Congress. Once more, this extensive review process leads to delays in program execution.

The Congress reminds the Administration that once a bill is enacted into law, the Administration is expected to execute the program laid out in the appropriations Act in the most efficient and effective way possible. The Congress endeavors to ensure that funds provided in addition to the Administration request are executable by the Corps for items that were either underfunded in the Administration's request or were omitted from the Administration's request due to other Administration priorities or criteria. The Congress expects the Administration to develop plans that execute the maximum amount of funds possible in a given fiscal year. While constraints that may challenge the execution of funds are sometimes unavoidable, it is expected that in those instances funds would be obligated and carried over for expenditure in the subsequent fiscal year. Some unobligated carry-over of funds in a program the size and complexity of the Corps' is inevitable, but should be an option of last resort. With the backlog of ongoing work in the Corps' program, there should be multiple ways that the Administration can improve execution.

Currently the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are combined for oversight and policy review with more science based activities, such as the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy's Science programs. As these infrastructure programs are quite different from science based programs, the Administration should consider a reorganization within the Office of Management and Budget that would align the infrastructure agencies – such as the Corps of Engineers, the

Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Transportation – under the same branch to provide more effective oversight and policy review of these similar programs.

The Administration needs to return its focus to executing the Civil Works program and not to addressing multiple conflicting agendas with program execution as an afterthought.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL
(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

The agreement includes a provision relating to reprogramming.

The agreement includes a provision prohibiting the use of funds to carry out any contract that commits funds beyond the amounts appropriated for that program, project, or activity.

The agreement includes a provision concerning funding transfers related to fish hatcheries.

The agreement includes a provision regarding research and development on salmon survival.

The agreement includes a provision regarding the allocation of funds.

The agreement includes a provision relating to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 regarding Missouri River Recovery.

The agreement includes a provision relating to the use of the Modified Charleston Method.

The agreement includes a provision relating to unobligated balances. The Corps of Engineers is directed to consider the status of the funds and the risk to project completion prior to rescinding funds from individual project balances. Funds shall not be rescinded from projects where such an action would endanger the completion of a project.

The agreement includes a provision prohibiting funds from being used to develop or implement changes to certain definitions for the purposes of the Clean Water Act during fiscal year 2015.

The agreement includes a provision regarding the Mobile Harbor limited reevaluation report.

The agreement includes a provision regarding section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The agreement includes a provision regarding an interpretative rule.