Calendar No. 876

110TH CONGRESS *2d Session* | SENATE | REPORT 110–416

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2009

JULY 14, 2008.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3258]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 3258) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2009

Total of bill as reported to the Senate	$33,767,000,000
Amount of 2008 appropriations	31,508,398,000
Amount of 2009 budget estimate	31,695,700,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2008 appropriations	+2,258,602,000
2009 budget estimate	+2,071,300,000

CONTENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2009 beginning October 1, 2008, and ending September 30, 2009, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities, including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, Delta Regional Authority, Denali Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 2009 budget estimates for the bill total $31,695,700,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $33,767,000,000. This is $2,071,300,000 above the budget estimates and $2,258,602,000 above the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water held six sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2009 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

The recommendations for fiscal year 2009 therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of 28 to 10 the Committee on July 10, 2008, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The Corps of Engineers is made up of approximately 35,000 civilian and 650 military members that perform both military and civil works functions. The military and civilian engineers, scientists and other specialists work hand in hand as leaders in engineering and environmental matters. The diverse workforce of biologists, engineers, geologists, hydrologists, natural resource managers and other professionals meets the demands of changing times and requirements as a vital part of America's Army.

The Corps' mission is to provide quality, responsive engineering services to the Nation including:

—Planning, designing, building and operating water resources and other civil works projects. (Navigation, Flood Control, Environmental Protection, Disaster Response, et cetera)

—Designing and managing the construction of military facilities for the Army and Air Force. (Military Construction)

—Providing design and construction management support for other Defense and Federal agencies. (Interagency and International Services)

The Energy and Water bill only funds the Civil Works missions of the Corps of Engineers. Approximately 23,000 civilians and about 190 military officers are responsible for this nationwide mission.

From our hundreds of rivers, lakes and wetlands to our thousands of miles of coastal shoreline, we are fortunate in America to enjoy an abundance of water resources. As a Nation, we value these resources for their natural beauty; for the many ways they help meet human needs; and for the fact that they provide habitat for thousands of species of plants, fish and wildlife.

The Congress has given the Corps of Engineers the responsibility of helping to care for these important aquatic resources.

Through its Civil Works program the Corps carries out a wide array of projects that provide:

—Coastal storm damage reduction

—Disaster preparedness and response

—Environmental protection and restoration

—Flood damage reduction

—Hydropower

—Navigable waters

—Recreational opportunities

—Regulatory oversight
—Water supply

One of the biggest challenges the Corps and other Government agencies face is finding the right balance among the often conflicting concerns our society has related to our water resources. Society wants these resources to help fuel economic growth (navigation, hydropower). Society wants them to provide social benefits (recreation). And finally society wants to be sure that they are available for future generations (environmental protection and restoration).

The Corps is charged with seeking to achieve the best possible balance among these competing demands through an integrated approach to water resources management that focuses on regional solutions, involving an array of stakeholders (that is other Government agencies, environmental groups, businesses and private organizations). In recent years, the Corps has implemented this approach largely by concentrating on watersheds.

OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The fiscal year 2009 budget request for the Corps of Engineers is composed of $4,741,000,000 in new budget authority. This is a decrease of $130,000,000 from the fiscal year 2008 request. The President's overall budget priorities are stated to be to (1) continue long-term economic growth, (2) win the global war on terror, and (3) secure the homeland. The Committee fails to understand how this budget proposal for the Corps complies with either goal 1 or goal 3. How can one be taken seriously about providing for long term economic growth when one is proposing less funding for national infrastructure that contributes to economic growth than had been proposed in the previous year. It is certainly not because a large number of projects were completed in fiscal year 2008 or that a considerable amount of backlogged maintenance work was done. It appears to once again be a short-sighted budgetary decision. The Committee finds it remarkable that the administration can request and receive billions of dollars for infrastructure improvements in other countries and yet continues to shortchange our own. This budget request is more than $846,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2008 enacted budget for the Corps. The fiscal year 2008 enacted amount was contained in a bill the President signed that comported to his top-line budget numbers. However, once again, it appears that the baseline for the Corps budget is not the enacted amount but the amount the President proposes. If the administration would accept the reality of the Nation's infrastructure needs and budget accordingly, the gulf between the budget request and the enacted amount might not be as large. At a time when this existing infrastructure, the foundation of our economic security and quality of life, is depreciating much faster than it is being recapitalized, when our increasing population is placing much greater stress on the Nation's vital water resources, when shifts in population centers mean new and different problems and when a growing environmental awareness requires new solutions to persistent problems, this underfunding is unacceptable and threatens our continued well-being.

The Nation has been struck by a number of natural disasters over the last several years ranging from hurricanes, tornados, nor'easters and river flooding. This Committee has appropriated more than $14,000,000,000 to the Corps of Engineers to cope with the effects of these disasters on Federal facilities or facilities that are part of the Federal protection systems. This is more than six times the annual construction budget of the Corps. Some of these damages may not have been incurred had more robust infrastructure budgets been proposed by this and prior administrations. Yet no lesson seems to be learned from these disasters. The current flooding in the Midwest is in many ways a predictable repeat of the 1993 flood. Few of the recommendations made after that event were implemented. If they had, much of the damage and suffering currently occurring might have been avoided. Congress has successfully increased investments in our Nation's infrastructure over the last 8 years however these increases have most often been accomplished without the active support of the administration.

The administration budget continues the trend of underfunding the General Investigations [GI] account thereby depriving us of the Nation's primary tool to identify future challenges and develop innovative solutions to water resources challenges and needs. The fiscal year 2002 GI request was $130,000,000. This has declined to $91,000,000 in fiscal year 2009. Compare this to the fiscal year 2008 enacted amount of $167,000,000. This decline is not due to a reduction in water resources needs, rather, it appears to be a deliberate attempt to choke off the Corps planning program. Of the $91,000,000 recommended in the budget request less than 50 percent is for actual studies that might eventually become projects. Nearly half of these study funds are dedicated to a single study. Therefore, the rest of the Nation has to share a little over $21,000,000 for all of the rest of the studies in the Nation. This budget request greatly inhibits the Corps ability to do proper planning or to address workforce considerations. Budgets such as these, if enacted, will erode the Corps technical competency in the planning area.

Planning in the Corps is a specialized skillset and once that ability is lost, it is difficult to reestablish. Most of the criticisms of the Corps project development process in recent years have centered on the planning process. The administration is providing funding for some improvements to the Planning program such as funding the Planning Associates Program and Planning Centers of Expertise. However, planning studies have to be undertaken to utilize these improvements. The Committee believes that the Corps should have a robust planning program to not only address new water resource needs but to evaluate changes throughout the project development process. Continued budgets like this will lead to a complete loss of this vital Corps of Engineers' competency. The administration should seriously revise their priorities for this account in the fiscal year 2010 budget.

The Construction, General [CG] and Operation and Maintenance [O&M] accounts have to be discussed jointly due to the way the budget request blurs the line between the traditional project split between the two accounts.

Priorities for the CG account are based on six criteria for fiscal year 2009. The primary criterion again is the project's benefit to cost ratio [BCR]. Projects with high risk to human safety and a BCR greater than 1.5 or are significant or cost effective aquatic ecosystem restoration projects are given funding for current contract needs. No new construction starts met the administration's new start criteria for fiscal year 2009. Projects complying with treaties and biological opinions and/or meeting mitigation requirements as well as dam safety, seepage control and static instability correction were given the maximum funding for efficient and effective execution.

Once again, the O&M account appears to have been increased by more than $231,000,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted amount. However the administration has again proposed shifting major project rehabilitations and environmental compliance activities associated with completed projects from CG to O&M. Also shifted to O&M are dredged material disposal projects, beach erosion restoration due to completed navigation projects and initial nourishment of beach projects. This shifting of projects was allegedly done in the name of budget transparency—trying to show the true costs of project operations. This seems to be a very weak justification in that the Bureau of Reclamation which has similar projects in their construction accounts still has not received similar guidance in their budget preparation. By shifting some of these projects such as major rehabs and beach nourishments to O&M the administration was able to circumvent their own new start criteria. Further, by funding environmental compliance activities in the individual O&M projects seems to make the budget process less transparent by hiding how much these activities are costing the Nation by distributing these costs across multiple projects as opposed to a single line item in previous budgets. Finally, the administration's budget proposal limits coastal storm damage reduction projects that require periodic sand renourishments to those where the erosion is due to navigation projects. It also proposes to limit Federal participation to initial beach nourishment.

Shifting of projects from the two accounts totals almost $265,000,000. This corresponds to a similar decrease in CG funding for fiscal year 2009. If the projects are shifted back to their traditional accounts, the O&M budget is $2,210,225,000. That is over $33,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2008 enacted amount. Further the administration proposed spreading the O&M funding over 28 additional individual projects than what they had proposed in fiscal year 2008. This is the ultimate example of doing more with less. Prices for labor, fuel and materials have all increased over the previous year, not decreased and yet the Corps is expected to do more with less. The Committee notes that the Corps maintenance backlog is more than $1,000,000,000 and increases by about $100,000,000 annually as the inventory of projects ages.

After criticism from this Committee concerning the presentation of O&M as 21 separate regions based on watersheds, the administration modified their proposal for fiscal year 2009. The O&M budget is now proposed as 54 separate regions based on sub watersheds as opposed to discrete projects. The discrete projects are still listed for each region, it is just that the administration has not at-

tached any funding levels to any of the projects so this Committee nor any one else would know how much funding might be provided for individual projects. The lack of specificity and detail in a nearly $2,500,000,000 request is appalling and will be discussed in more detail later. The Committee continues to believe this so called "regional budget' is no more than an aggregation of the projects within a specific watershed not the development of a regional budget. The Committee believes that the Corps should budget regionally and take advantage of whatever efficiencies can be gained by budgeting in this manner. However, it should also be noted that projects are individually analyzed and authorized. Estimates of O&M costs are established as a part of the project development process. If individual O&M estimates are not displayed, there is no way to know if the projects are costing more or less than was anticipated and no way to learn from past errors in developing O&M costs or procedures.

The regulatory budget is $180,000,000 for fiscal year 2009. This is the same as in fiscal year 2008.

The Committee is disappointed that funding for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] was cut by $10,000,000 from the fiscal year 2008 amount of $140,000,000. This program was transferred to the Corps from the Department of Energy, because the Committee was concerned with management and cost issues of the program within the Energy Department. This is a program that is being well managed by the Corps and should have stable, adequate budget resources to continue these radiological clean-up activities.

The Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account is funded at $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2009. The Committee supports this funding for disaster readiness and preparedness activities of the Corps of Engineers.

The budget request separates the budget request for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) from the General Expenses [GE] account. The Committee continues to believe that the Assistant Secretary's office should be funded in the Defense Appropriations bill. However, until such time as that can be reintegrated into that bill, the Committee is grateful to see that the budget request proposes it as a separate account. The Assistant Secretary's duties encompass much more than the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers and the budget needs of the office should be addressed separately.

The Committee is pleased to see an increase in the GE budget for fiscal year 2009. With the increases in responsibilities for the headquarters of the Corps in overseeing larger budgets as well as the massive rebuilding of the flood and storm damage reduction measures in the New Orleans area, it is appropriate that this account should be increased. The Committee notes that the Corps operates one of the most efficient headquarters staffs in the National Capital region. Only about 3.5 percent of their staffing is at their headquarters level as opposed to 10 percent or more for comparable agencies in the National Capital region.

The administration has proposed legislation and funding to complete the 100-year protection for the greater New Orleans Hurricane Protection System as a part of the fiscal year 2009 budget re-

quest. The administration has proposed to authorize a single hurricane protection project to encompass the Lake Ponchartrain and Vicinity and the West Bank and Vicinity projects along with the other improvements that were authorized and funded in Public Law 109–148 and Public Law 109–234. The Southeast Louisiana projects that provide interior drainage to this system are also proposed to be included. The Budget proposes $5,671,000,000 in emergency funding as a part of the fiscal year 2009 request. The budget proposal also provides legislation to modify the cost sharing for the remaining uncompleted cost shared project features to 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. This change results in an increase to the non-Federal interests of $213,000,000 for a total non-Federal share that exceeds $1,500,000,000. The administration says that the Federal funds are needed no later than October 1, 2008 in order to have all of this work completed by the beginning of hurricane season in June 2011.

The Congress provided these emergency funds in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, (Public Law 110–252) signed by the President on June 30, 2008.

PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING

The Committee has watched with interest over the last 5 years as the Corps has moved to a "performance based budget" model. Unfortunately, the Committee does not see improvement in the budgeting of the Nation's Civil Works infrastructure program as a result of this new model. In fact, the Committee believes quite the opposite is true. Rather than an integrated program, the budget for the Civil Works program seems to continue to degenerate toward a yearly collection of interchangeable projects dependent only on the budgetary whims and criteria in use in that particular year. The current method of performance based budgeting utilized in this budget preparation turns the Nation away from infrastructure investments that return two and even three times their cost.

In fiscal year 2005, more than 130 projects were budgeted by the administration for construction; this year there are only about 82. However, Congress funded more than 300 projects in fiscal year 2008 and has averaged about 315 annually since fiscal year 2000. Unfortunately, the budget request pretends that these on-going projects which have been funded annually for many years in enacted legislation do not exist. Further the budget assumes it costs nothing to ignore these projects. If Congress funded only the budget request for Construction, General, the administration would quickly discover that termination costs for unfunded ongoing projects could easily exceed the request. This is irresponsible budgeting on the part of the administration.

From the Committee's perspective, the Corps' budget seems to be developed exactly in the opposite manner that it should be. It appears that overall spending targets are set by the administration and then their priority projects are inserted within these targets. Criteria are then established to justify funding the lower priority projects within the remaining funding targets. The problem with budgeting in this manner is evident in the construction account for fiscal year 2009. Six priority projects consume 32 percent of the requested dollars in this account. Another 11 projects related to dam

safety consume another 27 percent. That means that some 65 projects have to split the remaining 41 percent of the budgeted construction dollars.

The logic behind this budgeting rational appears to be that concentrating scarce resources on finishing a few higher performing projects will allow the Nation to reap the benefits of these projects sooner. The trouble with this is that these are long-term projects that take many years to complete. At the rate the budget is headed, we will only be funding the administration's six priority projects and the dam safety repairs in another couple of years with little else in the pipeline. The Committee questions this rationale when benefits of flood control projects can be accrued incrementally as project elements are completed. Even navigation projects can accrue benefits for a partially completed project. For instance, the administration claims to be providing completion funds for the Columbia River Channel Deepening project. However, the Committee understands that there is a 1 mile segment where additional work will be required once the dredging work is completed to provide full project depth and dimension. The cost of this 1 mile reach has not yet been determined. However, ports and terminals downstream of this reach will benefit from the deeper channel and those national benefits will accrue to the economy. Even the Port of Portland, which is above this reach, believes that with proper tidal conditions, they can reap some benefit from the deeper project until this remaining reach is completed. These are net positive benefits to the national economy compared to the value of the benefits that are deferred by suspending or terminating these other projects in order to concentrate resources on such a few projects.

In some cases these deferred benefits may never be realized due to these terminations. Local sponsors who share in these projects' cost may lose their ability to share these costs or may lose public support for finishing these projects. Once these priority projects are completed, one has to wonder whether there will be any projects or sponsors interested in resuming construction in an infrastructure program that suspends projects based on changeable annual criteria.

In the past, Corps budgets were developed from the bottom up, District to Division to Headquarters to ASA to OMB. District commanders were responsible for developing and managing a program within their geographic area. Division Commanders were responsible for integrating the District office programs into a single Division-wide program. The Headquarters office integrated the Division Programs into a single national program. The OASA assured that the program complied with administration policy and budgetary guidance and OMB developed the budgetary guidance and provided funding levels. Decisions for budgeting were made within the framework of administration policy by those who knew the projects and programs best, not Washington level bureaucrats.

Another benefit of budgeting in this manner is that it allows the Corps to undertake workforce planning to distribute their work across the Nation. When one chooses to concentrate nearly 60 percent of the construction budget in a handful of projects, there is no way the workload can be balanced across the remainder of the Nation with what is left. Unlike other Federal agencies that have a

salaries and expense component to their budget, the Corps does not, at least not at the District office level. Virtually all costs at District offices (rent, utilities, labor, materials, et cetera) are charged to projects and studies as directed by Congress. This enables the public to be informed of the true cost of all projects. Accordingly, it is necessary that the budget process be consistent with the accounting practice. When dealing with such large differences in workload from fiscal year to fiscal year it is clear that the administration gave little thought to how this budget would impact the Corps' organizational structure or ability to maintain a technically competent workforce. Congress has repeatedly demonstrated that it desires to keep the structure of the Corps of Engineers as it is currently configured. Yet, if the budget were enacted, there would be no way to maintain this workforce, due to how budgetary criteria skewed the projects to certain areas of the country. Neither a pure "bottom up" budget process, nor a performance-based budget process is perfect. Experienced decision makers are expected to exercise informed judgment to achieve a balanced program considering all factors. Once more, the administration appears to have submitted a very unbalanced program using oversimplified decision metrics to consider only a few objectives (for example BCR and efficient completion of a few projects) that do not take into account the long-term needs of the Nation or the organization expected to manage the program.

The recently enacted WRDA bill made numerous reforms to Corps of Engineers procedures. However, one change that Congress did not include was changing the BCR necessary for a project to be authorized for construction from the current 1.0 to 1. The budgetary criterion mentioned above requires a BCR to be 3.0 to 1 for full budgeting or a 1.5 to 1 for partial budgeting. This performance based budgeting criteria furthers the divide between what is required for authorization and what is required to be budgeted.

These criteria used to be one and the same. Many of the projects in the recently enacted water resources development act do not meet this criteria, increasing the backlog of authorized but unconstructed projects. These new projects, along with the ongoing projects not funded in the budget and the increasing number of major rehabilitations needed for aging infrastructure, are affecting and will continue to affect the national economy. Existing water resources infrastructure is wearing out. The Nation needs to recapitalize if we are to remain competitive in a global marketplace. Infrastructure budgets, starting from the administration level, have got to be increased. If not, the Nation will continue to face unscheduled outages, damaged incomplete infrastructure and other emergency situations that must be dealt with through ever increasing emergency appropriations.

FISCAL YEAR 2009 BUDGET INITIATIVES

The administration has proposed the same changes to how the civil works program is appropriated for fiscal year 2009 that have been proposed in fiscal year 2008 and fiscal year 2007. These include the regionalization of operations and maintenance funding and migrating four categories of projects from the Construction,

General account to the Operations and Maintenance account. The Committee has rejected all of these initiatives.

Regionalized operations and maintenance funding segregates funding for projects into 54 watershed regions around the country as opposed to displaying operations and maintenance costs by project as has been the tradition. As projects, not regions, are authorized and funded by Congress, the Committee must reject this proposal. Operation and Maintenance budgets are developed on a project by project basis. For large river basins such as the Ohio or the Missouri, budgeting for the individual projects, as authorized, involve multiple Districts and Divisions. As the proposals in the budget are not developed as a systemized budget, aggregating them in the fashion proposed does not lead to the "true costs" of operating the system, it just adds up the various parts. The Committee does not believe that this proposal advances the budgeting for operations and maintenance.

The Committee is not opposed to a systemized budget for projects. In fact, in the fiscal year 2008 Energy and Water joint explanatory statement the Congress directed the Corps to prepare systemized, integrated budgets for four regions of the country to demonstrate the value of this approach to the Committee. The budget request did not include these regional budgets. Until the value of a regional budget is demonstrated to the Committee, regional budgeting will not be considered.

The Committee rejects the initiative to move Endangered Species Act [ESA] compliance activities from Construction, General to Operations and Maintenance. The stated reason for this change was budget transparency or to more appropriately show the true costs of operating these projects. The Committee has two issues with this logic. Budget transparency fades when the costs are rolled into the regionalized budgets. However, even if they were budgeted on a project by project basis, the casual observer would have no notion of how much of the operational costs of these projects is related to ESA compliance. Second, these are only being considered as operational costs because mitigation for these projects was not undertaken when the projects were constructed as is now required by subsequent laws. Were these projects constructed today, formulation of the projects would have required avoidance and minimization measures for the endangered species as project construction costs.

If one wanted to take this argument to the extreme, all of the Everglades Restoration should be budgeted under the Central and South Florida O&M project since construction of this project resulted in the environmental restorations that are now being implemented. However, the costs for this work would not be transparent in the budget. By retaining the ESA compliance measures as separate line items in the CG account, it is much more transparent as to how much is being funded for these activities.

The budget has proposed moving major rehabilitation for locks and dams from the Construction, General account to the Operations and Maintenance account. Corresponding to this is a legislative proposal to allow the proceeds from the Inland Waterway Trust Fund to be utilized in the Operations and Maintenance account. Current law only allows these funds to be utilized in the

Construction, General account. The Congress moved major rehabilitation from the Construction, General account to the Operation and Maintenance account in fiscal year 1985. Subsequently as the backlog increased, it was returned to the Construction, General account in the fiscal year 1993 budget. The stipulations involved in moving it back to the Construction account included that these major rehabilitations would involve more than a simple restoration of project function. Operational improvements were considered as a part of the rehab. As such, the rehabilitated, or recapitalized, projects were considered new investment opportunities for the country, the same as other new projects, and had to compete as new starts in the Construction, General program. This is entirely appropriate as these recapitalized projects provide increased levels of service and performance not envisioned in their original construction. If they didn't, under existing administration policy, the repairs would be considered major maintenance and would be funded under the Operation and Maintenance account. To help fund these major rehabs, legislation allowed half the costs of the major rehab to be borne by the Inland Waterway Trust Fund with the other half to come from the General Treasury. The Committee does not believe moving these projects back to the Operations and Maintenance account will solve the backlog of major rehabs and rejects this proposal. The Committee believes that the real intent of this proposal is to skirt the new start issue in the CG account. The Corps has proposed initiating a major rehab report for the Lower Monumental Lock and Dam. By including this in O&M they don't have to consider this as a new start under their own budgeting criterion.

The Committee is disappointed that the administration has recycled their beach policy from the fiscal year 2008 budget. This proposal was rejected by the Congress. The authorizing committees that prepared the recently enacted Water Resources Development Act chose to reject this policy as well. The Committee rejects the policy again this year. The Committee notes that beaches are the leading tourist destination in the United States and that about 50 percent of our population lives near our Nation's coasts. Typically shore protection projects are justified on storm damages prevented alone, and the recreation benefits only enhance the benefit to cost ratio. Shore protection projects should be viewed in the same manner as levees along our rivers. These projects mitigate storm damage in the same fashion that levees mitigate riverine flooding.

The maximum Federal Government contribution to Federal shore protection projects is 65 percent of the total project cost but the Government receives all the benefits in reducing Federal disaster assistance payments. Like much of our other infrastructure, by paying for Federal shore protection projects now, we can avoid many of the catastrophic losses and disaster assistance payments associated with hurricanes and coastal storms. Simply stated, the Nation can pay now to avoid losses or pay more later to recover from severe impacts. It truly makes sense to be proactive and not reactive in this environment.

The Committee believes that this budget proposal is no way to run a robust national infrastructure program. The Committee recommended that the Corps include additional criteria into the

project prioritization process and commends the administration for having done so for the fiscal year 2009 budget request. However, the net result is that the mix of projects is substantially unchanged. The Committee does not believe that this prioritization method can be salvaged into a useable system. Further, the Committee has seen no evidence that it has improved the budget process.

Rather than trying new budget models and new prioritization criteria, the country needs to invest more heavily in its water resources. Water resource projects are some of the only Federal expenditures that go through a rigorous benefit to cost process to determine benefits to the national economy. The standard of living that we currently enjoy is due to the excess capacity that was built into our water resources infrastructure by previous generations. By failing to make new investments and recapitalizing aging infrastructure, the Nation is not only falling behind our competition around the world, but is jeopardizing our future economic growth.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS

The Committee commends the Corps for the layout of the budget justifications for fiscal year 2009. Grouping projects by the Division office rather than according to business lines makes the justifications much more useful to the Committee and provides more easily accessible information to the public. The Committee expects that this method of displaying the budget justifications will be continued for the fiscal year 2010 budget.

The Committee finds the justifications for O&M projects to be totally inadequate. Inadequate is an understatement, there were no justifications provided for O&M. The only information provided was the business line totals for each region. How the information was established to justify these totals is a mystery in the justification statements. When the Committee staff initially inquired about information for the individual projects that made up the funded regions, they were told that OMB had directed that information concerning individual projects was not to be released. Fortunately OMB relented on this point and allowed the Corps to provide this information. For a $2,500,000,000 account this is an unacceptable manner to justify a budget. More information was provided for the $40,000,000 in studies in the GI account than was provided for all of O&M.

The Committee is also disappointed in the justifications for the Continuing Authorities Program and the Dam Safety/Seepage Stability Correction Program. The justifications for these items showed a total dollar value and listed projects, but give the Committee no idea how the program totals were arrived at. There is no way to know whether the administration proposal underfunds or overfunds these programs.

The Committee believes that budget justifications serve to justify the administration's request. The budget justifications could be improved by providing more relevant budget and project information. For fiscal year 2010 the Corps is directed to provide, at a minimum, detailed project information for each O&M project justifying the needs for each project. If the administration chooses to continue

to provide the business line information, it may be provided as a separate appendix to the justifications.

INLAND WATERWAY TRUST FUND

When the fiscal year 2008 budget was presented to Congress, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) notified the committee of a looming deficit in the Inland Waterway Trust Fund [IWTF] due to the amount of work that was being funded on the inland waterway system. He stated that legislation would be forthcoming from the administration to address this expected shortfall. The Congress never received a proposal in calendar year 2007. Even though the Environment and Public Works Committee was working on a WRDA bill, and the WRDA could have been the appropriate vehicle for the legislation, no legislation was forthcoming.

When the fiscal year 2009 budget was presented to Congress, the budget announced a proposal to phase out the existing fuel tax that funds the IWTF and phase in a lockage fee. It also announced that a legislative proposal would be forthcoming. The legislative proposal was finally submitted to Congress on April 4, 2008. Six months before the beginning of the new fiscal year. The administration's budget for fiscal year 2009 was predicated on this significant change in law being enacted by October 1, 2008. More funding was proposed to be utilized from the IWTF than was estimated to be available utilizing the current revenue source. The only way to fund the administration's budget request for IWTF projects, as they had been cost shared, was through a change in law.

The Committee has supported and continues to support sharing the cost of construction and major rehabilitations between the IWTF and the General Treasury in the Construction, General account. The Committee believes that this arrangement makes the users active partners in the overall inland waterway system and provides for a better more efficient system. As the Congress already pays 100 percent of the O&M costs of the inland waterway system, the Committee would not support a change in cost sharing for the IWTF. Even if it did support a cost share change, this would only prolong the inevitable bankrupting of the IWTF.

The current fuel tax generates about $90,000,000 annually. Currently awarded continuing contracts for IWTF projects will require approximately $60,000,000 of this amount for the next 4 years. The administration has proposed and the Committee has been appropriating considerably more than that amount from the fund over the last several years. Therefore, the Committee believes that the only way to solve the problem is to generate additional revenues in the fund. The current fuel tax is spread relatively equitably across all commercial users of the inland waterway system. However, the fuel tax has remained at $0.20 per gallon of diesel fuel since 1996. Inflation and increased efficiency in tow boats has eroded the value of the fuel tax. One potential solution is to index the fuel tax to inflation. Another solution would be to keep the current fuel tax in place but to add a lock user fee to the revenue stream. This way, all users would pay something and those that use the locks would pay more. A wholesale change from a fuel tax to a user fee as proposed by the administration appears to be unacceptable to Congress or the inland waterway industry. However, the Com-

mittee only proffers these as discussion topics. The one problem the Committee sees with a user fee is that it could deter use of waterways. As waterways are the most efficient mode of transport any solution to the funding shortfall should not provide disincentives for using the inland waterways.

To fund the administration request for fiscal year 2009 would require approximately $117,000,000 in IWTF revenues. The Corps has informed the Committee that there will not be that much available in fiscal year 2009. The Corps has also informed the Committee that in order to keep from exceeding available revenues that they have not awarded a planned contract in fiscal year 2008 that would have requirements in fiscal year 2009 for the Lock and Dams 2, 3, and 4 on the Monongahela River. To address the funding shortfall in the IWTF the Committee is taking the unusual step of directing in legislative text that only nine inland waterway projects will have access to IWTF revenues in fiscal year 2009 in order to assure that planned work does not exceed revenues. The Corps is directed in fiscal year 2009 to utilize the general fund of the U.S. Treasury to fund inland waterway projects without specific statutory requirements to be funded from the IWTF. The Committee intends this to be a single year change. Fiscal year 2009 inland waterway projects funded entirely with General Fund revenues should be brought to a logical stopping point and deferred until such time as the IWTF revenue stream is enhanced and these projects can again be cost shared with the IWTF.

Legislative text is also being included to prohibit the Corps from entering into any new continuing contracts for any inland waterway project until the revenue stream for the IWTF is enhanced. The administration should submit the fiscal year 2010 budget based on expected revenues in the IWTF not based on projections based on legislation that may or may not happen. If the budget is submitted utilizing the same assumptions on the IWTF that the administration made this year, the Committee will have no choice but to curtail spending on all inland waterway projects in fiscal year 2010 to a level that fits within the IWTF estimated revenues.

No change in law has been made nor will this Committee propose any to alleviate the funding problem that will occur in fiscal year 2009. That means the Committee cannot fund the administration's request as proposed.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING

The budget for the Corps of Engineers consists of individual line items of projects. As presented by the President, the budget contains 151 specific line item requests for funding. As was previously discussed the O&M request proposed expending funds in an additional 54 line items listed as watershed basins or subbasins. However, once the detail was received from the administration concerning O&M, the O&M funding was spread across 820 specific line items. This totals 971 specific line item requests for directed spending by the administration. Additional funding is requested by the administration for nationwide line items. The administration does not consider anything that the administration requests as an earmark. Yet all of these line items were specific requests by the administration of the Congress to be funded in fiscal year 2009. They

did not request these funds programmatically, they requested them for a specific project in a specific location for a specific purpose.

The President published an Executive Order [EO] on January 29, 2008, that directs his agency heads to ignore congressionally directed spending items that are contained in the explanatory reports that accompany legislative text and states that an "earmark" is any funding requested by Congress that circumvents a merit based or competitive allocation process. The EO does not define what a merit based or competitive allocation process is, but one can assume that it will be how the administration chooses to define it and projects added by Congress will not be considered.

The Committee has traditionally included funding for the Corps of Engineers by account in legislative text and provided the details for each account within the report that accompanies the legislation. This was primarily done to provide the agency some flexibility in how funds were expended and to allow the Corps to effectively manage their program while honoring the intent of Congress. The primary intent of Congress has always been that once the Congress funded a study, it intended for the study phase to be completed to determine if Federal investment is warranted. By the same token, once the Congress committed to initiation of construction of a project, it intended for the project to be completed and the national economy to accrue the project benefits. With this Executive Order in place, the Committee is concerned that this intent might not be followed. There appears to be little desire for discussion of what exactly is meant in this Executive Order, so the Committee has executed its constitutional prerogatives by including statutory language to incorporate by reference all of the details of each account from the report that accompanies the legislative text, into the actual legislative text. This will ensure that the intent of Congress is fully complied with.

CONTINUING CONTRACTS AND REPROGRAMMING

The Committee expects the Chief of Engineers to execute the Civil Works program generally in accordance with congressional direction. This includes moving individual projects forward in accordance with the funds annually appropriated. However, the Committee realizes that many factors outside the Corps' control may dictate the progress of any given project or study. Because the individual projects are being incorporated into the legislative text the Corps is cautioned that while the Committee is firmly in favor of utilizing continuing contracts for the Civil Works program, it may be difficult to award this type of contract under these constraints.

Because of the Committee's concern that congressional intent be followed, reprogramming authority has been withdrawn from all but the O&M account and the O&M portion of the Mississippi River and Tributaries project.

Reprogramming authority is as follows:

Operations and Maintenance.—Unlimited reprogramming authority is granted in order for the Corps to be able to respond to emergency situations. The Chief of Engineers must notify the House and Senate Appropriations Committees of these emergency actions as soon thereafter as practicable. For all other situations, for a base less than $1,000,000, the reprogramming limit is $150,000. For a

base over $1,000,000, 15 percent up to a limit of $5,000,000 per project or activity. Amounts over this limit require approval of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. The Committee does not object reprogramming up to $150,000 to any continuing project or program that did not receive an appropriation in the current year.

Mississippi River and Tributaries.—The Corps should follow the same reprogramming guidelines for the Operation and Maintenance portions of the Mississippi River and Tributaries account as listed above.

5-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE BUDGET PLANNING

While the Committee appreciates the Corps' attempts to provide a meaningful 5-year budget plan, it recognizes the inherent difficulties between the legislative and executive branches in preparing a useful plan. The executive branch is unwilling to project a 5-year horizon for projects for which they do not budget leaving a sizeable percentage of the Corps annual appropriations with a year to year event horizon for planning purposes. The fact that a sizeable portion of the annual appropriations are dedicated to congressional priorities is not a new phenomenon. Many major public works projects over the last two centuries have been funded on an annual basis without a clear budget strategy. The Committee would welcome the ideas and the opportunity to work with the executive branch to determine a mutually agreeable way to develop an integrated 5-year comprehensive budget that displays true funding needs for congressional as well as administration priorities. Anything less will only give a partial view of the investments needed in water resources infrastructure.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $5,300,000,000. This is $559,000,000 over the administration's budget request and $287,087,000 less than the fiscal year 2008 enacted amount. This table excludes the request for emergency appropriations for the New Orleans hurricane protection system as requested in the budget since it has been funded through an emergency supplemental appropriations act. Funding is displayed in the following tables in the accounts where projects have been traditionally located and comparisons to the budget request are made as if the request was presented in the traditional manner. Funding by account is as follows:

	Fiscal year 2009 request	Committee recommendation	Request vs. recommendation
General Investigations	$91,000	$166,000	+$75,000
Construction, General	1,666,775	2,004,500	+337,225
Mississippi River and Tributaries	240,000	365,000	+125,000
Operation and Maintenance	2,210,225	2,220,000	+9,775
Regulatory	180,000	183,000	+3,000
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies	40,000	40,000	.....
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	130,000	140,000	+10,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the	.....	.....	.....
Army (Civil Works)	6,000	4,500	−1,500
General Expenses	177,000	177,000	.....

	Fiscal year 2009 request	Committee recommendation	Request vs. recommendation
Total	4,741,000	5,300,000	+ 559,000

NEW STARTS

The passage of the WRDA bill in 2007 presented the Committee with the challenge of 7 years of pent up demand for new studies and projects. The Committee had to balance the funding needs of ongoing work with the future ability to fund potential new start studies and projects. Ultimately the Committee decided to fund a very limited number of new studies and projects. The Committee's essential criterion for deciding new starts was to ensure that the projects or studies were only for traditional Corps missions. Therefore the Committee excluded from consideration:

(1) New environmental infrastructure authorizations;

(2) Non traditional project authorizations;

(3) Authorizations that have not been through the traditional two phase planning process;

(4) New projects under section 206 and section 1135 of the Continuing Authorities Program as these program sections are oversubscribed;

(5) Projects that included demonstration features;

(6) New projects that would require funds from the Inland Waterway Trust Fund because of lack of funding in the IWTF.

DISCLOSURE PROVISIONS

The Committee received more than 3,000 requests for projects, programs, studies or activities for the Corps of Engineers for fiscal year 2009. These requests included the budget request as well as requests by Members. The Committee obviously was unable to accommodate all of these requests.

In the interest of providing full disclosure of funding provided in the Energy and Water bill, all disclosures are made in the report accompanying the bill.

All of the projects funded in this report have gone through the same rigorous public review and approval process as those proposed for funding by the President. The difference in these projects, of course, is that the congressionally directed projects are not subject to the artificial budgetary prioritization criteria that the administration utilizes to decide what not to fund.

For those programs, projects, or studies that were included in the budgetary documents provided in the budget request, the words "The President" has been added to denote this administration request. The level of funding provided for each of these programs, projects or studies should not be construed as what was requested. Rather, the only intent is to disclose the requestor.

It should be noted that many line items only have the President listed as the requestor. It should not be inferred that the affected Members are not interested in these projects studies or activities. Rather this is due to Committee direction that it is unnecessary to request the President's budget as the individual administration requests are the basis of the Senate bill.

The purposes for the funding provided in the various accounts is described in the paragraphs associated with each account. The location of the programs, projects or studies are denoted in the account tables.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2008	$167,261,000
Budget estimate, 2009	91,000,000
Committee recommendation	166,000,000

This appropriation funds studies to determine the need, engineering feasibility, economic justification, and the environmental and social suitability of solutions to water and related land resource problems; and for preconstruction engineering and design work, data collection, and interagency coordination and research activities.

The planning program is the entry point for Federal involvement in solutions to the Nation's water resource problems and needs. Unfortunately, the General Investigations [GI] account is eviscerated in the budget request. Nationwide studies and programs consume over half of the administration's GI request. This budget is saying that the Nation should concentrate scarce resources on completing studies but not carrying forward ongoing studies or allowing new starts. The Committee continues to believe this argument is remarkably shortsighted. It assumes that the country will stop growing and that new investment opportunities will not be present.

In truth, as the country grows, new investment opportunities will be presented and some previously authorized projects may no longer make sense or may be less competitive. The Corps should keep presenting the administration and Congress with new investment opportunities in order for the Nation to remain competitive in a global economy. The only conclusion one can draw from the administration's GI proposal is that they are determined to redirect the Corps toward construction, operation and maintenance by strangling their ability to evaluate water resource problems and needs.

The Committee has provided for a robust and balanced planning program for fiscal year 2009. The Committee has used the traditional view within the Corps planning program that only considers new starts as those that have never received GI funds before. The Committee believes that to maintain a robust planning program, a mix of new reconnaissance studies must be included with the existing feasibility and PED studies. As such the Committee has included a few new reconnaissance studies in this account. To provide additional transparency in the budget process, the Committee has segregated the budget into three columns in the following table.

The first column represents the reconnaissance phase of the planning process. These studies determine if there is a Federal interest in a water resource problem or need and if there is a cost sharing sponsor willing to move forward with the study. The next column represents the feasibility phase of the study. These detailed cost shared studies determine the selected alternative to be recommended to the Congress for construction. The third column rep-

resents the Preconstruction engineering and design phase. These detailed cost shared designs are prepared while the project recommended to Congress is awaiting authorization for construction.

The Committee believes that by segregating the table in this manner that more attention will be focused on the various study phases, and a more balanced planning program will be developed by the administration. As the last two columns are generally cost shared, they demonstrate the commitment by cost sharing sponsors to be a part of the Federal planning process. By the same token, it also shows the level of commitment of the Federal Government to these cost sharing sponsors. The Committee directs that the fiscal year 2010 planning budget be presented to the Committee in this fashion.

The budget request and the recommended Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED
ALASKA					
ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK	100			100	400
BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	400			400	
HOMER HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK				400	
KENAI RIVER BLUFF EROSION, AK				500	
MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED, AK				400	
VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK				150	
YAKUTAT HARBOR, AK	700			700	
ARIZONA					
AGUA FRIA RIVER TRILBY WASH, AZ				250	
LITTLE COLORADO RIVER WATERSHED, AZ				250	
PIMA COUNTY, AZ	275			275	
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION, AZ		658			658
ARKANSAS					
LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESOURCE STUDY, AR			254		
MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR					250
PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR					500
SOUTHWEST, ARKANSAS, AR				327	
WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO				500	
WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO BATESVILLE, AR					325
CALIFORNIA					
BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA				350	
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA	900			900	
CARPINTERIA SHORELINE STUDY				443	
COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA		950			950
COYOTE DAM, CA				250	
GOLETA BEACH, CA				150	
HAMILTON CITY, CA					500
HEACOCK AND CACTUS CHANNELS, CA					500
HUMBOLDT BAY LONG TERM SHOAL MGMT, CA				200	
LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, WOODLAND AND VICINITY				200	
LOS ANGELES RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA				590	
LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA				400	
MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA				150	
MATILIJA DAM, CA					1,000
MIDDLE CREEK, CA					500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED
PAJARO RIVER, CA					1,000
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA				300	
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SAMP, CA				200	
ROCK CREEK, KEEFER SLOUGH, CA				200	
SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN COMP, CA				1,000	
SAC—SAN JOAQUIN DELTA ISLANDS AND LEVEES, CA	468			2,000	
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SAMP, CA				250	
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA				200	
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN (SJRB), FRAZIER CREEK/ STRATHMO				200	
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS, ORESTIMBA CR				400	
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, LOWER SAN JAOQUIN RIVER, CA				600	
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN (SJRB), WHITE RIVER/DRY CREEK				125	
SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA				250	
SOLANA-ENCINITAS SHORELINE, CA	171			171	
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO SHORELINE, CA				1,400	
SUTTER COUNTY, CA	339			339	
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING, CA AND NV				125	
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	191			191	
COLORADO					
BASALT, CO			50		
CACHE LA POUDRE, CO				5	125
CHATFIELD, CHERRY AND BEAR CREEK, RESERVOIRS, CO				200	
SOUTH BOULDER CREEK, CO			2	250	
CONNECTICUT					
CONNECTICUT RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT, MA, NH & VT				450	
DELAWARE					
RED CLAY CREEK, CHRISTINA RIVER WATERSHED, DE				300	
FLORIDA					
FLAGER COUNTY, FL				250	
LAKE WORTH INLET, FL				200	
MILE POINT, FL	50			50	
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	550			550	
SARASOTA, LIDO KEY, FL					158
ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL				250	
WALTON COUNTY, FL					591
GEORGIA					
AUGUSTA, GA		278			278
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	150			150	
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA		700			700
TYBEE ISLAND, GA	250			250	
GUAM					
HAGATNA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, GUAM	350			350	
HAWAII					
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	300			300	
HILO HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HI			100		
HYDROELECTRIC POWER ASSESSMENT, HI			300		
KAHUKU, HI					344
KALAELOA BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, HI				350	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED
MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	.....	200	.....	200	.....
WAILUPE STREAM, OAHU, HI	.....	.....	.....	.....	300
ILLINOIS					
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	500	.....	.....	500	.....
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	400	.....	.....	400	.....
INTERBASIN CONTROL OF GREAT LAKES—MISSISSIPPI RIVER AQ NUISANCE SPECIES, IL, IN, OH, WI	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
KEITH CREEK, ROCKFORD, IL	.....	.....	.....	548	.....
PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	.....	.....	.....	.....	50
PRAIRIE DUPONT LEVEE, IL	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
S. FORK, SOUTH BRANCH, CHICAGO RIVER, (BUBBLY CREEK)	.....	.....	.....	400	.....
UPPER MISS—ILLINOIS WW SYSTEM, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	.....	.....	.....	10,000	.....
UPPER MISS RVR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN & WI	.....	.....	220	.....	.....
INDIANA					
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	300	.....	.....	300	.....
IOWA					
CEDAR RIVER TIME CHECK AREA, IA	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
HUMBOLT, IA	.....	.....	2	150	.....
KANSAS					
MANHATTAN, KS	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
TOPEKA, KS	.....	100	.....	.....	100
UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS	.....	.....	.....	.....	150
LOUISIANA					
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA	.....	1,599	.....	.....	1,599
BOSSIER PARISH, LA	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	53	.....	.....	600	.....
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	.....	.....	.....	162	.....
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	67	.....	.....	67	.....
CROSS LAKE, LA	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM REST, LA (SCIENCE PRO	10,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	10,000	.....	.....	10,000	.....
PORT OF IBERIA, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000
ST. CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	500	.....	.....	500	.....
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
SOUTHWEST COASTAL LOUISIANA HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA	.....	.....	.....	1,500	.....
WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	.....	.....	.....	900	.....
MAINE					
SEARSPORT HARBOR, ME	.....	.....	.....	157	.....
MARYLAND					
ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES COMP PLAN, MD	.....	.....	.....	400	.....
BALTIMORE METRO WATER RESOURCES—PATAPSCO URBAN RIVER	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
CHESAPEAKE BAY MARSHLANDS, MD	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, MARYLAND COASTAL MANAGEMENT	.....	.....	.....	200	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED
CHESAPEAKE BAY SUSQUEHANNA RESERVOIR SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT	.....	.....	100	100	.....
EASTERN SHORE, MID-CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND, MD	.....	.....	.....	.....	983
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST. MARY'S, MD	.....	.....	.....	.....	150
MIDDLE POTOMAC COMP PLAN, MD, VA, PA, WV, DC	.....	.....	.....	175	.....
MIDDLE POTOMAC WATERSHED, GREAT SENECA CREEK, AND MUDDY	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN LOW FLOW MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRO	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
MASSACHUSETTS					
BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA	.....	2,300	.....	.....	2,300
PILGRIM LAKE, TRURO & PROVINCETOWN, MA	96	.....	.....	96	.....
MICHIGAN					
GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	200	.....	200	.....	.....
GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS (RAP), MI	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
LANSING, GRAND RIVER WATERFRONT RESTORATION, MI	.....	.....	50	.....	.....
ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
MINNESOTA					
MARSH LAKE, MN (MN RIVER AUTHORITY)	.....	.....	.....	227	.....
MINNEHAHA CREEK WATERSHED, MN	.....	.....	.....	350	.....
MINNESOTA RIVER BASIN, MN & SD	.....	.....	.....	350	.....
WILD RICE RIVER, RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN	271	.....	.....	271	.....
MISSISSIPPI					
PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
MISSOURI					
BRUSH CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	.....	.....	.....	274	.....
KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS	262	.....	.....	315	.....
MISSOURI RIVER DEGRADATION, MO	88	.....	.....	588	.....
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L45 & R460–471, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	300
RIVER DES PERES, MO	.....	.....	.....	150	.....
SWOPE PARK, KANSAS CITY, MO	.....	138	.....	.....	.....
MONTANA					
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	200	.....	.....	500	.....
NEBRASKA					
LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	.....	.....	.....	177	.....
NEW HAMPSHIRE					
MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA	200	.....	.....	200	.....
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, HN & ME	.....	.....	.....	82	.....
NEW JERSEY					
DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE, NJ	290	.....	.....	290	.....
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	204	.....	.....	204	.....
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	200	.....	.....	500	.....
LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ	.....	.....	.....	.....	375
NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLET	.....	.....	.....	4	150
NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT	.....	.....	.....	150	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED
PASSAIC RIVER MAIN STEM, NJ					250
PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ					297
PECKMAN RIVER BASIN, NJ				375	
RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ				300	
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ				300	
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ					100
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ					100
SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES					250
SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ					375
STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ				250	
NEW MEXICO					
ESPANOLA VALLEY RIO GRANDE AND TRIBS, NM				400	
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX				500	
SANTA FE, NM				28	
NEW YORK					
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	100			100	
FORGE RIVER WATERSHED, LONG ISLAND, NY				125	
HASHAMOMUCK COVE, SOUTHOLD, NY				125	
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	200			200	
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY				250	
MONTAUK POINT, NY					375
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY				150	
NORTH SHORE LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY				175	
SAW MILL RIVER WATERSHED, NY					250
SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY				200	
TEN MILE RIVER WATERSHED, DUTCHESS CTY, NY & LITCHFIEL				125	
WESTCHESTER COUNTY STREAMS, NY				175	
UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY				300	
NEVADA					
TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV					5,000
NORTH CAROLINA					
BOGUE BANKS, NC				132	
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	150			150	
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC		200			200
NORTH CAROLINA INTERNATIONAL PORT, NC			100		
SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC				386	
NORTH DAKOTA					
MISSOURI RIVER, ND, MT, SD, NE, IA, KS, MO				3,000	
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD & MANITOBA, CANADA				500	
OHIO					
BELPRE, OH					150
CUYAHOGA RIVER BULKHEAD STUDY, OH					126
HOCKING RIVER BASIN, MONDAY CREEK, OH					300
MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH					500
WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, BLANCHARD RIVER WATERSHED, OH				250	
WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH, IN, & MI				250	
OKLAHOMA					
GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER BASIN WATERSHED, OK, MO, KS & AR				60	
GRAND LAKE COMPREHENSIVE, OK				250	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK	.....	.....	.....	500	.....
WASHITA RIVER BASIN, OK	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
OREGON					
AMAZON CREEK, OR	.....	.....	.....	350	.....
WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA	.....	.....	.....	.....	500
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	240	.....	.....	240	.....
PENNSYLVANIA					
BLOOMSBURG, PA	.....	.....	.....	.....	700
DELAWARE RIVER DREDGED MATERIAL UTILIZATION, PA, DE, &	.....	.....	125	.....	.....
UPPER OHIO NAVIGATION STUDY, PA	.....	.....	.....	4,200	.....
SOUTH CAROLINA					
EDISTO ISLAND, SC	218	.....	.....	218	.....
SOUTH DAKOTA					
JAMES RIVER, SD & ND	.....	.....	.....	350	.....
WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	.....	.....	.....	.....	450
TENNESSE					
MILL CREEK WATERSHED, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	100	.....	.....	100	.....
TEXAS					
ABILENE, TX	.....	.....	.....	150	.....
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX	400	.....	.....	400	.....
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	.....	150	.....	.....	.....
DALLAS FLOODWAY, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	.....	207	.....	.....	1,000
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	400	.....	.....	400	.....
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER REALIGNMENTS, TX	200	.....	.....	200	.....
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	.....	150	.....	.....	150
GIWW, PORT OCONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	350	.....	.....	350	.....
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	223	.....	.....	223	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	425	.....	.....	425	.....
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	250	.....	.....	650	.....
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	.....	.....	.....	.....	350
RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	100	.....	.....	100	.....
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	.....	.....	.....	.....	500
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	.....	.....	.....	400	.....
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX	.....	.....	.....	150	.....
VERMONT					
MONTPELIER, VT	.....	.....	.....	750	.....
VIRGINIA					
AIWW BRIDGE AT DEEP CREEK, VA	.....	.....	.....	.....	500
CLINCH RIVER WATERSHED, VA	.....	.....	.....	150	.....
DISMAL SWAMP AND DISMAL SWAMP CANAL, VA	.....	.....	.....	262	.....
ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA	.....	97	.....	.....	97
FOUR MILE RUN, VA	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216)	300	.....	.....	300	.....
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	175	.....	.....	175	.....
NEW RIVER, CLAYTOR LAKE, VA	.....	.....	.....	.....	150
UPPER RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, VA (PHASE II)	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
VICINITY AND WILLOUGHBY SPIT, VA	.....	.....	.....	.....	200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED
WASHINGTON					
CENTRALIA, WA	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,200
CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
ELLIOTT BAY SEAWALL, WA	.....	.....	.....	750	.....
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA & OR	100	.....	.....	100	.....
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	400	.....	.....	1,500	.....
PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	.....	.....	57	.....	.....
SKAGIT RIVER, WA	.....	.....	.....	505	.....
SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	.....	.....	.....	375	.....
WEST VIRGINIA					
CHERRY RIVER BASIN, WV	.....	.....	.....	150	.....
LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
OHIO RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, WV, KY, OH, PA	.....	.....	.....	600	.....
WISCONSIN					
WAUWATOSA, WI	.....	.....	200	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL FOR PROJECTS	33,356	7,727	1,760	83,207	30,306
NATIONAL PROGRAMS					
AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUPPORT TRI-CADD	350	.....	.....	350	.....
ACTIONS FOR CHANGE TO IMPROVE INVESTIGATIONS	2,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	1,400	.....	.....	5,600	.....
Coastal Data Information Program	.....	.....	.....	(1,000)	.....
Pacific Island Land Ocean Typhoon Experiment, HI	.....	.....	.....	(1,000)	.....
Surge and Wave Island Modeling Studies, HI	.....	.....	.....	(1,200)	.....
Wave Data Study	.....	.....	.....	(1,000)	.....
COMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	100	.....	.....	100	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	75	.....	.....	75	.....
FEMA/MAP MOD COORDINATION	1,500	.....	.....	1,500	.....
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	220	.....	.....	220	.....
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	8,000	.....	.....	11,000	.....
White Clay Creek, New Castle, Delaware	.....	.....	.....	(200)	.....
Hurricane Evacuation Studies, Hawaii	.....	.....	.....	(1,000)	.....
Kekaha Flood Study, HI	.....	.....	.....	(100)	.....
Iowa Multi-State Dam Safety Analyses, Iowa	.....	.....	.....	(37)	.....
Little Sioux Watershed, IA	.....	.....	.....	(30)	.....
Mon—Maq Dam Removal Study & Local Floodplain Mas	.....	.....	.....	(100)	.....
City of Gretna GIS, Louisiana	.....	.....	.....	(254)	.....
East Baton Rouge Parish, LA [GIS]	.....	.....	.....	(400)	.....
Livingston Parish, LA (GIS)	.....	.....	.....	(735)	.....
Papillion Creek Watershed, Flood Plain Mapping,	.....	.....	.....	(500)	.....
Southeastern, PA	.....	.....	.....	(300)	.....
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	250	.....	.....	250	.....
INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW	1,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	200	.....	.....	200	.....
NATIONAL SHORELINE STUDY	375	.....	.....	375	.....
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	4,080	.....	.....	4,580	.....
Lake Tahoe Coordination	.....	.....	.....	(500)	.....
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	7,000	.....	.....	8,750	.....
Delaware Estuary Salinity Monitoring Study, Delaware	.....	.....	.....	(200)	.....
Bacon Creek, Sioux City, IA	.....	.....	.....	(50)	.....
Boyer River, Missouri Valley, IA	.....	.....	.....	(13)	.....
Little Sioux Watershed, IA	.....	.....	.....	(30)	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED
Kansas River Basin Technical Assistance, Kansas	.....	.....	.....	(400)	.....
Fife Lake Aquatic Weed Control, MI	.....	.....	.....	(300)	.....
Choctaw County Reservoir, MS	.....	.....	.....	(100)	.....
Jones County Water Supply, MS	.....	.....	.....	(50)	.....
Mississippi Band of Choctaws, MS	.....	.....	.....	(50)	.....
Assessment of Bridges and Impacts on Flows and F	.....	.....	.....	(150)	.....
Asheville, NC	.....	.....	.....	(50)	.....
PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM	2,100	.....	.....	3,100	.....
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	225	.....	.....	225	.....
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	150	.....	.....	150	.....
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	16,892	.....	.....	28,000	.....
Submerged Aquatic Vegetation, Maryland	.....	.....	.....	(1,000)	.....
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	50	.....	.....	50	.....
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	600	.....	.....	600	.....
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	350	.....	.....	350	.....
TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	1,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....
WATER RESOURCES PRIORITIES STUDY	2,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, NATIONAL PROGRAMS	49,917	.....	.....	67,375	.....
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	.....	−16,648	.....
TOTAL	83,273	7,727	1,760	133,934	30,306
GRAND TOTAL	91,000	91,000	.....	166,000	.....

Anchorage Harbor Deepening, Alaska.—The Committee recommended $500,000 to complete the feasibility study and to initiate preconstruction engineering and design. Anchorage harbor provides services to approximately 90 percent of the total population of Alaska, including two military bases.

Valdez Harbor Expansion, Alaska.—The Committee recommends $150,000 to complete the feasibility phase of the study. The demand for moorage space in the harbor far exceeds the existing capacity of 510 vessels. Rafting during the commercial fishing season has been reported up to eight boats deep on a regular basis.

May Branch, Fort Smith, Arkansas.—$500,000 is recommended to continue preconstruction engineering and design for this flood control project.

Bolinas Lagoon, California.—The Committee recommends $350,000 to continue feasibility studies of providing solutions that would restore and maintain a natural tidal prism configuration and tidal circulation in the lagoon.

Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration, California.—$590,000 is recommended to continue the feasibility studies for environmental and historic riparian habitat restoration. Potential projects may provide opportunities to restore environmental conditions, improve water quality, public access, open space and recreation. The potential projects will maintain or improve the current level of flood damage reduction benefits.

Malibu Creek Watershed, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $150,000 to complete the draft feasibility re-

port of methods to manage the sediment to facilitate ongoing efforts to improve the ecosystem in Malibu Creek and lagoon.

Rock Creek and Keefer Slough, California.—$200,000 is recommended to continue the feasibility phase of the study. The primary project purposes include flood control with the use of setback levees and floodwalls, and ecosystem restoration and minimum maintenance. The flood control facilities are to be designed with additional capacity to allow for the natural development of habitat.

Sacramento-San Joaquin Comprehensive Study, California.—The Committee recommended $1,000,000 for the feasibility study. The study provides a long-range management program for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins with the objective of improving the flood carrying capacity of the system while restoring and protecting environmental features including wetlands as well as fish and wildlife habitat.

Chatfield, Cheery Creek and Bear Creek, Reservoirs.—The recommendation includes $200,000 for feasibility studies to convert flood control storage to water supply storage.

Basalt, Colorado.—The Committee recommended $50,000 to review planning studies that were initiated under section 206 of the Continuing Authorities Program to determine if there is a Federal interest in this ecosystem restoration project.

Flagler County, Florida.—$250,000 is recommended to continue feasibility studies for shore damage reduction. The Committee notes that recent storms have begun to threaten the county's major evacuation route to State Road A1A.

Walton County, Florida.—$591,000 is recommended to continue the preconstruction, engineering and design phase. This study is a test bed for the Institute of Water Resources Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction model.

Hilo Harbor Modifications, Hawaii.—The Committee recommends $100,000 to initiate the reconnaissance study to address the Federal interest in modifying the 1930s era designed harbor to accommodate large modern cargo vessels and improve safety in the harbor.

Interbasin Control of Great Lakes—Mississippi Aquatic Nuisance Species, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin.—The Committee recommends $300,000 to initiate studies of the range of options and technologies available to prevent the spread of aquatic nuisance species between the Great lakes and the Mississippi River Basins through various aquatic pathways.

Upper Mississippi River—Illinois Waterway Navigation System, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for continuation of preconstruction engineering and design studies. The Committee recognizes the need to modernize this more than 60-year-old navigation system and has provided continued funding for both structural design and environmental restoration work.

Humbolt, Iowa.—The Committee recommends $152,000 to initiate a cost-shared feasibility study that would investigate ecosystem restoration on the West Fork of the Des Moines River (fish passage, dam removal, dredging, tributary and floodplain restoration) and ancillary recreational features.

Cross Lake, Louisiana.—$250,000 is recommended for investigations of improvements to Cross Lake and alternative sources of fresh water for Shreveport and Caddo Parish.

Louisiana Coastal Area Ecosystem Restoration, Louisiana.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for these important studies. The Committee has again elected not to fund a separate Science and Technology line item under this study and directs the Corps not to include this line item in the fiscal year 2010 budget. As has been previously stated by this Committee worthwhile science work should be budgeted within the study line item as is done for all other studies and projects. A separate line item is superfluous.

The reduction made to these studies should not be viewed as any diminution of support for these efforts, rather it is an attempt to balance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

To the extent practicable, the Committee directs the Corps to expedite preconstruction engineering and design studies of a sediment diversion at Myrtle Grove. The work should focus on project performance using capacity to take sufficient advantage of large pulsed flows during these less-than-annual high-flow periods, and during river flood events, when a large amount of sediment is freely available in the river water column. The Committee further notes that the success of ongoing efforts to bolster structural hurricane protection and rebuilding hurricane damaged communities depends on arrest and reversal of the coastal land lost problems in the near term, that resolution of the land loss issue will require construction of sediment reintroduction projects, such as the Myrtle Grove diversion.

Chesapeake Bay, Susquehanna Reservoir Sediment Management, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia.—It has been estimated that 280 million tons of sediment originating from the Susquehanna River watershed are trapped behind the four hydroelectric dams located on the Lower Susquehanna River between Havre de Grace, Maryland, and Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Three of the four dams Holtwood, Safe Harbor, and York Haven have reached steady state. It is estimated that the Conowingo Dam will cease to have trapping capacity in 15 to 20 years. Once this last reservoir reaches steady state, the sediment input to the bay may increase dramatically. The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 for to examine the impact of the Lower Susquehanna River Dams on sediment transport into the Bay.

Minnesota River Basin, Minnesota.—The Committee recommendation includes $350,000 for continuation of the feasibility study. This study will evaluate projects/methods to reduce flood damages, restore aquatic ecosystems, create wildlife habitat, reduce erosion and sediment, and improve water quality in the Minnesota River Basin and upper Mississippi River.

Missouri River Degradation, Mile 340 to 400, Missouri and Kansas.—The Committee recommended $588,000 to initiate feasibility studies. The Missouri River in this reach has experienced significant degradation or downcutting of the river bed. There is a strong indication that this degradation could impact navigation, flood control and other infrastructure in the area.

Yellowstone River Corridor, Montana.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to continue feasibility studies.

Delaware Basin Comprehensive, New Jersey.—The Committee recommended $290,000 to continue evaluation of alternative solutions to the region's problems regarding flooding and environmental restoration along the New Jersey portion of the Delaware River and tributaries.

Western Lake Erie Basin Study, Ohio, Indiana and Michigan.—$250,000 is recommended to continue the Comprehensive investigation of measures to improve fish and wildlife habitat, navigation, flood damage reduction, recreation, and water quality in the Maumee, Ottawa and Portage River watersheds.

Walla Walla River Basin, Oregon and Washington.—$500,000 is recommended to continue preconstruction, engineering and design studies for environmental restoration of the watershed; focusing primarily on establishing year round instream flows.

Neches River Basin, Texas.—$100,000 is recommended to initiate reconnaissance studies for flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, water supply, and recreation possibilities within the watershed.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Bridge Replacement at Deep Creek, Chesapeake, Virginia.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design phase of the replacement bridge.

Montpelier, Vermont.—The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 to initiate feasibility studies of flood damage reduction on the Winooski River.

Vicinity of Willoughby Spit, Norfolk, Virginia.—The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 to continue the general reevaluation study of the shore protection project that was severely damaged by Hurricane Isabel.

Actions for Change to Improve Investigations.—The Committee did not recommend funding for this item. The Committee believes that the activities proposed in the budget request for this line item should be incorporated into the various funded planning activities that the Corps has underway.

Planning Support Program.—The Committee has recommended an additional $1,000,000 above the budget request to support the Planning Centers of Expertise. A portion of these funds should be provided to the National Planning Center of Expertise for Coastal Storm Damage Reduction to develop a process for managing shore protection projects as part of a systems approach to coastal protection for the purpose of achieving improved project performance, increased cost effectiveness, and enhanced benefits.

Other Coordination Programs.—$500,000 is recommended for Lake Tahoe coordination activities.

Planning Assistance to States.—The Committee recommendation includes $9,000,000 for this nationwide cost-shared program. The Committee recognizes that there are hundreds of these studies ongoing at any given time. The Committee has provided a listing in the table of projects that should be given priority if cost sharing funds are available from the local sponsors.

Coastal Field Data Collection.—The Committee has recommended $5,600,000 for this nationwide program. In addition to

budgeted funds, $4,200,000 has been recommended to continue the Coastal Data Information Program; Surge and Wave Island Modeling Studies, Hawaii; the Pacific Island Land Ocean Typhoon Experiment Program and the Wave Data Study. The California Beach Processes Study has been incorporated into the Coastal Data Information Program. These are all studies that have been underway for a number of years and the Committee supports their continuation.

Flood Plain Management Services Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $11,000,000. The Committee has recommended a listing in the table of projects that should be given priority if cost sharing funds are available from the local sponsors.

Research and Development.—The Committee has included $28,000,000 for the Corps nationwide research and development programs. The Committee believes that this is an important area of the Corps' program that should be supported and has recommended $11,108,000 above the budget request. Within the funds recommended, the Corps should continue submerged aquatic vegetation research in the Chesapeake Bay.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2008	$2,294,029,000
Budget estimate, 2009 [1]	1,402,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,004,500,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $5,761,000,000.

This appropriation includes funds for construction, major rehabilitation and related activities for water resources development projects having navigation, flood and storm damage reduction, water supply, hydroelectric, environmental restoration, and other attendant benefits to the Nation. The construction and major rehabilitation for designated projects for inland and costal waterways will derive one-half of the funding from the Inland Waterway Trust Fund. Funds to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund will be applied to cover the Federal share of the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities Program.

The Committee has previously stated its rejection of the administration's proposal to move projects from this account to the Operations and Maintenance account.

Consequently, the Committee has elected to display the President's budget request as if these projects had been requested in the CG account rather than the O&M account. This makes the actual budget request for CG, $1,666,775,000 rather than $1,402,000,000 as requested in the budget. The projects moved from the O&M request include:

[In thousands of dollars]

Project Name	Amount
Columbia River Fish Recovery OR & WA	$95,700
Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Recovery, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND, SD	85,000
Chief Joseph Dam Gas Abatement, WA	6,500
Howard Hanson Dam Ecosystem Restoration, WA	15,000
Williamette River Temperature Control, OR	3,331
Lower Snake River, WA & OR	1,500
Assategue, MD	500
Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, NJ	150

[In thousands of dollars]

Project Name	Amount
Folly Beach, SC	35
Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, NY	500
Cape May Inlet to Lower Township, NJ	2,500
Delaware Bay Coastline, Roosevelt Inlet to Lewes Beach, DE	350
Houston Ship Channel, TX	500
Section 111 Program	5,325
Poplar Island, MD	9,185
Dredged Material Disposal Facilities	8,965
Indiana Harbor (Confined Disposal Facility), IN	8,385
Section 204/145	2,278
Lower Monumental Lock and Dam, OR and WA	3,123
Markland Locks & Dam, KY & IL	10,600
Locks No. 27, Mississippi River, IL	2,598
Lock and Dam 11, Mississippi River, IA	2,750
TOTAL Projects Migrating from Construction to O&M	264,775

The projects that included in the line item above for Dredged Material Disposal Facilities are listed in the Construction, General table.

Due to constrained funding, the Committee reduced the requested amounts for some administration projects. This should not be perceived as a lack of support for any of these projects, rather it is an attempt by the Committee to balance out the program across the Nation and fund most of the projects or studies that were funded in fiscal year 2008 but were not addressed by the administration proposal.

Even with a $559,000,000 increase to the Corps' accounts, the Committee is unable to address all of the needs. By the Committee's estimate, less than 60 percent of the needed funding is available for this account. Construction schedules will slip due to this constrained funding. This will result in deferred benefits to the national economy. The Committee does not believe that there is any way to prioritize our way out of this problem without serious unintended consequences. Adequate resources have been denied for too long. Only providing adequate resources for these national investments will resolve this situation.

The Committee has included a limited number of new construction starts as well as provided completion funding for a number of projects. As in the General Investigations account, the Committee has embraced the traditional view of new starts. New starts are generally defined as those projects that have not received Construction, General funding in the past or those that required new authorization to undertake the work. The Committee has not included the administration's proposed new construction starts for the lower Monumental Lock and Dam, Washington, major rehabilitation study that was proposed for funding in the Operations and Maintenance account because it would be cost-shared with the Inland Waterway Trust Fund.

The appropriation provides funds for the Continuing Authorities Program (projects which do not require specific authorizing legislation), which includes projects for flood control (section 205), emergency streambank and shoreline protection (section 14), beach erosion control (section 103), mitigation of shore damages (section 111), navigation projects (section 107), snagging and clearing (sec-

tion 208), aquatic ecosystem restoration (section 206), beneficial uses of dredged material (section 204), and project modifications for improvement of the environment (section 1135).

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA		
MOBILE HARBOR TURNING BASIN, AL		3,400
PINHOOK CREEK, HUNTSVILLE, AL		1,400
TUSCALOOSA, AL		7,500
ALASKA		
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK		3,000
ALASKA COASTAL EROSION, AK		4,500
HAINES BOAT HARBOR, AK		1,000
SEWARD HARBOR BREAKWATER EXTENSION		1,000
ST. PAUL HARBOR, AK		2,000
UNALASKA, AK		6,000
ARIZONA		
NOGALES WASH, AZ		3,000
RIO DE FLAG FLAGSTAFF, AZ		3,000
TRES RIOS, AZ		3,000
ARKANSAS		
OZARK—JETA TAYLOR POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	17,300	17,300
RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAN, LA, AR & TX		2,500
RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA		4,000
WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOW, AR		2,000
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES) , CA	13,000	13,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), CA	9,000	9,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM RAISE), CA		2,000
CALFED LEVEE STABILITY PROGRAM, CA		5,000
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA		5,000
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	4,900	4,900
HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT, CA		3,000
KAWEAH RIVER, CA	1,000	1,000
LLAGAS CREEK, CA		400
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	5,700	5,700
MID VALLEY AREA LEVEE, CA		1,500
MURRIETA CREEK, CA		5,000
NAPA RIVER, CA	7,395	11,000
OAKLAND HARBOR (50-FOOT PROJECT), CA	25,092	24,000
PETALUMA RIVER, CA		350
PORT LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA		885
SACRAMENTO DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	900	900
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	23,968	23,968
SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, GRR, CA		500
SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION, CA		500
SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA		1,000
SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA		750
SAN RAMON VALLEY RECYCLED WATER, CA		3,500
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	8,100	14,000
SANTA MARIA RIVER LEVEES, CA		6,000
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	12,000	12,000
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	8,000	8,000
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER (ENLARGEMENT), CA		500
TAHOE BASIN RESTORATION, CA		3,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA		5,000
UPPER NEWPORT BAY, CA		3,000
WEST SACRAMENTO, CA		2,000
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA		3,000
CONNECTICUT BRIDGEPORT ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, CT		500
DELAWARE		
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES BEACH		350
DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE		390
FLORIDA		
BREVARD COUNTY, FL		500
CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	2,773	2,773
FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS, FL		2,200
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	77,400	77,400
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL		3,500
LAKE WORTH SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL		1,000
MIAMI HARBOR, FL		500
PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL		1,000
SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	185,000	130,000
Central and Southern Florida, FL	(100,188)	(95,188)
Everglades and S. Florida Ecosystem Restoration	(3,797)	(3,797)
Kissimmee River, FL	(31,015)	(31,015)
Modified Water Deliveries, FL	(50,000)	
ST. LUCIE INLET, FL	4,000	4,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL		500
GEORGIA		
ATLANTA, EI, GA		2,000
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	1,450	1,450
HAWAII IAO STREAMS, HI		500
IDAHO		
RURAL IDAHO		4,000
ILLINOIS		
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	2,500	2,500
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	5,750	5,750
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL, SECOND BARRIER, IL	500	500
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	1,000	4,000
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	5,620	8,000
EAST ST. LOUIS, IL	200	1,207
EAST ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY, IL		375
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, LOCKPORT LOCK AND DAM, IL (REPLACEM	28,600	28,600
LOCK AND DAM 27, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (MAJOR REHAB)		2,598
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	34,000	34,000
NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL		300
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	114,000	114,000
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO &	20,000	18,000
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	684	3,700
INDIANA		
NDIANA HARBOR CONFIND DISPOSAL FACILITY, IN [1]		8,385
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	8,000	8,000
IOWA		
DAVENPORT, IA		4,850
DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA		5,000
DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA		3,900
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)		2,750
MISSOURI RIVER FISH MITIGATION, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE [1]		70,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PERRY CREEK, IA		3,800
KANSAS		
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	10,000	10,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS (DAM SAFETY)	23,800	23,800
KENTUCKY		
KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	22,330	22,330
MARKLAND LOCKS AND DAM, KY, IL (MAJOR REHAB) [1]		10,600
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	6,270	6,270
WOLF CREEK, KY (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	57,000	57,000
LOUISIANA		
COMITE RIVER DIVERSION CANAL, LA		10,000
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA (FC)		2,000
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK REPLACEMENT, LA		2,000
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	1,500	8,500
LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (CG)		2,500
OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA		1,600
MARYLAND		
ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC		30
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD [1]		1,900
ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD		200
BALTIMORE METRO RESOURCES, GWYNNS FALLS, MD		500
CHARLESTOWN, MD		50
CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION		2,500
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA		2,000
CUMBERLAND, MD		200
POPLAR ISLAND, MD [1]		12,000
MASSASSACHUSETTS		
MUDDY RIVER, MA	4,000	5,000
MICHIGAN		
GENESEE COUNTY, MI		600
GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MI		2,500
NEGAUNEE, MI		500
SAULT STE. MARIE, MI		2,000
MINNESOTA		
BRECKENRIDGE, MN		2,877
CROOKSTON, MN	300	300
LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER (MAJOR REHAB), MN		2,000
MISSISSIPPI		
DESOTO COUNTY REGIONAL WASTEWATER SYSTEM, MS		4,860
MISSISSIPPI ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, MS		18,000
MISSOURI		
BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO		2,000
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	1,700	1,700
CHESTERFIELD, MO		3,000
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	25,000	25,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	5,011	5,011
MISSOURI & MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT, MO		1,500
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM (L–385), MO, IA, NE & KS		2,600
ST. LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	2,000	3,750
SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO		2,000
MONTANA		
FORT PECK CABIN CONVEYANCE, MT		1,500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
RURAL MONTANA, MT		5,000
NEBRASKA		
ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	4,828	4,828
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD		1,000
SAND CREEK, SAUNDERS COUNTY, NE		2,400
WESTERN SARPY COUNTY AND CLEAR CREEK, NE		3,000
NEVADA		
RURAL, NV (EI)		18,000
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR, NJ (NJ SHORE PROT	11,700	11,700
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET (ABSECON IS		3,000
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, BRIGANTINE		80
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ [1]		2,500
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, NJ, PA & DE		5,000
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET & PECK BEACH, NJ		3,000
GREAT EGG HARBOR TO TOWNSENDS INLET, NJ		250
HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ		100
JOSEPH G. MINISH WATERFRONT, NJ		4,000
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ [1]		150
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, NJ		1,500
RAMAPO RIVER AT MAHWAH AND SUFFERN, NJ		500
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, PORT MONMOUTH, NJ		2,000
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	10,000	10,000
SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ		2,000
TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ		3,000
NEW MEXICO		
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM		2,400
ALAMOGORDO, NM	4,200	4,200
CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM		5,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE		800
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE RESTORATION, NM		24,016
NEW MEXICO (Environmental Infrastructure), NM		7,000
RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE, NM	800	800
SOUTHWEST VALLEY ALBUQUERQUE, NM		8,000
NEW YORK		
ATLANTIC COAST OF LONG ISLAND, LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY		100
ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	3,800	3,800
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET & JAMAICA BAY, NY		750
FIRE ISAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY [1]		500
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	2,150	2,150
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	90,000	85,000
NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY		1,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC		250
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC		2,000
WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC		300
NORTH DAKOTA		
GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (REPLACEMENT)	3,500	3,500
LAKE SAKAKAWEA PROJECT, ND		17,048
MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, ND		1,000
NORTH DAKOTA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, ND		10,000
OHIO		
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	4,000	4,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
OKLAHOMA		
CANTON LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	21,200	21,200
OREGON		
COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR & WA	36,000	36,000
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	2,455	2,455
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	3,120	3,120
WILLAMETTE TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR [1]		3,331
PENNSYLVANIA		
EMSWORTH L&D, OHIO RIVER, PA (STATIC INSTABILITY CORRE	25,800	25,800
GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	600	600
LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA		4,782
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3, AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	40,806	19,050
POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA &	150	150
PRESQUE ISLE, PA		1,000
WYOMING VALLEY (LEVEE RAISING), PA		3,000
PUERTO RICO		
PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	45,000	43,000
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	12,000	12,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
FOLLY BEACH, SC [1]		35
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD		4,000
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD		4,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL DAM, TN (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	53,400	53,400
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	42,000	42,000
TEXAS		
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	5,382	5,382
CENTRAL CITY, FORT WORTH, UPPER TRINITY RIVER, TX		500
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX		2,000
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX		13,000
HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	21,700	19,700
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX [1]		500
JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX		2,000
RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX & OK		1,500
SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX		10,000
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	23,465	21,465
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX		3,000
UTAH		
RURAL UTAH, UT (EI)		12,000
VERMONT		
BURLINGTON HARBOR, VT		500
LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED INITIATE, VT		2,000
VIRGINIA		
JAMES RIVER DEEPWATER TURNING BASIN, VA		1,763
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (REPLACEMENT)	14,000	14,000
LYNCHBURG CSO, VA		300
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA		1,000
RICHMOND CSO, VA		300
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	1,075	1,075
VIRGINIA BEACH (HURRICANE PROTECTION), VA		3,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH GAS ABATEMENT, WA [1]	.....	2,500
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, OR & WA [1]	.....	92,000
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	.....	3,000
HOWARD HANSEN DAM, WA [1]	.....	15,000
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	1,500	1,500
LOWER MONUMENT LOCK & DAM, WA [1]	.....	.....
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMP, WA, OR, ID [1]	.....	1,500
MOUNT ST. HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	1,410	4,410
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (FISH PASSAGE)	1,000	1,000
PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS RESTORATION, WA	.....	621
SHOALWATER BAY SHORELINE, WA	.....	2,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	12,000	12,000
GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	.....	1,500
ISLAND CREEK BASIN IN AND AROUND LOGAN, WV	.....	200
LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, VA:		
Virgina	.....	8,000
West Virginia	.....	8,500
LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WV	.....	1,050
MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	9,000	9,000
ROBERT C. BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	1,000	1,000
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	900	900
WISCONSIN		
MILWAUKEE HARBOR CDF EXPANSION, WI	.....	1,600
SUBTOTAL FOR PROJECTS	1,296,684	1,897,220
NATIONAL PROGRAMS		
ABANDONED MINE RESTORATION	.....	1,000
ACTIONS FOR CHANGE TO IMPROVE CONSTRUCTION	4,600	.....
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	3,500	4,550
CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM:		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	10,295	25,000
Chattahoochee Fall Line Ecosystem, AL & GA	.....	.....
Brownsville Branch, AR	.....	.....
St. Helena—Napa River Project, CA	.....	.....
Sweetwater Reservoir Ecosystem Restoration, CA	.....	.....
Upper York Creek Dam Removal, CA	.....	.....
Arkansas River Habitat Restoration Project, CO	.....	.....
Blue River, CO	.....	.....
Goose Creek, CO	.....	.....
Lower Boulder Creek, CO	.....	.....
North Fork Gunnison River, CO	.....	.....
Tamarisk Eradication, CO	.....	.....
Rose Bay, Voluisia Co, FL	.....	.....
Jackson Creek, GA	.....	.....
Mokuhinia/Mokuula Restoration, HI	.....	.....
Emiquon Preserve, IL	.....	.....
Eugene Field, IL	.....	.....
Hofmann Dam, IL	.....	.....
Orland Park, IL	.....	.....
Squaw Creek, (Round Lake Drain), IL	.....	.....
Chariton River/Rathbun Lake, IA	.....	.....
Duck Creek, Davenport, IA	.....	.....
Whitebreast Creek Watershed, IA	.....	.....
Storm Lake, IA	.....	.....
Ventura Marsh Habitat, Clear Lake, IA	.....	.....
Buras Marina, LA	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Lake Killarney, Louisiana State Penitentiary, LA		
Lake Verret, Assumption Parish, LA		
Mandeville Ecosystem Restoration, LA		
University Lakes, Baton Rouge, LA		
Vermillion River Ecosystem Restoration, LA		
Zemurray Park Lake Restoration, Tangipahoa Paris		
Milford Pond Restoration, Milford, MA		
Deep Run/Tiber Hudson, Howard County, MD		
Dog Island Shoals, MD		
Greenbury Point, MD		
North Beach, MD		
Northwest Branch, Anacostia River, MD		
Pleasure Island, MD		
Urieville Lake, MD		
Western Branch, Patuxent River, MD		
Wright's Creek, Dorchester Creek, MD		
Marion Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, MI		
Painter Creek, MN		
Musconetcong River Dam Removals, NJ		
Pennsville, Salem County, NJ		
Rancocas Creek Fish Passage, NJ		
Kings Park, NY		
Lower Hempstead Harbor, NY		
Soundview Park, Bronx, NY		
Asheville, Buncombe County, NC		
Concord Streams Restoration, NC		
Heron Haven, NE		
Wilson Bay Restoration, NC		
Drayton Dam, ND		
Christine/Hickson Dams, ND		
Incline and Third Creeks, NV		
Blue Hole Lake State Park, NM		
Bottomless Lakes State Park, NM		
Janes-Wallace Memorial Dam, Santa Rosa, NM		
Olentangy 5th Avenue Dam, OH		
Arrowhead Creek, OR		
Beaver Creek, OR		
Eugene Delta Ponds, OR		
Camp Creek—Zumwalt Prairie, OR		
Springfield Millrace, OR		
Codorus Creek Watershed Restoration, PA		
Winneapaug Pond Restoration, RI		
Spring Lake, San Marcos, TX		
Stephenville, WWTP, TX		
Tangier Island, Accomack County, VA		
Carpenter Creek, WA		
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204,		7,187
Isle Aux Herbes, AL		
Blackhawk Bottoms, IA		
Atchafalaya River, Shell Island, St. Mary Parish		
Barataria Bay Waterway, LA		
Calc Rv, Mi 5–14 Ks, LA		
Shell Island Pass, LA		
Newburyport Harbor, MA		
21st Avenue West Channel, Duluth, MN		
Wanchese Marsh Creation, NC		
Maumee Bay Restoration, OH		
Wynn Road CDF, OH		
Restoration of Cat Islands, WI		
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC	2,301	10,000
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	2,617	43,123

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Wynne, AR		
Cosgrove Creek, Calaveras County, CA		
Las Gallinas Creek/Santa Venetia Levee, CA		
White Slough, CA		
Oak Creek, Florence, Colorado		
Little Mill Creek, New Castle County, DE		
Pennsylvania Avenue Improvement Project, Bethany		
Turkey Creek, Ben Hill County, GA		
Keopu-Hienaloli Stream, HI		
Kuliouou Stream, Oahu, HI		
Wailele Stream, Oahu, HI		
Indian/Dry Creek Cedar Rapids, IA		
Mad Creek, Muscatine, IA		
Red Oak Creek, Red Oak, IA		
Winnebago River, Mason City, IA		
Crosscreek, Rossville, KS		
Concordia, KS		
Eureka Creek, Manhattan, KS		
Hopkinsville Dry-Dam, KY		
Bayou Choupique, St. Mary Parish, LA		
Bayou Queue de Tortue, Vermillion Parish, LA		
Town of Carencro, Lafayette Parish, LA		
Elkton, MD		
North River, Peabody, MA		
Salisbury RIver, Brockton, MA		
Ada, MN		
Montevideo, MN		
Granite Falls, MN		
McKinney Bayou, Tunica County, MS		
Blacksnake Creek, St. Joseph, MO		
Livingston, MT		
Little River Diversion, Dutchtown, MO		
Platte River, Fremont, NE		
Platte River, Schuyler, NE		
Randolph, NE (Middle Logan Creek)		
Jewett Brook, Laconia, NH		(100)
Hatch, NM		
Assunpink Creek, Hamilton Township, Mercer County, NJ		
Jackson Brook, NJ		
Mill Brook, Highland Park, NJ		
Pennsville, NJ		
Poplar Brook, Deal and Ocean Township, NJ		
Upper Passaic River and Tributaries, Long Hill Township, NJ		
Port Jervis, NY		
Pigeon River Watershed, NC		
Swannanoa River Watershed, NC		
Wahpeton, ND		
Rio Descalabrado, PR		
Rio Guamani-Guaya, PR		
Blanchard River, Ottawa, OH		
Duck Creek Flood Warning System, OH		
Findley, OH		
Independence, OH		
Philadelphia Shipyard Sea Wall, Philadelphia, PA		
Beaver Creek & Tribs, Bristol, TN		
Farmers Branch, Tarrant County, TX		
Pecan Creek, Gainesville, TX		
WV Statewide Flood Warning System, WV		
NAVIGATION PROGRAM (SECTION 107)	559	8,000
Savoonga Harbor, AK		
Kahoolawe Harbor, Kahoolawe, HI		

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
North Kohala Navigation Improvements, HI		
Port Fourchon Extension, Lafourche Parish, LA		
Shortcut Canal, Terrebonne Parish, LA		
Bass Harbor, ME		
Round Pond, Bristol, ME		
St. Jerome's Creek, St. Mary County, MD		
Mackinac Isle, Harbor Breakwall, MI		
Northwestern Michigan, Traverse City, MI		
Ontonagon Channel Extension, MI		
Grand Marais Harbor of Refuge, MN		
McQuade Road Harbor of Refuge, Duluth, MN		
Hampton Harbor, NH		
Ottawa River Navigation, Toledo, OH		
Delaware River, Fairless Turning Basin, PA		
Charlestown Breachway and Inlet, RI		
Northwest Tennessee Harbor, TN		
Nassawadox Creek, VA		
MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES (SECTION 111) [1]		10,000
Mobile Pass, AL		
Camp Ellis, Saco, ME		
Vermillion, OH		
Fairport Harbor, OH		
Mattituck Harbor, NY		
Tybee Island Channel Impacts, GA		
PROJECT MODS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 1135)	6,544	25,000
Lower Cache Restoration, AR		
Millwood Lake, Grassy Lake, AR		
Rock Creek @ Boyle Park, Little Rock, AR		
Tujunga Wash Environmental Restoration, CA		
Lower Kingman Island, DC		
Kanaha Pond, Maui, HI		
Kaunakakai Str, Molokai, HI		
Rathbun Lake Habitat Restoration, IA		
Indian Ridge Marsh, Chicago, IL		
Green River Dam, Mod, KY		
Bayou Desiard, Monroe, LA		
Frazier/Whitehorse Oxbow Lake Weir, LA		
Lake Fausse Pointe, Iberia Parish, LA		
Lake St. Joseph, Tensas Parish, LA		
Morganza Fore-Bay Restoration, LA		
Sea Lamprey Barrier Program, MI		
Lake Whittington Weir, MS & AR		
Sand Hill River, MN		
Duck Creek, MO		
Bloomington State Park, MO		
Blue Valley Wetlands, Jackson, MO		
Prison Farm, ND		
Assunpink Creek, Trenton, NJ		
Lincoln Park West, Ecosystem Restoration Study,		
Pine Mount Creek, NJ		
Pond Creek Salt Marsh Restoration, Cape May County, NJ		
Las Cruces Dam Environmental Restoration, Doña Ana County, NM		
Pueblo of Santa Ana Aquatic Restoration, NM		
Route 66 Environmental Restoration, Albuquerque, NM		
Spring Creek, NY		
Belhaven Harbor, NC		
Tappan Lake, OH		
Lower Columbia Slough, OR		
Eagleland Ecosystem, TX		
Lake Champlain Lamprey Barriers, VT		
Village of Oyster, Northampton County, VA		

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Braided Reach, WA		
Shorty's Island, WA		
SHORE PROTECTION (SECTION 103)		7,500
Athol Springs, Lake Erie, NY		
Lasalle Park, Buffalo, NY		
Old Lakeshore Road, NY		
Lake Erie At Painesville, OH		
Philadelphia Shipyard, PA		
Ft. San Geronimo, PR		
Veteren's Drive Shoreline, St. Thomas, VI		
Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Hampton, VA		
Lincoln Park Beach Seattle, WA		
SNAGGING AND CLEARING (SECTION 208)		500
Muscatatuck River Log Jam, Scott County, IN		
Oran, MO		
Blackwell Lake, Blackwell, OK		
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	48,600	48,650
Dam Safety Assurance Studies:		
Isabella Dam, CA		
Martis Creek Dam, CA & NV		
Cherry Creek Dam, CO		
Dworshak Dam, ID		
Mississippi Lock and Dam 25, MO		
John Day Lock and Dam, OR & WA		
Seepage/Stability Correction Major Rehabilitation Study:		
Hidden Dam, CA		
Whittier Narrows Dam, CA		
Hop Brook Dam, CT		
Mansfield Hollow Dam, CT		
Lake Shelbyville Dam, IL		
Green River Lake Dam, KY		
J. Edward Roush Dam, KY		
Nolin Lake dam, KY		
Rough River Lake Dam, KY		
Salamonie Lake Dam, KY		
Beach City Dam, OH		
Bolivar Dam, OH		
Mohawk Dam, OH		
Zoar Levee (Dover Dam), OH		
Keystone lake Dam, OK		
East Branch Dam, Clarion River, PA		
Montgomery Locks and Dam, PA		
Addicks Dam, Buffalo Bayou, TX		
Lewisville Dam, TX		
Ball Mountain Dam, VT		
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM (DMDF)		8,965
Savannah Harbor, GA		
Rogue River, MI		
Charleston Harbor, SC		
Green Bay Harbor, WI		
EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION	21,000	21,000
ESTUARY RESTORATION PROGRAM (PUBLIC LAW 106–457)	5,000	1,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE	50	50
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE	250	250
SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		875
SUBTOTAL FOR NATIONAL PROGRAMS	105,316	222,650
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE		−115,370
TOTAL	1,402,000	2,004,500

[1] ITEMS REQUESTED BY THE ADMINISTRATION IN OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE.

Tuscaloosa, Alabama.—The Committee recommends $7,500,000 for the relocation project at Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Akutan Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Alaska Coastal Erosion, Alaska.—The Committee recommendation provides $4,500,000 for Alaska Coastal Erosion. The following communities are eligible recipients of these funds: Kivalina, Newtok, Shishmaref, Koyukuk, Barrow, Kaktovik, Point Hope, Unalakleet, and Bethel.

Nogales Wash, Arizona.—The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for continuation of this flood control project.

Red River Below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas.—The Committee recommends $2,500,000 to continue levee rehabilitation work in Arkansas and Louisiana to protect the 1.7 million acre flood plain from crop damage; loss of livestock; damage to levees, railroads, highways, industries, and other river and urban developments.

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas and Louisiana.—The Committee recommends $4,000,000 for protection of critical infrastructure and land along the Red River below Index, Arkansas. The project plan provides for revetment, dikes, or cutoffs that can be accomplished in advance of developing the design for the entire project.

American River Watershed (Folsom Dam Miniraise), California.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000. Within the funds recommended, $1,000,000 is for the replacement bridge.

Mid Valley Area Levee Reconstruction, California.—-The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 reconstruction of this flood control project. The project includes levee reconstruction through installing landside berms with toe drains, ditch relocation, embankment modification, slurry cut-off walls, and developing land for fish and wildlife mitigation.

Oakland Harbor, California.—The Committee recommends $24,000,000 to continue construction of this project. The reduction made to this project should not be viewed as any diminution of support for this project, rather an attempt to balance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

Santa Ana River, California.—The Committee recommends $14,000,000 to continue construction of this flood control project.

West Sacramento, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for a general reevaluation of the flood control project and other project needs.

Delaware Coast Protection, Delaware.—The Committee recommendation includes $350,000 to reimburse the state for the Federal share of the annual operation and maintenance of the sand bypass facilities.

Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem Restoration, Florida.—The Committee has chosen to display the various, separately authorized components of the project in the table in addition to a single line item as was proposed in the budget. The Committee believes that it is prudent to maintain visibility of the various project elements in the budget process. The reduction made under this heading should not be viewed as any diminution of support for this

project, rather an attempt to balance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

The Committee has provided no funding for the Modified Waters Delivery Plan as proposed in the budget. The Committee has chosen to fund this project in the Department of the Interior and related agencies bill. The Committee directs the administration to include the Modified Waters Delivery Plan funding in the Interior budget in future budget submissions.

Central and South Florida, Florida.—Within the funds recommended, the Corps shall continue work on the Upper St. Johns River project.

Florida Keys Water Quality Improvements, Florida.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,200,000 for continued implementation of this project. The Committee urges the administration to budget for this project due to the interrelationship of this work to the Everglades Restoration project, Biscayne Bay and southern Florida's nearshore waters.

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has recommended $3,500,000 to continue work on the channel deepening project as well as for a second general reevaluation report.

Tampa Harbor, Florida.—$500,000 is provided for preconstruction engineering and design of navigation improvements and channel deepening.

Atlanta, Georgia.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 to continue this project.

Rural Idaho Environmental Infrastructure, Idaho.—The Committee recommends $4,000,000 for this project. Within the funds provided the Corps should give consideration to projects at Aamon (Eastern Idaho Regional Project), Bellevue, Buhl, Burley, Greenleaf, Hazelton, Lava Hot Springs, Pocatello, Rexburg, Rigby, Rupert, Sandpoint, Shelley (Eastern Idaho Regional Project), Soda Springs, St. Anthony, Twin Falls (Auger Hills), and Wendell. Other communities that meet the program criteria should be considered as funding allows.

Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Illinois.—The Committee has recommended $6,250,000 for construction on aquatic nuisance species Barriers I and II.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois.—The Committee recommends $34,000,000 for continued construction of this project.

Olmsted Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Illinois and Kentucky.—The Committee recommends $114,000,000 to continue construction of this project. None of the funds provided for the Olmsted Locks and Dam Project or any other construction funds are to be used to reimburse the Claims and Judgment Fund.

Indiana Harbor (Confined Disposal Facility), Indiana.—The Committee has retained funding for this project in the Construction, General account rather than moving it to the Operations and Maintenance account as proposed in the budget.

Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers, Iowa.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design and initiate construction of this flood control project. The plan includes reconstructing 13,600 feet of levees and associated facilities to provide improved flood protection to the Birdland Park and Central Place neighborhoods and modifications

to 19 closure structures in the existing downtown Des Moines Federal levee system.

Missouri Fish and Wildlife Recovery, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota and South Dakota.—The Committee recommends $70,000,000 for this project. Within the recommended funds, $15,000,000 is to be used for modifications to the Intake Dam to provide additional habitat for the pallid sturgeon. To ensure that independent science guides Missouri River Recovery and its applications of adaptive Management and to ensure that the success of the recovery efforts are adequately measured and money wisely spent, the Committee directs that funds provided through Missouri River Recovery to the U.S. Geological Survey for science and monitoring should not be reduced below fiscal year 2007 levels.

Turkey Creek, Kansas and Missouri.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, Kentucky.—The Committee recommends $22,330,000 for continuation of the highway and railroad bridges superstructure contract. Funding deficits in the Inland Waterway Trust Fund prohibit the Committee from providing additional funds for the upstream lock excavation contract. The Committee recognizes that this is a critical path contract for the overall schedule. However, until the revenue stream for the Inland Waterway Trust Fund is enhanced, the Committee actions will be limited by available Trust Fund revenues.

Markland Locks and Dam, Kentucky and Illinois.—The Committee has provided $10,600,000 for construction on this major rehabilitation requested by the administration. The Committee has provided these funds here rather than in O&M as proposed in the budget request.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana.—The Committee has recommended $8,500,000 for navigation channel refinement features, land purchases and development for mitigation of project impacts, and construction of project recreation and appurtenant features.

Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana.—The Committee has recommended $2,500,000 to continue efforts to provide 100-year flood protection for this project. Surveys show the levee grade is deficient by 12–18 inches.

Louisiana Hurricane Protection System.—It is the Committee's understanding that the Corps has sufficient legal authority to afford credit for the lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and disposal areas provided by the non-Federal sponsor for the Lake Ponchartrain and Vicinity, West Bank and Vicinity, and Southeast Louisiana projects that the Corps determines are necessary for such projects.

Chesapeake Bay Environmental Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia.—The Committee has recommended $2,500,000 for continuation of this project. Within the funds recommended, $328,000 is included to complete the environmental studies concerning non-native oysters.

Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery, Maryland and Virginia.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 to continue oyster recovery efforts.

Fort Peck Dam and Lake, Montana.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 for continuation of the disposition of Fort Peck cabins.

Rural Montana, Montana.—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for this project. Within the funds provided the Corps should give consideration to the following projects: County Water District of Billings Heights, Phase II Upgrade; Seeley Lake Water System Upgrade; Gildford Wastewater System Improvements; Daly Ditches Water; City of Shelby, Wastewater System Improvements; Muddy Cluster Water Line; Manhattan Water Project; Ten Mile Estates/Pleasant Valley Wastewater Improvements; Town of Stevensville, Water Improvement Project; Eureka Water Expansion; City of Troy, Water Project Phase II; Fort Belknap Water Treatment Plant; Crow Agency Wastewater Collection System Improvement Project; Columbia Falls Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements; City of Hamilton, Wastewater Facility Critical Upgrades; Bigfork County Water and Sewer District Wastewater Treatment Facilities Improvements; Bozeman Water Reclamation Facility Reconstruction; City of Helena, Missouri River Water Treatment Plant Reconstruction; City of Butte, Big Hole Drinking Water Supply Diversion Dam Replacement; City of Billings, Water Treatment Plant Improvements; Greater Woods Bay Wastewater Collection System; Homestead Acres Water and Sewer Well Acquisition; Manhattan Water improvements; Great Falls Upper/Lower River Road Water and Sewer District Improvements; Judith Gap Wastewater Improvements; Loma County Water Improvement Project; and Carter Water Improvement Project, Phase II.

Sand Creek, Nebraska.—The Committee recommends $2,400,000 to complete construction of this project.

Rural Nevada, Nevada.—The Committee recommendation provides $18,000,000 for this project. Within the funds provided the Corps should give consideration to projects at North Lemmon Valley; Spanish Springs Valley Phase II; Huffaker Hills Water Conservation; Lawton-Verdi; Boulder City; Lyon County; Gerlach; Searchlight; Incline Village; Esmeralda County; Cold Springs; Fallon; Goldfield; Churchill County; West Wendover; Yearington; Virgin Valley Water District; Lovelock; Truckee Meadows Water Authority; McGill-Ruth Consolidated Sewer and Water District; Carlin; Moapa; Indian Springs; Eldorado Valley; Ely and Carson City. Other communities that meet the program criteria should be considered as funding allows.

Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-basin, New Jersey.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000 to continue construction of this project. The Committee notes that this area has been subject to frequent flooding with the latest flood occurring in 2007. The Committee urges the Corps to utilize available funds to expedite completion of this project.

Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor, New Jersey.—The Committee recommends $11,700,000 for this shore protection project. Funds should be utilized for continuation of the beach fill project.

Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Acequias Irrigation System, New Mexico.—The Committee recommends $2,400,000 to continue restoration of these historic irrigation distribution systems.

Middle Rio Grande Restoration, New Mexico.—The Committee recommendation includes $24,016,000 to continue environmental restoration efforts along the Rio Grande River within Bernalillo County.

Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.—The original health care facility for the Three Affiliated Tribes was permanently inundated due to the impoundment of Lake Sakakawea. A replacement healthcare facility was promised but never constructed. The Committee recommendation includes $17,048,000 for construction of the replacement health care facility. The Corps should work closely with the Indian Health Service and the Three Affiliated Tribes on the design and construction of this facility. The Committee suggests that the Corps utilize the expertise in their military programs office for this project.

North Dakota [EI], North Dakota.—The Committee has recommended $10,000,000 for this program. $1,600,000 is for work related to the replacement of the Devils Lake Water supply pipeline and $8,400,000 is for the Parshall water project.

Locks and Dams 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River, Pennsylvania.—The Committee recommendation includes $19,050,000 to continue construction of this project. The reduction made to this project is a result of a continuing contract that the Corps chose not to award in fiscal year 2008 due to insufficient funds within the Inland Waterway Trust Fund. Not awarding the contract in fiscal year 2008, obviated the need for follow-on funding in fiscal year 2009 thus lowering the amount needed for this project in fiscal year 2009.

Presque Isle, Pennsylvania.—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 to continue this project.

Big Sioux River, South Dakota.—The Committee recommends $4,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, South Dakota.—The Committee notes that title IV of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, Public Law 106–53 as amended, authorizes funding to pay administrative expenses, implementation of terrestrial wildlife restoration plans, activities associated with land transferred or to be transferred, and annual expenses for operating recreational areas. The Committee recommends $4,000,000 for this effort. Within the funds recommended, the Committee directs that not more than $1,000,000 shall be provided for administrative expenses, and that the Corps is to distribute the remaining funds as directed by title IV to the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe.

Chickamauga Lock, Tennessee.—The Committee recommends $42,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Central City, Fort Worth, Upper Trinity River Basin, Texas.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the Central City, Fort Worth, Texas, project.

Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana.—The Committee recommends $1,500,000 to continue construction.

San Antonio Channel Improvement, Texas.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to continue this flood control project.

Sims Bayou, Houston, Texas.—The Committee recommendation includes $21,465,000 for this project. The reduction made to this project should not be viewed as any diminution of support for this project, rather an attempt to balance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

Rural Utah, [EI], Utah.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000 to continue construction of eligible projects.

Burlington Harbor, Vermont.—The Committee recommends $500,000 to continue work on removal of oil bollards in the harbor.

Lake Champlain Watershed Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for continuation of this project.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—The Committee has chosen not to follow the budget proposal to include this work within the various O&M items in the system. The Committee believes that it is prudent to maintain visibility of the costs of environmental compliance activities for this project and have included funding in this account in this line item. $92,000,000 is recommended for this project.

Lower Monumental Lock and Dam, Washington and Oregon.—The Committee recommends no funding for this new start recommended by the administration in the O&M account. The Committee believes it to be imprudent to initiate the major rehabilitation report that would be cost shared in the Inland Waterway Trust Fund when construction work has to be curtailed due to the funding shortfalls in the Inland Harbor Trust Fund. The Committee believes this project should not be initiated until the revenues have been enhanced for the Inland Waterway Trust Fund.

Mud Mountain, Washington.—The Corps has recommended $1,000,000 for fish passage at this project.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Cumberland River, West Virginia, Kentucky and Virginia.—The Committee recommends $16,500,000 for the continuation of the project. Within the funds recommended, the Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 for the Buchanan County, Dickenson County, and Grundy, Virginia elements. Further, the recommendation includes $8,500,000 for Kermit, Lower Mingo County, McDowell County, Upper Mingo and Wayne County, West Virginia.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,550,000 for this program. Funds above the budget request are included for cost-shared programs for Lake Gaston, North Carolina; Lake Champlain, Vermont; and Lake Chautauqua, New York.

Actions for Change to Improve Construction.—The Committee did not recommend funding for this item. The Committee believes that the activities proposed in the budget request for this line item should be incorporated into the various funded construction activities that the Corps has underway.

Dredged Material Disposal Facilities Program.—The Committee has retained this program in the Construction, General account rather than the Operations and Maintenance account as proposed by the budget.

Shore Line Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program.—The Committee has recommended $875,000 to be used along with prior year funds for an innovative approach to storm damage reduction at Sacred Falls Beach Park, Hawaii, by restoring and maintaining a pocket beach with an innovative sediment retaining structure.

Ability to Pay.—Section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 Public Law 99–662, as amended, requires that all project cooperation agreements for flood damage reduction projects, to which non-Federal cost sharing applies, will be subject to the ability of non-Federal sponsors to pay their shares. Congress included this section in the landmark 1986 act to ensure that as many communities as possible would qualify for Federal flood damage reduction projects, based more on needs and less on financial capabilities. The Secretary published eligibility criteria in 33 CFR 241, which requires a non-Federal sponsor to meet an ability-to-pay test. However, the Committee believes that the Secretary's test is too restrictive and operates to exclude most communities from qualifying for relief under the ability-to-pay provision. For example, 33 CFR 241.4(f) specifies that the test should be structured so that reductions in the level of cost sharing will be granted in "only a limited number of cases of severe economic hardship," and should depend not only on the economic circumstances within a project area, but also on the conditions of the State in which the project area is located.

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM

When Congress authorized the initial Continuing Authorities in the 1940s and 1950s, they were envisioned to provide a small pool of money available to the Corps of Engineers to solve very small localized problems without being encumbered by the longer study and project authorization process. As more programs were added to the Continuing Authorities Program [CAP] they became increasingly popular with congressional Members and the public. More and more congressionally directed projects began to appear in the annual appropriations bills. At first these congressionally directed projects were added to the base program. As more and more of these congressionally directed projects came into the program it became difficult for these congressionally directed projects to be added to the base, and as such, the base program began to shrink. Congressionally directed projects now dominate all sections of the CAP Program. Congressionally directed projects have proliferated to such an extent that several of the sections are over-subscribed.

The table below shows the Federal obligations, the allocations through fiscal year 2008, the balance to complete, and the annual statutory limit for each section of the program. With roughly a $1,000,000,000 backlog and appropriations averaging $120,000,000, depending on the section of the program it could be from two to ten years before all of the current projects in the program are completed.

CAP section	Federal obligation	Allocations through fiscal year 2008	Planned fiscal year 2008 allocations	Balance to complete	Statutory limit
14	$69,548,012	$38,328,057	$9,707,357	$21,512,598	$15,000
103	48,386,819	15,522,875	4,451,555	28,322,389	30,000
107	118,598,140	38,181,184	7,232,400	73,184,556	35,000
111	50,283,000	3,574,645	1,919,000	44,789,355	[1]
204	35,317,018	7,398,318	1,373,000	26,545,700	15,000
205	548,772,450	162,448,027	42,370,804	343,953,619	55,000
206	457,038,102	120,987,115	29,149,778	306,901,210	50,000
208	1,349,900	713,899	.....	636,001	7,500
1135	267,193,752	117,611,141	29,174,000	120,408,611	40,000
Totals	1,596,487,193	504,765,261	125,467,894	966,254,038	.....

[1] Not Applicable

The budget justifications for the CAP program do not provide much useful information as to how the administration developed its program for fiscal year 2009. There is a dollar value associated with each section and a listing of projects in priority order that corresponds to the amount. However, the Committee has no way of knowing whether the amount shown is adequate. The Corps is directed to provide more information to justify the amount shown on the justification sheets for fiscal year 2010.

Starting in fiscal year 2008 the Committee no longer provided any congressional earmarks for the section 14, Emergency Bank Stabilization authority. The Committee has not provided either the administration's earmark requests for this section or requests by Members for fiscal year 2009. By definition these are projects that are estimated to fail within 9–12 months. As an emergency situation the Chief of Engineers should have the responsibility for determining how these funds are expended in the most efficient and effective manner. Budget justifications for this section should display the anticipated projects and associated costs to be undertaken in the budget year as well as the anticipated resources necessary to address emergencies that arise in the budget year.

CAP projects and studies are listed in the Construction, General table immediately preceding this section. This listing includes the priority projects listed in the President's budget request as well as those that were requested by Members. With one exception, the Committee has not provided dollar amounts for the named projects in the report. This lack of specificity in project amounts is intended to give the Chief of Engineers flexibility within the various sections of the CAP program in order to address the backlog. The Committee has repeated the guidance below from the fiscal year 2008 statement of the managers that accompanied Public Law 110–161 detailing how the Corps should prioritize work in the CAP program.

Priorities for Design and Implementation [D&I] Phase:

1. D&I work for continuing projects that have executed PCAs.

2. D&I funding for projects approved by Corps Headquarters to execute a PCA.

3. D&I work which does not require executed agreements (for example continuing or pre-PCA design) for ongoing projects.

4. D&I funding for projects with approved Feasibility Reports moving into D&I.

Priorities for Feasibility Phase:

1. Feasibility phase funding for projects with executed FCSAs.

2. Feasibility phase funding for projects approved by Corps Headquarters to execute a FCSA.

3. Feasibility phase work which does not require a FCSA for ongoing projects.

4. Feasibility phase funding for initiations or restarts.

Within the last-funded priority level within the D&I and Feasibility phases, if the projects qualifying for funding exceed the available funding, funds shall be allocated based on project outputs and the non-Federal sponsor's ability to meet local obligations.

Remaining funds, if any, may be allocated to additional projects in accordance with the aforementioned priorities, except that remaining funds for section 14 projects shall be allocated to the most urgently needed projects.

The Committee is concerned that if the Corps adhered strictly to the priorities above, that all funding would be exhausted for construction. Therefore, in order to provide a mix of studies, design and construction within each CAP section the Committee directs that funding be generally divided 80/20 between the D&I phase and the Feasibility phase within each authority.

The Chief of Engineers should provide a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 30 days of enactment of this bill detailing how funds will be distributed to the individual items in the various CAP sections for the fiscal year. The Chief should 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.

Even though the Committee is providing a listing of projects that are of interest, the Corps should develop the program based on all of the projects in each section whether named in this report or not. Priorities should be based on the factors outlined above. The Corps is directed not to initiate any new continuing authorities projects in sections 205, 206 or section 1135 without explicit congressional direction. New projects may be initiated in the remaining sections after an assessment is made that such projects can be funded over time based on historical averages of the appropriation for that section and approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriation.

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

Appropriations, 2008	$387,402,000
Budget estimate, 2009	240,000,000
Committee recommendation	365,000,000

This appropriation funds planning, construction, and operation and maintenance activities associated with water resource projects located in the lower Mississippi River Valley from Cape Girardeau, Missouri to the Gulf of Mexico. The Committee wishes to reiterate that MR&T project is a good model for the Corps to examine for moving towards a watershed approach.

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Fiscal year 2009 budget request	Fiscal year 2009 recommendation
IINVESTIGATIONS		
BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	.....	43
SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	.....	400
ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA	790	790
MORGANZA TO THE GULF, LA	.....	6,000
SPRING BAYOU, LA	.....	300
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	125	130
QUIVER RIVER, MS	.....	250
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, STORM WATER MGMT STUDY, TN	34	34
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	400	1,430
CONSTRUCTION		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	.....	50,200
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, DIKES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	12,134	.....
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, REVETMENT OPERATIONS, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	33,089	.....
GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	.....	9,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	20,000	63,823
ST. FRANCIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AR & MO	.....	5,700
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,025	2,025
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	6,300	15,500
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	2,259	3,933
YAZOO BASIN—BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	.....	2,275
YAZOO BASIN—DELTA HEADWATERS PROJECT, MS	.....	18,000
YAZOO BASIN—MAIN STEM, MS	.....	25
YAZOO BASIN—REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	.....	2,800
YAZOO BASIN—UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	.....	14,000
YAZOO BASIN, BACKWATER LESS ROCKY BAYOU	.....	50
YAZOO BASIN—YAZOO BACKWATER, MS	.....	5,000
ST. JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	.....	200
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	65,211	70,000
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	128	128
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	249	249
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	256	256
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	161	161
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	15,873	16,368
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	4,445	8,200
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	1,880	1,880
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	1,039	1,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	135	135
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	93	93
HICKMAN/MAGNOLIA BLUFF, KY	.....	60
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,117	2,117
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	8,619	8,619
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	162	162
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	42	42
BONNET CARRE, LA	2,346	2,346
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,727	1,927
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	53	53
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	578	578
OLD RIVER, LA	13,882	13,882
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	2,501	2,501
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	436	436
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	101	101
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	424	424
YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	6,228	6,673
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	171	1,500
YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS	6,388	7,417
YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS	1,650	1,650
YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS	6,201	7,166

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Fiscal year 2009 budget request	Fiscal year 2009 recommendation
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	1,128	2,237
YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS	6,971	8,916
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	694	925
YAZOO BASIN, WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	272	285
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	393	442
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS	634	534
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	185	185
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	4,567	4,567
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	81	81
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	3,283	3,283
MAPPING	1,488	1,488
ANTICIPATED REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	(15,975)
ADJUSTMENTS	52	.....
TOTAL	240,000	365,000

General Investigations

Morganza to the Gulf, Louisiana.—The Committee has recommended $6,000,000 to continue Preconstruction Engineering and Design for this project. The Committee has included legislative language which allows the local interest to construct the Houma Navigation Canal Lock with non-Federal funds. This shall not be considered initiation of the Federal project. The Committee is aware that substantial environmental analysis has been conducted on the Houma Navigation Canal Lock as well as the other portions of the Morganza alignment. Furthermore, the Committee is aware of significant engineering work that is underway using both Federal and non-Federal funding. Accordingly, the Committee urges the Corps to resolve any permitting issues that may develop as a result of non-Federal spending, as expeditiously as possible. Finally, the Committee remains sensitive to the critical need for hurricane and flood protection in the Terrebonne and Lafourche Parish area of Louisiana, and is providing this flexibility to allow the local sponsors to move forward on components while further reviews are taking place on the larger project.

Quiver River, Mississippi.—The Committee has recommended $250,000 to initiate studies to identify options for improving water quality while addressing other needs

Collection and Study of Basic Data.—The Committee recommends an additional $1,000,000 for Lidar mapping in the Yazoo River Basin.

Construction

Grand Prairie, Arkansas.—The Committee has recommended $9,000,000 for continued construction of the project.

Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and Tennessee.—Additional funds above the budget request could be used for the following activities: relief wells (parcel 1) at Delta, Mississippi; relief wells at Wilson, Arkansas; relief wells at Barfield, Arkansas; relief wells at Tunica, Mississippi; relief wells (parcel 2) at Delta, Mississippi; engineering and design work for levee construction work at three sites in Mis-

souri; engineering and design work for levee construction work at two sites in Arkansas; engineering and design for construction work near Cairo, Illinois; acquisition of mitigation lands; to continue construction on the MRL features of the St. Johns Bayou-New Madrid Floodway; fund Magna Vista-Brunswick, Mississippi, Item 468–L; Bayou Vidal-Elkridge, Louisiana, Item 419–R; Bayou Vidal-Elkridge, Louisiana, Item 416–R; Magna Vista-Brunswick, Mississippi, Item 465–L; advance completion of levee enlargement; concrete slope paving contract; slope stability contract; and complete the LMRMRIS.

Yazoo Basin, Backwater Pumping Plant, Mississippi.—The Committee has recommended $5,000,000 to fully fund pump and motor contracts and initiate purchase of conservation easements. Funds are also provided for the center associated with the Theodore Roosevelt National Wildlife Refuge.

Yazoo Basin, Big Sunflower Basin, Mississippi.—The Committee recognizes the need for control of bank erosion along the Big Sunflower River and has recommended $2,275,000 for the continued construction of the Yazoo Basin, Big Sunflower River Project. $1,500,000 is recommended to continue bank stabilization erosion repairs at selected sites in the Sunflower Basin.

Yazoo Basin, Delta Headwaters Project, Mississippi.—The Committee has recommended $18,000,000 to continue construction of this erosion protection projects in the Yazoo Basin.

Yazoo Basin, Upper Yazoo Project, Mississippi.—The Committee has recommended $14,000,000 to continue construction of this flood control project. The Committee regrets that budgetary constraints do not allow funding at a more optimal level. Additional non-defense discretionary budgetary resources will be needed in future years if the project is to proceed at or near the Corps' schedule.

Maintenance

Hickman/Magnolia Bluff, Kentucky.—The Committee recommends $60,000 to prepare plans and specifications and to repair damage to the maintenance access road and a concrete-lined drainage ditch caused by a September 2006 flood.

Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and Tennessee.—Funds provided above the budget request are to provide gravel surfacing to selected locations along roads on top of levees in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana to ensure all weather access for flood fights and for other backlog maintenance.

Mississippi Lakes.—The Committee has recommended additional funding to address the maintenance backlog at Arkabutla, Sardis, Enid and Grenada Lakes in Mississippi.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2008	$2,243,637,000
Budget estimate, 2009	2,475,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,220,000,000

This appropriation funds operation, maintenance, and related activities at the water resources projects that the Corps operates and maintains. Work to be accomplished consists of dredging, repair, and operation of structures and other facilities, as authorized in

the various River and Harbor, Flood Control, and Water Resources Development Acts. Related activities include aquatic plant control, monitoring of completed projects where appropriate, removal of sunken vessels, and the collection of domestic waterborne commerce statistics.

The Committee continues to believe that it is essential to provide adequate resources and attention to operation and maintenance requirements in order to protect the large Federal investment. In order to cope with the current fiscal situation, the Corps has had to defer or delay scheduled maintenance activities.

The O&M budget request appears to have been increased by nearly $231,363,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted amount. However this is very misleading. Shifting of projects from the CG account to the O&M account totals $264,775,000. Once these projects are shifted back to CG, that leaves a decrease of $33,412,000 when compared to fiscal year 2008. The Committee notes that the Corps maintenance backlog is more than $1,000,000,000 and increases by about $100,000,000 annually as the inventory of projects ages.

The Committee has chosen to display the budget request as the discrete projects that are the tradition as opposed to the regional budget proposed by the administration. Also the Committee has chosen to migrate the projects that the administration proposed in O&M back to their traditional location in the CG account. This makes the actual budget request for O&M $2,210,225,000 rather than $2,475,000,000 as presented in the budget. A list of these migrated projects is displayed under the CG heading earlier in this report.

Maintenance of our aging water infrastructure inventory gets more expensive every year, however, it is consistently underfunded. If this trend continues, the Corps will not be able to maintain expected levels of service at all of its projects. The Committee has maintained its tradition of supporting what the budget request terms as "low use harbors and waterways". The Committee recognizes the importance of these facilities and will continue to provide funding for them. Unfortunately due to budget constraints the Committee was not able to provide nearly enough funding as is needed for our aging infrastructure.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA—COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	375	375
ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL	15,672	15,672
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	22,191	22,191
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,230	5,230
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	60	60
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	21,562	21,562
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	100	100
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	94	94
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	2,350	2,350
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	22,009	22,009
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	8,417	8,417

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, AL	120	120
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	17,601	17,601
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	2,225	2,225
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	840	840
HOMER HARBOR, AK	620	620
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	1,058	1,058
LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL, AK	.....	500
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	350	350
NOME HARBOR, AK	780	780
PETERSBERG NORTH HARBOR PROJECT, AK	.....	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	550	550
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,585	1,585
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	98	98
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,206	1,206
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	39	39
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	171	171
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	5,270	5,270
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	8,384	8,384
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,427	1,427
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	7,367	7,367
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	8,491	8,491
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	6,317	6,317
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,286	1,286
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,354	1,354
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,156	1,156
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	6,861	6,861
HELENA HARBOR, AR	90	400
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	508	508
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	28,395	28,395
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,074	2,074
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	4,591	4,591
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,609	1,609
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,920	3,920
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	14	500
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	8,509	8,509
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,287	5,287
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	8	8
WHITE RIVER, AR	52	52
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	3	160
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,954	1,954
BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,820	1,820
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	5,360	5,360
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,384	3,384
DANA POINT HARBOR, CA	.....	700
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	5,067	5,067
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	443	443
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,786	1,786
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	5,144	5,144
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	3,822	3,822
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,404	1,404
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,996	3,996
MARINA DEL REY, CA	2,499	2,499
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, CA & NV	737	737

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	239	239
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	285	285
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,630	1,630
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,115	2,115
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,730	1,730
NOYO HARBOR, CA	.....	750
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	7,445	7,445
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,620	1,620
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,854	2,854
PINOLE SHOAL MANAGEMENT STUDY, CA	.....	500
PORT HUENEME, CA	4,029	4,029
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	2,422	2,422
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	6,950	6,950
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30-FOOT PROJECT), CA	5,582	5,582
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,566	1,566
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	175	175
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,106	1,106
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	2,805	2,805
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,514	2,514
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	5,411	5,411
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,140	1,140
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,148	3,148
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	2,090	2,090
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,639	1,639
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,791	1,791
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	2,982	2,982
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,912	1,912
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	3,095	3,095
YUBA RIVER, CA	129	129
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	332	332
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,176	1,509
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	870	1,203
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	457	457
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,418	2,418
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	720	720
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	956	1,290
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	416	416
BRIDGEPORT HARBOR DREDGING, CT	.....	2,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	547	547
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	338	338
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	919	919
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	316	316
LONG ISLAND SOUND DMMP, CT	1,000	1,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	493	493
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	385	385
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,100	1,100
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	374	374
THOMASTON DAM, CT	615	615
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	568	568
DELAWARE		
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES [1]	350	.....
HARBOR OF REFUGE, LEWES, DE	.....	500
INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, SUSSEX COUNTY, DE	.....	500
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE	14,065	14,065
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, DE	40	40
MISPILLION RIVER, DE	30	500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	30	30
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	147	147
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	2,750	3,750
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	62	62
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL)	805	805
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	28	28
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	25	25
FLORIDA		
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	4,404	4,404
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	13,234	13,234
ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	25	25
EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	400	400
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	2,025	2,025
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	300	300
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	.....	1,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	325	2,500
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	6,000	6,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	9,165	9,165
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	2,675	2,675
MIAMI RIVER, FL	10,820	10,820
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	4,530	4,530
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,385	2,385
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	55	55
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	67	67
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	1,265	1,265
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	4,420	4,420
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	30	30
SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	357	357
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	4,550	4,550
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, FL	405	405
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	6,016	6,016
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	3,418	3,418
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	257	1,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	5,545	5,545
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,946	7,946
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	7,703	7,703
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	12,188	12,188
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, GA	63	63
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	142	142
J. STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	11,066	11,066
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA	162	162
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	8,386	8,386
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA [1]	19,170	13,895
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	183	183
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	7,446	7,446
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	200	548
HALEIWA HARBOR, OAHU, HI	.....	1,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	659	659
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	537	537
WAIANAE HARBOR, HI	.....	1,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,539	1,539
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,404	2,404

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	354	334
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,801	1,801
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	469	469
ILLINOIS		
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,015	2,015
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	44	.....
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	4,780	4,780
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,155	4,155
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	475	475
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	203	203
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	38,121	36,287
GRAFTON, IL TO LAGRANGE LOCK & DAM	(1,834)	.....
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	.....	1,834
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, IL	65	65
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	2,298	2,342
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,903	1,903
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	860	860
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	4,761	4,761
LOCK AND DAM 27, MISSISSIPPI RVR, IL (MAJOR REHAB) [1]	2,598	.....
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	63,207	63,207
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	111	111
REND LAKE, IL	4,570	4,570
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	565	565
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	1,099	1,099
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	20,004	20,004
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	1,649	1,649
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	160	160
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	2,053	2,053
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	1,226	1,226
INDIANA HARBOR, CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY, IN [1]	8,385	.....
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	3,138	3,138
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	635	635
J. EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	2,842	2,842
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,051	1,051
MONROE LAKE, IN	1,326	1,326
PATOKA LAKE, IN	1,150	1,150
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	185	185
ROUSH RIVER MAJOR REHAB PROJECT, IN	300	300
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	1,226	1,226
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	91	91
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,887	2,887
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	466	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	717	1,183
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RVR, IA (MAJOR REHAB) [1]	2,750	.....
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	166	166
MISSOURI RIVER—RULO TO MOUTH, IA, KS, MO & NE	5,106	5,106
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA, KS, MO & NE	2,560	2,560
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO [1]	85,000	.....
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,214	2,277
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,278	3,278
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,908	3,908
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,975	2,042
COUNCIL GRAVE LAKE, KS	1,328	1,328
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	569	569

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	734	734
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,284	1,284
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	722	764
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	177	177
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,042	1,042
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,330	1,418
MARION LAKE, KS	1,504	1,504
MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,035	2,111
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,076	2,133
PEARSON-SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	1,048	1,048
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,452	2,516
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,914	1,969
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	30	30
TORONTO LAKE, KS	535	535
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,060	2,135
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,577	1,977
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	10,255	10,255
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	3,969	5,969
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,250	1,250
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	2,433	2,433
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,797	1,797
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	1,098	1,098
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,768	1,768
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	25	25
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,830	1,830
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,445	1,445
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	2,698	3,698
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	4,942	4,942
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	554	554
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	10	10
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,748	1,748
MARKLAND LOCKS AND DAM, KY & IN (MAJOR REHAB) [1]	10,600	.....
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	1,062	1,062
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	102	102
NOLIN LAKE, KY	3,337	3,337
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	39,419	39,419
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH	4,485	4,485
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	954	954
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	7	7
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,832	2,832
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,312	1,312
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	7,834	7,834
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,180	1,180
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	8,993	8,993
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	926	926
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	809	809
BAYOU LACOMBE, LA	.....	450
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	724	724
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	18	18
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	321	321
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	14	14
BAYOU TECHE, LA	209	209
CADDO LAKE, LA	181	181
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	14,968	14,968
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,848	1,848
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	17,769	17,769
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	662	1,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,814	1,814
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	10,555	10,555
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	17	440
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	5	85
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,969	1,969
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	3,136	3,136
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	55,325	55,325
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,500	1,500
TANGIPAHOA RIVER, LA	.....	321
TCHEFUNCTE RIVER & BOGUE FALIA, LA	.....	400
WALLACE LAKE, LA	200	200
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	32	500
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	239	500
MAINE		
DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME	1,200	1,200
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	29	29
NARRAGUAGUS RIVER, ME	.....	600
PORTLAND HARBOR, ME	100	100
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	750	750
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
MARYLAND		
ASSATEAGUE, MD [1]	500	.....
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50-FOOT), MD	16,193	16,193
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)	338	338
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	98	98
HERRING BAY AND ROCKHOLD CREEK, MD	.....	500
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	.....	500
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	89	89
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,713	1,713
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	450	450
PARISH CREEK, MD	.....	500
POPLAR ISLAND, MD [1]	9,185	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	376	376
RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD	.....	500
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	64	64
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	135	135
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	1,400	1,400
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	580	580
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	574	574
BOSTON HARBOR, MA	6,000	6,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	515	515
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	11,546	11,546
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	291	291
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	232	232
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	398	398
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	503	503
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	381	381
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	526	526
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	489	489
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	272	372
NEW BEDFORD AND FAIRHAVEN HARBOR, MA	.....	250
NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA	.....	400
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	1,200	1,200
TULLY LAKE, MA	543	543
WEST HILL DAM, MA	674	674
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	497	497

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MICHIGAN		
ALPENA HARBOR, MI		
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI		
AU SABLE, MI		
BAY PORT HARBOR, MI		
BIG BAY HARBOR, MI		
BLACK RIVER (GOGEBIC), MI		
CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI		
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI	156	156
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	197	197
CLINTON RIVER, MI		
DETROIT RIVER, MI	5,327	5,327
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI		
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,312	1,312
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI		
GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI		
GRAYS REEF PASSAGE, MI	180	180
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	588	588
INLAND ROUTE, MI		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	230	230
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	86	86
LAC LA BELLE HARBOR, MI		
LELAND HARBOR, MI		
LES CHENEAUX ISLAND CHANNELS, MI		
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI		
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI		
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	442	442
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI		
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI		
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI		
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI		
MICHIGAN HARBOR DREDGING, MI		5,000
MONROE HARBOR, MI	1,018	1,018
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	350	350
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI		
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	655	655
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI		
PETOSKEY HARBOR, MI		
POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR, MI		
PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI		
PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI		
PORTAGE HARBOR, MI		
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	312	312
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	276	276
ROUGE RIVER, MI [1]	1,321	1,161
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	3,798	3,798
SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI		
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	75	75
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI		
ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,791	1,791
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	595	595
ST. MARYS RIVER, MI	18,836	18,836
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,444	2,444
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI		
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE—WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	172	172
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	4,929	4,929
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	623	623
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	431	431
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	200	200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	44,904	44,904
ORWELL LAKE, MN	256	256
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	95	95
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	84	84
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,170	3,170
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	323	323
TWO HARBORS, MN	300	300
MISSISSIPPI		
CLAIRBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	1	60
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	135	135
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	3,715	10,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	223	223
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	30	160
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,517	1,900
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	4,130	8,000
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	193	193
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	82	82
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	11	11
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, MS	30	30
YAZOO RIVER, MS	26	26
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	10	500
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	6,449	6,449
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,825	2,825
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,528	8,863
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	1,688	1,688
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	885	935
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	1,057	1,100
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	25,359	25,359
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	152	400
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO (MILE 889)	.....	300
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,056	2,108
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	14	14
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	327	327
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,162	1,203
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	8	8
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,320	3,828
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR	6,667	6,667
UNION LAKE, MO	10	10
MONTANA		
FT. PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,170	4,444
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	54	54
LIBBY DAM, MT	1,712	1,712
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	88	88
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	5,935	6,518
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,721	1,786
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	508	508
PAPILLION CREEK, NE	531	531
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	702	702
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	127	127
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	204	204
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	567	567

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	514	514
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	619	619
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,081	1,081
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	37	37
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	598	598
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	300	300
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	596	596
NEW JERSEY		
ABSECON INLET, NJ	.....	265
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	225	225
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ [1]	2,500	.....
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	243	243
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	15	15
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	18,778	18,778
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	750	750
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	253	253
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ [1]	150	.....
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	160	160
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	250	250
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	300	300
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEM, NJ	254	254
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	1,363	1,363
RARITAN AND SANDY HOOKS BAYS, LEONARDO, NJ	40	40
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	200	200
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	220	220
SALEM RIVER, NJ	70	70
SHARK RIVER, NJ	775	775
SHOAL HARBOR AND COMPTON CREEK, NJ	300	300
SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	120	120
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	2,220	2,220
COCHITI LAKE, NM	2,392	2,392
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,121	1,121
GALISTEO DAM, NM	423	423
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	811	811
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	684	684
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PRO	.....	200
RIO GRANDE BOSQUE REHABILITATION, NM	.....	4,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	940	940
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	502	502
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	452	452
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM	1,201	1,201
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	424	424
ARKPORT DAM, NY	225	225
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,235	1,235
BRONX RIVER, NY	250	250
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	50	50
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	220	220
EAST RIVER, NY	500	500
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	4,220	4,220
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	473	473
EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	180	180
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY [1]	500	.....
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	380	380
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	80	80
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	500	500
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	1,125	1,125

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	1,525	1,525
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	1,031	1,031
JAMAICA BAY, NY	250	250
JONES INLET, NY	350	350
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	700	700
LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	10	10
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	200	200
MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	20	20
MORICHES INLET, NY	2,050	2,050
MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY	4,839	4,839
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	6,750	6,750
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	4,000	4,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	6,300	6,300
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSIT	950	950
NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	220	220
PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	150	150
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,830	1,830
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	1,605	1,605
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	200	200
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	839	839
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	551	551
WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	250	250
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	553	553
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	900	2,000
B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,633	1,633
BOGUE INLET, NC	.....	400
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	718	718
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	.....	600
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,683	1,683
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	250	250
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	.....	200
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,100	4,100
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	365	365
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	5,000	5,000
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	800	800
NEW TOPSAIL INLET, NC	.....	400
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	675	675
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	150	300
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	400	400
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	2,977	2,977
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	13,000	13,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN-HALEY LAKE, ND	153	153
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	9,435	11,789
HOMME LAKE, ND	151	293
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	360	360
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,017	1,742
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	572	572
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	119	119
SOURIS RIVER, ND	280	280
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATER, ND	24	24
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	1,439	1,439
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,850	1,850
BERLIN LAKE, OH	4,867	4,867
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	2,149	2,149
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	2,520	2,520

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	6,710	6,710
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	350	350
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	1,359	1,359
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	1,445	1,445
DILLON LAKE, OH	1,454	1,454
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	2,026	2,026
HURON HARBOR, OH	1,530	1,530
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	452	452
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	2,423	2,423
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	24	24
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	2,023	2,023
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,383	1,383
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	8,275	8,275
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	593	593
OHIO—MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL, OH	1,089	1,089
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	1,307	1,307
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	295	295
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	35	35
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	223	223
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	4,701	4,701
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	791	791
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	865	865
WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE, OH	1,837	1,837
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	472	472
BIRCH LAKE, OK	648	648
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,903	1,903
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,707	1,707
COPAN LAKE, OK	937	937
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	5,348	5,348
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	10,218	10,218
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	742	742
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	256	256
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	555	555
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,493	1,493
HULAH LAKE, OK	476	476
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	177	177
KAW LAKE, OK	2,574	2,574
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	6,073	6,073
MCCLELLAN—KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	5,819	5,819
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,923	1,923
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	164	164
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	119	119
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,099	1,099
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OK	6,599	6,599
SARDIS LAKE, OK	912	912
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	520	520
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,318	1,318
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,794	3,794
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,093	1,093
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	4,695	4,695
WISTER LAKE, OK	678	678
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	904	904
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	427	427
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	11,701	9,691
CHETCO RIVER, OR	574	574
COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	24,973	18,052
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	15,125	15,125

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR	640	640
COOS BAY, OR	4,769	4,769
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	307	307
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	991	991
COUGAR LAKE, OR	1,549	5,380
DEPOE BAY, OR	3	124
DETROIT LAKE, OR	2,064	2,564
DORENA LAKE, OR	831	831
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	918	1,418
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	1,433	1,433
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,823	2,323
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	792	1,292
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, OR	33	33
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	413	413
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	7,049	7,049
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	2,261	2,761
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,560	3,560
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	5,183	5,183
PORT ORFORD, OR	7	7
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	220	220
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	587	587
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	82	82
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	583	583
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	5	5
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	10,400	10,400
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	35	2,200
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	635	635
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	210	210
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	62	62
WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR [1]	3,331	.....
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	610	610
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,482	1,482
YAQUINA RIVER, OR	.....	300
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,578	6,578
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	591	591
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	215	215
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,311	1,311
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,736	2,736
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,734	1,734
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,847	1,847
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	2,530	2,530
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	625	625
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	2,179	2,179
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	633	633
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	774	774
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	228	228
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	592	592
JOHNSTOWN, PA	2,255	2,255
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	2,493	2,493
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	2,880	2,880
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,823	1,823
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	12,392	12,392
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	24,796	24,796
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	509	509
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	70	70
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	505	505
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	20	20
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,312	3,312
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	46	46

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	2,000	3,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,366	2,366
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	331	331
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	93	93
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,213	2,213
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	3,115	3,115
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	1,017	1,017
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	1,033	1,033
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	471	471
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	2,908	2,908
PUERTO RICO		
ARECIBO HARBOR, PR	100	100
RHODE ISLAND		
GREAT SALT POND, BLOCK ISLAND, RI (new Harbor)	.....	250
BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR, RI	360	500
FOX POINT HURRICANE BARRIER, RI	.....	500
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	43	43
POINT JUDITH HARBOR OF REUGE, RI	1,250	1,250
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	400	400
PROVIDENCE HARBOR SHIPPING CHANNEL, RI	.....	300
WOONSOCKET, RI	.....	300
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	724	1,500
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC [1]	12,527	9,947
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	4,685	4,685
FOLLY RIVER, SC [1]	35	.....
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	690	690
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	65	65
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	624	624
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,799	6,799
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	.....	3,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	303	303
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	223	223
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	7,328	7,328
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	49	49
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	403	403
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	8,977	9,277
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	52	52
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	7,021	7,021
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,829	6,829
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	1,200	1,200
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	6,386	6,386
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	6,262	6,262
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	85	85
J. PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,602	4,602
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	9,845	9,845
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	9	9
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	20,219	20,219
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	107	107
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	1,354	1,354
ARKANSAS—RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI	1,415	1,415
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	1,417	1,417

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	2,162	2,162
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,122	3,122
BELTON LAKE, TX	3,567	3,567
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,302	2,302
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	3,259	3,259
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,723	1,723
CANYON LAKE, TX	3,686	3,686
CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX	348	348
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,398	3,398
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	6,393	6,393
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	38	38
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	4,179	4,179
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	7,020	7,020
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	6,022	6,022
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	2,706	2,706
GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	2,926	2,926
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,225	2,225
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,900	2,900
GREENS BAYOU, TX	850	850
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	31,874	31,874
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,479	1,479
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	15,354	14,854
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	1,936	1,936
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	2,001	2,001
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	1,771	1,771
LAKE KEMP, TX	214	214
LAVON LAKE, TX	3,065	3,065
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	4,110	4,110
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,173	6,173
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	3,542	3,542
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	2,066	2,066
O.C. FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	907	907
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,005	1,005
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	2,155	2,155
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	304	304
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	1,456	1,456
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	8,822	8,822
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	5,820	5,820
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	101	101
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	3,157	3,157
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	2,210	2,210
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,482	1,482
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	100	1,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	2,735	2,735
WACO LAKE, TX	3,090	3,090
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,747	1,747
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	8,559	8,559
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	4,532	4,532
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	75	75
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	598	598
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	719	719
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	70	70
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	80	80
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	635	635
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	747	747
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	681	681
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	578	578

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	.....	500
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA	1,823	1,823
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA	967	967
CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	266	266
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	207	207
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,022	2,022
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	1,108	1,108
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	226	226
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,667	3,667
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	11,571	11,571
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,938	1,938
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	1,058	1,058
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	10,072	10,072
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	656	656
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	6,961	6,961
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	870	870
RUDEE INLET, VA	370	370
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, VA	54	54
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	260	260
YORK RIVER, VA	250	250
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM GAS ABATEMENT, WA [1]	6,500	.....
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	785	785
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	3	500
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	6	500
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID [1]	95,700	.....
EDIZ HOOK, WA	63	63
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,293	1,293
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	9,180	9,180
HOWARD HANSON DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA [1]	15,000	.....
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	2,627	2,627
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,982	4,982
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WA	70	70
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	623	623
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	7,554	7,554
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,360	2,360
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	6,874	6,874
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	7,787	4,664
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, [1]	1,500	.....
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	2,437	2,437
MOUNT ST. HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	257	257
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	3,271	3,271
NEAH BAY, WA	308	308
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	338	338
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	997	997
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	1,572	1,572
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	506	506
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	913	913
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	248	248
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	53	53
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	.....	400
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	120	120
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	7,696	7,696
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	34	34
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,473	2,500
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,508	1,508
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,973	1,973

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	2,044	2,044
ELKINS, WV	14	14
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	255	255
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	9,380	9,380
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	30,292	30,292
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,700	2,700
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	2,836	2,836
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,039	1,039
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,044	2,044
SUTTON LAKE, WV	2,210	2,210
TYGART LAKE, WV	1,521	1,521
WISCONSIN		
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	611	611
FOX RIVER, WI	1,775	3,775
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI [1]	4,344	5,394
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	125	125
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	650	650
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	160	160
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	16	16
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	498	498
TWO RIVER HARBOR, WI	.....	400
WYOMING		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	34	34
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	326	326
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	87	87
TOTALLING ADJUSTMENTS	−20	.....
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	2,348,593	2,161,160
REMAINING ITEMS		
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	690	690
ASSET MANAGEMENT/FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	4,750	4,750
BUDGET/MANAGEMENT SUPPORT FOR O&M BUSINESS LINES	5,865	5,865
ACTIONS FOR CHANGE TO IMPROVE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	7,737	4,000
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,475	2,475
CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204/207/933)	2,278	.....
NATIONAL MITIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 111)	5,325	.....
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	1,500	1,500
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	12,000	12,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,062	1,062
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION (DOE	6,080	6,080
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)	1,391	1,391
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	270	270
FACILITY PROTECTION	12,000	12,000
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODEL	900	900
INDEPENDENT (PART) ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENT—STEWARDSHIP	500	500
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	3,708	3,708
INLAND NAVIGATION SAFETY INITIATIVE	3,000	3,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	1,780	1,780
MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,575	1,575
NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING PROGRAM	7,000	13,900
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	15,000	15,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS (NEPP)	6,000	6,000
NATIONAL (LEVEE) FLOOD INVENTORY	10,000	10,000
NATIONAL NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	3,326	3,326
NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR REALLOCATION	300	300
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT (ABS–P2, WINABS)	300	300

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION:		
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	500
PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SEC 3)	50	50
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,271	4,271
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	725	725
RECREATION ONE STOP (R1S) NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVAT	1,130	1,130
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	1,391	4,500
Southeast Oahu Regional Sediment Management, HI		(500)
North Carolina RSM, NC		(600)
Delaware Estuary RSM, NJ		(300)
South Jetty and Clatsop Spit, OR		(500)
South Coastal Rhode Island Regional Sediment Management		(750)
Long Island Coastal Planning, NY		(500)
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHAB	608	608
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS)	653	653
SUBTOTAL FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED UNDER STATES	126,140	124,809
TOTALLING ADJUSTMENTS	267	
ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE		−65,969
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	2,475,000	2,220,000

[1] ITEMS FUNDED IN CONSTRUCTION.

Lowell Creek Tunnel, Alaska.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for studies to divert tunnel flood flows away from the city of Seward.

Petersberg Harbor, Alaska.—$500,000 is recommended to obtain environmental clearances in advance of a planned dredging of the harbor in 2010.

Helena Harbor, Arkansas.—The Committee recommends $400,000 for maintenance dredging of this harbor.

Osceola Harbor, Arkansas.—The Committee recommends $500,000 for maintenance dredging of this harbor.

Dana Point Harbor, California.—The Committee has recommended $700,000 for surveys and dredging.

Noyo Harbor, California.—$750,000 is recommended for dredging.

Cherry Creek, Chatfield, and Trinidad Lakes, Colorado.—The Committee has recommended an additional $1,000,000 for continued repairs at these three lakes. This action in no way is intended to alter the Corps of Engineers' lease and property accountability policies. It is the Committee's understanding that the State of Colorado has agreed to cost share this project on a 50–50 basis. It is also the understanding of the Committee that the Secretary is not to assume, nor share in the future of the operation and maintenance of these recreation facilities.

Harbor of Refuge, Lewes, Delaware.—The Committee recommends $500,000 to perform a stability analysis, as well as, surveys and design work on the historic breakwater in this harbor.

Small Harbors, Delaware.—The Committee recommendation includes funds to dredge a number of small harbors in Delaware. With the limited funding available to the Committee, the Committee has attempted to provide for some of the dredging needs of the State. However, recognizing that conditions on these small har-

bors is constantly changing the Committee is directing the Corps to propose a dredging program for fiscal year 2009 that would most effectively utilize the scarce funds available for these harbor projects.

Wilmington Harbor, Delaware.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,750,000 for this project. Additional funds recommended above the budget request are for maintenance of disposal areas and additional dredging.

Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee to Anclote, Florida.—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for maintenance dredging.

Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Florida.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,500,000 for maintenance dredging.

Miami River, Florida.—The Committee recommends $10,820,000 for completion of the dredging of the Miami River Channel. This project provides the first maintenance dredging of the Miami River since its original authorization in 1930.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Georgia.—$1,000,000 is recommended for dredging critical areas of this waterway as well as for work related to new upland disposal sites.

Savannah Harbor, Georgia.—The Committee recommendation for Savannah Harbor includes the funds recommended for O&M in this account and $5,275,000 in the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities program in the Construction, General account. The administration proposed these two funding amounts as a single line item in O&M.

Barbers Point, Hawaii.—The Committee recommends an additional $348,000 above the budget request for daily operation and maintenance and facility upgrades to public use facilities.

Northwestern Division Projects, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, and Oregon.—Small changes were recommended to the budget request by the Corps. The Senate request shown for these projects represents the revised budget amount not an increase or decrease taken by the Committee.

Chicago Harbor, Illinois.—The Committee is aware of the City of Chicago's interest in modifying the existing Chicago Lakefront Inner Breakwater consistent with the City of Chicago's 2016 Olympic Master Plan for Chicago Harbor. The Committee encourages the Chicago District of the Army Corps of Engineers to work with the City of Chicago on preliminary design concepts, cost estimates and other aspects of the project to determine what environmental, recreational and economic development benefits might be achieved by the City's proposal.

Green and Barren Rivers, Kentucky.—The Committee recommends an additional $1,000,000 for the Green River Lock and Dam number 3 (Rochester Lock) detailed engineering analysis for stabilizing the existing lock structure and further the evaluation of the stability of the dam structure.

Barren River Lake, Kentucky.—The Committee recommends an additional $2,000,000 for the Port Oliver Public Use Facility.

Small Waterway Dredging on the Louisiana Coast, Louisiana.—The Committee has included additional funds for a number of the smaller waterways on the Louisiana gulf coast that were not funded in the administration's budget request. With the limited funding

available to the Committee, the Committee has attempted to provide for some of the dredging needs of the State. However, recognizing that conditions on these small waterways is constantly changing the Committee is directing the Corps to propose a dredging program for fiscal year 2009 that would most effectively utilize the scarce funds available for these harbor projects.

Small Harbors, Maryland.—The Committee recommendation includes funds to dredge a number of small harbors used by waterman on the Chesapeake Bay. With the limited funding available to the Committee, the Committee has attempted to provide for some of the dredging needs of the State. However, recognizing that conditions on these small waterways is constantly changing the Committee is directing the Corps to propose a dredging program for fiscal year 2009 that would most effectively utilize the scarce funds available for these harbor projects

New Bedford, Fairhaven, and Acushnet, Massachusetts.—The Committee has recommended an additional $100,000 to evaluate improvements to the barrier in cooperation with the city to improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

Michigan Harbor Dredging, Michigan.—The Committee notes that there are some 50 federally maintained harbors and waterways in Michigan. However, the Committee also notes that fewer than 20 are budgeted. With the limited funding available to the Committee, the Committee has recommended $5,000,000 under this line item to provide for some of the dredging needs of the State rather than trying to fund small amounts for each project. The Committee has listed all of the harbors and waterways in the table that are eligible for this funding. However, recognizing that conditions on these small waterways is constantly changing and the Great Lakes are suffering from near historic low water levels, the Committee is directing the Corps to propose a dredging program for fiscal year 2009 that would most effectively utilize the scarce funds available for these harbor and waterway projects.

Rouge River, Michigan.—The Committee recommendation for Rouge River includes the funds recommended for O&M in this account and $160,000 in the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities program in the Construction, General account. The administration proposed these two funding amounts as a single line item in O&M.

Mouth of the Yazoo River, Mississippi.—-The Committee includes additional funds for the maintenance dredging of the entrance to the Vicksburg Harbor.

Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi.—The Committee has recommended $7,500,000 for this project. Additional funds above the budget request are to perform maintenance dredging of the Bar Channel, the Pascagoula River, and Bayou Casotte channels.

Rosedale Harbor, Mississippi.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for maintenance dredging of the harbor.

Absecon Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee recommends $250,000 for dredging of the inlet.

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program, New Mexico.—The Committee has included $200,000 for the Corps to participate with the Bureau of Reclamation, the State and other agencies in the Rio Grande Collaborative Program.

Rio Grande Bosque Rehabilitation, New Mexico.—The Committee includes $4,000,000 to continue fire reduction work and general Bosque rehabilitation in order to complete repairs and fire protection resulting from 2003 and 2004 fires in the urban interface.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, North Carolina.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for dredging of the project.

Coastal Inlets, North Carolina.—The Committee has included additional funds for the coastal inlets on the North Carolina coast that were not funded in the administration's budget request. With the limited funding available to the Committee, the Committee has attempted to provide for some of the dredging needs of the State. However, recognizing that conditions on these inlets are constantly changing the Committee is directing the Corps to propose a dredging program for fiscal year 2009 that would most effectively utilize the scarce funds available for these inlets.

Garrison Dam and Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.—The Committee recommends $1,700,000 for the Williston Pumping Plant feature of the project; $100,000 for mosquito control; and $500,000 for the Corps to work in cooperation with the Friends of Lake Sakakawea to ensure the recreation sites around the lake can be utilized.

Homme Lake, North Dakota.—Additional funds are recommended for dam safety activities and non-routine maintenance activities.

Lake Ashtabula and Baldhill Dam, North Dakota.—Additional funds are recommended to ensure basic levels of service, and for non-routine maintenance and dam safety activities.

Oregon Coastal Ports, Oregon.—The Committee has included additional funds for a number of the coastal harbors on the Oregon coast that were either not funded or underfunded in the administration's budget request. With the limited funding available to the Committee, the Committee has attempted to provide for some of the dredging needs of the State. However, recognizing that conditions on these inlets are constantly changing the Committee is directing the Corps to propose a dredging program for fiscal year 2009 that would most effectively utilize the scarce funds available for these harbors.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, South Dakota.—The Committee notes that title VI of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, as amended, requires that funding to inventory and stabilize cultural and historic sites along the Missouri River in South Dakota, and to carry out the terrestrial wildlife habitat programs, shall be provided from the Operation and Maintenance account. The Committee provides $3,000,000 to protect cultural resource sites and provide funding to the State and tribes for approved restoration and stewardship plans and in compliance with the requirements of title VI, directs the Corps to contract with or reimburse the State of South Dakota and affected tribes to carry out these duties.

Rhode Island Harbors, Rhode Island.—The Committee has included additional funds for a number of the harbors in Rhode Island that were either not funded or underfunded in the administration's budget request. With the limited funding available to the Committee, the Committee has attempted to provide for some of the dredging needs of the State. However, recognizing that condi-

tions on these inlets are constantly changing the Committee is directing the Corps to propose a dredging program for fiscal year 2009 that would most effectively utilize the scarce funds available for these harbors.

Fox Point Hurricane Barrier, Rhode Island.—$500,000 is recommended for the transfer of the project and routine O&M of the project.

Woonsocket, Rhode Island.—$300,000 is recommended for the transfer of the project and routine O&M of the project.

Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina.—The Committee recommendation for Charleston Harbor includes the funds recommended for O&M in this account and $2,580,000 in the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities program in the Construction, General account. The administration proposed these two funding amounts as a single line item in O&M.

Oahe Dam, Lake Oahe, South Dakota, and North Dakota.—The Committee has recommended $300,000 to allow the Corps to modify public facilities so that they can be utilized with the extreme low water levels currently being experienced on the lake.

Houston Ship Channel, Texas.—The Committee recommendation for the Houston Ship Channel includes the funds recommended for O&M in this account and $500,000 in the Construction, General account for beneficial use of dredged material. The administration proposed these two funding amounts as a single line item in O&M.

Texas Water Allocation Study, Texas.—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for this ongoing study.

Chinook, Head of Sand Island, and Baker Bay, Washington.—The Committee notes the proximity of Corps navigation facilities on the Columbia River between Chinook and the Head of Sand Island, Washington, and at Baker Bay, Washington, and encourage the Corps of Engineers to seek ways to achieve cost savings and efficiency, such as by utilizing appropriate contracting methods while having these two projects be considered together when seeking bids and awarding contracts.

Mud Mountain Dam, Washington.—Within the funds recommended, the Corps is directed to continue to satisfy Federal fish passage obligations for the term of the cooperative agreement with Puget Sound Energy.

Beech Fork Lake, West Virginia.—Additional funds recommended above the budget request are for repairs of public use facilities.

Fox River, Wisconsin.—Additional funds recommended above the budget request are to reimburse Wisconsin, in accordance with the agreement, for the costs of repairs and rehabilitation of the transferred locks and for the Corps of Engineers to undertake major repairs for the dams and associated infrastructure.

Green Bay Harbor, Wisconsin.—The Committee recommendation for Green Bay Harbor includes the funds recommended for O&M in this account and $950,000 in the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities program in the Construction, General account. The administration proposed these two funding amounts as a single line item in O&M. The Committee has also recommended an additional $1,050,000 for backlog maintenance dredging.

Actions for Change to Improve Operation and Maintenance.—The Committee has recommended $4,000,000 for this item. The Com-

mittee believes that these funds can serve to make significant improvements to the way the Corps administers completed projects to account for changed conditions since construction.

National Coastal Mapping.—$13,900,000 is recommended for this program. Additional funds recommended above the budget request are for LIDAR bathymetry for use in regional sediment management and for Coastal Zone Mapping and Imaging LIDAR/LASER to be conducted with the University of Southern Mississippi.

Regional Sediment Management Demonstration Program.—The Committee has recommended $4,500,000 for this program, $3,000,000 above the budget request. Within the funds recommended, the Corps is directed to undertake studies for the Southeast Coast of Oahu, Hawaii; the State of North Carolina; South Coastal Rhode Island; Delaware Estuary, New Jersey; and for Long Island, New York coastal planning.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 2008	.....
Budget estimate, 2009	$40,000,000
Committee recommendation	40,000,000

The Committee has recommended $40,000,000 for the FCCE account. This account provides funds for preparedness activities for natural and other disasters, response, and emergency flood fighting and rescue operations, hurricane response, and emergency shore protection work. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean water where the source has been contaminated or where adequate supplies of water are needed for consumption.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2008	$180,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009	180,000,000
Committee recommendation	183,000,000

An appropriation of $183,000,000 is recommended for the regulatory program of the Corps of Engineers.

This appropriation provides for salaries and costs incurred administering regulation of activities affecting U.S. waters, including wetlands, in accordance with the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 33 U.S.C. section 401, the Clean Water Act of 1977 Public Law 95–217, and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 Public Law 92–532.

The appropriation helps maintain program performance, protects important aquatic resources, and supports partnerships with States and local communities through watershed planning efforts.

The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers has begun a pilot program aimed at streamlining decisions for certain complex, high impact permit applications which have national or large regional implications. Specifically, we understand this program is focusing on projects related to rail capacity expansion, highway construction and pipelines where knowledge and experience gained in one district can be shared with other districts facing similar challenges, thus promoting efficiencies, the development and sharing of "best practices," and use of virtual or dedicated teams to expedite broad-impact permit applications. Since the Committee con-

tinues to be concerned about the permit application backlog and delays in making permit decisions, it fully supports this effort and encourages the Corps to dedicate even more attention and expand its efforts to an even greater extent in developing and using this pilot program to minimize negative impacts of the backlog and resulting delays, especially where there are significant impacts to the nation's economy and environmental health. The Committee further supports the three emphasis areas selected for the pilot program as it believes them to be critical elements of a healthy, expanding economy which must be vigorously developed, but in an environmentally sound manner.

The Committee is keenly aware that U.S. economic health and national security depends on the continued availability of reliable and affordable energy. The Committee is also aware that the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Regulatory Branch plays a key role by authorizing much of the 1.13 billion tons of coal production expected this year through its regulatory program.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps to work with the Office of Surface Mining [OSM] to develop a more efficient process for issuing permits associated with surface coal mining operations. To avoid unnecessary time delays and duplication of agency resources, the Corps shall maintain the availability of a meaningful general permit for surface coal mining that may be issued in coordination with and for the term of the permit already required pursuant to the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act [SMCRA]. The Corps should also dedicate sufficient personnel and financial resources to support a consistent program for permit review and issuance.

The Committee has included legislative text directing the Corps to reimburse the Port of Arlington, Oregon, up to $3,200,000 of the funds recommended for direct construction costs determined by the secretary to have been incurred by the port as a result of the issuance of a permit to construct a commercial dock and offload facility. Due to not scrupulously following established permit procedures the Corps was forced to withdraw the permit after the port had invested some $2,500,000. The port is now required to deconstruct these facilities. Reimbursement for the costs for removal of these facilities shall also be provided within this amount.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2008	$140,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009	130,000,000
Committee recommendation	140,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $140,000,000 to continue activities related to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] in fiscal year 2005.

The responsibility for the cleanup of contaminated sites under the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program was transferred to the Army Corps of Engineers in the fiscal year 1998 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Public Law 105–62.

FUSRAP is not specifically defined by statute. The program was established in 1974 under the broad authority of the Atomic Energy Act and, until fiscal year 1998, funds for the cleanup of con-

taminated defense sites had been appropriated to the Department of Energy through existing appropriation accounts. In appropriating FUSRAP funds to the Corps of Engineers, the Committee intended to transfer only the responsibility for administration and execution of cleanup activities at eligible sites where remediation had not been completed. It did not intend to transfer ownership of and accountability for real property interests that remain with the Department of Energy.

The Corps of Engineers has extensive experience in the cleanup of hazardous, toxic, and radioactive wastes through its work for the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies. The Committee always intended for the Corps' expertise be used in the same manner for the cleanup of contaminated sites under FUSRAP. The Committee expects the Corps to continue programming and budgeting for FUSRAP as part of the Corps of Engineers—Civil program. The Committee directs the Corps to prioritize sites that are nearing completion during fiscal year 2008.

The Corps is directed to prioritize sites that are nearing completion and initiate cleanup expeditiously for the former Sylvania nuclear fuel site in Hicksville, New York.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2008	$175,046,000
Budget estimate, 2009	177,000,000
Committee recommendation	177,000,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommendation is $177,000,000.

Executive Direction and Management.—The Office of the Chief of Engineers and 8 division offices supervise work in 38 district offices.

Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity.—This support center provides administrative services (such as personnel, logistics, information management, and finance and accounting) for the Office of the Chief of Engineers and other separate field operating activities.

Institute for Water Resources.—This institute performs studies, analyses, and develops planning techniques for the management and development of the Nation's water resources.

United States Army Corps of Engineers Finance Center.—This center provides centralized support for all Corps finance and accounting.

Office of Congressional Affairs.—The Committee has included statutory language for the past several years prohibiting any funds from being used to fund an Office of Congressional Affairs within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers. The Committee believes that an Office of Congressional Affairs for the Civil Works Program would hamper the efficient and effective coordination of issues with the Committee staff and Members of Congress. The Committee believes that the technical knowledge and managerial expertise needed for the Corps headquarters to effectively address Civil Works authorization, appropriation, and headquarters policy matters resides in the Civil Works organization. Therefore, the

Committee strongly recommends that the Office of Congressional Affairs not be a part of the process by which information on Civil Works projects, programs, and activities is provided to Congress.

The Committee reminds the Corps that the General Expenses account is to be used exclusively for executive oversight and management of the Civil Works Program.

In 1998, The Chief of Engineers issued a Command Directive transferring the oversight and management of the General Expenses account, as well as the manpower associated with this function, from the Civil Works Directorate to the Resource Management Office. The Corps is reminded that General Expense funds are appropriated solely for the executive management and oversight of the Civil Works Program under the direction of the Director of Civil Works.

The Committee is pleased with the efforts of the Corps to restructure the management of general expense funds. It continues to believe that the general expense dollars are ultimately at the discretion of the Chief of Engineers and are intended to be utilized in his effort to carry out the Corps' civil works mission. The new controls put in place to manage the general expense dollars and evaluate the needs of the Corps address the Committee's previous concerns. The Committee requests the Corps continue to provide biannual written notification of the dispersal of general expense funds.

Millions of dollars have been spent over the last several years on an initiative to contract out Government jobs in order to make the Government more efficient. However, in more than 70 percent of the cases Government employees win the competition for their jobs. The Committee fails to see any evidence of cost savings or increased efficiency by undergoing these expensive competitions. Therefore, the Committee directs that no funds provided in this account or otherwise available for expenditure shall be used to comply with the competitive sourcing initiative.

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

Appropriations, 2008	$4,500,000
Budget estimate, 2009	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,500,000

The Committee has recommended $4,500,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) [OASA(CW)]. As has been previously stated, the Committee believes that this office should be funded through the Defense appropriations bill and directs the administration to budget for this office under the Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance—Army account in future budget submissions. The Committee continues to believe that the ASA(CW) has neither the time nor should he be involved in the day-to-day operational matters of the civil works program. It is the Committee's opinion that the traditional role of the ASA(CW) is to provide the Chief of Engineers advice about policy matters and generally be the political spokesperson for the administration's policies; however, the Chief of Engineers is responsible for carrying out the program. This is underscored by the administration's budget documents that state that the OASA(CW) provides policy direction and oversight for the civil works program and the Head-

quarters of the Corps provides executive direction and management of the civil works program.

The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works advises the Secretary of the Army on a variety of matters, including the Civil Works program of the Corps of Engineers. The Assistant Secretary is a member of the Army Secretariat with responsibilities, such as participating in Continuity of Government exercises that extend well beyond Civil Works. The Assistant Secretary also oversees the administration, operation and maintenance, and capital development of Arlington National Cemetery and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery. Congressional oversight of the Army Cemetery program lies not with the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, but rather with the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and with the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

The Army's accounting system does not track OMA funding of overhead or Army-wide support offices on the basis of which office receives support, nor would it be efficient or effective to do so for a 20-person office. Instead, expenses such as legal support, personnel services, finance and accounting services, the executive motor pool, travel on military aircraft, and other support services are centrally funded and managed on a department-wide basis. Transferring the funding for the expenses of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works to a separate account has greatly complicated the Army's accounting for such indirect and overhead expenses with no commensurate benefit to justify the change. The Committee does not agree that these costs should be funded in this bill and therefore has only provided funding for salaries and expenses as in previous years.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Section 101. The bill includes language concerning reprogramming guidelines.

Section 102. The bill includes language prohibiting implementation of competitive sourcing or HPO.

Section 103. The bill includes language prohibiting the divesting or transferring Civil Works functions.

Section 104. The bill includes language concerning report notifications.

Section 105. The bill includes language concerning reallocations in Lake Cumberland, Kentucky.

Section 106. The bill includes language regarding the Middle Rio Grande Collaborative Program, New Mexico.

Section 107. The bill includes language regarding congressional budget justifications.

Section 108. The bill includes language authorizing a study of the Missouri River.

Section 109. The bill includes language increasing the cost ceiling for the Folsom, California, Bridge.

Section 110. The bill includes language regarding crediting of non-Federal expenditures on the San Lorenzo River, California project.

Section 111. The bill includes language concerning the Missouri River Levee System.

Section 112. The bill includes language concerning Corps of Engineers Senior Executive Service positions.

Section 113. The bill includes language regarding a replacement health care facility at Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.

Section 114. The bill includes language concerning continuing contracts and the Inland Waterway Trust Fund.

Section 115. The bill includes language increasing the cost ceiling on the LMRMRIS.

Section 116. The bill includes language modifying the Middle Rio Grande Bosque project.

Section 117. The bill includes language modifying the San Antonio, Texas, project.

Section 118. The bill includes language concerning the Morganza to the Gulf, Louisiana project.

Section 119. The bill includes language concerning Chatfield Lake, Colorado.

Section 120. The bill includes language increasing the cost ceiling for the Big Sioux River, South Dakota project.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2008	$43,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009	42,000,000
Committee recommendation	42,000,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2009 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act totals $42,000,000. An appropriation of $39,373,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction; $987,000 for fish, wildlife, and recreation, mitigation and conservation. The Committee recommendation provides $1,640,000 for program administration and oversight.

Legislative language is included which allows up to $1,500,000 of the funds provided to be used for administrative costs.

The Central Utah Project Completion Act (titles II–VI of Public Law 102–575) provides for the completion of the central Utah project by the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. The Act also authorizes the appropriation of funds for fish, wildlife, recreation, mitigation, and conservation; establishes an account in the Treasury for the deposit of these funds and of other contributions for mitigation and conservation activities; and establishes a Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission to administer funds in that account. The act further assigns responsibilities for carrying out the act to the Secretary of the Interior and prohibits delegation of those responsibilities to the Bureau of Reclamation.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2008	$949,882,000
Budget estimate, 2009[1]	779,320,000
Committee recommendation	927,320,000

[1] Includes rescission of $175,000,000.

An appropriation of $927,320,000 is recommended by the Committee for general investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation. The water and related resources account supports the development, management, and restoration of water and related natural resources in the 17 Western States. The account includes funds for operating and maintaining existing facilities to obtain the greatest overall level of benefits, to protect public safety, and to conduct studies on ways to improve the use of water and related natural resources. Work will be done in partnership and cooperation with non-Federal entities and other Federal agencies.

The Committee has divided underfinancing between the Resources Management Subaccount and the Facilities Operation and Maintenance subaccount. The Committee directs that the underfinancing amount in each subaccount initially be applied uniformly across all projects within the subaccounts. Upon applying the underfinanced amounts, normal reprogramming procedures should be undertaken to account for schedule slippages, accelerations or other unforeseen conditions.

DISCLOSURE PROVISIONS

The Committee received more than 130 requests for projects, programs, studies or activities for the Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal year 2009. These were items that were additions to the budget request as well as those included in the budget request. The Committee obviously was unable to accommodate all of these requests.

In the interest of providing full disclosure of funding provided in the Energy and Water bill, all disclosures are made in this report accompanying the bill.

All of the projects funded in this report have gone through the same rigorous public review and approval process as those proposed for funding by the President. The difference in these projects, of course, is that the congressionally directed projects are not subject to the artificial budgetary prioritization criteria that the administration utilizes to decide what not to fund.

A new table has been added to the end of this report to show the requestors of the various projects. For those programs, projects, or studies that were included in the budgetary documents provided in the budget request, the words "the President" has been added to denote this administration request. The level of funding provided for each of these programs projects or studies should not be construed as what was requested. Rather, the only intent is to disclose the requestor.

It should be noted that many line items only have the President listed as the requestor. It should not be inferred that the affected members are not interested in these projects studies or activities. Rather this is due to Committee direction that the President's budget requests are the basis for the Committee bill and a requests by the affected Members is unnecessary unless a Member wishes to request a different amount than the budget request.

The purposes for the funding provided in the various accounts is described in the paragraphs associated with each account. The location of the programs, projects or studies are denoted in the account tables.

The amounts recommended by the Committee are shown on the following table along with the budget request.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
ARIZONA				
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	.....	9,900	.....	9,900

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT	.....	.....	1,000	.....
COLORADO RIVER BASIN, CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT	26,528	322	28,028	322
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	2,350	.....	2,350	.....
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	320	.....	320	.....
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER REUSE PROJECT	200	.....	200	.....
SALT RIVER PROJECT	469	131	469	131
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT	325	.....	325	.....
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	718	.....	718	.....
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	2,969	.....	2,969	.....
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,658	20,205	1,658	20,205
YUMA EAST WETLANDS	.....	.....	1,500	.....
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA PROJECT	1,016	702	1,016	1,102
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	352	.....	352	.....
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PLANT	800	.....	1,500	.....
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECTS:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	1,708	7,772	1,708	7,772
AUBURN—FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	2,088	.....	2,088	.....
DELTA DIVISION	15,138	5,599	15,138	5,599
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,591	2,943	1,591	2,943
FRIANT DIVISION	1,988	3,733	3,988	3,733
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	12,006	1,145	16,006	1,145
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINTAINANCE	.....	24,091	.....	24,091
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	931	1,497	7,931	1,497
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	675	100	675	100
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	391	.....	391	.....
SHASTA DIVISION	150	7,764	150	7,764
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	7,215	3,102	7,815	3,102
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	1,117	8,334	1,117	8,334
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	3,497	5,422	3,497	5,422
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	303	.....	303	.....
INLAND EMPIRE REGIONAL WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	.....	.....	1,000	.....
IRVINE BASIN GROUND AND SURFACE WATER	.....	.....	1,000	.....
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS	100	.....	100	.....
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	692	.....	692	.....
LONG BEACH DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJ	.....	.....	1,000	.....
MOKELUMNE RIVER REGIONAL WATER STORAGE & CONJUNCTIVE USE STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	558	.....	558	.....
ORLAND PROJECT	.....	703	.....	703
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	700	.....	700	.....
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	3,000	.....	3,000	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	700	.....	700	.....
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	250	.....	250	.....
SOLANO PROJECT	1,626	2,863	1,626	2,863
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	260	.....	260	.....
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT	389	31	389	31
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP	49,743	257	49,743	257
COLLBRAN PROJECT	166	1,390	166	1,390
COLORADO—BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	450	12,842	450	12,842
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	204	.....	204	.....
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	75	154	75	154
FRYINGPAN—ARKANSAS PROJECT	172	8,123	172	8,123
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	164	1,281	164	1,281
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY	36	3,059	36	3,059
MANCOS PROJECT	42	104	42	104

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	50	2,366	50	2,366
PINE RIVER PROJECT	184	151	184	151
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT	292	4,345	292	4,345
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	128	136	128	136
UPPER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS	250	.....	250	.....
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	2,769	2,515	2,769	2,515
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	18,000	.....	18,000	.....
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	179	.....	179	.....
LEWISTON ORCHARDS PROJECTS	548	30	548	30
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	2,768	2,790	2,768	2,790
KANSAS				
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	73	.....	73	.....
WICHITA-CHENEY PROJECT	10	375	10	375
WICHITA PROJECT—EQUUS BEDS DIVISION	50	.....	1,050	.....
MONTANA				
FORT PECK RESERVATION/DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	.....	.....	15,000	.....
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	.....	653	.....	653
HUNTLEY PROJECT	52	108	52	108
LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT	31	15	31	15
MILK RIVER PROJECT	308	1,340	308	1,340
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	134	.....	134	.....
ROCKY BOYS/NORTH CENTRAL MONTANA REGIONAL WATER	.....	.....	10,000	.....
SUN RIVER PROJECT	75	275	75	275
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	12	158	12	158
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	64	.....	64	.....
NEVADA				
HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY	200	.....	200	.....
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	5,021	2,684	7,521	2,684
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	900	.....	2,725	.....
NORTH LAS VEGAS, WATER REUSE	.....	.....	3,000	.....
NEW MEXICO				
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER RECYCLING AND REUSE	.....	.....	1,000	.....
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,657	1,127	2,657	1,127
EASTERN NEW MEXICO RURAL WATER SUPPLY	.....	.....	500	.....
JICARILLA APACHE RESERVATION RURAL WATER SYSTEM	.....	.....	1,000	.....
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	13,047	9,653	16,047	9,653
NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY, NM, UT, CO	.....	.....	1,000	.....
NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	77	.....	77	.....
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	.....	203	.....	203
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	590	3,752	590	3,752
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	59	.....	59	.....
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	57	.....	57	.....
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	23	35	23	35
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS	29	.....	29	.....
NORTH DAKOTA				
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN—GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT	16,495	5,611	64,375	5,611
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	48	241	48	241
CENTRAL OKLAHOMA MASTER CONSERVATORY DISTRICT FEASIBILITY STUDY	.....	.....	250	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	25	651	25	651
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	.....	523	.....	523
NORMAN PROJECT	26	447	26	447
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	128	.....	128	.....
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	30	1,396	30	1,396
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	65	416	65	416
OREGON				
BURNT, MALHEUR, OWYHEE, AND POWER RIVER BASIN WATER OPTIMIZATION FEASIBILITY STUDY	.....	.....	300	.....
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	407	444	407	444
DESCHUTUS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	.....	.....	300	.....
DESCHUTES PROJECT	238	178	988	178
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	542	286	542	286
KLAMATH PROJECT	23,388	1,612	23,388	1,612
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	294	.....	444	.....
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	577	325	577	325
SAVAGE RAPIDS DAM REMOVAL	3,000	.....	3,000	.....
TUALATIN BASIN WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	.....	.....	400	.....
TUALATIN PROJECT TITLE TRANSFER AND FACILITY ASSESSMENT STUDY	.....	.....	106	.....
TUALATIN PROJECT	111	270	111	270
UMATILLA PROJECT	954	2,978	954	2,978
SOUTH DAKOTA				
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	.....	.....	30,000	.....
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	.....	15	.....	15
MNI WICONI PROJECT	16,240	10,000	27,000	10,182
PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER SYSTEM	.....	.....	2,000	.....
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM	.....	86	.....	86
TEXAS				
BALMORHEA PROJECT	41	17	41	17
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	59	86	59	86
LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES	50	.....	4,050	.....
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	25	533	25	533
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	35	367	35	367
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	146	.....	146	.....
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT	146	32	146	32
MOON LAKE PROJECT	3	73	3	73
NEWTON PROJECT	4	38	4	38
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	156	.....	456	.....
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	196	172	196	172
PARK CITY FEASIBILLTY STUDY	.....	.....	500	.....
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	951	415	951	415
SCOFIELD PROJECT	55	78	55	78
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	203	20	203	20
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	121	.....	121	.....
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,028	720	1,028	720
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	30	107	30	107
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	3,737	6,811	6,737	6,811
ODESSA SUBAREA SPECIAL STUDY	600	.....	1,000	.....
WASHINGTON AREA PROJECTS	85	10	85	10
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	57	.....	145	.....
YAKIMA PROJECT	1,201	6,565	1,701	6,799
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	8,503	.....	8,503	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER STORAGE	.....	.....	500	.....
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT	91	3,242	91	3,242
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	302	1,578	302	1,578
SHOSHONE PROJECT	84	665	84	665
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS	26	.....	26	.....
SUBTOTAL FOR PROJECTS	274,970	213,288	438,679	213,704
REGIONAL PROGRAMS				
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I	.....	9,444	.....	9,444
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II	5,850	.....	5,850	.....
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECTION 5	1,918	3,995	1,918	3,995
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECTION 8	710	.....	710	.....
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	265	.....	265	.....
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,250	.....	1,250
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	.....	71,500	.....	71,500
SAFETY OF EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	.....	18,500	.....	18,500
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	500	.....	500	.....
EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	.....	1,422	.....	1,422
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	21,939	.....	21,939	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,739	.....	1,739	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	973	.....	973	.....
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	.....	6,254	.....	6,254
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,384	.....	1,384
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	2,163	.....	2,163	.....
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	7,481	.....	7,481	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMS	243	.....	243	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	16,400	.....	16,400	.....
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	.....	714	.....	714
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	7,020	.....	7,020	.....
NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,658	.....	1,658	.....
OPERATIONS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	684	522	684	522
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN—OTHER PICK-SLOAN	3,687	37,053	3,687	37,053
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	847	250	847	250
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	641	155	641	155
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	2,132	.....	2,132	.....
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT (TITLE XXVII)	.....	.....	1,000	.....
RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	951	.....	951	.....
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:				
DESALINATION AND WATER PURIFICATION PROGRAM	375	1,600	2,375	1,600
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	9,000	.....	9,000	.....
RURAL WATER LEGISLATION, TITLE I	1,000	.....	1,000	.....
SITE SECURITY	.....	28,950	.....	28,950
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	800	.....	3,300	.....
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECHNICAL SUPPORT	93	.....	93	.....
WATER FOR AMERICA INITIATIVE	19,000	.....	19,000	.....
SUBTOTAL, REGIONAL PROGRAMS	108,069	182,993	113,169	183,393
UNDER FINANCING	.....	.....	−18,183	−3,442
TOTAL WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	383,039	396,281	533,665	393,655
GRAND TOTAL	779,320	779,320	927,320	927,320

Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act, Arizona.—Funds are recommended for advance planning and environmental compliance ac-

tivities for rehabilitation of the San Carlos Irrigation Project in cooperation with the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District.

Central Arizona Project, Colorado River Basin.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funds for activities related to the Gila River Settlement in New Mexico and Arizona.

Central Valley Project—Friant Division.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $1,000,000 for the Friant-Kern and Madera canals capacity improvements and an additional $1,000,000 for the Semi Tropic Phase II groundwater banking.

Miscellaneous Project Programs.—An additional $4,000,000 above the budget request is provided for anadromous fish screen projects.

Central Valley Project-Sacramento River Division.—Within the funds recommended, $2,000,000 is recommended for the Sacramento Valley Integrated Plan and $5,000,000 is recommended for the Red Bluff Diversion Dam.

Central Valley Project-Trinity River Division.—The Committee has recommended $600,000 above the budget request to accelerate implementation of the Trinity River Restoration Program.

Mokelumne River Regional Water Storage, California.—The Committee directs the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to initiate a feasibility study authorized in title V of Public Law 109–338. In carrying out this study, the Secretary of the Interior shall include the entire Mokelumne River drainage as the study area and shall also consider regional projects that include recommendations for expansion of reservoir storage capacities. This study shall include in the feasibility study analysis the project currently under consideration by the Mokelumne River Forum and described in both the Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority and the Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras Integrated Regional Water Management Plans.

As authorized, this study is intended to be regional in scope and shall examine the feasibility of providing additional water supply and improved water management reliability to Mokelumne River Forum member agencies through the development of new storage and conjunctive use programs and projects, including, but not limited to, the Eastern San Joaquin Ground Water Basin, Pardee Reservoir, Lower Bear Reservoir, and Duck Creek.

Fort Peck, Dry Prairie Rural Water System, Montana.—The Committee has recommended $15,000,000 for continued construction of this rural water project.

Middle Rio Grande Project, New Mexico.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $3,000,000 for additional needs in the Middle Rio Grande Collaborative Program.

Truckee Canal Reconstruction, Nevada.—The canal breached in January 2008, flooding Fernley, Nevada. The Committee recommendation includes $2,500,000 under the Lahontan Basin project for Reclamation to perform an exploration/risk analysis of the canal to determine the full extent of rehabilitation needed for the canal to resume flows above 350 cubic feet per second.

Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin, Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota.—Within the Committee recommendation, $52,000,000 is recommended for rural water projects. Of this amount, $26,000,000 shall be expended for the following projects: $8,000,000 for the Northwest Area Water Supply; $6,000,000 for the South Central

Regional Water District; $4,000,000 for the North Central Rural Water System; $8,000,000 for the Southwest Pipeline. Additionally the Committee recommends $1,880,000 for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Irrigation Project.

Deschutes Project, Oregon.—Within the funds provided, $750,000 is recommended for water conservation measures.

Oregon Investigations Program, Oregon.—$150,000 above the budget request is recommended for developing appraisal-level designs and cost estimates for on-reservation distribution systems.

Northern Utah Investigations Program, Utah.—The Committee has recommended an additional $300,000 for the Rural Water Technology Alliance.

Columbia Basin Project, Washington.—The Committee recommends an additional $3,000,000 above the budget request for the Potholes Reservoir Supplemental Feed Route Implementation.

Odessa Subarea Special Study, Washington.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for this study.

Yakima Project, Washington.—$500,000 of the funds recommended under this heading are for the Storage Dam Fish Passage Feasibility Study.

Salt Cedar/Russian Olive Control.—The Committee has recommended no funding under the 2006 Salt Cedar/Russian Olive Control Act. Studies have shown that there is no water salvage gained by eradication of these invasive nuisance species. Without the water salvage component, there is no real nexus to Reclamation's mission of providing water and power to the West. The Committee agrees that these invasive species need to be controlled and eradicated, where possible, due to their ability to outcompete native vegetation. However, this mission is much more suited to other Federal agencies than the Bureau of Reclamation.

Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title I.—In fiscal years 2006 and 2008, the conferees expressed their concern that the Bureau of Reclamation was making excess releases of approximately 100,000 acre feet of water per year from storage in Colorado River reservoirs to help meet the United States' Colorado River water quality obligations to Mexico. The excess releases are being made because Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District's agricultural return flows—that bypass the Colorado River and are discharged to the Cienega de Santa Clara in Mexico (bypass flows)—are not counted as part of the 1.5 million acre-feet of water that the United States is required to deliver annually to Mexico. Because the bypass flows are not counted, system storage from the Colorado River has been used to make up for the bypass flows. The Yuma Desalting Plant was originally constructed to treat the flows and return a portion of them to the river, thus reducing excess releases from Colorado River reservoirs.

The current drought and projected long-term water demands have heightened concern about this demand on the river system. Consequently, in fiscal years 2006 and 2008, the conferees also directed the Bureau of Reclamation to dedicate sufficient resources to the Yuma Desalting Plant so that one-third operational capacity may be achieved by the end of calendar years 2006 and 2008, respectively. To date, the plant is not one-third operational, although Reclamation did conduct a demonstration run at one-tenth capacity

for 90 days in 2007. The Committee, once again, directs the Bureau of Reclamation, within the funds provided for the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, title I, to dedicate sufficient funds to the Yuma Desalting Plant so that one-third operational capacity may be achieved by the end of calendar year 2008. The Bureau of Reclamation is also directed to provide the Committee with a status report of the plant's operational status by no later than March 1, 2009. If the plant is not one-third operational by the end of calendar year 2008, the report shall include an explanation as to why the Bureau of Reclamation has failed to comply with the Committee's directive.

Drought Emergency Assistance.—The Committee has provided the budget request for this program. Within the funds provided, the Committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to provide full and fair consideration for drought assistance from the State of Hawaii.

Research and Development, Desalination Research and Development Program.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 above the budget request to be provided to New Mexico State University for research activities undertaken at or associated with the National Inland Desalination Research Facility.

Title XVI, Water Reclamation, and Reuse.—The Committee has provided $3,300,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, the Committee has included $2,500,000 for the WateReuse Foundation. These funds are available to support the Foundation's research priorities.

Water for America Initiative.—A critical component of reducing tension among multiple water users is collaborative planning and joint operations. Within the funds provided, funds are provided for the Desert Research Institute to address water quality and environmental issues in ways that will bring industry and regulators to mutually acceptable answers. Within the amounts provided, Reclamation is urged to continue urban water conservation projects identified through the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Innovative Conservation Program; industrial water efficiency surveys to assess opportunities to conserve water in industrial water use; and for weather based irrigation controller activities to pilot ways to speed distribution and acceptance of these landscape water efficiency devices.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2008	$59,122,000
Budget estimate, 2009	[1] 56,079,000
Committee recommendation	56,079,000

[1] Includes $7,500,000 legislative proposal on which Congress has not acted.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $56,079,000 for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund. The Committee is aware that the legislation to effect a transfer of $7,500,000 in Friant surcharges to a new San Joaquin River Restoration Fund has not been enacted. However, the Committee has provided the administration's full request and included legislative text that would allow these funds to be utilized in the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund. It is the Committees' understanding that even if the legislation establishing the new fund is not established, inclusion of the Committee's legislative text would allow Reclamation

to undertake San Joaquin River Settlement Act activities within existing authorities.

The Central Valley Project Restoration Fund was authorized in the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, title 34 of Public Law 102–575. This fund was established to provide funding from project beneficiaries for habitat restoration, improvement and acquisition, and other fish and wildlife restoration activities in the Central Valley project area of California. Revenues are derived from payments by project beneficiaries and from donations. Payments from project beneficiaries include several required by the act (Friant Division surcharges, higher charges on water transferred to non-CVP users, and tiered water prices) and, to the extent required in appropriations acts, additional annual mitigation and restoration payments.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2008	$40,098,000
Budget estimate, 2009	32,000,000
Committee recommendation	42,000,000

This account funds activities that are consistent with the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, a collaborative effort involving 18 State and Federal agencies and representatives of California's urban, agricultural, and environmental communities. The goals of the program are to improve fish and wildlife habitat, water supply reliability, and water quality in the San Francisco Bay-San Joaquin River Delta, the principle hub of California's water distribution system.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2008	$58,811,000
Budget estimate, 2009	59,400,000
Committee recommendation	59,400,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is $59,400,000. This is the same as the budget request.

The policy and administrative expenses program provides for the executive direction and management of all reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, DC, Denver, Colorado, and five regional offices. The Denver office and regional offices charge individual projects or activities for direct beneficial services and related administrative and technical costs. These charges are covered under other appropriations.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Section 201. The bill includes language regarding the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson Reservoir in California.

Section 202. The bill includes language that states requirements for purchase or lease of water from the Middle Rio Grande or Carlsbad Projects in New Mexico.

Section 203. The bill includes language regarding Drought Emergency Assistance.

Section 204. The bill includes language concerning the Water for America Initiative.

Section 205. The bill includes language regarding the Rio Grande Collaborative water operations team.

Section 206. The bill includes language concerning expending funds from the Desert Terminus Lakes program for the Truckee River Settlement Act.

Section 207. The bill includes language concerning expending funds from the Desert Terminus Lakes program.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT [LDRD]

The Committee recognizes the invaluable role the Laboratory Directed Research and Development [LDRD] program provides to the Federal Government and the Nation in general. Discretionary LDRD investments have been and will continue to be responsive to the energy needs of the Nation, as evidenced by recent R&D projects in materials science, optoelectronics, computer science, and high energy density physics. Cutting-edge LDRD research provides the science base for energy-specific applications such as fuel cells, hydrogen technologies, carbon management, nuclear energy and solid state lighting. In addition, LDRD is the national labs' most important tool for maintaining the vitality of the national labs in support of other national security missions. LDRD enables the labs to hire the "best and brightest" young scientists and engineers and allows them to seek innovative science and technology solutions for current or emerging national security issues, including those of energy security. LDRD investments have been effective in providing solutions for today's energy problems and demonstrate the inherent flexibility of the program to provide national security mission support on a very timely basis. Energy climate research needs can best be addressed by continuing a vibrant LDRD program at the national laboratories.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The Committee requires the Department to promptly and fully inform the Committee when a change in program execution or funding is required during the fiscal year. A reprogramming includes the reallocation of funds from one activity to another within an appropriation, or any significant departure from a program, project, or activity described in the agency's budget justification, as presented to and approved or modified by Congress in an appropriations act or the accompanying statement of managers or report. For construction projects, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project identified in the justifications to another or a significant change in the scope of an approved project.

Reprogrammings should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change program, project, or activity allocations specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the act or report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require such changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee and be fully explained and justified.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Appropriations, 2008	$1,722,407,000
Budget estimate, 2009	1,255,393,000
Committee recommendation	1,928,259,000

The Committee recommendation is $1,928,259,000 for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, $672,866,000 above the President's request. The Department's request for the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy program is $467,014,000 less than the fiscal year 2008 appropriation. The reduction is driven by the complete elimination of the Weatherization Assistance Program (−$227,222,000), but also reflects large cuts to Hydrogen R&D (−$64,849,000) and the National Renewable Energy Laboratories Facilities and Infrastructure (−$62,194,000) subprograms. This Committee continues to support a broad and ambitious research, development and deployment program that covers a variety of technological approaches to solve this Nation's energy problems. Our recommendation, therefore, restores most of the administration's reductions and increases some areas beyond the request. In addition, this Committee recognizes that the Department may carry out international cooperative agreements, including the U.S.-Israeli energy cooperation agreement as described in the Energy Independence and Security Act, section 917, as long as these agreements are consistent with activities described in the congressional budget justification. The Committee recommends $5,000,000 to support the U.S.-Israeli energy cooperation agreement.

Local Government and Tribal Technology Demonstrations.—The Committee provides $50,000,000 and recommends establishment of a new, competitive grant program that funds city government-led, county government-led, and/or tribal nations-led demonstration projects capable of reducing electricity demand involving public and private partnerships. The Department shall prioritize projects that have substantial local cost-share match, that are replicable in the future under market conditions after demonstration of cost/benefit advantages, and that meet goals of greenhouse gas and/or water use reductions. The Committee recommends that each project achieve at least a 50 percent reduction in energy usage. The Committee recommends each grant not exceed $5,000,000 per project and the total Federal share of each project be capped at 50 percent.

Hydrogen Technology.—The Committee recommends $175,000,000, a total of $28,787,000 above the request. The Committee agrees with the Department's proposal to transfer several subprograms from the Hydrogen budget to the Vehicles Technology budget in fiscal year 2009. With this increase, the Committee's recommendation for all hydrogen programs in the Department's fiscal year 2009 budget amounts to $296,500,000.

Of the increased funding, $22,000,000 is applied to Hydrogen Production and Delivery R&D, which supports development of hydrogen fuel from various sources such as wind, solar, or biomass. While the program has used natural gas to meet the 2015 production-cost goal, clearly that is not enough. Renewable hydrogen remains a critical element of our future energy system and our Nation's security. A total of $11,500,000 is provided for Systems Analysis, $3,787,000 above the request, so that model validation refine-

ment and analysis of selected cross-cutting issues for multiple production pathways is not deferred, as proposed by the administration. Finally, $3,000,000 is provided for Manufacturing R&D, which is $3,000,000 above the request. Manufacturing R&D must be conducted in parallel with technology development to commercialize new technologies through a domestic supplier base as expeditiously as possible.

Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D.—The Committee recommends $235,000,000, an increase of $10,000,000 above the request. With the additional funds, the Department should pursue development of biofuels from non-food sources, especially those with the largest potential to sequester industrial carbon-dioxide, such as algae, that are also compatible with gasoline and diesel fuels. These biofuels will be developed from a variety of renewable feedstocks, including algae, that exhibit greater than 50 percent greenhouse gas benefits compared to conventional hydrocarbon fuels. This research should include demonstrations using brackish water.

The Committee also recommends that the Department expand its Thermochemical Platform research and development to focus on conversion of biomass to bio-crude, particularly upgrading these bio-crudes to refinery grade feedstocks that compliment the existing petroleum refining and fuel distribution infrastructure. This expanded research and development program is an important part of expanding research collaboration between the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and Washington State University, in a new Bioproducts, Sciences and Engineering Laboratory in Richland, Washington.

Solar Energy.—The Committee recommends $229,000,000, an increase of $72,880,000 over the President's request. A total of $59,495,000 of this increase is transferred from the Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences program. The distribution of the $229,000,000 for Solar Energy is as follows: $156,833,000 for Photovoltaic Energy Systems; $50,000,000 for Concentrating Solar Power; and $22,167,000 for Solar Heating and Lighting.

Wind Energy.—The recommendation is $62,500,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the request. With the increase, this office should work with the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability to develop better models and transmission interconnection systems with the purpose of increasing the ease of adding electricity from wind to the grid. The Committee has provided a budget increase in the Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability program to assist the Wind Energy program by providing support for the key area of transmission, which is needed to take electricity generated by wind power to the marketplace.

Within available funds, the program shall establish a manufacturing initiative jointly with the Industrial Technologies Program focusing on manufacturing issues for the rapidly growing wind energy industry.

Geothermal Technology.—The recommendation for Geothermal Technology is $30,000,000, the same as the administration's request, which is already $10,182,000 above fiscal year 2008. The Committee understands that workforce and educational activities are critical to the future of the geothermal industry, and the De-

partment's future budget requests should include funding for these needs.

The Committee encourages the Department to focus its efforts on research and development of Enhanced Geothermal Systems. However, we recognize that there is significant near term crossover benefit for both the enhanced and existing hydrothermal systems—for example, through pursuit of geothermal mapping, existing hydrothermal systems marketers may find new areas to place capacity.

Water Power Energy R&D.—The Committee recommends $30,000,000, a total of $27,000,000 above the request. With the additional funding, this Committee directs the Department to accelerate the comprehensive resource assessment of water power in the United States and accelerate the technology characterizations, with the goal of completing them in fiscal year 2009, 1 year sooner than projected in the budget. The Department should also carry out the establishment of one National Marine Renewable Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Center as described in the Energy Independence and Security Act [EISA], section 634. The Committee recognizes ocean and tidal power research efforts as identified in the EISA and directs the Department, working with the Department of Commerce, as indicated in EISA section 633, to utilize the DOE's only marine sciences laboratory to undertake a research and development program to expand marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy programs.

Vehicle Technologies.—The Committee provides $293,000,000, an increase of $71,914,000 over the request. Consistent with the EISA section 641(g), the Committee provides an additional $50,543,000, for a new total of $100,000,000, for vehicle energy storage systems demonstrations aimed at developing novel, high capacity energy storage, onboard management, integration into electric drive vehicle platforms and the grid, and new technologies and processes that reduce manufacturing costs. These cost-shared demonstrations are to be conducted through consortia. Another $15,000,000 of the increase is provided to Fuels Technology subprogram, bringing its total to $31,122,000. These funds will expand and accelerate testing of intermediate fuel blends (15 percent-20 percent ethanol mixed with 80 percent-85 percent gasoline) on vehicles, other engines, and infrastructure components to provide data on how these blends may affect materials, durability, performance, and emissions and alleviate supply/demand imbalances. Work should be done in coordination with the Biomass Program. The remaining $6,371,000 of the increase is provided to the Safety Codes and Standards subprogram to facilitate efforts in quantitative risk assessment, component and system level testing, leak detection technologies, and fuel quality R&D, for a variety of fuels and technologies. Finally, the Department is directed to continue research efforts in the area of computational predictive engineering of lightweight thermoplastic polymer composites.

Building Technologies.—The Committee provides $176,481,000, an increase of $52,716,000 over the request. Commercial Buildings Integration is increased $27,000,000 to a total of $40,000,000, for expansion of partnerships with leading laboratories, universities, and DOE selected consortia, consistent with EISA section 422.

Emerging Technologies is provided an increase of $10,000,000, for a new total of $49,465,000. The entire $10,000,000 is for solid state lighting research and development. Residential Buildings Integration is provided a $5,000,000 increase, for a new total of $31,900,000. The increased funding will enable the program to move more quickly into testing strategies that achieve a 50 percent reduction in the energy used in a home. Technology Validation and Market Introduction is increased $9,716,000, for a new total of $34,116,000. Of this increase, $8,000,000 is for building energy codes for continued assistance to States and the balance of $1,716,000 is for expansion of the Energy Star labeling for energy efficient and renewable technologies that deliver energy savings and reduced emissions. The remaining $1,000,000 of the increase is provided to evaluate models for accelerating and advancing appliance standards and test procedures, specifically evaluating international regulatory models that can be considered for adoption in the United States.

Industrial Technologies.—The Committee provides $65,119,000, an increase of $3,000,000 over the request. The increase provides for organizing a cross-cutting manufacturing initiative for clean energy technologies developed in other Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy programs, including wind turbine gearboxes, carbon fiber and other lightweight materials for automotive applications, sensors and controls, and other technologies that benefit from improved manufacturing techniques.

Federal Energy Management Program.—The Committee recommends $22,000,000, the same as the request.

Facilities and Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends $36,982,000, an increase of $23,000,000 above the budget request. The Department is directed to use $12,000,000 of the increase to execute an existing memorandum of agreement with Sandia National Laboratories for supercomputing equipment and capacity to support the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy-based mission needs. Numerical simulation on high performance computers enables the study of complex engineering systems and natural phenomena that would be too expensive, or even impossible, to study by direct experimentation. This resource will be located at Sandia to take advantage of the more than 20 years of experience with high performance computing hardware and software development. The Committee expects both laboratories to contribute in their respective areas of scientific and engineering excellence. The remaining $11,000,000 is provided for continuing two construction projects at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory—$4,000,000 is provided for the Energy Systems Integration Facility, bringing the total funding for the project to $8,000,000; $7,000,000 is provided for the South Table Mountain Infrastructure project, which is $7,000,000 above the request.

Weatherization Assistance Program.—The Committee provides $201,181,000, a total of $201,181,000 above the request. Of that amount, $200,000,000 is for weatherization grants and $1,181,000 is for training and technical assistance.

Intergovernmental Activities.—The Committee provides $50,000,000 for the State Energy Program Grants, $6,000,000 for

Tribal Energy Activities and $5,000,000 for Renewable Energy Production Incentives.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $121,846,000, the same as the budget request, which will assist the Office by providing 30 new hires to fill critical skill gaps commensurate with the technical workload increases to programs.

Program Support.—The Committee recommends $15,000,000, which is $5,000,000 less than the request, but still $4,199,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted appropriation. The Committee supports the program's efforts to enhance its Planning, Analysis, and Evaluation subprogram and especially its efforts to improve its Technology Advancement and Outreach subprogram, but because of overall budget constraints cannot fully support the request.

Use of Prior Year Balances.—The Committee does not accept the proposal to reduce this request by using $738,000 of prior year uncosted balances.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee includes $124,150,000 for the following list of projects that provide for research, development, and demonstration of energy efficiency or renewable energy technologies or programs. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation
Algal-Base Renewable Energy for Nevada, Desert Research Institute, Reno, NV for the development of algal-based energy system	750,000
Alternative Energy for Higher Education, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, for a solar energy project	$1,200,000
Alternative Energy School of the Future, Clark County, Andre Agassi Charitable Foundation, Las Vegas, NV, for a solar fuel cell system	1,250,000
Alternative Fuel Cell Membranes for National Energy Independence, University of Southern Mississippi, USM, MS, for advanced fuel cell membrane research	1,000,000
Anaerobic Digester and Combined Heat Power Project, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, MD, for a study on anaerobic power generation	600,000
Bioenergy and Bioproducts Laboratory, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, to conduct research on biofuel conversion, biofuel testing, and certification	1,000,000
Bioenergy Demonstration Project: Value-Added Products from Renewable Fuels, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE, for research on the byproducts of biofuel production	2,000,000
Biogas Center of Excellence, Michigan Economic Development Corporation, Flint, MI, for a center for the production of biogas	1,000,000
Biomass Energy Resources Center, Biomass Energy Resource Center, Montpelier, VT, for the installation of new small scale technology	1,500,000
Biomass Gasification Research and Development Project, Port of Benton, Richland, WA, for the gasification and research of biomass	1,000,000
Biorefinery for Ethanol, Chemicals, Animal Feed and Biomaterials from Sugarcane Bagasse, Louisiana State University Agricultural Center, Baton Rouge, LA, for a biomass conversion project	1,000,000
Bipolar Wafer Cell NiMH Lithium Ion Battery, Electro Energy, Danbury, CT, to advance wafer cell battery technology	2,000,000
Carbon Neutral Green Campus, Nevada State College, Clark County, NV for environmental sustainability	250,000
Center for Biomass Utilization, University of North Dakota Energy and Environmental Research Center, Grand Forks, ND, for research on biomass production and its byproducts	2,000,000
Center for Nanoscale Energy, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, for nanomaterials research	5,000,000
Central Vermont Recovered Biomass Facility, Vermont Sustainable Jobs Fund, Montpelier, VT, for a digester system	1,000,000
Chariton Valley Densification—Phase II, Chariton Valley RC&D, Inc, Centerville, IA, for research on switchgrass	1,000,000
Christmas Valley Renewable Energy Development, Oregon Department of Energy, Salem, OR, for the development of a renewable energy-producing facility	400,000
City of Miami Green Initiative, City of Miami, Miami, FL, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and fuel consumption in the city	1,000,000

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation
Clean Power Energy Research Consortium, Nicholls State University, Louisiana State University, University of New Orleans, Tulane University, Southern University, University of Louisiana, Thibodeaux, LA, for a joint venture of Louisiana universities to promote alternative fuels	2,000,000
Clean Technology Commercialization Initiative, Ben Franklin Technology Partners, Harrisburg, PA, to support clean and alternative energy technologies	1,000,000
Coastal Ohio Wind Project, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, for wind energy research	1,000,000
Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, The Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, Inc., St. Simons Island, N/A, to support university-industry research and technology transfer projects	1,000,000
Cooling Heating and Power and Bio-Fuel Application Center, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, to conduct research on increased energy efficiency through the use of electric and thermal delivery systems	2,000,000
Development of Biofuels Using Ionic Transfer Membranes, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Clark County, NV for biofuels research	600,000
Development of High Yield Tropical Feedstocks, University of Hawaii, College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, Honolulu, HI, for a tropical bioenergy project	1,500,000
Dueco Plug-In Hybrid Engines, Dueco Inc., Waukesha, WI, for new plug-in hybrid electric propulsion technology	2,000,000
Energy Production Through Anaerobic Digestion, New Jersey Department of Agriculture, Trenton, NJ, for an-aerobic digester technology	500,000
Fluid Flow Optimization of Aerogel Blanket Manufacturing Process, Aspen Aerogels, Northborough, MA, for energy-efficient insulation research	1,500,000
Forestry biofuel statewide Collaboration Center, Michigan Economic Development Corporation, Upper Peninsula, MI, to improve the supply chain for woody biomass	1,500,000
Genetic Improvements of Switchgrass, University of Rhode Island at Kingston, Kingston, RI, to improve switchgrass for use as a biofuel	1,500,000
Geothermal Power Generation Plant, Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT), Klamath Falls, OR, for a geothermal power plant	1,600,000
Great Basin Center for Geothermal Energy, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, to continue and expand the Center's activities in promoting geothermal power	650,000
Great Plains Wind Power Test Facility, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, for the testing, characterization, and improvement of grid-connected wind turbines and wind-driven water desalination systems	2,000,000
Hawaii-New Mexico Sustainable Energy Security Partnership, Hawaii Natural Energy Institute, Honolulu,, HI, to continue the analysis and technology efforts of the Partnership	3,000,000
Hollow Glass Microspheres, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Clark County, NV for hydrogen storage methods research	550,000
Hydroelectric Power Generation, Quincy, City of Quincy, Quincy, IL, for Quincy's efforts to install hydroelectric plants at locks and dams	500,000
Hydrogen Storage System for Vehicular Propulsion, Delaware State U., Dover, Delaware State University, Dover, DE, to develop a hydrogen storage system	1,500,000
Integrated Solar Energy Windows, PPG Industries, Pittsburgh, PA, for the development of next generation, transparent photovoltaic (PV) solar cells	1,000,000
Integrated Sustainability Initiative, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, to promote campus sustainability	1,000,000
Kansas Biofuels Certification Laboratory, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, for analysis of biofuels, measuring emissions of biofuels, and research of biofuel cells	1,000,000
La Samilla Solar Trough Storage Project, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, for solar trough storage advancement	2,000,000
Landfill Gas Utilization Plant, County of Chautauqua, Chautauqua County, NY, for landfill-gas power generation	2,000,000
Lightweight Composites for Heavy-Duty Vehicles and Hydrogen Storage, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, to advance the use of lightweight composite materials for vehicles	500,000
Maine Tidal Power Initiative, University of Maine, Orono, ME, to develop protocols that allow locations in northern New England to be prioritized for tidal energy development	1,000,000
MidSouth/Southeast Bioenergy Consortium, MidSouth/Southeast Bioenergy Consortium, Fayetteville, AR, for research on the byproducts of biofuel production	1,500,000
Multifunctional Solar Energy Systems Research, Utah State University, Logan, UT, for research and development of multifunctional electricity-producing systems	1,000,000
National Agriculture-Based Industrial Lubricants (NABL), Biomass (IA), University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA, for the advancement of biobased industrial and automotive lubricants and for biofuels services	600,000
National Center for Commercialization of Bioenergy, Kansas State University, Olathe, KS, for the commercialization of near market bioenergy technologies to meet national renewable fuel mandates	750,000

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation
National Wind Energy Center, University of Houston, Houston, TX, to focus on developing advanced offshore wind technology for cost-effective, renewable clean energy production	2,000,000
Nevada Institute for Renewable Energy Commercialization, Incline Village, NV, for the promotion of renewable energy in business	500,000
New School Green Building, The New School, New York, NY, for an environmentally friendly school facility	2,000,000
North Carolina Center for Automotive Research, North Carolina Center for Automotive Research, Jackson, NC, to equip the Chassis Dynamics Laboratory	1,000,000
Offshore Renewable Energy, Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council, Wakefield, RI, to develop an Ocean Special Area Management Plan	700,000
Ohio Advanced Energy Manufacturing Center (OAEMC), Edison Welding Institute, Columbus, OH, for an advanced energy manufacturing program	1,000,000
Oregon Solar Highway, Oregon Department of Transportation, Salem, OR, to demonstrate the feasibility of large-scale deployment of solar photovoltaic technology	1,000,000
Pecos Valley Biomass Energy Project, NM, Clark County School District, Roswell, NM, for a bio-methane gas system	2,500,000
Placer County Biomass Utilization Pilot Project, Placer County, Auburn, CA, for a biomass facility	1,500,000
Pope/Douglas Third Combuster Expansion, Pope/Douglas Solid Waste Management, Alexandria, MN, to increase waste to energy capacity	1,000,000
Power Grid Reliability and Security, Washington State University, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, to create solutions for grid reliability and security enhancements	1,000,000
Renewable Energy Clean Air Project, County of Koochiching, International Falls, MN, for syn-gas energy production	700,000
Renewable Energy Development Venture, Pacific International Center for High Technology Research, Honolulu, HI, to expand potential energy resources in the State of Hawaii	2,500,000
Renewable Energy Feasibility Study, City of Trenton, Trenton, NJ, to examine possible renewable energy sources	500,000
Renewable Energy Integration and Development, Clark and Washoe Counties, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), Las Vegas, NV, for a renewable energy center	2,000,000
Renewable/Sustainable Biomass Project, Alaska Village Initiatives, Alaska, AK, for use of biomass for energy generation in rural Alaska villages	500,000
Sandia National Lab Concentrating Solar, Sandia National Lab, Albuquerque, NM, for concentrating solar activities	3,000,000
Solar Panels and Environmental Education, County of Essex, Newark, NJ, for the installation of solar panels to further environmental education	1,000,000
Solar Park Pilot Project, City of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, FL, to develop a renewable energy plan for the City's parks	1,000,000
Solar Power Generation, Township of Cherry Hill, Cherry Hill, NJ, for solar technology	300,000
Solar Thermal Demonstration Project, Clark County School District, Clark County, NV, for solar technology for schools	1,250,000
Southern Regional Center for Lightweight Innovative Design, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, to reduce emissions and posture the US for less reliance on foreign oil	4,000,000
Southwest Alaska Regional Geothermal Energy Project, Naknek Electrical Association, Naknek, AK, for an exploratory well for a 25MW geothermal plant to serve villages in rural Alaska	3,000,000
Stamford Waste-to-Energy Project (CT), City of Stamford, Stamford, CT, to convert dried sludge into clean, renewable energy	2,000,000
Strategic Biomass Initiative, Mississippi Technology Alliance, Jackson, MS, to encourage bioenergy industry in the southeast	500,000
Sun Grant Initiative, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD, for regional biomass feedstock research and education	4,000,000
Sustainable Energy for Homes and Businesses, Vermont Department of Public Service, Montpelier, VT, to support Vermont's wind and solar program	750,000
Sustainable Energy for Vermont Schools Competition, Vermont Superintendents Association, Montpelier, VT, for school-based projects to highlight sustainable energy technologies	900,000
Sustainable Energy Research Center, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, to develop new engineering and scientific knowledge and serve as a catalyst to create sustainable energy industries in the southeastern United States	10,500,000
Sustainable Las Vegas, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Clark County, NV to increase conservation and sustainability in Las Vegas	1,000,000
The Institute for Energy, Environment and Sustainability, Johnson County Community College, Overland Park, KS, to serve as a resource for local education, business and civic entities and would include education and training in renewable energy	750,000

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation
Thin Film Photovoltaic Research & Development, Omega Optical, Brattleboro, VT, to research solar panel technology	1,000,000
Tidal Energy Study, Snohomish County PUD No. 1, Everett, WA, for environmental studies of possible tidal energy pilot plants	500,000
Transportable Emissions Testing Lab, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, for mobile labs that test bus emissions	1,000,000
USD Catalysis Group for Alternative Energy, South Dakota Catalysis Group, Vermilion, SD, for the development of metal oxide and carbon catalyzed reactions technologies	1,100,000
Vermont Biofuels Initiative, Vermont Sustainable Jobs Fund, Montpelier, VT, to test the feasibility of different uses of biodiesel	1,500,000
Wind Turbine Model and Pilot Project for Alternative Energy, University of Delaware, Newark, DE, for a shore-side wind turbine	1,500,000

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

Appropriations, 2008	$138,556,000
Budget estimate, 2009	134,000,000
Committee recommendation	166,900,000

The Committee recommendation for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability is $166,900,000, an increase of $32,900,000 above the request. Of the increase, $10,000,000 is provided for Visualization and Controls, bringing the program total to $35,305,000, to accelerate the development of a resilient power grid through inherently secure control systems and wide-area monitoring tools. Additional funds help implement a national wide-area grid monitoring system in support of the independent system operators. Another $4,000,000 of the increase is applied to the Energy Storage and Power Electronics line, bringing that subprogram total to $17,403,000. The increase supports enhanced efforts on power electronic activities. Finally, an additional $6,000,000 is provided for Renewable and Distributed Systems Integration subprogram, bringing the total to $39,306,000. This funding supports renewable energy grid integration activities facilitating increased deployment of renewables and other clean energy sources to power our Nation. In particular, the Committee encourages continuation of the electricity transmission, distribution, and energy assurance activities including the Modern Grid Initiative, and its Phase 2 Development Field Tests for the Allegheny Power Initiative, and encourages the Department to continue research and development in grid reliability and renewable energy integration at the Electricity Infrastructure Operations Center at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee includes $12,900,000 above the request for the following list of projects that provide for research, development, and demonstration of electricity delivery and energy reliability technologies or programs. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation
Alternate Fuel for Cement Processing, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, to focus on the integration of the burning process into existing kiln systems in Lafarge plants, maximization of burn efficiency and minimization of waste/discharge	$1,500,000
Center of Excellence Lab, Bismarck State College, Bismarck, ND, to develop a state-of-the art lab	1,400,000
Energy Development and Reliability, Bismarck State College, Bismarck, ND, to promote and advance the region's energy industry	300,000
Integrated Distribution Management System, Southern Company, Birmingham, AL, to provide seamlessly integrated set of information systems providing all of the major functionality needed to operate an electric distribution system	1,500,000
Iowa Stored Energy Plant, Iowa Associations of Municipal Utilities, Ankeny, IA, for compressed air energy storage project	1,500,000
Navajo Electrification Demonstration Program, Navajo Tribal Utility Authority, Fort Defiance, AZ, to provide electric power to homes on the reservation	2,000,000
North Dakota Energy Workforce Development, Bismarck State College, Bismarck, ND, for a workforce development programs	1,900,000
San Mateo County Solar Genesis Project, County of San Mateo, Redwood City, CA, for a solar power electric generation facility	1,500,000
SmartGrid Integration Lab, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, CO, to demonstrate core smart grid capabilities	1,000,000
Technology Development, Red River Valley Research Corridor, Grand Forks, ND, to promote and advance the research, development and commercialization activities occurring in North Dakota's Red River Valley Research Corridor	300,000

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Appropriations, 2008	$961,665,000
Budget estimate, 2009	853,644,000
Committee recommendation	803,000,000

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy research and development includes a total of $803,000,000.

Integrated University Program.—The Committee provides $15,000,000 for a new Integrated University Program. The Committee is concerned about the lack of stable support for the nuclear engineering programs across the Nation. The Office of Nuclear Energy's University Program has been repeatedly restructured and elements of this program where moved to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission last year. To be the effective source of innovation and highly trained engineers and scientists that the Nation needs, our nuclear engineering programs must have sustained support for multiyear research projects and modern curricula. The needs go beyond nuclear energy with pressing shortfalls in trained professionals capable of supporting crucial nuclear nonproliferation missions such as nuclear forensics and international safeguards.

The Committee provides the Office of Nuclear Energy [NE], the Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC], and Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation [DNN] $15,000,000 each (for a total of $45,000,000) for a new Integrated University Program. Of this amount, $10,000,000 shall be used by each organization to support university research and development in areas relevant to the organization's mission; and $5,000,000 will be used by each organization to support a Nuclear Science and Engineering Grant Program. The Grant Program will be coordinated and jointly implemented by the NE, NRC, and DNN. It will support multiyear research projects

that do not align with programmatic missions but are critical to maintaining the discipline of nuclear science and engineering. The Office of Nuclear Energy shall provide a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on how the NE, NRC, and DNN will coordinate the Integrated University Program and provide a stable source of funding for nuclear engineering university programs.

Nuclear Power 2010.—The Committee recommends $241,600,000 to support the development of license applications for new nuclear power plant designs under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's combined Construction and Operating License process. This is the same amount as the budget request.

Generation IV.—The Committee recommends $70,000,000 for the Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative, the same as the request.

Nuclear Hydrogen Initiative.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for nuclear hydrogen research and development.

Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative.—The Committee recommends $229,700,000 for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative to support the development of advanced spent fuel separation processes and fuel fabrication technologies. The funds should support a balanced portfolio of technologies for managing actinide inventories utilizing both fast and thermal reactors. Improving methods and capabilities for developing and qualifying recycled fuels should be priority. Advanced materials modeling and simulation capabilities should be utilized to aid this effort. No funding is provided for grid appropriate reactors.

The Committee, consistent with the recommendation in the Fiscal year 2008 Conference report, continues to provide additional investment in laboratory facilities. Within the available funds, $15,000,000 is provided to support upgrades to Los Alamos hot cells and the materials test station, and $15,000,000 to Oak Ridge to upgrade its radiological facilities.

RADIOLOGICAL FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

Radiological Facilities.—The Committee recommends $41,000,000, an increase of $2,300,000. The additional $2,300,000 will be added to the "Research reactor infrastructure" program for a total of $6,000,000 to support university research reactors, including reactor instrumentation and equipment upgrades.

IDAHO FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends $119,700,000, an increase of $15,000,000 to support nuclear research and development at the Idaho National Laboratory. Funds will be used to support the Advanced Test Reactor National Scientific User Facility program at INL. These funds will support university and industry related research programs and allow for capability enhancements to support nuclear fuels and materials research. The funds will also be used for maintenance and infrastructure investment to support the INL mission as a preeminent nuclear energy R&D laboratory.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends $73,000,000 for Program Direction, a decrease of $7,500,000. The decrease is based upon the Committee's decision to put the Mixed Oxide Facility under the Nuclear Nonproliferation program.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee includes $3,000,000 for the following list of projects.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED NUCLEAR ENERGY PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation
Technologies Ventures Corporation, Technologies Ventures Corporation, Albuquerque, NM, for technology transfer activities	$3,000,000

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The Committee recommends the transfer of funds of $149,000,000 in the Clean Coal Technology to fossil energy research and development.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2008	$742,838,000
Budget estimate, 2009	754,030,000
Committee recommendation	876,730,000

The Committee recommendation for Fossil Energy Research and Development is $876,730,000, an increase of $122,700,000 above the request.

The Committee believes that the Department has failed to recognize and stress the importance of restoring a sustained and balanced commitment to fossil energy research and development. The Committee feels that the Department has failed to fully recognize the significance of the Carbon Sequestration Program as evidenced in recent findings of a panel of scientific experts from the International Energy Agency [IEA]. The IEA validated that the Department's Regional Carbon Sequestration Partnerships and their large-scale CO_2 tests are the world's most ambitious. The Committee has provided additional funding to sustain technology development and to send a clear message that the Congress is serious about making a long-term investment in fossil energy.

Clean Coal Power Initiative.—The Committee recommends $232,300,000 for the Clean Coal Power Initiative. The Committee is disappointed that the Department has underfunded its commitment and thus delayed the current and future rounds of the Clean Coal Power Initiative. This lack of commitment leaves an even wider gap in the development and demonstration of advanced clean coal technologies. These technology advancements are critically important for addressing the existing fleet of coal-fired power plants as well as the next generation of fossil-fuel powered facilities. The Committee anticipates that more than $600,000,000 will be available for the Round 3 solicitation and encourages the Department to proceed with issuing this solicitation for carbon capture and stor-

age and innovative uses of carbon dioxide. The Office of Fossil Energy is required to provide the Committee a status report on all nine awarded projects for the Clean Coal Power Initiative's Round 1 and 2, including completed and ongoing projects.

FutureGen.—The Committee recommends no funding for the FutureGen account. The Committee has supported the technical and scientific efforts behind the FutureGen initiative for the past 5 years but does not support funding for the "restructured" effort this year. The Committee has instead provided funds for the Clean Coal Power Initiative at a level of $147,300,000 more than the budget request. The Committee has distributed the remaining $8,700,000 of the budget request within Fossil Energy Research and Development. The Committee understands that $134,000,000 of unobligated balances remain in this account and are set aside for future use with this program but are not available until March 2009.

Fuels and Power Systems.—The Committee recommends $412,132,000 for fuels and power systems, an increase of $29,400,000. The recommendation includes $50,000,000 for Innovations for Existing Plants [IEP]. The IEP program is directed to continue carbon capture research for the existing fleet. Of the IEP funds, $12,000,000 is for Federal laboratories, in collaboration with research institutions, to continue to conduct research and development on the critical link between water and fossil energy extraction and utilization and how different regions of the country can employ water efficiency technology. In light of the new Clean Air Mercury Rule, the Committee supports $5,000,000 in additional research for a broader mercury program. The Committee understands the Department has been moving forward on the Ramgen Compression Initiative, and it is the Committee's expectation that the Department fully complete the development and testing of the Ramgen CO_2 compressor. The Committee recommends $63,000,000 for the Advanced Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle activities and $30,000,000 for Advanced Turbines. The Committee recommends $149,132,000 for Carbon Sequestration activities. Additional funds are needed for the Regional Partnerships to carry out the large-scale projects that were awarded in fiscal year 2008 into field activities, in order to accelerate wide-scale deployment of advanced clean coal technologies with carbon capture and storage. The Committee encourages the Office of Fossil Energy to continue research on the co-sequestration of carbon dioxide and criteria pollutants with other offices and agencies. The Office of Fossil Energy shall be the lead office for these activities. Within available funds, the Department is encouraged to study geologic resources that have the potential to be regionally and nationally significant in order to reduce data gaps. Within in available funds for Carbon Sequestration, the Committee encourages the program to continue to study carbon dioxide accelerated growth algae technology to recycle carbon and produce fuels. The Committee recommends $30,000,000 for Fuels to support both fuels from coal liquids and hydrogen. Within available funds for Fuels, the Committee recommendation includes adequate funding to continue the integrated coal and biomass research activity to address carbon emissions and technology barrier issues. The Committee recommends $60,000,000 for Fuel Cell Re-

search. The Committee recommends $30,000,000 for Advanced Research. Of this funding, $5,000,000 is for computational energy sciences.

Natural Gas Technologies.—The Committee recommendation includes $20,000,000. Of this amount, $15,000,000 is provided for methane hydrates, and $5,000,000 is for research to continue to develop technology solutions to minimize the impact, or develop treatment technologies for produced water as a by-product of natural gas production.

Oil Technology.—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for Oil Technology. Of this funding, the Committee recommends $1,200,000 to continue support for the Risk Based Management System, a nationwide database for oil and gas regulations and technology developments. The Committee recommends the continuation of the stripper well program.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $152,804,000 for Program Direction, of which $122,054,000 is for the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

Other Programs.—The Committee recommends $9,700,000 for fossil energy environmental restoration. The Committee recommendation is $656,000 for the special recruitment program. The Committee recommendation for plant and capital equipment is $17,748,000, of which $9,848,000 is to be directed to the Morgantown site, $6,900,000 to the Pittsburgh site, and $1,000,000 to the Albany site. The Committee recommendation for cooperative research and development is $5,000,000.

The Committee continues to support the Department's project management efforts and the role of the National Energy Technology Laboratory [NETL], with assistance from the Golden field office, in setting up a successful Project Management Center [PMC]. The Committee encourages the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to continue the collaboration and funding of the PMC with the NETL.

Use of Prior Year Balances.—The Committee supports the use of prior year balances in the amount of $11,310,000 from completed or cancelled construction projects, the same as the budget request.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes $32,700,000 for the following congressionally directed projects.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED FOSSIL ENERGY PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation
Arctic Energy Office, Arctic Energy Office, Fairbanks, AK, for research in fossil energy, natural gas technologies, and oil technologies	$6,000,000
Center for Zero Emissions Research and Technology, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, for research related to carbon sequestration, greenhouse gas emissions, and clean power generation	4,500,000
CO_2 Capture/Sequestration Research, Pennsylvania State University, Centre County, PA, to study carbon capture and sequestration	500,000
Fossil Fuel Research & Development, University of North Dakota Energy and Environmental Research Center, Grand Forks, ND, to address strategic national energy issues	4,000,000
Gulf Of Mexico Hydrates Research Consortium, University of Mississippi, University of Mississippi, MS, to develop and deploy an integrated multi-sensor station on the seafloor in the Gulf of Mexico	1,200,000
Long Term Environmental and Economic Impacts of the Development of a Coal Liquefaction Sector in China, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, for the study of the development of commercial liquefaction plants	500,000

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED FOSSIL ENERGY PROJECTS—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation
Multi-Year Demonstration of Carbon Sequestration in a Deep Saline Reservoir, Xcel Energy, Denver, CO, to determine the feasibility of geologic CO_2 sequestration in a deep saline reservoir	1,500,000
National Center for Hydrogen Technology, University of North Dakota Energy and Environmental Research Center, Grand Forks, ND, for the development of hydrogen technologies	3,000,000
Shale Oil Upgrading Utilizing Ionic Conductive Membranes, Ceramatec, Inc., Salt Lake City, UT, to develop processes for upgrading oil shale, making oil extract high quality and affordable	1,000,000
Solid Oxide Fuel Cells, Siemens Power Generation, Pittsburgh, PA, to support development, construction, and testing of the fuel processing systems	2,000,000
The Center for Advanced Separation Technology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, to support efforts to develop new technologies that reduce the cost of separations in coal, metals, and industrial mining operations	3,000,000
University of Kentucky Coal-Derived Low Energy Materials for Sustainable Construction Project, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, to research alternative uses for coal combustion byproducts	1,000,000
Refining Capacity Study, North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, Mandan, ND, to study refining capacity	500,000
Utah Center for Ultra Clean Coal Utilization & Heavy Oil Research, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, to continue research on the commercial viability and validity of unconventional and clean energy technologies	4,000,000

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

Appropriations, 2008	$20,272,000
Budget estimate, 2009	19,099,000
Committee recommendation	19,099,000

The Committee recommends $19,099,000 for fiscal year 2009, the same as the budget request for the operation of the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves. The Department is directed to operate the field as close to maximum efficiency as possible, given available funds.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

Appropriations, 2008	$186,757,000
Budget estimate, 2009	344,000,000
Committee recommendation	205,000,000

The Committee recommends $205,000,000 for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Of these funds, the Committee directs the Department use $31,507,000 to initiate new site expansion activities and support beyond land acquisition, consistent with the budget request. While the Committee has provided for the operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, it does not support any other expansion activities at this time.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

Appropriations, 2008	$12,335,000
Budget estimate, 2009	9,800,000
Committee recommendation	9,800,000

The Committee recommends $9,800,000, the same as the budget request.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2008	$95,460,000
Budget estimate, 2009	110,595,000
Committee recommendation	110,595,000

The Committee recommends $110,595,000 for the Energy Information Administration.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2008	$182,263,000
Budget estimate, 2009	213,411,000
Committee recommendation	269,411,000

For the Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup program, the Committee recommends $269,411,000, an increase of $56,000,000 above the President's request. The fiscal year 2009 program is underfunded to the point even this administration has admitted that, for the first time in its 20-year history, the cleanup budget request is insufficient to meet its existing regulatory compliance milestones. The result is non-compliance with regulatory agreements and layoffs around the cleanup complex. Thus, the Committee has had to significantly increase our mark in the hope of avoiding those consequences.

Internal Reprogramming Authority.—In fiscal year 2009, Environmental Management may transfer up to $2,000,000, one time, between accounts listed below to reduce health and safety risks, gain cost savings, or complete projects, as long as a program or project is not increased or decreased by more than $2,000,000 in total during the fiscal year. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or to change funding levels for programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the act or report. The Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives and the Senate must be notified within 30 days after the use of this internal reprogramming authority.

The following is a list of account control points for internal reprogramming purposes: West Valley Demonstration Project; Gaseous Diffusion Plants; Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning; Small Sites; and transfers between construction line item(s) and the operating budget within the same site, as applicable.

West Valley Demonstration Project.—The Committee includes $72,900,000 for West Valley, $15,300,000 above the budget request. The Committee provides the additional funding for decontamination and decommissioning of facilities to reduce the surveillance and maintenance costs at the site.

Gaseous Diffusion Plants.—The Committee recommends $92,696,000, a net increase of $11,400,000 at Paducah for completion of the Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion [DUF^6] facility. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommends $34,959,000 for Paducah for operations and $15,400,000 to complete construction of the Depleted Uranium Facility at Paducah, for which the administration did not request any funding. The Committee shifted $4,000,000 from operations to construction activities and provided an additional $11,400,000 to complete construction in fiscal year 2009. The Committee recommends the budget request of $42,337,000 for the Portsmouth facility.

The Committee remains deeply concerned by the Department's inadequate management of the DUF^6 conversion facilities in Paducah, Kentucky and Portsmouth, Ohio. Shortly after the Committee authorized these projects, the Department estimated that construc-

tion would be completed in 2006 and operations would commence shortly thereafter. Despite the Committee's action to provide the Department all the funds requested, these facilities remain incomplete and behind schedule for startup. The Committee is concerned that continued mismanagement will significantly increase costs and needlessly delay the disposal of this hazardous material. Within 60 days of this report, the Department of Energy shall provide this Committee with a final cost and schedule estimate, a description of how it plans to meet that schedule, and how it plans to prevent similar problems in future contracts.

Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning Project.—The Committee recommends $10,755,000, the same as the budget request.

Small Sites.—The Committee includes $90,060,000 for fiscal year 2009, a total of $25,647,000 above the request. Within this account, the Brookhaven National Laboratory is provided $29,015,000, which is $20,582,000 above the request, to continue decontamination and decommissioning of the Graphite Research Reactor and the High Flux Beam Reactor. The Stanford Linear Accelerator Center is provided $7,883,000, which is $3,000,000 above the request, to meet a fiscal year 2009 milestone at risk due to the lack of funding in the request. Moab is provided $32,578,000, an increase of $2,065,000 above the request.

The Committee provides $459,000 to Argonne, $187,000 for the California sites, $12,533,000 for the Energy Technology Engineering Center, $4,400,000 for the Idaho National Laboratory, $1,905,000 for the Los Alamos National Laboratory, and $1,100,000 for Completed Sites/Program Support, all the same as requested.

The Committee has again included bill language regarding the Department's activities at the Energy Technology and Engineering Center, Santa Susana Field Laboratory, in Simi Valley, California. The Committee understands that the Department is working toward, but has not finalized the interagency agreement with the EPA as required in H.R. 2764. It is the expectation of the Committee that this agreement would provide EPA with all the funding necessary to begin the radiological site characterization survey in fiscal year 2008, and that DOE would continue its funding of the survey to its completion, as determined by EPA. The bill language requires the Department to provide EPA with the funding it requires in fiscal year 2009 for ongoing work on the survey.

Uncosted Offset.—The Committee does not accept the proposal to reduce this request by using $653,000 of prior year uncosted balances.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for the following congressionally directed projects.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation
Bioinformatics and Computational Biology Initiative, The University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, to provide data management support for research in genomics and metabolomic programs	1,000,000
Southwest Experimental Fast Oxide Reactor Decommissioning [SEFOR], University of Arkansas in Fayetteville, Fayetteville, AR, for the decommissioning of SEFOR in Strickler, AR	2,000,000

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriations, 2008	$622,162,000
Budget estimate, 2009	480,333,000
Committee recommendation	515,333,000

Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund.—The Committee provides $515,333,000, a total of $35,000,000 above the budget request. Last year's budget reported that the site closure of the East Tennessee Technology Park would be completed in 2010 rather than in 2008, a 2-year slip. This budget now states that completion cannot be expected sooner than 2015, a further delay of 5 years. This Committee recognizes that this schedule slip is solely due to lack of funding in the request; and has, therefore, provided a total of $199,495,000, an increase of $15,265,000, for the decontamination and decommissioning of the East Tennessee Technology Park.

The Committee recommends $115,614,000 for continued cleanup activities at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Paducah, Kentucky. This amount is the same as appropriated in fiscal year 2008 and $19,735,000 over the Department's request. The Committee is concerned that the cuts proposed in the Department's budget will harm cleanup efforts of the plant and this report includes additional funds to accelerate the decontamination and decommissioning of the C–410 building and the West End Smelter. In recent years, this Committee has provided funds above the requested amount, which have been used to accelerate important projects such as the removal of 1,900 uranium tetrafluoride drums and the disposal of all outdoor Designated Material Storage Areas. From the amounts provided, the Committee recommends the Department continue to support research activities designed to address pressing environmental remediation problems at the Paducah site and provide objective data and analysis to stakeholders such as the Department as well as State and Federal regulators.

Uranium/Thorium Reimbursement.—The Committee recommends no funding for this activity, the same as the request.

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2008	$4,017,711,000
Budget estimate, 2009	4,721,969,000
Committee recommendation	4,640,469,000

The Committee recommends $4,640,469,000 for the Office of Science. This is $622,758,000 above fiscal year 2008 and represents the single largest increase for any program in the bill. From within available funds, the Office of Science is directed to retain the Nation's existing capability to produce a wide range of isotopes including californium-252. Consistent with the cost-sharing requirements of Public Law 101–101, the Department is directed to develop a cost recovery strategy to ensure the long-term viability of this program.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The Committee provides $804,960,000 for High Energy Physics. The Committee has long been a strong supporter of the Department's space-based Joint Dark Energy Mission [JDEM] and is

pleased that the recent National Academy of Sciences' Beyond Einstein Program Assessment Committee [BEPAC] judged this mission to be the top priority. The Committee concurs with the view of the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel that the cost cap recently announced may limit the scientific capabilities assumed by the BEPAC review, and that an increase in the budget beyond the current funding scenarios would be justified. The Committee recommends the full budget request of $10,030,000 for conceptual designs for Joint Dark Energy Mission. The Committee recommends full funding of the Non Accelerator Physics, University Research programs and includes $3,200,000 for EXO 200, neurtrinoless double beta decay experiments, an increase of $1,000,000 to complete construction in 2009.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee provides $510,080,000 for Nuclear Physics, the same as the budget request. Within the available funds, the Committee recommends $24,900,000 for the Isotope Production and Applications program. The Committee has been frustrated with the lack of cooperation among the various Federal agencies, which has resulted in no Federal request to sustain this important responsibility in previous years. The Committee recommends $5,000,000 within the available funds for the Research Isotope Development and Production Subprogram to develop and implement a research and production strategy consistent with the National Academy of Science study entitled "State of the Science of Nuclear Medicine." In developing this capability, the Department is encouraged to work with researchers and commercial customers to develop a predictable and reliable supply of isotopes.

The Committee directs the Office of Science to complete a study on the feasibility of expanding the capability of the University of Missouri Research Reactor to supply up to half the United States demand for feedstock medical imaging compounds in the form of molybdenum-99 and technetium-99. The Committee also requests that the Department outline options for preserving U.S. production of californium-252.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee provides $598,540,000 for Biological and Environmental Research, $30,000,000 more than the budget request.

Biological Research.—The Committee recommends $423,613,000, an increase of $10,000,000 to support additional investment in nuclear medicine. The Committee supports the budget request of $48,500,000 for the operation and maintenance of the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory.

Radiochemistry and Instrumentation.—A recent report the National Academy of Sciences, Advancing Nuclear Medicine through Innovation, recommended the enhancement of the Federal commitment to nuclear medicine research. The Committee is concerned that the Department may be looking to move this research in other directions and emphasizes its commitment to nuclear medicine medical application research at the Department of Energy. Within the funds provided, $23,121,000 is for Radiochemistry and Instrumentation. Of the $23,121,000, $17,500,000 is for nuclear medicine

medical application research. The Committee emphasizes its commitment to nuclear medicine medical application research at the Department of Energy. All of the added funds must be awarded competitively in one or more solicitation that includes all sources—universities, the private sector, and Government laboratories.

The Committees support full funding for Testing and Low Dose Research. The Committees also notes that diagnostics are currently in development between the University of New Mexico [UNM] and Los Alamos National Laboratory utilizing the unique capabilities of Las Alamos National Laboratory at the IPF and LANSCE and the radiopharmaceutical expertise of UNM at the Center for Isotopes in Medicine.

Climate Change Research.—The Committee recommends $174,927,000, an increase of $20,000,000 to support improved climate modeling and monitoring within the DOE–NNSA laboratories.

Climate Change Modeling.—The nexus of climate and energy presents enormous challenges to our national security and to our economy. It is imperative that the United States continues to provide strong science leadership that guides policy choices and technology investments. The Committee believes the DOE–NNSA Labs are best equipped to develop and deploy a national system for science-based stewardship that combines advanced modeling, multi-scale monitoring, and impact analysis tools. These labs, with their experience in nuclear weapons nonproliferation and their unique capabilities across a wide range of technical resources are best able to develop and implement this comprehensive climate research strategy. The challenge of certifying the nuclear weapons stockpile in an era of test-ban treaties has produced one of the world's greatest computational resources through the NNSA's Stockpile Stewardship program. These computational capabilities have also been applied to the development of sophisticated global climate models that can assess climate changes far into the future. However, these models are still too coarse to resolve the details of climate change at the scale of watersheds or State boundaries, where many public policy decisions are made. In addition, the models do not capture realistically all of the complex physical processes and feedbacks between the atmosphere, ocean, and land where natural and man-made carbon fluxes are exchanged. The Committee recommends an additional $10,000,000 to support development of modeling strategies to support a comprehensive modeling program and to focus on scaling global models to regional scale to improve the predictive value of these models. Similarly, more formal information science methods must be applied to move from the current state, where predictions of climate models developed by different groups are averaged over a range of emissions scenarios, to a state where uncertainties are systematically reduced for the most important variables through deliberate validation and verification using experiments to measure sensitivities and feedbacks. These techniques have been implemented in the nuclear stockpile stewardship program to provide much stronger confidence in predictions for complex systems.

The DOE–NNSA Labs can also apply their expertise in developing sensors and measurement systems to provide a comprehen-

sive assessment of global carbon fluxes. Improved measurements must feed into models to depict the complex carbon exchanges that occur between the atmosphere, oceans, terrestrial ecosystem, and human activities at a variety of spatial and temporal scales. A global system will require remote sensing and in situ monitoring of atmospheric greenhouse gases and other chemical indicators to allow attribution of sources and sinks. Remote sensing includes satellite sensors that can observe modest changes in greenhouse gases against a high background signal. Methods to observe plume gas signatures associated with carbon fluxes will be necessary to provide source attribution information. The Committee recommends an additional $5,000,000 to support research and development of ground and space based monitoring.

In order to make informed policy decision regarding our energy and water need in the future, the Committee encouraged the Department to apply Laboratory expertise in consequence analysis modeling using complex infrastructure data to assess long-term energy impacts through linkages of climate change with infrastructure. The impacts of energy choices are linked to global markets, and to our financial, energy, electrical, and transportation infrastructure. We must understand the sensitivity of this complex system to different policy options for climate change, including linkages that may lead to costly unintended consequences. The Committee recommends an additional $5,000,000 to develop decision analysis tools that can describe this system at an appropriate level of complexity and integration are required to give rapid insights at regional, national, and global scales on long-term consequences of investments at the intersection of energy technology and climate policy. Because of the inherent sensitivity of the data and potential vulnerabilities, this area requires capabilities at the national security science laboratories.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee provides $1,415,378,000 for Basic Energy Sciences. Of these funds $145,468,000 is provided for construction activities as requested in the budget. The remaining $1,269,910,000 is for research. Within the research funds provided $17,000,000 is for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research [EPSCoR]. Of the decrease, $59,495,000 of basic solar research is moved to the EERE solar energy research and development program.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee provides $368,820,000 for Advanced Scientific Computing Research, the same as the budget request. The Committee is concerned that the Department has limited cooperation between the NNSA and DOE laboratories in supporting the advanced computing architecture and algorithm development. The Committee expects the Office of Science to continue to support joint research through the Institute for Advanced Architecture and Advanced Algorithms.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee provides $493,050,000 for Fusion Energy Sciences, the same as the budget request. The Committee understands the Department's difficult decision to close the National Compact Stellarator Experiment [NCSX] project. The fiscal year 2009 budget request included $20,342,000 for the NCSX. The Department is directed to reallocate these funds as proposed by the Department to the Committee under Scenario II. The Committee understands this means approximately $9,000,000 will be used for orderly closeout of NCSX, $9,250,000 will be used to restore run times for three facilities and support major upgrade work at NSTX, and $2,000,000 will be used to enhance non-NCSX stellarator research. Recent advances in pulse power have renewed interest in nuclear energy systems that utilize both fusion and fission. The Committee directs the Department to work with laboratories and industry to develop a systems concept that identifies the challenges, opportunities and future research path of such a fusion-fission hybrid system.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee provides $110,260,000 to support infrastructure activities, the same as the budget request. The Committee reiterates its strong support for the construction of the Physical Sciences Facility at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory [PNNL]. This project is funded through three separate accounts, all of which have important national missions at PNNL. Notwithstanding this unique funding arrangement, the Committee expects the Under Secretary of Science to take the lead in ensuring that the fiscal year 2010 budget requests are coordinated among all the parties, and will be sufficient to complete the project in that fiscal year.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee provides $80,603,000 for Safeguards and Security activities, the same as the budget request. The program provides funding for physical security, information protection, and cyber security for the national laboratories and facilities of the Office of Science.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee provides $186,695,000 for the Office of Science Program Direction. The reduction from the budget request reflects the Committee's disapproval of the proposed increase in funding for headquarters and the field offices. The Committee supports the $8,916,000 for the Office of Science and Technical Information.

SCIENCE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

These initiatives support the mission of the Department's Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists program. The Committee provides $13,583,000, the same as the budget request.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECTS

The Committee recommendation includes $58,500,000 for the following list of projects.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SCIENCE PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation
Antibodies Research, University of North Dakota Research Foundation, Grand Forks, ND, to research and develop antibodies for disease threats	$2,750,000
Bionanotechnology: Research and Commercialization, Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, LA, for bionanotechnology and biofuels research	1,500,000
Center for Advanced Energy Studies, Idaho National Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID, to conduct a pilot program to demonstrate the Nuclear Science Talent Expansion program	3,000,000
Center for Diagnostic Nanosystems, Marshall University, Huntington, WV, for disease detection and diagnosis research	2,000,000
Center for Nanomedicine and Cellular Delivery, School of Pharmacy, University of MD, Baltimore, MD, for research	750,000
Center of Excellence and Hazardous Materials, Carlsbad, NM, for applied research	2,000,000
Climate Change Modeling Capability, Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, NM, for climate change modeling	5,000,000
Computing Capability, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, to increase supercomputing power	5,000,000
Contrast Media and Wound Closure Reduction Study, University of Mississippi, University of Mississippi, MS, for efficiency in Iodine-based medical imaging for diagnostic procedures	650,000
Facilitating blood-brain barrier research, Seattle Science Foundation, Seattle, WA, for cooperative research	1,500,000
Former Workers Medical Surveillance Programs, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, for medical surveillance, needs assessment and former worker medical screenings	1,000,000
Functional MRI Research, University of Vermont College of Medicine, Burlington, VT, to support MRI research	1,250,000
Intermountain Center for River Restoration and Rehabilitation, Utah State University, Logan, UT, to continue researching river restoration and environmental management	600,000
Marine Systems Research, University of Massachusetts at Boston, Boston, MA, for research into aquatic ecosystems, marine biology, fisheries and mammal sustainability	500,000
Materials and Energy Research Development, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, for environmental and materials research	1,000,000
Matter-Radiation Interactions in Extremes, Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, NM, for advanced materials testing	7,000,000
Mind Institute, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, to advance the understanding of mental illness through advanced brain imaging	12,000,000
Neuroscience research, Dominican University, River Forest, IL, for research in to memory dysfunctions	500,000
Pioneer Valley Life Sciences Institute Biomedical Research, Pioneer Valley Life Science Institute, Springfield, MA, for research programs	500,000
Regenerative medicine, Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science, North Chicago, IL, for regenerative medicine research	500,000
Research into Proton Beam Therapy, Seattle Cancer Care Alliance, Seattle, WA, to research new uses for proton beam therapy	1,500,000
Sandia Nanotechnology Engineering Center, Sandia National Lab, Albuquerque, NM, for nanotechnology engineering activities	5,000,000
Supercapacitors, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, for work to be done in Ostego, NY on supercapacitors	1,500,000
Sustainable Biofuels Development Center, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, to support research efforts in alternative energy technologies	1,500,000

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2008	$187,269,000
Budget estimate, 2009	247,371,000
Committee recommendation	195,390,000

The Committee recommendation for the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management includes $195,390,000 from fees collected by the Secretary which are deposited into the fund established by Public Law 97–425, as amended, and $193,000,000 pro-

vided from the defense appropriation for a total of $388,390,000. This total is $106,352,000 below the request.

The Committee directs the Department to exercise great discretion to ensure that any work undertaken at or near Yucca Mountain is consistent with the requirements contained in section 113(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and elsewhere that no repository construction shall be undertaken prior to the issuance of a repository license by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee provides $1,950,000 for the following list of projects.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation
Cooperative agreement between the Department of Energy and Inyo County, Inyo County, Independence, CA, to complete studies under the cooperative agreement	$1,600,000
Inyo County Affected Unit of Local Government, County of Inyo, Inyo County, CA, to conduct scientific oversight responsibilities and participate in licensing activities	350,000

INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2008	$5,459,000
Budget estimate, 2009	19,880,000
Committee recommendation	19,880,000

OFFSETTING RECEIPTS

Appropriations, 2008	−$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009	−19,880,000
Committee recommendation	−19,880,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2008	$4,459,000
Budget estimate, 2009	
Committee recommendation	

The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008 authorized the Department to issue loan guarantees under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 until September 30, 2009. The budget request proposes to extend authorization for $20,000,000,000 for eligible projects other than nuclear power facilities through fiscal year 2010 and $18,500,000,000 for eligible nuclear power facilities through fiscal year 2011. The Committee recommends a no-year limitation on the authorization for the entire $38,500,000,000 for all projects.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 2008	$309,662,000
Budget estimate, 2009	272,144,000
Committee recommendation	272,144,000

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2008	−$161,247,000
Budget estimate, 2009	−117,317,000
Committee recommendation	−117,317,000

The Committee recommends $272,144,000 for Departmental Administration, a net appropriation of $154,827,000. The Departmental Administration account funds eleven Department-wide management organizations support administrative functions such as human resources, accounting, budgeting, workforce diversity and project management activities.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2008	$46,057,000
Budget estimate, 2009	51,927,000
Committee recommendation	51,927,000

For the Office of Inspector General, the Committee recommends $51,927,000 consistent with the budget request. The Office of Inspector General identifies opportunities for cost savings and operational efficiencies and provides the Department of Energy with the assurance that those attempting to defraud the Government are apprehended.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2008	$6,297,466,000
Budget estimate, 2009	6,618,079,000
Committee recommendation	6,524,579,000

The Committee recommends $6,524,579,000 for National Nuclear Security Administration Weapon Activities. This is $93,500,000 below the request and $227,113,000 above current year.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

Life Extension Programs.—The Committee recommends $211,385,000 for the Life Extension Program, the same as the budget request.

Stockpile Systems.—The Committee recommends $338,682,000 for the Stockpile Systems account, the same as the budget request.

Reliable Replacement Warhead.—The Committee recommends no funds for the Reliable Replacement Warhead.

Weapons Dismantlement.—The Committee recommends $205,712,000, an increase of $22,000,000 above the request and $71,037,000 over current year levels. Within the Operations and Maintenance Activities, the Committee recommends $138,822,000, an increase of $22,000,000. The Committee understands that delays with the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility [PDCF] has created a 4- to 6-year gap between the time when PDCF can produce feedstock and when it will be required for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility. Within the available funds, the Committee recommends an additional $22,000,000 toward expanded operations of the AIRES line to ensure there is adequate feedstock

available when the MOX facility begins operations. In addition, the Committee expects the NNSA to undertake efforts to identify ways to reduce production of by-product and waste material, lower the dose exposure to workers and achieve operational cost savings. The Committee recommends $66,890,000 as requested for the construction request 99–D–144, the Pit disassembly and conversion facility, SRS. The Committee strongly urges the Department to develop updated cost estimates from the original estimates provided in 2006. Further, the NNSA should analyze and report on whether more timely and more cost-effective alternatives to the PDCF exist within the existing NNSA complex.

Stockpile Services.—The Committee recommends $888,376,000 for Stockpile Services, a decrease of $43,560,000. The Committee provides $10,000,000 for Pit Manufacturing Capability, a decrease of $43,560,000. The $10,000,000 is to be used to fund mission transfers from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory to Los Alamos National Laboratory as proposed in the request.

CAMPAIGNS

The campaigns provide the foundation for the experimental science-based activities that support the NNSA Stockpile Stewardship mission. Research supported by the programs provide data that is used with the super computing capabilities at each of the laboratories needed to support the life extension program and to certify to the President the confidence of the nuclear deterrent.

Science Campaign.—The Committee recommends $331,070,000 for the Science Campaign, an increase of $8,000,000. Within these funds, $82,413,000 is recommended for Primary Assessment Technologies, an increase of $8,000,000 to be used for to support subcritical experiments and to support fielding and diagnostics of Powder Gun, JASPER gas gun, the Borolo experiment, and the ongoing series of Phoenix experiments. The Committee recommends $28,734,000, to support the Dynamic Plutonium Experiments an increase of $5,000,000 to support additional experiments in order to understand the detailed physics of primary boost by 2015. The Committee continues to support the Advance Certification program to increase the confidence in changes to warhead design to increase the safety and reliability margins of the stockpile without underground testing. The Committee recommends $20,000,000 for Advanced Certification activities. The Committee recommends $29,418,000 for Advanced Radiography, consistent with the requested level. The Committee is pleased that work on the second beam-line at the DARHT facility is completed and it is beginning to produce extraordinary experimental hydrodynamic test data. The Committee recommends $79,292,000 for Secondary Assessment Technologies as requested. Test readiness is decreased to $5,408,000.

Engineering Campaign.—The Committee recommends $162,742,000 for the Engineering Campaign, an increase of $20,000,000. The Committee believes the Engineering Campaign offers the best opportunity to explore, develop and deploy state-of-the-art use control and surety devices to our stockpile. The Committee has provided the resources to rapidly develop innovative engineering solutions to support advanced use denial as well as weap-

ons surveillance sensors that will allow for more accurate assessment of the safety and reliability of the stockpile. The Committee recognizes there are broad applications beyond on-weapons controls and encourages the NNSA to look at other applications including securing special nuclear material and nonproliferation applications. Enhanced Surety is provided $45,641,000, an increase of $10,000,000 to support research and development of enhanced surety applications consistent with the 2007 JASON Reliable Replacement Warhead study Recommendation 2(a) to develop a "physical understanding of enhanced surety features." Weapons Systems is provided $17,105,000, the same as the request. Nuclear survivability is provided $21,753,000 consistent with the request. Enhanced surveillance is provided $78,243,000, an increase of $10,000,000 to support additional research of micro devices that will improve the real time surveillance of the existing stockpile, as well as other security applications. Within the additional funds, the Committee also recommends an increase in the University Robotics program of $1,000,000 to be used to enhance the request of $2,100,000.

Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign.—The Committee recommends $453,242,000 for the ICF campaign activities. This is an increase of $32,000,000.

Ignition.—The Committee recommends $103,644,000, consistent with the budget request.

NIF Diagnostics, Cryogenics and Experimental Support.—The Committee provides $68,248,000 as requested.

Pulsed Power Inertial Confinement Fusion.—The Committee recommends $10,920,000, an increase of 2,000,000 to support for development of the Linear Transformer Driver concept.

Joint Program in High Energy Density.—The Committee supports the budget request to fund a joint program with the Office of Science to support joint research utilizing NNSA facilities.

Facility Operations and Target Production.—The Committee recommends $210,384,000, an increase of $30,000,000. Of this increase $15,000,000 is for National Ignition Facility operations and target production and an increase of $15,000,000 to support single shift operations on the Z machine and to explore advanced concepts.

NIF Assembly and Installation.—$56,899,000 is provided, as requested, to support this budgeted activity.

Construction.—No funding is provided for NIF construction, consistent with the request.

Advanced Simulation and Computing.—The Committee is frustrated by the lack of information regarding the computing strategy for the NNSA laboratories in this budget. The budget lacks specifics regarding the acquisition priorities and budget to support new computing platforms. How computing time will be allocated and the existing computing workload divided among the labs remains unclear. The Committee requests that the NNSA provide a written report outlining its shared computing strategy to address these issues. The Committee expects this strategy to have the benefit of an independent review and be submitted to the Senate Energy and Water Development Subcommittee within 6 months after enactment.

While the Office of Science supports a strategy to expand its leadership in computing capabilities and capacity, the Committee is concerned about the declining NNSA investment in computing platforms needed to sustain the computing capability at each the three national security labs. Advanced computing capabilities are critical to each of our national laboratories, enabling a wide range of programmatic activities. The Committee has recommended new climate change modeling responsibilities for the national labs, and computational modeling and simulation will play a very big role in the success of this program. It is imperative the NNSA labs have the capability to support this and other missions. The President has requested $171,000,000 for computational systems, which is $13,000,000 below current year levels. Even more troubling is the out-year funding proposed in this budget which falls to an average of $126,000,000 during years 2010 to 2014. This is nearly $60,000,000 below current year levels and is insufficient to meet our needs in the areas of national security, advanced engineering, climate change, nuclear physics and biology, all major scientific priorities for the Department of Energy and NNSA.

The Committee understands that NNSA is planning to spend $42,000,000 for the Sequoia system, although this figure is not identified in the budget request. The total estimated cost of this system is $142,000,000 for the base system with an option for $35,000,000 for additional memory making it the most expensive NNSA computer acquisition to date. The Committee is concerned about the cost of this platform in light of the declining budgets for the ASC program. The Committee does not believe that the administration has requested sufficient funding to support the Sequoia acquisition as well as upgrade computing capacity at each of the labs and make the investments in future platforms necessary to sustain advanced computing capabilities at each of the three weapons labs. Prior to the release of any funding for the Sequoia system in fiscal year 2009, the Committee directs the NNSA to provide a report explaining the out year computing acquisition strategy and how, within the existing 5-year budget plan, the Department intends to fulfill the proposed capacity systems acquisition, upgrades of the Red Storm system and provide for the acquisition of future advanced computing systems. The Committee does support the budget request of $15,000,000 to develop the new Zia platform under the new memorandum of agreement between Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories.

The Committee recommends $573,742,000 for the Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign, an increase of $12,000,000 above the budget request. Within available funding, the Department is directed to continue to fund the Institute for Advanced Architecture and Algorithms at $7,000,000 and an additional $5,000,000 is to provide for operations of the Red Storm system to expand it uses for national security problems. The Committee supports the budget request for the Los Alamos Roadrunner Computing platform.

Readiness Campaign.—The Committee recommends $158,037,000 for the Readiness Campaign, a decrease of $25,000,000. Within these funds, the Committee recommends the tritium readiness activities be funded at $71,265,000, a decrease of

$11,000,000, due to unobligated balances in this account, stockpile readiness be funded at $21,731,000, a decrease of $7,000,000, and non-nuclear readiness at $33,165,000, a decrease of $7,000,000. The remaining activities are funded at the budget request level.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

The Committee recommends $1,703,745,000, a reduction of $21,778,000. This funding is used to support the operations and maintenance of the NNSA laboratories, productions facility, equipment purchases and personnel. Of these funds:

Operations of Facilities.—The Committee recommends $1,193,907,000 for this account. This funding level reflects a reduction of $19,000,000 from the proposed $37,687,000 increase for the Kansas City Plant.

Program Readiness.—The Committee recommends the requested amount of $73,841,000.

Material Recycle and Recovery.—The Committee recommends the requested amount of $72,509,000.

Containers.—The Committee recommends the requested amount of $23,398,000.

Storage.—The Committee recommends the requested amount of $29,846,000.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $310,244,000 a reduction of $2,778,000. The Committee has provided this funding increase to make key investments in laboratory infrastructure and security needs.

Project 09–D–007, LANSCE Reinvestment Project [PED], Los Alamos, New Mexico.—The Committee recommends $35,000,0000, an increase of $30,000,000 to fund the refurbishment designs for this user and experimental facility.

Project 09–D–404, Test Capabilities Revitalization II, Sandia, New Mexico.—The Committee recommends $3,200,000 the same as the budget request.

Project 08–D–801, High Pressure Fire Loop, Pantex, Texas.— The Committee recommends $2,000,000 the same as the request.

—*08–D–802, High Explosives Pressing Facility, Pantex, Texas*.—The Committee recommends $28,233,000 the same as the request.

—*08–D–804, TA–55 Reinvestment Project, Los Alamos, New Mexico*.—The Committee recommends $7,900,000 the same as the request.

—*08–D–804 Ion Beam Laboratory Refurbishment, SNL, Albuquerque, New Mexico*.—The Committee recommends $10,014,000 the same as the request.

—*07–D–140 Project Engineering and Design, Various Locations*.—The Committee recommends $7,446,000 the same as the request.

—*07–D–220 Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility Upgrade Project, LANL, New Mexico*.—The Committee recommends $19,660,000 the same as the request.

—*06–D–140 Project Engineering and Design, Various Locations*.—The Committee recommends $47,083,000 for these projects. Of the amount provided, $8,500,000 is for the TA–55 reinvestment project. For the design of the Uranium Proc-

essing Facility $38,583,000 is provided, the same amount as current year funding and a decrease of $57,578,000 below the request. The Committee does not believe the Department has provided adequate justification to support the Uranium Processing Facility at Y–12 and has reprogrammed funding from this activity to other higher priorities in the past. The Committee notes the Cost Analysis Improvement Group has identified potential long-term cost-savings by constructing the UPF facility at another existing NNSA complex site. The Committee is concerned the NNSA is not giving this issue vigorous consideration.

—*06–D–420 NTS Replace Fire Stations 1 & 2, Nevada Test Site, Nevada.*—The Committee recommends $9,340,000, the same as the request.

—*05–D–402, Beryllium Capability Project, Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee*.—The Committee recommends $5,015,000, the same as the request.

—*04–D–125, Chemistry and Metallurgy Facility Replacement Project, Los Alamos, New Mexico*.—The Committee recommends $125,000,000 for this project, an increase of $24,800,000. The recommendation provides additional funding to make up for funding shortfalls in previous This facility allows for the consolidation of the NNSA's plutonium analytical chemistry and actinide research activities and replaces the exiting facility which sits atop an active seismic fault. The Committee is sensitive to the fact that the rising cost of materials such as concrete and steel has increased project cost estimates by over 30 percent for this project. The Committee is also aware of the fact that changes in the seismic requirements have required significant design changes that include 4 foot thick walls and doubling the thickness of the concrete slab to 10 feet.

—*04–D–128, TA–18 Mission Relocation Project, Los Alamos, New Mexico*.—The Committee recommends $10,353,000, the same as the request.

SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Committee recommendation for the Secure Transportation Asset program is $221,072,000 as requested. This organization provides an invaluable service is responsible for the safe and secure transport of our nuclear weapons, weapons components and special nuclear material.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS INCIDENT RESPONSE

The Committee recommends full funding for the nuclear weapons incident response program. The committee provides $221,936,000 as requested.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION

The Committee provides $163,549,000 for Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization activities, a decrease of $6,000,000 in operations and maintenance. This program was developed to reduce the backlog in deferred maintenance of aging infrastructure facili-

ties throughout the complex. The old facilities continue to be a drain on resources and should be demolished or disposed of as quickly as possible.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS AND OPERATIONS

The Committee recommends $28,316,000 for environmental projects and operations, a decrease of $12,271,000.

TRANSFORMATION DISPOSITION

The Committee does not provide any of the $77,391,000 requested to initiate the transformation disposition program. The Committee agrees with the goals of the new program, but notes with significant frustration that while the Department of Energy and Office of Management and Budget managed to find $77,391,000 for decommissioning and demolition of these non-contaminated buildings under the NNSA's control, the two agencies at the same time proposed hundreds of millions in cuts to ongoing D&D work of radiological contaminated buildings under the control of the Office of Environmental Management [EM]. The EM controlled buildings are contaminated and present a threat to human health and the environment. The administration argues these NNSA transformation disposition funds will lead to cost savings by decreasing hotel costs. However, the same logic applies to the EM program. On balance, the Committee does not see the logic in DOE and OMB's priorities between these two programs D&D activities.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation for the Safeguards and Security program is $859,839,000 as requested.

Defense Nuclear Security.—The Committee recommends $690,217,000 as requested.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $47,111,000 as requested to support the following projects:

—*08–D–701 Nuclear Materials S&S Upgrade Project Los Alamos National Laboratory.*—The Committee provides $46,000,000 as requested.

—*05–D–170 Project Engineering and Design, Various Locations.*—The Committee recommends $1,111,000 as requested.

Cyber Security.—The Committee provides $122,511,000 as requested.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECTS

The Committee recommends $3,500,000 for the following list of projects.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED WEAPONS ACTIVITIES PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation
Arrowhead Center, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM, to promote prosperity in New Mexico through economic development	$1,000,000
Electronic Record for Worker Safety and Health, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Clark County to help the Nevada Site Office improve responses to DOE worker claims	1,500,000
Renewable Energy Planning, National Nuclear Security Administration, Nevada Test Site, NV, for planning to maximize renewable energy production at the Site	500,000

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED WEAPONS ACTIVITIES PROJECTS—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation
Restore Manhattan Project Sites, Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, NM, for historic preservation	500,000

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriations, 2008	[1] $1,657,996
Budget estimate, 2009	1,247,966
Committee recommendation	1,909,056

[1] Includes $322,000,000 in reallocated prior year balances.

The Committee recommends $1,909,056,000, an increase of $175,000,000 above the request and $251,060,000 above current year levels. The Committee has restored funding for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility as it continues to serve a significant nonproliferation objective. The Committee recommends a significant upgrade in the Nation's technical capability to deal with proliferation threats by focusing greater investment in laboratory capabilities and improving the capabilities available to IAEA inspectors. Significant funding has also been provided to accelerate efforts to repatriate nuclear material from around the world and provide for its secure storage or elimination. The Committee has provided $15,000,000 to Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation to support its participation in an Integrated University Program. The Committee recommends $10,000,000 of this amount to be used to support university programs in technical areas vital to the nonproliferation mission, including nuclear forensics and international nuclear safeguards. In addition, not less than $5,000,000 of this amount will be used for grants to support research projects that do not align with programmatic missions but are critical to maintaining the discipline of nuclear science and engineering.

NONPROLIFERATION AND VERIFACTION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends $350,091,000, an increase of $75,000,000 above the request. The additional funds will be provided to increase our capabilities in proliferation detection. Of this amount, $30,000,000 is provided to support sustained, multi-year funding for detection research, including investments in simulation and data analysis capabilities relevant to the nonproliferation and international safeguards missions. NNSA should take advantage of the significant investments in advanced computing and algorithm development at the national laboratories for its nonproliferation programs. The Committee remains concerned that despite Congressional direction, additional funds have been used to reinforce existing efforts rather than to increase the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation's role in investing in core capabilities and infrastructure. Within the available increase, the Committee recommends $20,000,000 for a more effective nuclear forensic and attribution capability. A recent American Association for the Advancement of Science report concludes that our technical ability to provide decision makers with critical analyses in a timely manner needs improvement. Both our pre-detonation and post-detonation evaluation capabilities must be strengthened. We also have critical shortages

in personnel with key skills such as radiochemistry. Within the additional funds, $10,000,000 is provided for nuclear explosion monitoring directed at expanding nuclear explosion monitoring for very low yield nuclear testing around the world. The Committee directs the Department to utilize not less than an additional $5,000,000 to competitively fund an integrated suite of research, technology development and demonstration projects including infrasound, hydroacoustic, and seismic technologies for nuclear explosion monitoring. An additional $10,000,000 is provided to support the Integrated University Program. The Committee recommendation includes the request of $13,147,000 to continue construction of the Physical Sciences Laboratory at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The Committee recommends $175,467,000, an increase of $35,000,000 above the request and $25,474,000 above current year levels. Within the additional funds $20,000,000 is available to support the Next Generation Safeguards Initiative; $10,000,000 to be available to support disablement and material removal efforts in North Korea or other emerging threats, and $5,000,000 to support the Integrated University Program.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS PROTECTION AND COOPERATION

The Committee recommends $429,694,000 consistent with the request. The Committee has provided this office with significant funding increases in the past and supports the mission of this office.

ELIMINATION OF WEAPONS-GRADE PLUTONIUM PRODUCTION

The Committee recommends $141,299,000 consistent with the request.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The Committee recommends $528,782,000, consistent with the budget request. The Committee believes the nonproliferation mission remains the overall objective of this project and has restored the funding to Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.

U.S. Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition.—The Committee recommends $40,774,000 consistent with the budget request. Consistent with the budget request, the Committee has included $39,274,000 for the research reactor fuel project and the reliable fuel supply project. By September 2009, the Department expects to have completed the downblending of nearly all of the 17.4 metric tons of HEU for the reliable fuel supply program. The Committee expects the Department to provide a written report by the end of the fiscal year to update the Committee on how the Department intends to utilize the reliable fuel supply and under what terms and conditions this material will be made available to other nations. Further, the Committee encourages the Department to consider possible domestic needs as well consistent with the fiscal year 2008 conference report.

Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility.—The Committee recommends $19,200,000 to support operations and maintenance including the development of the feedstock and testing of fuel assemblies as requested and $467,808,000 for construction and other project costs, consistent with the budget request. The Committee understands that the deep cuts to the program in fiscal year 2008 will increase the total cost and result in delay in the completion of this project but encourages the NNSA do its best to safely accelerate completion of this project.

GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

The Committee recommends $284,641,000, an increase of $65,000,000 above the request and $86,416,000 above current year levels. Of the additional funding $20,000,000 is provided to support the development of high density fuels to replace HEU cores; and an additional $45,000,000 is provided to accelerate the removal of proliferation sensitive materials from around the world. The NNSA has recovered more than 16,000 radiological sources in an effort to reduce the threat of attacks involving radiological dispersion devices. While the recovered sources are no longer needed by their previous owners, some may still find useful application and could be used to reduce the demand for new source material. We should look to maximize the recycling of such material and minimize the need for foreign imports. Using available funds a report should be produced on the benefits and costs of establishing a process for the reuse of recovered radiological sources for industrial or other legitimate purposes.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2008	$774,686,000
Budget estimate, 2009	828,054,000
Committee recommendation	828,054,000

Through the Naval Reactors program, the National Nuclear Security Administration is working to provide the U.S. Navy with nuclear propulsion plants that are capable of responding to the challenges of 21st century security concerns. The Committee recommends $828,054,000 for the Naval Reactors program.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 2008	$402,137,000
Budget estimate, 2009	404,081,000
Committee recommendation	404,081,000

The Committee recommends $404,081,000 for the Office of the Administrator, the same as the President's request.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2008	$5,349,325,000
Budget estimate, 2009	5,297,256,000
Committee recommendation	5,771,506,000

The Committee recommendation for Defense Environmental Cleanup is $5,771,506,000, an increase of $474,250,000 above the

President's request. The Committee is disappointed with the administration's fiscal year 2009 budget proposal, which is $167,000,000 less than the veto-threat constrained fiscal year 2008 appropriation. The fiscal year 2009 program is underfunded to the point even this administration has admitted that, for the first time in its 20-year history, the cleanup budget request is insufficient to meet its existing regulatory compliance milestones. In testimony presented to the Committee this past April, the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management admitted this budget was as much as $900,000,000 short of supporting regulatory compliance milestones. The result is a budget request that, if unchanged, would result immediately in non-compliance with regulatory agreements and layoffs around the cleanup complex. Thus, our Committee has had to significantly increase, to the tune of $554,250,000, our recommendation for the entire Environmental Cleanup program in the hope of avoiding many of those consequences. We warn the Department not to rely on the Congress to solve its legal obligations in the future, and we expect a budget submittal that is legally compliant in fiscal year 2010.

Reprogramming Control Levels.—In fiscal year 2009, the Environmental Management program may transfer funding between projects within the controls listed below using guidance contained in the Department's budget execution manual (DOE M 135.1–1A, Chapter IV). If the amount of a single transfer, or the cumulative amount of multiple transfers, between projects within the control level exceeds 25 percent of the fiscal year 2009 appropriated level, the Environmental Management program must notify both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 30 days after the transfer. The Committee recommends the following reprogramming control points for fiscal year 2009:

—Closure sites;
—Savannah River site, 2012 completion projects;
—Savannah River site, 2035 completion projects;
—Savannah River site, tank farm operations projects;
—Waste Isolation Pilot Plant;
—Idaho National Laboratory;
—Oak Ridge Reservation;
—Hanford site; 2012 completion projects;
—Hanford site; 2035 completion projects;
—Office of River Protection, tank farm operations projects;
—Office of River Protection, Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant;
—Program Direction;
—Program Support;
—Technology Development and Deployment;
—All construction line items;
—NNSA sites; and
—Safeguards and Security.

Internal Reprogramming Authority.—Since only a few of the sites above have multiple control points to which the internal reprogramming statute applies, Environmental Management site managers may transfer up to $5,000,000, one time, between accounts listed below to reduce health and safety risks, gain cost savings, or complete projects, as long as a program or project is not

increased or decreased by more than $5,000,000 in total during the fiscal year. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or to change funding levels for programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the act or report. The Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives and the Senate must be notified within 30 days after the use of this internal reprogramming authority.

The following is a list of account control points for internal reprogramming purposes:

—Savannah River site, 2012 completion projects;
—Savannah River site, 2035 completion projects;
—Savannah River site, tank farm operations projects;
—Hanford site; 2012 completion projects;
—Hanford site; 2035 completion projects; and
—Transfers between construction line item(s) and the operating budget within the same site, as applicable.

Closure Sites.—The Committee includes $59,383,000, an increase of $13,500,000 above the request, to assure disposal of the Fernald Byproducts Waste.

Hanford Site.—The Committee includes $1,020,564,000, a total of $168,777,000 above the budget request. Of the increase, $80,577,000 is directed to the River Corridor Closure Project; $9,000,000 is directed to the stabilization and disposition of special nuclear material at the Plutonium Finishing Plant; $45,000,000 is provided for solid waste operations in the 200 Area; and $25,700,000 is for remediation of the groundwater and vadose zone. The Committee notes the Department's continued support for the B-Reactor Museum and the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response [HAMMER] facility, which are provided for within available funds at the site.

Idaho Cleanup Project.—The Committee recommends $465,124,000, which is $33,000,000 over the request. From within available funds, $2,000,000 is provided to continue the national spent fuel program. An increase of $18,000,000 is provided for increased buried transuranic waste retrieval, characterization, and shipping, as required by State agreement. Another $8,000,000 is provided to avoid interrupting currently mobilized decontamination and decommissioning teams which are reducing Environmental Management's site footprint and cost of operation. Finally, $7,000,000 is provided for the exchange of spent nuclear fuel with the Savannah River Site, South Carolina.

NNSA Sites.—The Committee recommendation is $346,084,000, a total of $101,000,000 above the request. The Committee recommends $245,467,000 for cleanup at Los Alamos National Laboratory, $83,000,000 above the request. The increase is necessary to prevent the site from missing agreed upon cleanup milestones in fiscal year 2009. The Committee also provides $75,674,000 for Nevada, $10,000,000 above the request, for characterization and certification of remaining transuranic waste stored at Nevada for disposal at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant; $3,000,000 for the Sandia National Laboratory, $3,000,000 above the request, for Landfill Remediation activities per the regulatory closure requirement; and $5,000,000 above the request for continuing decontamination and decommissioning at the Separations Processing Research Unit.

Oak Ridge Reservation.—The recommendation is $255,000,000, an increase of $17,330,000 above the budget request, $13,330,000 of which will continue decontamination and decommissioning of facilities "owned" by Environmental Management at the Y–12 and Oak Ridge National Laboratory complexes. The remaining $4,000,000 will be used for TSCA Operations through fiscal year 2009 to support Paducah and Portsmouth cleanup efforts.

Office of River Protection.—The Committee provides $1,031,443,000, an increase of $53,000,000 above the request. The entire increase is for supplemental treatment activities and single shell tank retrievals in the tank farms. The Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant is fully supported at $690,000,000.

Savannah River Site.—The Committee includes $1,264,961,000, an increase of $58,536,000 above the budget request. The additional funding will complete Transuranic waste drum shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant; provide for groundwater cleanup (+$11,692,000) and decontamination and decommissioning (+$35,344,000), for packaging special nuclear materials (+$8,000,000) for long term storage; and preparing spent nuclear fuel for exchange with Idaho ($3,500,000).

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant [WIPP].—The recommendation is $231,661,000 for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. The increase of $20,137,000 maintains the fiscal year 2008 level of transuranic waste shipments and receipts at this site.

Program Direction.—The Committee includes $308,765,000, the same as the requested amount.

Program Support.—The Committee includes $33,930,000, the same as the request.

Safeguards and Security.—The Committee recommends $260,341,000. The $9,000,000 increase is for security upgrades at the Canister Storage Building in Hanford, Washington, for special nuclear material that will not be shipped offsite to South Carolina.

Technology Development and Deployment.—The Committee provides $22,250,000.

Federal Contribution to Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.—The recommendation is $463,000,000, the same as the request.

Uncosted Offset.—The Committee does not accept the proposal to reduce this request by using $1,109,000 of prior year uncosted balances.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee includes $9,000,000 for the following list of projects.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation
Characteristics and Clean-up of U.S. Nuclear Legacy, Institute for Clean Energy Technology, Mississippi State, MS, for renewal of the cooperative agreement with the DOE to help expedite the cleanup of the nuclear defense sites	$4,000,000
Water Resources Data, Modeling, and Visualization Center, Desert Research Institute, Washoe County, NV for water research	1,000,000
WIPP Records Archive, WIPP, Carlsbad, NM, for records archiving	4,000,000

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2008	$754,359,000
Budget estimate, 2009	1,335,996,000
Committee recommendation	827,503,000

The Committee recommendation is $827,503,000, for Other Defense Activities, the same as requested, with the exception of the MOX construction project, which is funded under the Nuclear Nonproliferation program. This amount is sufficient to provide for the Office of Health, Safety and Security ($447,918,000), the Office of Legacy Management ($185,981,000), Safeguards and Security for Nuclear Energy's Idaho Site ($78,811,000), Defense Related Administrative Support, which contributes its share toward the Department's administrative costs ($108,190,000), and the Office of Hearings and Appeals ($6,603,000).

The Committee concurs with the budgetary change proposed by the Office of Legacy Management to consolidate its mission funding under a single appropriation. This consolidation leads to efficiencies in managing the approximately 80 former research and production sites, and administering the pension and benefit plans for retired cold war employees.

The Committee also concurs with the change in policy for Nuclear Energy's Safeguards and Security Reimbursable Work, which again can lead to efficiencies in managing and executing the program.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committed recommends $1,050,000 for the following list of projects.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation
Medical Monitoring at Paducah, KY, Portsmouth, OH, and Oak Ridge, TN, Paducah, Portsmouth, and Oak Ridge Medical Monitoring, Paducah, KY, Portsmouth, OH, and Oak Ridge, TN, to provide for continued conventional medical work-ups and lung scans and re-scans for current and former workers	$1,050,000

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2008	$199,171,000
Budget estimate, 2009	247,371,000
Committee recommendation	193,000,000

The Committee recommendation for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal under the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management is $193,000,000. Along with $195,390,000 from fees collected by the Secretary which are deposited into the fund established by Public Law 97–425, as amended, the Committee provides a total of $388,390,000 for fiscal year 2009.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Department of Energy's marketing agency for electric power in the Pacific Northwest. Bonneville provides electricity to a 300,000 square mile service area in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets the

power from Federal hydropower projects in the Northwest, as well as power from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also exchanges and markets surplus power with Canada and California. The Committee recommends no new borrowing authority for BPA during fiscal year 2009.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2008	$6,404,000
Budget estimate, 2009	7,420,000
Committee recommendation	7,420,000

For the Southeastern Power Administration, the Committee recommends $7,420,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee provides $63,522,000 for purchase power and wheeling.

The Southeastern Power Administration markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers projects in 11 Southeastern States. Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through transmission arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2008	$30,165,000
Budget estimate, 2009	28,414,000
Committee recommendation	28,414,000

For the Southwestern Power Administration, the Committee recommends $28,414,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee provides $46,000,000 for purchase power and wheeling.

The Southwestern Power Administration is the marketing agent for the power generated at the Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana, with a total installed capacity of 2,158 megawatts. It operates and maintains some 1,380 miles of transmission lines, 24 generating projects, and 24 substations, and sells its power at wholesale, primarily to publicly and cooperatively-owned electric distribution utilities.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2008	$228,907,000
Budget estimate, 2009	193,346,000
Committee recommendation	218,346,000

The Western Power Administration is responsible for marketing the electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission. Western also operates and maintains a system of transmission lines nearly 17,000 miles long, providing electricity to

15 Central and Western States over a service area of 1.3 million square miles.

The Committee notes that Western Area Power Administration funding for Construction, Rehabilitation, Operations and Maintenance is significantly reduced from prior levels. The budget proposes to offset this reduction by a far greater reliance on use of alternative financing. While direct customer financing is well established there are limits on the availability of this alternative financing mechanism. The Committee is concerned that continued reductions in Western's construction program could impair the reliability of the transmission systems.

The Committee recommends $218,346,000 for the Western Area Power Administration. The total program level for Western in fiscal year 2009 is $901,634,000, which includes $74,544,000 for construction and rehabilitation, $52,365,000 for system power operation and maintenance, $600,960,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and $166,423,000 for program direction. The Committee recommendation includes $7,342,000 for the Utah Mitigation and Conservation Fund.

Offsetting collections total $406,484,000; with the use of $3,366,000 of offsetting collections from the Colorado River Dam Fund (as authorized in Public Law 98–381), this requires a net appropriation of $218,346,000.

An increase in purchase power and wheeling use of receipt authority of $75,000,000, over and above the request of $328,100,000, is needed to provide for increases in cost of power, continuing drought conditions, and for certain unforeseen charges.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriations, 2008	$2,477,000
Budget estimate, 2009	2,959,000
Committee recommendation	2,959,000

The Falcon Dam and Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande River generate power through hydroelectric facilities and sell this power to public utilities through the Western Power Administration. This fund, created in the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, defrays the costs of operation, maintenance, and emergency activities and is administered by the Western Area Power Administration. For the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund, the Committee recommends $2,959,000 the same as the request.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2008	$260,425,000
Budget estimate, 2009	273,400,000
Committee recommendation	273,400,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2008	−$260,425,000
Budget estimate, 2009	−273,400,000
Committee recommendation	−273,400,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY					
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy RDD&D:					
Local Government and Tribal technology demonstration	.....	.....	50,000	+50,000	+50,000
Hydrogen Technology	211,062	146,213	175,000	−36,062	+28,787
Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D	198,180	225,000	235,000	+36,820	+10,000
Solar energy	168,453	156,120	229,000	+60,547	+72,880
Wind energy	49,545	52,500	62,500	+12,955	+10,000
Geothermal technology	19,818	30,000	30,000	+10,182	.....
Water Power Energy	9,909	3,000	30,000	+20,091	+27,000
Vehicle technologies	213,043	221,086	293,000	+79,957	+71,914
Building technologies	108,999	123,765	176,481	+67,482	+52,716
Industrial technologies	64,408	62,119	65,119	+711	+3,000
Federal energy management program	19,818	22,000	22,000	+2,182	.....
Facilities and infrastructure:					
National Renewable Energy Laboratory [NREL]	6,918	9,982	21,982	+15,064	+12,000
NREL Solar equipment recapitalization	7,927	.....	.....	−7,927	.....
Construction:					
08–EE–02 South-table mountain site infrastructure development, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, Co	6,831	.....	7,000	+169	+7,000
08–EE–01 Energy systems integration facility, National Renewal Energy Laboratory, Golden, CO	54,500	4,000	8,000	−46,500	+4,000
Subtotal, Construction	61,331	4,000	15,000	−46,331	+11,000
Subtotal, Facilities and infrastructure	76,176	13,982	36,982	−39,194	+23,000
Program direction	104,057	121,846	121,846	+17,789	.....
Program support	10,801	20,000	15,000	+4,199	−5,000
Subtotal, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy RDD&D	1,254,269	1,197,631	1,541,928	+287,659	+344,297

Federal energy assistance:					
Weatherization assistance	222,713	.....	200,000	−22,713	+200,000
Training and technical assistance	4,509	.....	1,181	−3,328	+1,181
Subtotal, Weatherization	227,222	.....	201,181	−26,041	+201,181
Other:					
State energy program	44,095	50,000	50,000	+5,905	.....
International renewable energy program	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Tribal energy activities	5,945	1,000	6,000	+55	+5,000
Renewable energy production incentive	4,955	.....	5,000	+45	+5,000
Asia pacific	.....	7,500	.....	.....	−7,500
Subtotal, Other	54,995	58,500	61,000	+6,005	+2,500
Subtotal, Federal energy assistance	282,217	58,500	262,181	−20,036	+203,681
Use of prior year balances	.....	−738	.....	.....	+738
Congressionally directed projects	185,921	.....	124,150	−61,771	+124,150
TOTAL, ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	1,722,407	1,255,393	1,928,259	+205,852	+672,866
ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY					
Research and development:					
High temperature superconductivity R&D	27,930	28,186	28,186	+256	.....
Visualization and controls	25,075	25,305	35,305	+10,230	+10,000
Energy storage and power electronics	6,741	13,403	17,403	+10,662	+4,000
Renewable and distributed systems integration	25,466	33,306	39,306	+13,840	+6,000
Subtotal, Research and development	85,212	100,200	120,200	+34,988	+20,000
Operations and analysis	11,451	14,122	14,122	+2,671	.....
Program direction	17,603	19,678	19,678	+2,075	.....
Congressionally directed projects	24,290	.....	12,900	−11,390	+12,900
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY	138,556	134,000	166,900	+28,344	+32,900
NUCLEAR ENERGY					
Research and development:					
Integrated University program	.....	.....	15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Nuclear power 2010	133,771	241,600	241,600	+107,829	.....
Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative	114,917	70,000	70,000	−44,917	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Nuclear hydrogen initiative	9,909	16,600	10,000	+91	−6,600
Advanced fuel cycle initiative	179,353	301,500	229,700	+50,347	−71,800
Subtotal, Research and development	437,950	629,700	566,300	+128,350	−63,400
Infrastructure:					
Radiological facilities management:					
Space and defense infrastructure	30,371	35,000	35,000	+4,629	
Medical isotopes infrastructure	14,828			−14,828	
Research reactor infrastructure	2,920	3,700	6,000	+3,080	+2,300
Oak Ridge nuclear infrastructure					
Subtotal, Radiological facilities management	48,119	38,700	41,000	−7,119	+2,300
INL infrastructure:					
INL Operations and infrastructure	115,935	104,700	119,700	+3,765	+15,000
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	75,261	78,811	78,811	+3,550	
Subtotal, INL Infrastructure	239,315	222,211	239,511	+196	+17,300
Program direction	80,872	80,544	73,000	−7,872	−7,544
Use of prior year balances					
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy	758,137	932,455	878,811	+120,674	−53,644
Funding from other defense activities	−75,261	−78,811	−78,811	−3,550	
Congressional directed projects			3,000	+3,000	+3,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	682,876	853,644	803,000	+120,124	−50,644
OFFICE OF LEGACY MANAGEMENT					
Legacy management	33,872			−33,872	

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY					
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2008	257,000			−257,000	
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2009	−149,000	149,000	149,000	+298,000	
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D [CCPI]	−69,363			+69,363	
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D [CCDI]					
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D	−74,317	−149,000	−149,000	−74,683	
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D (Fuels & Power Systems)	−20,809			+20,809	
TOTAL, CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY	−56,489			+56,489	
FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT					
Clean coal power initiative	69,363	85,000	232,300	+162,937	+147,300
FutureGen	74,317	156,000		−74,317	−156,000
Fuels and Power Systems:					
Innovations for existing plants	36,081	40,000	50,000	+13,919	+10,000
Advanced integrated gasification combined cycle	53,509	69,000	63,000	+9,491	−6,000
Advanced turbines	23,782	28,000	30,000	+6,218	+2,000
Carbon sequestration	118,908	149,132	149,132	+30,224	
Fuels	24,773	10,000	30,000	+5,227	+20,000
Fuel cells	55,490	60,000	60,000	+4,510	
Advanced research	37,159	26,600	30,000	−7,159	+3,400
Subtotal, Fuels and power systems	349,702	382,732	412,132	+62,430	+29,400
Subtotal, Coal	493,382	623,732	644,432	+151,050	+20,700
Natural Gas Technologies	19,818		20,000	+182	+20,000
Petroleum—Oil Technologies	4,954		5,000	+46	+5,000
Program direction	148,597	126,252	152,804	+4,207	+26,552
Plant and Capital Equipment	12,882	5,000	17,748	+4,866	+12,748
Fossil energy environmental restoration	9,483	9,700	9,700	+217	
Special recruitment programs	650	656	656	+6	
Cooperative research and development	4,954		5,000	+46	+5,000
Congressionally directed projects	48,118		32,700	−15,418	+32,700
Use of prior year balances		−11,310	−11,310	−11,310	
TOTAL, FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	742,838	754,030	876,730	+133,892	+122,700
NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES	20,272	19,099	19,099	−1,173	

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE	186,757	346,923	205,000	+18,243	−141,923
Use of prior year balances	.....	−2,923	.....	.....	+2,923
TOTAL, STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE	186,757	344,000	205,000	+18,243	−139,000
NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE	12,335	9,800	9,800	−2,535	.....
ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION	95,460	110,595	110,595	+15,135	.....
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP					
West Valley Demonstration Project	53,900	57,600	72,900	+19,000	+15,300
Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility (WA)	10,248	10,755	10,755	+507	.....
Gaseous Diffusion Plants	37,773	81,296	92,696	+54,923	+11,400
Small Sites	.....	64,413	90,060	+90,060	+25,647
Use of Prior year balances	.....	−653	.....	.....	+653
Congressionally directed projects	.....	.....	3,000	+3,000	+3,000
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	101,921	213,411	269,411	+167,490	+56,000
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND					
Decontamination and decommissioning	602,344	480,333	515,333	−87,011	+35,000
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	19,818	.....	.....	−19,818	.....
TOTAL, UED&D FUND/URANIUM INVENTORY CLEANUP	622,162	480,333	515,333	−106,829	+35,000
SCIENCE					
High energy physics:					
Proton accelerator-based physics	373,274	419,577	419,577	+46,303	.....
Electron accelerator-based physics	78,046	48,772	48,772	−29,274	.....
Non-accelerator physics	61,238	86,482	86,482	+25,244	.....
Theoretical physics	56,391	63,036	63,036	+6,645	.....

Advanced technology R&D	119,368	187,093	187,093	+67,725	
Total, High energy physics	688,317	804,960	804,960	+116,643	
Nuclear physics	415,187	479,019	479,019	+63,832	
Construction:					
07–SC–02 Electron beam ion source Brookhaven National Laboratory, NY	4,162	2,438	2,438	−1,724	
06–SC–01 Project engineering and design [PED] 12 GeV continuous electron beam accelerator facility upgrade, Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator facility (was project 07–SC–001), Newport News, VA	13,377	28,623	28,623	+15,246	
Total, Nuclear physics	432,726	510,080	510,080	+77,354	
Biological and environmental research:					
Biological research	407,530	413,613	423,613	+16,083	+10,000
Climate change research	136,867	154,927	174,927	+38,060	+20,000
Total, Biological and environmental research	544,397	568,540	598,540	+54,143	+30,000
Basic energy sciences:					
Research:					
Materials sciences and engineering research	946,403	1,125,579	1,038,839	+92,436	−86,740
Chemical sciences, geosciences, and energy biosciences	230,234	297,113	231,071	+837	−66,042
Subtotal, Research	1,176,637	1,422,692	1,269,910	+93,273	−152,782
Construction:					
08–SC–01 Advanced light source [ALS] user support building, LBNL, CA	4,954	11,500	11,500	+6,546	
08–SC–10 Project engineering and design [PED] Photon ultrafast laser science and engineering [PULSE] building renovation, SLAC, CA	941			−941	
08–SC–11 Photon ultrafast laser science and engineering [PULSE] building renovation, SLAC, CA	6,391	3,728	3,728	−2,663	
07–SC–06 Project engineering and design [PED] National Synchrotron light source II [NSLS–II]	29,727	93,273	93,273	+63,546	
05–R–320 LINAC coherent light source [LCLS]	50,889	36,967	36,967	−13,922	
705–R–321 Center for functional nanomaterials [BNL]	363			−363	
Subtotal, Construction	93,265	145,468	145,468	+52,203	
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,269,902	1,568,160	1,415,378	+145,476	−152,782
Advanced scientific computing research	351,173	368,820	368,820	+17,647	
Fusion energy sciences program	286,548	493,050	493,050	+206,502	

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Science laboratories infrastructure:					
Laboratories facilities support:					
Infrastructure support:					
Payment in lieu of taxes	1,506	1,385	1,385	−121	.....
Excess facilities disposal	8,748	14,844	14,844	+6,096	.....
Oak Ridge landlord	5,033	5,079	5,079	+46	.....
Subtotal, Infrastructure support	15,287	21,308	21,308	+6,021	.....
Construction:					
09–SC–72 Seismic life-safety, modernization and replacement of general purpose buildings Phase 2, PED/Construction, LBNL	.....	12,495	12,495	+12,495	.....
09–SC–73, Interdisciplinary science building Phase 1, PED, BNL	.....	8,240	8,240	+8,240	.....
09–SC–74, Technology and engineering development facilities PED, TJNAF	.....	3,700	3,700	+3,700	.....
08–SC–71 Modernization of laboratory facilities PED, ORNL	.....	14,103	14,103	+14,103	.....
07–SC–05 Physical science facilities, PNNL	.....	41,155	41,155	+41,155	.....
03–SC–001 Science laboratories infrastructure MEL–001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	49,574	9,259	9,259	−40,315	.....
Subtotal, Construction	49,574	88,952	88,952	+39,378	.....
Total, Science laboratories infrastructure	64,861	110,260	110,260	+45,399	.....
Safeguards and security	75,946	80,603	80,603	+4,657	.....
Science program direction:					
Headquarters	75,525	82,846	75,525	.....	−7,321
Office of Science and Technical Information	.....	8,916	8,916	+8,916	.....
Field offices	102,254	112,151	102,254	.....	−9,897
Total, Science program direction	177,779	203,913	186,695	+8,916	−17,218
Workforce development for teachers and scientists	8,044	13,583	13,583	+5,539	.....

Congressionally directed projects	123,623	.....	58,500	−65,123	+58,500
SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE	4,023,316	4,721,969	4,640,469	+617,153	−81,500
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−5,605	.....	.....	+5,605	.....
TOTAL, SCIENCE	4,017,711	4,721,969	4,640,469	+622,758	−81,500
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL					
Repository program	117,906	172,388	118,457	+551	−53,931
Program direction	69,363	74,983	74,983	+5,620	.....
Congressionally directed projects	.....	.....	1,950	+1,950	+1,950
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	187,269	247,371	195,390	+8,121	−51,981
INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY GUARANTEE PROGRAM					
Administrative operations	5,459	19,880	19,880	+14,421	.....
Offsetting collection	−1,000	−19,880	−19,880	−18,880	.....
Advance appropriation (Public Law 110–161)	42,000	25,000	25,000	−17,000	.....
Proposed change in subsidy cost	.....	355,000	355,000	+355,000	.....
TOTAL, INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY GUARANTEE PROGRAM	46,459	380,000	380,000	+333,541	.....
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION					
Administrative operations:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Office of the Secretary	5,751	5,700	5,700	−51	.....
Chief Financial Officer	41,998	45,048	45,048	+3,050	.....
Management	65,033	67,000	67,000	+1,967	.....
Human capital management	27,986	31,436	31,436	+3,450	.....
Chief Information Officer	47,106	53,738	53,738	+6,632	.....
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,733	4,700	4,700	−33	.....
Economic impact and diversity	5,614	3,545	3,545	−2,069	.....
General Counsel	29,889	31,233	31,233	+1,344	.....
Policy and international affairs	18,831	19,469	19,469	+638	.....
Public affairs	3,339	3,780	3,780	+441	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	250,280	265,649	265,649	+15,369	.....
Program support:					
Minority economic impact	829	855	855	+26	.....
Policy analysis and system studies	621	1,000	1,000	+379	.....
Environmental policy studies	528	531	531	+3	.....
Climate change technology program (prog. supp)	1,059	2,000	2,000	+941	.....
Cybersecurity and secure communications	34,865	34,512	34,512	−353	.....
Corporate management information program	28,164	27,250	27,250	−914	.....
Subtotal, Program support	66,066	66,148	66,148	+82	.....
Total, Administrative operations	316,346	331,797	331,797	+15,451	.....
Cost of work for others	91,420	48,537	48,537	−42,883	.....
SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	407,766	380,334	380,334	−27,432	.....
Funding from other defense activities	−98,104	−108,190	−108,190	−10,086	.....
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	309,662	272,144	272,144	−37,518	.....
Miscellaneous revenues	−161,247	−117,317	−117,317	+43,930	.....
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	148,415	154,827	154,827	+6,412	.....
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	46,057	51,927	51,927	+5,870	.....

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES					
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES:					
Life extension program:					
B61 Life extension program	61,908	2,189	2,189	−59,719	.....
W76 Life extension program	172,213	209,196	209,196	+36,983	.....
Total, Life extension program	234,121	211,385	211,385	−22,736	.....
Stockpile systems:					
B61 Stockpile systems	73,655	80,434	80,434	+6,779	.....
W62 Stockpile systems	2,112	1,645	1,645	−467	.....
W76 Stockpile systems	67,914	68,418	68,418	+504	.....
W78 Stockpile systems	38,245	43,349	43,349	+5,104	.....
W80 Stockpile systems	31,753	32,034	32,034	+281	.....
B83 Stockpile systems	24,534	25,759	25,759	+1,225	.....
W87 Stockpile systems	56,054	37,189	37,189	−18,865	.....
W88 Stockpile systems	45,820	49,854	49,854	+4,034	.....
Total, Stockpile systems	340,087	338,682	338,682	−1,405	.....
Reliable replacement warhead	.....	10,000	.....	.....	−10,000
Weapons dismantlement and disposition:					
Operations and maintenance	134,675	116,822	138,822	+4,147	+22,000
Construction: 99–D–141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, SRS	.....	66,890	66,890	+66,890	.....
Total, Weapons dismantlement and disposition	134,675	183,712	205,712	+71,037	+22,000
Stockpile services:					
Production support	279,529	302,126	302,126	+22,597	.....
Research and development support	32,691	36,231	36,231	+3,540	.....
Research and development certification and safety	178,504	193,375	193,375	+14,871	.....
Management, technology, and production	201,645	201,375	201,375	−270	.....
Pit manufacturing	.....	145,269	145,269	+145,269	.....
Pit manufacturing capability	.....	53,560	10,000	+10,000	−43,560
Total, Stockpile services	692,369	931,936	888,376	+196,007	−43,560
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,401,252	1,675,715	1,644,155	+242,903	−31,560

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Campaigns:					
Science campaign:					
Advanced certification, non-RRW	14,866	20,000	20,000	+5,134	
Primary assessment technologies	62,312	74,413	82,413	+20,101	+8,000
Dynamic plutonium experiments		23,734	28,734	+28,734	+5,000
Dynamic materials properties	96,140	85,805	85,805	−10,335	
Advanced radiography	30,402	29,418	29,418	−984	
Secondary assessment technologies	78,999	79,292	79,292	+293	
Test readiness	4,905	10,408	5,408	+503	−5,000
Subtotal, Science campaigns	287,624	323,070	331,070	+43,446	+8,000
Engineering campaign:					
Enhanced surety, non-RRW	34,137	35,641	45,641	+11,504	+10,000
Weapons system engineering assessment technology	19,314	17,105	17,105	−2,209	
Nuclear survivability	8,644	21,753	21,753	+13,109	
Enhanced surveillance	79,073	68,243	78,243	−830	+10,000
Microsystem and engineering science applications [MESA], other project costs	7,485			−7,485	
Construction:					
08–D–806 Ion beam laboratory refurbishment, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	9,911			−9,911	
01–D–108 Microsystem and engineering science applications [MESA], SNL, Albuquerque, NM	10,984			−10,984	
Subtotal, MESA	28,380			−28,380	
Subtotal, Engineering campaign	169,548	142,742	162,742	−6,806	+20,000
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign:					
Ignition	103,029	103,644	103,644	+615	
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	68,107	68,248	68,248	+141	
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	10,241	8,920	10,920	+679	+2,000
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	3,152	3,147	3,147	−5	
Facility operations and target production	112,012	180,384	210,384	+98,372	+30,000
Inertial fusion technology	29,426			−29,426	

Naval Research Laboratory	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
NIF assembly and installation	134,294	56,899	56,899	−77,395	.....
Subtotal	460,261	421,242	453,242	−7,019	+32,000
Construction: 96–D–111 National ignition facility, LLNL	9,945	.....	.....	−9,945	.....
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	470,206	421,242	453,242	−16,964	+32,000
Advanced simulation and computing	574,537	561,742	573,742	−795	+12,000
Pit manufacturing and certification:					
Pit manufacturing	137,323	.....	.....	−137,323	.....
Pit certification	37,273	.....	.....	−37,273	.....
Pit manufacturing capability	39,235	.....	.....	−39,235	.....
Subtotal, Pit manufacturing and certification	213,831	.....	.....	−213,831	.....
Readiness campaign:					
Stockpile readiness	18,562	28,731	21,731	+3,169	−7,000
High explosives and weapon operations	9,647	8,927	8,927	−720	.....
Nonnuclear readiness	25,103	40,165	33,165	+8,062	−7,000
Tritium readiness	71,831	82,265	71,265	−566	−11,000
Advanced design and production technologies	32,945	22,949	22,949	−9,996	.....
Subtotal, Readiness campaign	158,088	183,037	158,037	−51	−25,000
Total, Campaigns	1,873,834	1,631,833	1,678,833	−195,001	+47,000
Readiness in technical base and facilities [RTBF]:					
Operations of facilities:					
Kansas City Plant	84,702	122,389	103,389	+18,687	−19,000
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	89,303	85,160	85,160	−4,143	.....
Los Alamos National Laboratory	285,025	298,112	298,112	+13,087	.....
Nevada Test Site	64,863	92,203	92,203	+27,340	.....
Pantex	112,813	104,361	104,361	−8,452	.....
Sandia National Laboratory	153,873	127,827	127,827	−26,046	.....
Savannah River Site	85,738	108,114	108,114	+22,376	.....
Y–12 Productions Plant	224,190	216,904	216,904	−7,286	.....
Institutional Site Support	53,948	57,837	57,837	+3,889	.....
Subtotal, operations of facilities	1,154,455	1,212,907	1,193,907	+39,452	−19,000
Program readiness	70,099	73,841	73,841	+3,742	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Material recycle and recovery	71,567	72,509	72,509	+942	
Containers	21,760	23,398	23,398	+1,638	
Storage	34,462	29,846	29,846	−4,616	
Subtotal, RTBF	1,352,343	1,412,501	1,393,501	+41,158	−19,000
Construction:					
09–D–007, LANSCE Refurbishment PED Los Alamos National La, Los Alamos, NM			35,000	+35,000	+35,000
09–D–404, Test capabilities revitalization II, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM		3,200	3,200	+3,200	
08–D–801 High pressure fire loop [HPFL] Pantex Plant, Amerillo, TX	6,866	2,000	2,000	−4,866	
08–D–802 High explosive pressing facility Pantex Plant, Amerillo, TX	15,008	28,233	28,233	+13,225	
08–D–804 TA–55 Reinvestment project, Los Alamos National Laboratory [LANL]	5,885	7,900	7,900	+2,015	
08–D–806 Ion beam laboratory refurbishment, SNL Albuquerque, NM		10,014	10,014	+10,014	
07–D–140 Project engineering and design [PED], various locations	2,452	7,446	7,446	+4,994	
07–D–220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	26,162	19,660	19,660	−6,502	
06–D–140 Project engineering and design [PED], various locations	41,552	104,661	47,083	+5,531	−57,578
06–D–402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV	6,591	9,340	9,340	+2,749	
05–D–140 Project engineering and design [PED], various locations	1,961			−1,961	
05–D–402 Beryllium capability [BEC] project, Y–12 National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN		5,015	5,015	+5,015	
04–D–125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	74,141	100,200	125,000	+50,859	+24,800
04–D–128 TA–18 mission relocation project, Los Alamos Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	28,892	10,353	10,353	−18,539	
01–D–124 HEU materials facility, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	75,528			−75,528	
Subtotal, Construction	285,038	308,022	310,244	+25,206	+2,222
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,637,381	1,720,523	1,703,745	+66,364	−16,778
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization pgm	118,471	99,550	93,550	−24,921	−6,000
Construction:					
08–D–601 Mercury highway, Nevada Test Site, NV	7,651	11,700	11,700	+4,049	
08–D–602 Portable water system upgrades Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	22,070	27,666	27,666	+5,596	
07–D–253 TA 1 heating systems modernization [HSM] Sandia National Laboratory	12,751	15,755	15,755	+3,004	

06–D–601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	2,452	4,000	4,000	+1,548	.....
06–D–602 Gas main and distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	1,863	.....	.....	−1,863	.....
06–D–603 Steam plant life extension project [SLEP], Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN	14,733	10,878	10,878	−3,855	.....
Subtotal, Construction	61,520	69,999	69,999	+8,479	.....
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	179,991	169,549	163,549	−16,442	−6,000
Transformation disposition	.....	77,391	.....	.....	−77,391
Safeguards and security:					
Secure transportation asset:					
Operations and equipment	128,343	131,651	131,651	+3,308	.....
Program direction	83,180	89,421	89,421	+6,241	.....
Subtotal, Secure transportation asset	211,523	221,072	221,072	+9,549	.....
Defense nuclear security	728,123	690,217	690,217	−37,906	.....
Construction:					
08–D–701 Nuclear materials S&S upgrade project Los Alamos National Laboratory	48,550	46,000	46,000	−2,550	.....
05–D–170 Project engineering and design [PED], various locations	7,847	1,111	1,111	−6,736	.....
08–D–702 Material security consolidation project, Idaho National Lab, ID	14,713	.....	.....	−14,713	.....
Subtotal, Construction	71,110	47,111	47,111	−23,999	.....
Subtotal, Defense nuclear security	799,233	737,328	737,328	−61,905	.....
Cybersecurity	100,287	122,511	122,511	+22,224	.....
Total, Safeguards and security	899,520	859,839	859,839	−39,681	.....
Environmental projects and operations: Long term stewardship	8,592	40,587	28,316	+19,724	−12,271
Nuclear weapons incident response	158,655	221,936	221,936	+63,281	.....
Congressionally directed projects	47,232	.....	3,500	−43,732	+3,500
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−34,000	.....	.....	+34,000	.....
Use of prior year balances	−86,514	−366	−366	+86,148	.....
SUBTOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	6,297,466	6,618,079	6,524,579	+227,113	−93,500
Rescission of prior year balances	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	6,297,466	6,618,079	6,524,579	+227,113	−93,500

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION					
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	362,424	261,944	336,944	−25,480	+75,000
Construction:					
07–SC–05 Physical Science Facility, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA	.....	13,147	13,147	+13,147	.....
06–D–180 06–01 Project engineering and design [PED] National Security Laboratory, PNNL	24,772	.....	.....	−24,772	.....
Subtotal, Nonproliferation & verification R&D	387,196	275,091	350,091	−37,105	+75,000
Nonproliferation and international security	149,993	140,467	175,467	+25,474	+35,000
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	624,482	429,694	429,694	−194,788	.....
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	179,940	141,299	141,299	−38,641	.....
Fissile materials disposition:					
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition	.....	40,774	40,774	+40,774	.....
U.S. uranium disposition	66,235	.....	.....	−66,235	.....
Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility:					
Operations and maintenance	.....	19,200	19,200	+19,200	.....
Construction and other project costs: 99–D–143 MOX fuel fabrication facility	.....	467,808	467,808	+467,808	.....
Subtotal, Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility	.....	487,008	487,008	+487,008	.....
Subtotal, U.S. surplus fissile materials disp	66,235	527,782	527,782	+461,547	.....
Russian surplus materials disposition	.....	1,000	1,000	+1,000	.....
Total, Fissile materials disposition	66,235	528,782	528,782	+462,547	.....
Global threat reduction initiative	193,225	219,641	284,641	+91,416	+65,000
International nuclear fuel bank	49,545	.....	.....	−49,545	.....
Congressionally directed projects	7,380	.....	.....	−7,380	.....
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,657,996	1,734,974	1,909,974	+251,978	+175,000

Use of prior year balances	.....	−918	−918	−918	.....
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,657,996	1,734,056	1,909,056	+251,060	+175,000
Rescissions:					
Rescission of prior year balances—Russian Surplus Materials Disposition program	−57,000	.....	.....	+57,000	.....
Rescission of prior year balances—Fissile materials disposition MOX construction line	−115,000	.....	.....	+115,000	.....
Rescission of prior year balances for Emergency Supplemental for fiscal year 1999 (H.R. 4328, Public Law 102–277)	−150,000	.....	.....	+150,000	.....
Total, Rescissions	−322,000	.....	.....	+322,000	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,335,996	1,734,056	1,909,056	+573,060	+175,000
NAVAL REACTORS					
Naval reactors development	732,374	771,600	771,600	+39,226	.....
Construction:					
09–D–190, PED, Infrastructure upgrades, KAPL	.....	1,000	1,000	+1,000	.....
09–D–902, NRF Office Building #2, ECC upgrade, Idaho	.....	8,300	8,300	+8,300	.....
08–D–901 Shipping and receiving and warehouse complex [SRWC], BAPL	8,918	.....	.....	−8,918	.....
08–D–190 Project engineering and design, Expended Core Facility M–290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID	545	300	300	−245	.....
07–D–190 Materials research technology complex [MRTC]	446	12,400	12,400	+11,954	.....
Subtotal, Construction	9,909	22,000	22,000	+12,091	.....
Total, Naval reactors development	742,283	793,600	793,600	+51,317	.....
Program direction	32,403	34,454	34,454	+2,051	.....
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	774,686	828,054	828,054	+53,368	.....
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR					
Office of the Administrator	379,997	404,081	404,081	+24,084	.....
Congressionally directed projects	22,140	.....	.....	−22,140	.....
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	402,137	404,081	404,081	+1,944	.....
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	8,810,285	9,584,270	9,665,770	+855,485	+81,500

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP					
Closure Sites	42,050	45,883	59,383	+17,333	+13,500
Hanford Site:					
Operating projects 2012 accelerated completions	419,189	400,902	490,479	+71,290	+89,577
Operating projects 2035 accelerated completions	467,309	450,885	530,085	+62,776	+79,200
Total, Hanford Site	886,498	851,787	1,020,564	+134,066	+168,777
Idaho National Laboratory	508,358	432,124	465,124	−43,234	+33,000
NNSA:					
NNSA Service Center/SPRU	28,831	16,943	21,943	−6,888	+5,000
Nevada	80,368	65,674	75,674	−4,694	+10,000
California site support	367			−367	
Pantex	20,027			−20,027	
Sandia National Laboratories			3,000	+3,000	+3,000
Los Alamos National Laboratory	152,070	162,467	245,467	+93,397	+83,000
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	281,663	245,084	346,084	+64,421	+101,000
Oak Ridge Reservation	190,535	237,670	255,000	+64,465	+17,330
Office of River Protection:					
Waste treatment & immobilization plant	683,722	690,000	690,000	+6,278	
Tank Farm activities:					
Rad liquid tank waste stabil. and disposition	285,351	288,443	341,443	+56,092	+53,000
River protection community and regulatory support	467			−467	
Subtotal, Tank Farm activities	285,818	288,443	341,443	+55,625	+53,000
Total, Office of River Protection	969,540	978,443	1,031,443	+61,903	+53,000

Savannah River site:					
04–D–423 Container surveillance capability in 235F	10,900			−10,900	
04–D–414 Project Engineering and Design, 105–K		2,032	2,032	+2,032	
Subtotal, 2012 accelerated completions	10,900	2,032	2,032	−8,868	
Operating projects 2035 accelerated completions	509,394	498,651	557,187	+47,793	+58,536
Construction: 08–D–414 Project engineering and design Plutonium Vitrification Facility, VL	991			−991	
Subtotal, 2035 accelerated completions	510,385	498,651	557,187	+46,802	+58,536
Tank Farm activities:					
Rad liquid tank waste stabil. and disposition	513,799	578,218	578,218	+64,419	
05–D–405, Salt waste processing facility	87,199	127,524	127,524	+40,325	
03–D–414, Salt waste processing facility PED SR	9,910			−9,910	
Subtotal, Tank farm activities	610,908	705,742	705,742	+94,834	
Total, Savannah River site	1,132,193	1,206,425	1,264,961	+132,768	+58,536
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	234,585	211,524	231,661	−2,924	+20,137
Program direction	306,941	308,765	308,765	+1,824	
Program support	32,844	33,930	33,930	+1,086	
Safeguards and Security	259,332	251,341	260,341	+1,009	+9,000
Technology development	21,194	32,389	22,250	+1,056	−10,139
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	458,787	463,000	463,000	+4,213	
SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP	5,324,520	5,298,365	5,762,506	+437,986	+464,141
Congressionally directed projects	17,195		9,000	−8,195	+9,000
Use of prior year balances		−1,109			+1,109
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP	5,341,715	5,297,256	5,771,506	+429,791	+474,250
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES					
Health, safety and security:					
Health, safety and security	326,324	347,271	347,271	+20,947	
Program direction	99,137	99,597	99,597	+460	
Total, Health, safety and security	425,461	446,868	446,868	+21,407	

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Office of Legacy Management:					
Legacy management	144,060	174,397	174,397	+30,337	
Program direction	10,901	11,584	11,584	+683	
Total, Office of Legacy Management	154,961	185,981	185,981	+31,020	
Nuclear energy: Infrastructure: Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	75,261	78,811	78,811	+3,550	
Total, Nuclear energy	75,261	78,811	78,811	+3,550	
Defense related administrative support	98,104	108,190	108,190	+10,086	
Office of Hearings and Appeals	4,565	6,603	6,603	+2,038	
Subtotal, Other Defense Activities	758,352	826,453	826,453	+68,101	
Congressionally directed projects			1,050	+1,050	+1,050
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−3,003			+3,003	
Use of prior year balances	−990			+990	
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	754,359	826,453	827,503	+73,144	+1,050
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	199,171	247,371	193,000	−6,171	−54,371
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	15,105,530	15,955,350	16,457,779	+1,352,249	+502,429
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS					
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION:					
Operation and maintenance:					
Purchase power and wheeling	62,215	63,522	63,522	+1,307	
Program direction	6,404	7,420	7,420	+1,016	
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	68,619	70,942	70,942	+2,323	

Less alternative financing (PPW)	−13,802	−14,002	−14,002	−200	
Offsetting collections	−48,413	−49,520	−49,520	−1,107	
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	6,404	7,420	7,420	+1,016	
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION:					
Operation and maintenance:					
Operating expenses	11,892	12,865	12,865	+973	
Purchase power and wheeling	45,000	46,000	46,000	+1,000	
Program direction	22,054	24,330	24,330	+2,276	
Construction	4,269	5,991	5,991	+1,722	
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	83,215	89,186	89,186	+5,971	
Less alternative financing (for program direction)	−877	−2,200	−2,200	−1,323	
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	−6,304	−9,381	−9,381	−3,077	
Less alternative financing (PPW)	−10,000	−11,000	−11,000	−1,000	
Less alternative financing (Const.)	−869	−3,191	−3,191	−2,322	
Offsetting collections	−35,000	−35,000	−35,000		
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	30,165	28,414	28,414	−1,751	
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION:					
Operation and maintenance:					
Construction and rehabilitation	62,419	74,544	74,544	+12,125	
Operation and maintenance	52,873	52,365	52,365	−508	
Purchase power and wheeling	475,254	525,960	600,960	+125,706	+75,000
Program direction	156,128	166,423	166,423	+10,295	
Utah mitigation and conservation	7,114	7,342	7,342	+228	
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	753,788	826,634	901,634	+147,846	+75,000
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	−5,000	−15,499	−15,499	−10,499	
Less alternative financing (for Const.)	−30,690	−72,663	−47,663	−16,973	+25,000
Less alternative financing (for Program direction)	−10,000	−15,800	−15,800	−5,800	
Less alternative financing (for PPW)	−166,552	−197,842	−197,842	−31,290	
Offsetting collections (Public Law 108–477, Public Law 109–103)	−308,702	−328,118	−403,118	−94,416	−75,000
Offsetting collections (Public Law 98–381)	−3,937	−3,366	−3,366	+571	
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	228,907	193,346	218,346	−10,561	+25,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND: Operation and maintenance	2,477	2,959	2,959	+482	
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	267,953	232,139	257,139	−10,814	+25,000
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION:					
Federal energy regulatory commission	260,425	273,400	273,400	+12,975	
FERC revenues	−260,425	−273,400	−273,400	−12,975	
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	24,122,361	25,917,888	27,041,658	+2,919,297	+1,123,770
(Total amount appropriated)	(24,294,361)	(25,743,888)	(26,867,658)	(+2,573,297)	(+1,123,770)
(Rescissions, including emergency funding)	(−322,000)			(+322,000)	
(Deferrals)	(108,000)	(149,000)	(149,000)	(+41,000)	
(Advance appropriation)	(42,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(−17,000)	

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The following list of general provisions is recommended by the Committee. The recommendation includes several provisions which have been included in previous Energy and Water Appropriations Acts and new provisions as follows:

Section 301. Language is included under section 301 to provide incentives for downblending of highly enriched uranium.

Section 302. Language is included under section 302, which prohibits the use of funds in this act to initiate a request for proposal of expression of interest for new programs which have not yet been presented to Congress in the annual budget submission and which have not yet been approved and funded by Congress.

Section 303. Language is included under section 303 which prohibits the use of funds for severance payments under the worker and community transition program under section 3161 of Public Law 102–484.

Section 304. Language is included under section 304 to prohibit the augmentation of several payments under section 3161 of Public Law 102–484 unless a reprogramming request is submitted to Congress.

Section 305. Language is included in section 305, which permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill.

Section 306. Language is included that prohibits the use of funds by the Bonneville Power Administration to enter into energy efficiency contracts outside its service area.

Section 307. This section establishes certain notice and competition requirements for Department of Energy user facilities.

Section 308. Language is included specifically authorizing intelligence activities pending enactment of the fiscal year 2008 Intelligence Authorization Act.

Section 309. Language included in section 309 related to laboratory directed research and development authorizes an increase of 2 percent in laboratory directed research and development funds for the purpose of diversifying the laboratories' activities in the areas of energy security and global climate science and modeling.

Section 310. Language is included regarding transfer authority.

Section 311. The Committee has included a provision related to general plant projects.

Section 312. The Committee has included a provision related to the Reno Hydrogen Fuel Project.

Section 313. The Committee has included a provision related to the integrated university program.

Section 314. The Committee has included a provision related to naming laboratory facilities.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2008	$73,032,000
Budget estimate, 2009	65,000,000
Committee recommendation	85,000,000

Established in 1965, the Appalachian Regional Commission is an economic development agency composed of 13 Appalachian States and a Federal co-chair appointed by the President. For fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends $85,000,000 for the ARC, of which $6,325,000 is for salaries and expenses and $71,675,000 is for area development and $7,000,000 is for local development districts.

Area Development and Technical Assistant Program funds are used to increase job opportunities and income, improve education and health, strengthen infrastructure, and for the Appalachian Highway System. Such funds are allocated by formula, with assistance targeted to the most distressed and underdeveloped areas.

Local Development Districts Program funds assist local governments in promoting sustainable community and economic development in the Appalachian region.

The Committee recognizes the importance of trade and investment opportunities to the Appalachian Region and is encouraged by the findings in a report that Appalachian firms could find significant trade and investment opportunities, particularly in the energy, high technology, and transportation sectors in the Republic of Turkey and the surrounding region. In this regard, the Committee supports the Appalachian-Turkish Trade Project [ATTP], a project to promote opportunities to expand trade, encourage business interests, stimulate foreign studies, and to build a lasting and mutually meaningful relationship between Appalachian States and the Republic of Turkey, as well as the neighboring regions, such as Greece. The Committee commends the ARC for its leadership role in helping to implement the mission of the ATTP. The Committee expects the ARC to continue to be a prominent ATTP sponsor.

The Committee has included no earmarks in the ARC funds. The Commission allocates its funds by formula to its member States, based primarily on need. Under the Commission's formula system, earmarks out of ARC's base funding could come at the expense of those States that have no earmarks. Accordingly, the Committee directs that any earmarks in any State be taken from within that State's regular ARC allocation.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2008	$21,909,000
Budget estimate, 2009	25,499,000
Committee recommendation	25,499,000

For fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends $25,499,000, the same as the President's request, for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board [DNFSB]. This Board is responsible for evaluating the implementation of standards for design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Department of Energy's defense nuclear facilities. Based on these evaluations, the Board makes specific recommendations to the Secretary of Energy to ensure that both public and employee heath and safety are protected. The Committee encourages the DNFSB to undertake the responsibility to provide cost estimates to accompany their recommendations.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2008	$11,685,000
Budget estimate, 2009	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000

For the Delta Regional Authority, the Committee recommends $20,000,000. The Delta Regional Authority was established to assist the eight State Mississippi Delta Region in obtaining basic infrastructure, transportation, skills training, and opportunities for economic development. The Government Accountability Office recently reported that the DRA has a commendable record in the percentage of funds spent in rural America, and the Committee recognizes the DRA's role in bettering this underserved area of the Nation.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2008	$21,800,000
Budget estimate, 2009	1,800,000
Committee recommendation	21,800,000

The Denali Commission is a Federal-State partnership responsible for promoting infrastructure development, job training, and other economic development services in rural areas throughout Alaska. For fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends $21,800,000.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2008	$917,334,000
Budget estimate, 2009	1,007,956,000
Committee recommendation	1,022,956,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2008	−$771,220,000
Budget estimate, 2009	−847,357,000
Committee recommendation	−860,857,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2008	$146,114,000
Budget estimate, 2009	160,599,000
Committee recommendation	162,099,000

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for fiscal year 2009 is $1,022,956, an increase of $15,000,000 over the budget request. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $860,857,000 resulting in a net appropriation of $162,099,000. The Committee has provided $15,000,000 to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to support its participation in an Integrated University Program. The Committee recommends $10,000,000 of this amount to be used to support university programs relevant to the NRC mission. In addition, not less than $5,000,000 of this amount will be used for grants to support research projects that do not align with programmatic missions but are critical to maintaining the discipline of nuclear science and engineering.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2008	$8,744,000
Budget estimate, 2009	9,044,000
Committee recommendation	9,344,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2008	−$7,870,000
Budget estimate, 2009	−8,140,600
Committee recommendation	−8,410,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2008	$874,000
Budget estimate, 2009	904,000
Committee recommendation	934,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $9,344,000, an increase of $300,000 over the budget request. The additional funds will provide the Office of Inspector General with the necessary resources to provide effective oversight of the agency's IT security controls and information to identify vulnerabilities and mitigate risks to the agency's operations. The Committee also recommends that the current no year funding authority of the Office of Inspector General be retained. The Office of Inspector General, as an administrative entity, is fully integrated into the administrative processes at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to include its accounting, pay and travel system, as well as other infrastructure support systems. In addition, the proposed 2-year funding authority could limit the continuity of the Inspector General's oversight.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2008	$3,621,000
Budget estimate, 2009	3,811,000
Committee recommendation	3,811,000

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board was established to evaluate the scientific and technical validity of the Department of

Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board reports its findings no fewer than two times a year to Congress and to the Secretary of Energy. For fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends $3,811,000.

Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects

Appropriation, 2008	$2,261,000
Budget estimate, 2009	4,400,000
Committee recommendation	4,400,000

The Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects was established as an independent agency in the executive branch on December 13, 2006, pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act of 2004. The Committee recommends $4,400,000, the same as the budget request.

Tennessee Valley Authority

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2008	
Budget estimate, 2009	$17,000,000
Committee recommendation	

OFFSET FROM TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 2008	
Budget estimate, 2009	−$17,000,000
Committee recommendation	

The Committee recommendation does not include the administration's proposal to establish a congressionally funded Office of the Inspector General to oversee the Tennessee Valley Authority. In recent years, the TVA has funded the requests of the TVA–IG office out of power revenues and receipts. This process has worked well, and the Committee sees no compelling reason to change that mechanism for funding the TVA–IG.

General Provision, Independent Agencies

The following general provision is recommended by the Committee.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The following list of general provisions are recommended by the Committee.

Section 501. The provision prohibits the use of any funds provided in this bill from being used to influence congressional action.

Section 502. The provision addresses transfer authority under this act.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The Committee recommends funding for the following programs or activities which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2009:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: General Investigations; Construction, General; Mississippi River and Tributaries; Operations and Maintenance; Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program;

Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation;

Water and Related Resources;

Department of Energy: Energy Conservation and Supply Activities:

Office of Fossil Energy: Fossil Energy R&D, Clean Coal, Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Research;

Health, Safety and Security;

Non-Defense Environmental Management;

Office of Science;

Department of Administration;

National Nuclear Security Administration: Weapons Activities; Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation; Naval Reactors; Office of the Administrator;

Defense Environmental Management, Defense Site Acceleration Completion;

Other Defense Activities;

Defense Nuclear Waste Fund;

Office of Security and Performance Assurance;

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;

Power Marketing Administrations: Southeastern, Southwestern, Western Area; and

Energy Information Administration.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(C), RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on July 10, 2008, the Committee ordered reported an original bill (S. 3258) making appropriations for the energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and authorized the chairman of the Committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to offer the text of the Senate bill as a Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House companion measure, with the bill subject to amendment and subject to the

budget allocations, by a recorded vote of 29–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Johnson	
Ms. Landrieu	
Mr. Reed	
Mr. Lautenberg	
Mr. Nelson	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Stevens	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Craig	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. Brownback	
Mr. Allard	
Mr. Alexander	

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the Committee."

In compliance with this rule, changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italic; and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

OMNIBUS CONSOLIDATED RESCISSIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1996, PUBLIC LAW 104–134

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1996

TITLE III

RESCISSIONS AND OFFSETS

CHAPTER 1

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

SUBCHAPTER A—UNITED STATES ENRICHMENT CORPORATION PRIVATIZATION

SEC. 3102. DEFINITIONS.

[For purposes] *Except as provided in section 3112A, for purposes* of this subchapter:

* * * * * * *

SEC. 3112. URANIUM TRANSFERS AND SALES.

(a) TRANSFERS AND SALES BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall not provide enrichment services or transfer or sell any uranium (including natural uranium concentrates, natural uranium hexafluoride, or enriched uranium in any form) to any person except as consistent with this section.

* * * * * * *

(f) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be read to modify the terms of the Russian HEU Agreement.

SEC. 3112A. INCENTIVES FOR ADDITIONAL DOWNBLENDING OF HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMPLETION OF THE RUSSIAN HEU AGREEMENT.—The term "completion of the Russian HEU Agreement" means the importation into the United States from the Russian Federation pursuant to the Russian HEU Agreement of uranium derived from the downblending of not less than 500 metric tons of highly enriched uranium of weapons origin.

(2) DOWNBLENDING.—The term "downblending" means processing highly enriched uranium into a uranium product in any form in which the uranium contains less than 20 percent uranium-235.

(3) HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM.—The term "highly enriched uranium" has the meaning given that term in section 3102(4).

(4) HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM OF WEAPONS ORIGIN.—The term "highly enriched uranium of weapons origin" means highly enriched uranium that—

(A) contains 90 percent or more uranium-235; and

(B) is verified by the Secretary of Energy to be of weapons origin.

(5) LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM.—The term "low-enriched uranium" means a uranium product in any form, including uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) and uranium oxide (UO_2), in which

the uranium contains less than 20 percent uranium-235, including natural uranium, without regard to whether the uranium is incorporated into fuel rods or complete fuel assemblies.

(6) RUSSIAN HEU AGREEMENT.—The term "Russian HEU Agreement" has the meaning given that term in section 3102(11).

(7) URANIUM-235.—The term "uranium-235" means the isotope ^{235}U.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to support the continued downblending of highly enriched uranium of weapons origin in the Russian Federation in order to protect the essential security interests of the United States with respect to the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

(c) PROMOTION OF DOWNBLENDING OF RUSSIAN HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM.—

(1) COMPLETION OF THE RUSSIAN HEU AGREEMENT.—Prior to the completion of the Russian HEU Agreement, the importation into the United States of low-enriched uranium, including low-enriched uranium obtained under contracts for separative work units, that is produced in the Russian Federation and is not imported pursuant to the Russian HEU Agreement, may not exceed the following amounts:

(A) In the 4-year period beginning with calendar year 2008, 16,559 kilograms.

(B) In calendar year 2012, 24,839 kilograms.

(C) In calendar year 2013 and each calendar year thereafter through the calendar year of the completion of the Russian HEU Agreement, 41,398 kilograms.

(2) INCENTIVES TO CONTINUE DOWNBLENDING RUSSIAN HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM AFTER THE COMPLETION OF THE RUSSIAN HEU AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—After the completion of the Russian HEU Agreement, the importation into the United States of low-enriched uranium, including low-enriched uranium obtained under contracts for separative work units, that is produced in the Russian Federation, whether or not such low-enriched uranium is derived from highly enriched uranium of weapons origin, may not exceed—

(i) in calendar year 2014, 485,279 kilograms;
(ii) in calendar year 2015, 455,142 kilograms;
(iii) in calendar year 2016, 480,146 kilograms;
(iv) in calendar year 2017, 490,710 kilograms;
(v) in calendar year 2018, 492,731 kilograms;
(vi) in calendar year 2019, 509,058 kilograms; and
(vii) in calendar year 2020, 514,754 kilograms.

(B) ADDITIONAL IMPORTS IN EXCHANGE FOR A COMMITMENT TO DOWNBLEND AN ADDITIONAL 300 METRIC TONS OF HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the amount authorized to be imported under subparagraph (A) and except as provided in clause (ii), if the Russian Federation enters into a bilateral agreement with the United States under which the Russian Federation agrees to downblend an additional 300 metric tons of highly en-

riched uranium after the completion of the Russian HEU Agreement, 4 kilograms of low-enriched uranium, whether or not such low-enriched uranium is derived from highly enriched uranium of weapons origin and including low-enriched uranium obtained under contracts for separative work units, may be imported in a calendar year for every 1 kilogram of Russian highly enriched uranium of weapons origin that was downblended in the preceding calendar year, subject to the verification of the Secretary of Energy under paragraph (9).

(ii) MAXIMUM ANNUAL IMPORTS.—Not more than 120,000 kilograms of low-enriched uranium may be imported in a calendar year under clause (i).

(3) EXCEPTIONS.—The import limitations described in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to low-enriched uranium produced in the Russian Federation that is imported into the United States—

(A) for use in the initial core of a new nuclear reactor;

(B) for processing and to be certified for re-exportation and not for consumption in the United States; or

(C) to be added to the inventory of the Department of Energy.

(4) ADJUSTMENTS TO IMPORT LIMITATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The import limitations described in paragraph (2)(A) are based on the reference data in the 2005 Market Report on the Global Nuclear Fuel Market Supply and Demand 2005–2030 of the World Nuclear Association. In each of calendar years 2016 and 2019, the Secretary of Commerce shall review the projected demand for uranium for nuclear reactors in the United States and adjust the import limitations described in paragraph (2)(A) to account for changes in such demand in years after the year in which that report or a subsequent report is published.

(B) INCENTIVE ADJUSTMENT.—Beginning in the second calendar year after the calendar year of the completion of the Russian HEU Agreement, the Secretary of Energy shall increase or decrease the amount of low-enriched uranium that may be imported in a calendar year under paragraph (2)(B) (including the amount of low-enriched uranium that may be imported for each kilogram of highly enriched uranium downblended under paragraph (2)(B)(i)) by a percentage equal to the percentage increase or decrease, as the case may be, in the average amount of uranium loaded into nuclear power reactors in the United States in the most recent 3-calendar-year period for which data are available, as reported by the Energy Information Administration of the Department of Energy, compared to the average amount of uranium loaded into such reactors during the 3-calendar-year period beginning on January 1, 2011, as reported by the Energy Information Administration.

(C) PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTMENTS.—As soon as practicable, but not later than July 31 of each calendar year, the Secretary of Energy shall publish in the Federal Reg-

ister the amount of low-enriched uranium that may be imported in the current calendar year after the adjustments under subparagraph (B).

(5) AUTHORITY FOR ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENT.—In addition to the adjustment under paragraph (4)(A), the Secretary of Commerce may adjust the import limitations under paragraph (2)(A) for a calendar year if the Secretary—

(A) in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, determines that the available supply of low-enriched uranium and the available stockpiles of uranium of the Department of Energy are insufficient to meet demand in the United States in the following calendar year; and

(B) notifies Congress of the adjustment not less than 45 days before making the adjustment.

(6) EQUIVALENT QUANTITIES OF LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM IMPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The import limitations described in paragraphs (1) and (2) are expressed in terms of uranium containing 4.4 percent uranium-235 and a tails assay of 0.3 percent.

(B) ADJUSTMENT FOR OTHER URANIUM.—Imports of low-enriched uranium under paragraphs (1) and (2), including low-enriched uranium obtained under contracts for separative work units, shall count against the import limitations described in such paragraphs in amounts calculated as the quantity of low-enriched uranium containing 4.4 percent uranium-235 necessary to equal the total amount of uranium-235 contained in such imports.

(7) DOWNBLENDING OF OTHER HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The downblending of highly enriched uranium not of weapons origin may be counted for purposes of paragraph (2)(B), subject to verification under paragraph (9), if the Secretary of Energy determines that the highly enriched uranium to be downblended poses a risk to the national security of the United States.

(B) EQUIVALENT QUANTITIES OF HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM.—For purposes of determining the additional low-enriched uranium imports allowed under paragraph (2)(B), highly enriched uranium not of weapons origin downblended pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall count as downblended highly enriched uranium of weapons origin in amounts calculated as the quantity of highly enriched uranium containing 90 percent uranium-235 necessary to equal the total amount of uranium-235 contained in the highly enriched uranium not of weapons origin downblended pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(8) TERMINATION OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS.—The provisions of this subsection shall terminate on December 31, 2020.

(9) TECHNICAL VERIFICATIONS BY SECRETARY OF ENERGY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall verify the origin, quantity, and uranium-235 content of the highly enriched uranium downblended for purposes of paragraphs (2)(B) and (7).

(B) METHODS OF VERIFICATION.—In conducting the verification required under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Energy shall employ the transparency measures and access provisions agreed to under the Russian HEU Agreement for monitoring the downblending of Russian highly enriched uranium of weapons origin and such other methods as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(10) ENFORCEMENT OF IMPORT LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce shall be responsible for enforcing the import limitations imposed under this subsection and shall enforce such import limitations in a manner that imposes a minimal burden on the commercial nuclear industry.

(11) EFFECT ON OTHER AGREEMENTS.—

(A) RUSSIAN HEU AGREEMENT.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the terms of the Russian HEU Agreement, including the provisions of the Agreement relating to the amount of low-enriched uranium that may be imported into the United States.

(B) OTHER AGREEMENTS.—If a provision of any agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation, other than the Russian HEU Agreement, relating to the importation of low-enriched uranium, including low-enriched uranium obtained under contracts for separative work units, into the United States conflicts with a provision of this section, the provision of this section shall supersede the provision of the agreement to the extent of the conflict.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1996, PUBLIC LAW 104–303

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) SAN LORENZO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control, San Lorenzo River, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 30, 1994, at a total cost of $21,800,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $10,900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $10,900,000 and habitat restoration, at a total cost of $4,050,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,040,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,010,000.

(B) CREDIT TOWARD NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The Secretary shall credit toward the non-Federal share of the project the costs expended by non-Federal interests for the replacement and reconstruction of the Soquel Avenue Bridge, if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

(C) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—The credit under paragraph (B) may not exceed $2,000,000.

(D) LIMITATION OF TOTAL PROJECT COST.—The Secretary shall not include the costs to be credited under paragraphs (B) and (C) in total project costs in determining the amounts of the Federal and non-Federal contributions.

* * * * * * *

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004, PUBLIC LAW 108–137

TITLE II

GENERAL PROVISIONS

[SEC. 209. ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM. (a) Using funds previously appropriated, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, for purposes of improving the efficiency and expediting the efforts of the Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program Workgroup, is directed to establish an executive committee of seven members consisting of—

[(1) one member from the Bureau of Reclamation;

[(2) one member from the Fish and Wildlife Service; and

[(3) one member at large representing each of the following seven entities (selected at the discretion of the entity in consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service) currently participating as signatories to the existing Memorandum of Understanding:

[(A) other Federal agencies;

[(B) State agencies;

[(C) municipalities;

[(D) universities and environmental groups;

[(E) agricultural communities;

[(F) Middle Rio Grande Pueblos (Sandia, Isleta, San Felipe, Cochiti, Santa Ana, and Santo Domingo); and

[(G) Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District.

[(b) Formation of this Committee shall not occur later than 45 days after enactment of this Act.

[(c) Fiscal year 2004 appropriations shall not be obligated or expended prior to approval of a detailed spending plan by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

[(d) The above section shall come into effect within 180 days of enactment of this Act, unless the Bureau of Reclamation, in consultation with the above listed parties, has provided an alternative workgroup structure which has been approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.]

* * * * * * *

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006, PUBLIC LAW 109–103

TITLE I

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL PROVISIONS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

SEC. 117. LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER MUSEUM AND RIVERFRONT INTERPRETIVE SITE, MISSISSIPPI.—The Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4811) is amended by—

(1) * * *

(2) in section 103(c)(7)—

(A) by striking "There is" and inserting the following: "(A) IN GENERAL.—There is"; and

(B) by striking "$2,000,000" and all that follows and inserting the following: "**[**$15,000,000**]** *$26,000,000* to plan, design, and construct generally in accordance with the conceptual plan to be prepared by the Corps of Engineers.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 121. **[**(a) The Secretary of the Army may carry out and fund projects to comply with the 2003 Biological Opinion described in section 205(b) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 2949) as amended by subsection (b) and may award grants and enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, or interagency agreements with participants in the Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program Workgroup referenced in section 209(a) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108– 137; 117 Stat. 1850) in order to carry out such projects. Any project undertaken under this subsection shall require a non-Federal cost share of 25 percent, which may be provided through in-kind services or direct cash contributions and which shall be credited on a programmatic basis instead of on a project-by-project basis, with reconciliation of total project costs and total non-Federal cost share calculated on a three year incremental basis. Non-Federal cost share that exceeds that which is required in any calculated three year increment shall be credited to subsequent three year increments.**]** *(a) Hereafter, the Secretary of the Army may carry out and fund planning studies, watershed surveys and assessments, or technical studies at 100 percent Federal expense to accomplish the purposes of the 2003 Biological Opinion described in section 205(b) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 2949) as amended by subsection (b) or any related subsequent biological opinion, and the collaborative program long-term plan. In carrying out a study, survey, or assessment under this subsection, the Secretary of the Army shall consult with Federal, State, tribal and local governmental entities, as well as entities participating in the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species*

Collaborative Program referred to in section 205 of this Act: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army may also provide planning and administrative assistance to the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program, which shall not be subject to cost sharing requirements with non-Federal interests.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007, PUBLIC LAW 110–114

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 3118. MIDDLE RIO GRANDE RESTORATION, NEW MEXICO.

(a) * * *

(b) PROJECT SELECTION.—The Secretary shall select and shall carry out restoration projects in the Middle Rio Grande from Cochiti Dam to the headwaters of Elephant Butte Reservoir in the State of New Mexico *in accordance with the plans recommended in the feasibility report for the Middle Rio Grande Bosque, New Mexico, scheduled for completion in December 2008*.

(c) LOCAL PARTICIPATION.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary shall consult with, and consider the activities being carried out by—

(1) the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program; and

(2) the Bosque Improvement Group of the Middle Rio Grande Bosque Initiative.

(d) COST SHARING.—Any requirement for non-Federal participation in a project carried out in the bosque of Bernalillo County, New Mexico, pursuant to this section shall be limited to the provision of lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas necessary for construction, operation and maintenance of the project.

[(d)**]** *(e)* AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 to carry out this section.

* * * * * * *

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008, PUBLIC LAW 110–161

DIVISION C—ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

TITLE I

GENERAL PROVISIONS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

SEC. 115. The Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers is directed to plan, design, and construct a rural health care facility on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation of the Three Affiliated Tribes, North Dakota, at an estimated Federal cost of **[**$20,000,000. The Secretary shall transfer this facility to the Secretary of the Interior for operation and maintenance upon the completion of construction.**]** *$20,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary shall transfer ownership of this facility to the Secretary of*

Health and Human Services for operation and maintenance upon the completion of construction.

* * * * * * *

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93–344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation [1]	Amount of bill	Committee allocation [1]	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the Budget Resolution for 2009: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....
Discretionary	33,258	33,258	32,552	[1] 32,378
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2009	.....	.....	.....	[2] 19,392
2010	.....	.....	.....	9,071
2011	.....	.....	.....	2,967
2012	.....	.....	.....	728
2013 and future years	.....	.....	.....	1,124
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2009	NA	119	NA	24

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

DISCLOSURE OF CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

The Constitution vests in the Congress the power of the purse. The Committee believes strongly that Congress should make the decisions on how to allocate the people's money.

As defined in Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the term "congressional directed spending item" means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator, providing, authorizing, or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative, formula-driven, or competitive award process.

For each item, a Member is required to provide a certification that neither the Member nor the Senator's immediate family has a pecuniary interest in such congressionally directed spending item. Such certifications are available to the public on the website of the Senate Committee on Appropriations (www.appropriations.senate.gov/senators.cfm).

Following is a list of congressionally directed spending items included in the Senate recommendation discussed in this report, along with the name of each Senator who submitted a request to the Committee of jurisdiction for each item so identified. Neither

the Committee recommendation nor this report contains any limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits as defined in rule XLIV.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

Account	Project	Funding	Member
GI	ABILENE, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN-ELM CREEK)	150,000	Senator Cornyn
GI	AGUA FRIA RIVER TRILBY WASH, AZ	250,000	Senator Kyl
GI	AIWW BRIDGE AT DEEP CREEK, VA	500,000	Senators Warner, Webb
GI	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	300,000	The President, Senator Inouye
GI	AMAZON CREEK, OR	350,000	Senators Wyden, Smith
GI	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	250,000	Senator Landrieu
GI	ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD	400,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
GI	ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK	500,000	The President, Senator Stevens
GI	AUGUSTA, GA	278,000	The President
GI	BALTIMORE METRO WTR RES—PATAPSCO AND BACK RIVERS	250,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
GI	BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	400,000	The President
GI	BASALT, CO	50,000	Senator Salazar
GI	BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA	1,599,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	BELPRE, OH	150,000	Senator Voinovich, Brown
GI	BLOOMSBURG, PA	700,000	Senators Specter, Casey
GI	BOGUE BANKS, NC	132,000	Senator Burr
GI	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	350,000	Senator Boxer
GI	BOSSIER PARISH, LA	200,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	BOSTON HARBOR (45–FOOT CHANNEL), MA	2,300,000	The President
GI	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX	400,000	The President, Senator Cornyn
GI	BRUSH CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	274,000	Senators Brownback, Bond
GI	BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	100,000	The President
GI	CACHE LA POUDRE, CO	130,000	Senator Salazar
GI	CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	600,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	162,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	67,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA	900,000	The President
GI	CARPINTERIA SHORELINE STUDY	443,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	CEDAR RIVER (TIME CHECK AREA), CEDAR RAPIDS, IA	300,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
GI	CENTRALIA, WA	1,200,000	Senator Murray
GI	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO	200,000	Senators Allard, Salazar
GI	CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	1,000,000	Senator Murray
GI	CHERRY RIVER BASIN, WV	150,000	Senator Byrd
GI	CHESAPEAKE BAY MARSHLANDS, MD	1,000,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
GI	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, MARYLAND COASTAL MANAGEMENT	200,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
GI	CHESAPEAKE BAY SUSQUEHANNA RESERVOIR SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT, PA, MD, VA	200,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
GI	CLINCH RIVER WATERSHED, VA	150,000	Senators Warner, Webb
GI	CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN WATERSHED STUDY CT, MA, NH AN	450,000	Senators Gregg, Dodd, Lieberman
GI	COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	950,000	The President
GI	COYOTE DAM, CA	250,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	CROSS LAKE, LA WATER SUPPLY IMPROVEMENTS	250,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	150,000	The President
GI	CUYAHOGA RIVER BULKHEAD STUDY, OH	126,000	Senator Voinovich
GI	DALLAS FLOODWAY, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	1,000,000	The President, Senator Hutchison
GI	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE, NJ	290,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	DELAWARE RIVER DREDGED MATERIAL UTILIZATION, PA, DE, & NJ	125,000	Senator Specter
GI	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	500,000	The President, Senator Durbin
GI	DISMAL SWAMP AND DISMAL SWAMP CANAL, VA	262,000	Senators Warner, Webb
GI	EASTERN SHORE, MID CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND, MD	983,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
GI	EDISTO ISLAND, SC	218,000	The President
GI	ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA	97,000	The President
GI	ELLIOTT BAY SEAWALL	750,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
GI	ESPANOLA VALLEY RIO GRANDE AND TRIBS, NM	400,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
GI	FLAGLER BEACH, FL	250,000	Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
GI	FORGE RIVER WATERSHED, LONG ISLAND, NY	125,000	Senator Schumer
GI	FOUR MILE RUN, VA	300,000	Senators Warner, Webb
GI	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	400,000	The President
GI	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER	150,000	The President
GI	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER REALIGNMENT, TX	200,000	The President
GI	GIWW, PORT O'CONNER TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	350,000	The President
GI	GOLETA BEACH, CA	150,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER BASIN WATERSHED, OK, MO, KS & AR	60,000	Senators Brownback, Roberts
GI	GRAND LAKE COMPREHENSIVE, OK	250,000	Senator Inhofe
GI	GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	200,000	The President
GI	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS, MI	1,000,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow, Coleman, Schumer, Clinton, Voinovich, Brown, Kohl
GI	GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	223,000	The President
GI	HAGATNA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL	350,000	The President
GI	HAMILTON CITY, CA	500,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	HASHAMOMUCK COVE, SOUTHOLD, NY	125,000	Senator Schumer
GI	HEACOCK AND CACTUS CHANNELS, CA	500,000	Senators Feinstein,Boxer
GI	HILO HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HI	100,000	Senator Inouye

GI	HOCKING RIVER BASIN, MONDAY CREEK, OH	300,000	Senator Voinovich
GI	HOMER HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK	400,000	Senator Stevens
GI	HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	204,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	500,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	200,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer
GI	HUMBOLT BAY LONG TERM SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT, CA	200,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	HUMBOLT, IA	152,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
GI	HYDROELECTRIC POWER ASSESSMENT, HI	300,000	Senators Inouye, Akaka
GI	ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	400,000	The President
GI	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	300,000	The President
GI	INTERBASIN CONTROL OF GREAT LAKES-MISSISSIPPI RIVER AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES, IL, IN, OH, WI.	300,000	Senator Durbin
GI	JAMES RIVER, SD & ND	350,000	Senators Johnson, Thune
GI	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC	300,000	The President
GI	KAHUKU, HI	344,000	Senator Inouye
GI	KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS	315,000	The President, Senators Bond, Roberts
GI	KALAELOA BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, HI	350,000	Senator Inouye
GI	KEITH CREEK, ROCKFORD, IL	548,000	Senator Durbin
GI	KENAI RIVER BLUFF EROSION, AK	500,000	Senator Stevens
GI	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	250,000	Senator Schumer
GI	LAKE WORTH INLET, FL	200,000	Senator Bill Nelson
GI	LANSING, GRAND RIVER WATERFRONT RESTORATION, MI	50,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
GI	LITTLE COLORADO RIVER WATERSHED, AZ	250,000	Senator Kyl
GI	LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV	300,000	Senator Byrd
GI	LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	150,000	The President
GI	LOS ANGELES RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	590,000	Senators Feinstein,Boxer
GI	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	10,000,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA (SCIENCE PROGRAM)		The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, WOODLAND AND VICINITY	200,000	Senators Feinstein,Boxer
GI	LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	425,000	The President, Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
GI	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION OR & WA	100,000	The President
GI	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	400,000	Senators Feinstein,Boxer
GI	LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESOURCE STUDY, AR	254,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor
GI	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	177,000	Seators Ben Nelson, Hagel
GI	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S WATERSHED	150,000	Senator Cardin
GI	LOWER PUYALLUP RIVER ALTERNATIVES STUDY, WA	57,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
GI	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ	375,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	175,000	The President
GI	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	200,000	The President, Senator Inouye

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
GI	MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH	500,000	Senator Voinovich
GI	MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	150,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	MANHATTAN, KS	300,000	Senators Brownback, Roberts
GI	MARSH LAKE, MN (MN RIVER AUTHORITY)	227,000	Senators Coleman, Klobuchar
GI	MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	400,000	Senator Stevens
GI	MATILIJA DAM, CA	1,000,000	Senators Feinstein,Boxer
GI	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	250,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor
GI	MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA	200,000	The President, Senators Kennedy, Kerry
GI	MIDDLE CREEK, CA	500,000	Senators Feinstein,Boxer
GI	MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER WATERSHED, MD, VA, PA, WV, DC	175,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
GI	MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER—GREATER SENECA/MUDDY BRANCH, MD	300,000	Senator Cardin
GI	MILE POINT, FL	50,000	The President
GI	MILL CREEK WATERSHED, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	100,000	The President
GI	MINNEHAHA CREEK WATERSHED, UMR LAKE ITASCA TO L&D	350,000	Senators Coleman, Klobuchar
GI	MINNESOTA RIVER BASIN, MN & SD	350,000	Senator Coleman
GI	MISSOURI RIVER DEGRADATION STUDY, KS	588,000	The President, Senators Bond, Brownback, Roberts
GI	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460–471, MO	300,000	Senator Bond
GI	MISSOURI RIVER, ND, MT, SD, NE, IA, KS, MO	3,000,000	Senators Dorgan, Johnson, Baucus, Tester, Conrad, Thune
GI	MONTAUK POINT, NY	375,000	Senator Schumer
GI	MONTPELIER, VT	750,000	Senator Leahy
GI	NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	200,000	The President
GI	NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLET	154,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT	150,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	NEW RIVER, CLAYTOR LAKE, VA	150,000	Senators Warner, Webb
GI	NORTH CAROLINA INTERNATIONAL PORT, NC	100,000	Senators Dole, Burr
GI	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY	150,000	Senator Schumer
GI	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	175,000	Senator Schumer
GI	NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	650,000	The President, Senator Hutchison
GI	OHIO RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, WV, KY, OH, PA	600,000	Senators Byrd, Voinovich
GI	PAJARO RIVER, CA	1,000,000	Senators Feinstein,Boxer
GI	PASSAIC RIVER MAIN STEM, NJ	250,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ	297,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS	250,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
GI	PECKMAN RIVER BASIN AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	375,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez

GI	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	50,000	Senator Durbin
GI	PILGRIM LAKE, MA	96,000	The President
GI	PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	500,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor
GI	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	550,000	The President, Senator Martinez
GI	PORT OF IBERIA, LA	1,000,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR & PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME	82,000	Senator Gregg
GI	PRAIRIE DUPONT LEVEE, IL	200,000	Senator Durbin
GI	PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	1,500,000	The President, Senators Murray, Cantwell
GI	RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ	300,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ	300,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ	100,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ	100,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	350,000	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
GI	RED CLAY CREEK, CHRISTINA RIVER WATERSHED, DE	300,000	Senators Biden, Carper
GI	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD & MANITOBA, CA	500,000	Senator Dorgan, Coleman
GI	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	300,000	Senator Boxer
GI	RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	275,000	The President
GI	RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX	500,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
GI	RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	100,000	The President
GI	RIVER DES PERES, MO	150,000	Senator Bond
GI	RIVERSIDE COUNTY SAMP, CA	200,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	ROCK CREEK, KEEFER SLOUGH, CA	200,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	400,000	Senator Cornyn
GI	SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	500,000	Senator Hutchison
GI	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASINS COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, CA	1,000,000	Senators Feinstein,Boxer
GI	SAC-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA ISLANDS AND LEVEES, CA	2,000,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
GI	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SAMP, CA	250,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	200,000	Senator Boxer
GI	SAN JOAQUIN RB, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, ORESTIMBA CREE	400,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN (SJRB), FRAZIER CREEK/STRATHMO	200,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN (SJRB), LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	600,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN (SJRB), WHITE RIVER/DRY CREEK	125,000	Senator Feinstein
GI	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	250,000	Senator Boxer
GI	SANTA FE, NM	28,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
GI	SARASOTA, LIDO KEY, FL	158,000	Senator Bill Nelson
GI	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	700,000	The President, Senator Chambliss
GI	SAW MILL RIVER AT ELMSFORD/GREENBURGH, NY	250,000	Senator Schumer
GI	SEARSPORT HARBOR, ME	157,000	Senators Snowe, Collins
GI	SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	250,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	505,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
GI	SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	375,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
GI	SOLANA-ENCINITAS SHORELINE, CA	171,000	The President, Senators Feinstein, Boxer
GI	SOUTH BOULDER CREEK, CO	252,000	Senators Allard, Salazar
GI	SOUTH FORK OF SOUTH BRANCH OF CHICAGO RIVER	400,000	Senator Durbin
GI	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	375,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO SHORELINE, CA	1,400,000	Senators Feinstein,Boxer
GI	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	200,000	Senator Schumer
GI	SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK	500,000	Senator Inhofe
GI	SOUTHWEST COASTAL HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA	1,500,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	SOUTHWEST, ARKANSAS, AR	327,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor
GI	SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX	150,000	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
GI	ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL	250,000	Senator Bill Nelson
GI	ST. CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	500,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	ST. CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST. CLAIR MANAGEMENT PLAN, MI	200,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
GI	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	250,000	Senator Landrieu
GI	STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ	250,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC	386,000	Senators Dole, Burr
GI	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN LOW FLOW MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION STUDY, MD, PA, & NY.	300,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
GI	SUTTER COUNTY (Northern California Streams), CA	339,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
GI	TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING, CA AND NV	125,000	Senators Reid, Feinstein, Ensign
GI	TEN MILE RIVER, NY AND CT	125,000	Senator Schumer
GI	TOPEKA, KS	100,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
GI	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	5,000,000	Senators Reid, Ensign
GI	TYBEE ISLAND CHANNEL, GA	250,000	The President, Senator Chambliss, Isakson
GI	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	300,000	Senator Schumer
GI	UPPER MISS RIVER—ILLINOIS WW SYSTEM, IL, IA, MN, MO	10,000,000	Senators Harkin, Bond, Grassley, Coleman, Klobuchar
GI	UPPER MISS RVR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN & WI	220,000	Senators Durbin, Harkin, Bond, Grassley
GI	UPPER OHIO NAVIGATION STUDY, PA	4,200,000	Senators Byrd, Specter, Casey
GI	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	191,000	The President
GI	UPPER RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, VA (PHASE II)	200,000	Senators Warner, Webb
GI	UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS	150,000	Senator Brownback
GI	VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION, AZ	658,000	The President
GI	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	150,000	Senators Stevens, Murkowski
GI	VICINITY AND WILOUGHBY SPIT, VA	200,000	Senators Warner, Webb

GI	WAILUPE STREAM, OAHU, HI	300,000	Senator Inouye
GI	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA	500,000	Senators Murray, Wyden, Smith, Cantwell
GI	WALTON COUNTY, FL	591,000	Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
GI	WASHITA RIVER BASIN, OK	250,000	Senator Inhofe
GI	WATERTOWN, SD	450,000	Senators Johnson, Thune
GI	WAUWATOSA, WI	200,000	Senator Kohl
GI	WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	900,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	WESTCHESTER COUNTY STREAMS, NY	175,000	Senator Schumer
GI	WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, BLANCHARD RIVER WATERSHED, OH, IN, & MI	250,000	Senator Voinovich
GI	WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH, IN, & MI	250,000	Senator Voinovich
GI	WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO	500,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor
GI	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO BATESVILLE, AR	325,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor
GI	WILD RICE RIVER, RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN	271,000	The President, Senator Coleman
GI	WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	240,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
GI	YAKUTAT HARBOR, AK	700,000	The President
GI	YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	500,000	The President, Senators Baucus, Tester
GI	ACTIONS FOR CHANGE TO IMPROVE INVESTIGATIONS	.....	The President
GI	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	5,600,000	The President
GI	Coastal Data Information Program	(1,000,000)	Senators Feinstein, Cantwell
GI	Pacific Island Land Ocean Typhoon Experiment, HI	(1,000,000)	Senator Inouye
GI	Surge and Wave Island Modeling Studies, HI	(1,200,000)	Senator Inouye
GI	Wave Data Study	(1,000,000)	Senators Biden, Carper
GI	COMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	100,000	The President
GI	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	75,000	The President
GI	FEME/MAP MOD COORDINATION	1,500,000	The President
GI	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA PROGRAM	220,000	The President
GI	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	11,000,000	The President
GI	City of Gretna, LA (GIS)	(254,000)	Senator Landrieu
GI	East Baton Rouge Parish, LA (GIS)	(400,000)	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	Hurricane Evacuation Studies, Hawaii	(1,000,000)	Senator Inouye
GI	Iowa Multi-State Dam Safety Analyses, Iowa	(37,000)	Senator Grassley
GI	Kekaha Flood Study, HI	(100,000)	Senators Inouye, Akaka
GI	Little Sioux Watershed, IA	(30,000)	Senator Grassley
GI	Livingston Parish, LA (GIS)	(735,000)	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
GI	Mon-Maq Dam Removal Study & Local Floodplain Master Planning, Monticello, IA	(100,000)	Senator Grassley
GI	Papillion Creek Watershed, Flood Plain Mapping, Nebraska	(500,000)	Senators Ben Nelson, Hagel
GI	Southeastern, PA	(300,000)	Senators Specter, Casey
GI	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	250,000	The President
GI	INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW	1,000,000	The President
GI	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	200,000	The President

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
GI	NATIONAL SHORELINE STUDY	375,000	The President
GI	OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	4,580,000	The President
GI	Lake Tahoe Coordination	(500,000)	Senators Reid, Feinstein, Ensign
GI	PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	8,750,000	The President
GI	Asheville, NC	(50,000)	Senator Dole
GI	Assessment of Bridges and Impacts on Flows and Flooding, Delaware County, NY	(150,000)	Senator Schumer
GI	Bacon Creek, Sioux City, IA	(50,000)	Senator Grassley
GI	Boyer River, Missouri Valley, IA	(13,000)	Senator Grassley
GI	Choctaw County Reservoir, MS	(100,000)	Senator Wicker
GI	Delaware Estuary Salinity Monitoring Study, Delaware & New Jersey	(200,000)	Senator Lautenberg, Menendez
GI	Fife Lake Aquatic Weed Control, MI	(300,000)	Senator Levin, Stabenow
GI	Jones County Water Supply, MS	(50,000)	Senator Wicker
GI	Kansas River Basin Technical Assistance, Kansas	(400,000)	Senator Brownback
GI	Little Sioux Watershed, IA	(30,000)	Senator Grassley
GI	Mississippi Band of Choctaws, MS	(50,000)	Senator Wicker
GI	PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM	3,100,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Schumer
GI	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	225,000	The President
GI	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	150,000	The President
GI	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	28,000,000	The President, Senator Cochran
GI	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation, Maryland	(1,000,000)	Senator Cardin
GI	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	50,000	The President
GI	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	600,000	The President
GI	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM	350,000	The President
GI	TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	1,000,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
GI	TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	350,000	The President
GI	WATER RESOURCES PRIORITIES STUDY		The President
CG	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	2,400,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
CG	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	3,000,000	Senator Stevens
CG	ALAMOGORDO, NM	4,200,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
CG	ALASKA COASTAL EROSION, AK	4,500,000	Senators Stevens, Murkowski
CG	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA	13,000,000	The President, Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), CA	9,000,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
CG	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM RAISE), CA	2,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (PHASE I), MD & DC	30,000	Senator Cardin
CG	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	4,828,000	The President, Senators Ben Nelson, Hagel
CG	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD 1	1,900,000	The President, Senators Mikulski, Cardin

CG	ATLANTA (EI), GA	2,000,000	Senators Chambliss, Isakson
CG	ATLANTIC COAST OF LONG ISLAND, LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	100,000	Senator Schumer
CG	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	200,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
CG	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY & JAMAICA BAY, NY	750,000	Senator Schumer
CG	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT, NY	3,800,000	Senator Schumer
CG	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES, GWYNNS FALLS, MD	500,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
CG	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR (NJ SHORE PROTECTION), NJ	11,700,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	4,000,000	Senators Johnson, Thune
CG	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	2,000,000	Senator Bond
CG	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	1,700,000	The President, Senator Bond
CG	BLUESTONE LAKE (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE), WV	12,000,000	The President, Senator Byrd
CG	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	5,382,000	The President, Senator Cornyn
CG	BRECKENRIDGE, MN	2,877,000	Senators Dorgan, Coleman, Klobuchar
CG	BREVARD COUNTY (MID REACH), FL	500,000	Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
CG	BRIDGEPORT ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, CT	500,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
CG	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET (ABSECON), NJ	3,000,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, BRIGANTINE, NJ	80,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC (Ocean Isle)	250,000	Senators Dole, Burr
CG	BURLINGTON HARBOR, VT	500,000	Senator Leahy
CG	CALFED LEVEE STABILITY PROGRAM	5,000,000	Senator Feinstein
CG	CANTON LAKE (DAM SAFETY), OK	21,200,000	The President
CG	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ 1	2,500,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	2,773,000	The President, Senator, Martinez
CG	CENTER HILL DAM (SEEPAGE CONTROL), TN	53,400,000	The President, Alexander, Corker
CG	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	95,188,000	The President, Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
CG	CENTRAL CITY, FORT WORTH, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	500,000	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
CG	CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM	5,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
CG	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER (DEF CORR), IL	2,500,000	The President, Senator Durbin
CG	CHARLESTOWN, MD	50,000	Senator Mikulski
CG	CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION, MD, VA & PA	2,500,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin, Warner, Webb
CG	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	2,000,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin, Warner, Webb
CG	CHESTERFIELD, MO	3,000,000	Senator Bond
CG	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	4,000,000	Senators Johnson, Thune
CG	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL, DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	5,750,000	The President, Senators Durbin, Levin, Stabenow, Coleman, Voinovich, Brown, Kohl
CG	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL, SECOND BARRIER, IL	500,000	The President, Senators Durbin, Levin, Stabenow, Coleman, Voinovich, Brown, Kohl
CG	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	4,000,000	The President, Senator Durbin
CG	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	42,000,000	The President, Alexander, Corker
CG	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM GAS ABATEMENT, WA 1	2,500,000	The President, Senator Murray

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
CG	CLEARWATER LAKE (SEEPAGE CONTROL), MO	25,000,000	The President
CG	COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR & WA	36,000,000	The President, Senators Murray, Crapo, Wyden, Smith, Cantwell
CG	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID 1	92,000,000	The President, Senator Murray
CG	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	2,455,000	The President, Senators Murray, Wyden, Smith, Cantwell
CG	COMITE RIVER, LA	10,000,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
CG	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,000,000	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
CG	CROOKSTON, MN	300,000	The President, Senator Klobuchar
CG	CUMBERLAND, MD	200,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
CG	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX	13,000,000	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
CG	DAVENPORT, IA	4,850,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
CG	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES BEACH, DE 1	350,000	The President
CG	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	390,000	Senators Biden, Carper
CG	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, NJ, PA & DE	5,000,000	Senators Specter, Casey
CG	DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	5,000,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
CG	DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA	3,900,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
CG	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	8,000,000	The President, Senator Durbin
CG	DESOTO COUNTY REGIONAL WASTEWATER SYSTEM, MS	4,860,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
CG	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	3,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
CG	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA (FC)	2,000,000	Senator Landrieu
CG	EAST ST LOUIS AND VICINITY, IL	375,000	Senator Durbin
CG	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	1,207,000	The President, Senator Durbin
CG	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	3,120,000	The President
CG	EMSWORTH L&D, OHIO RIVER (STATIC INSTABILITY CORRECTION), PA	25,800,000	The President, Senators Specter, Casey
CG	EVERGLADES AND S. FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	3,797,000	The President, Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
CG	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	500,000	The President
CG	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	2,150,000	Senator Schumer
CG	FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS, FL	2,200,000	Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
CG	FOLLY BEACH, SC 1	35,000	The President
CG	FT. PECK CABIN CONVEYANCE, MT	1,500,000	Senators Baucus, Tester
CG	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT (REPLACEMENT), ND	3,500,000	The President
CG	GENESEE COUNTY, MI	600,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
CG	GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	600,000	The President
CG	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO PECK BEACH (OCEAN CITY), NJ	3,000,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	GREAT EGG HARBOR TO TOWNSENDS INLET, NJ	250,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez

CG	GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MI	2,500,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow, Coleman, Voinovich
CG	GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	1,500,000	Senator Byrd
CG	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	5,000,000	Senator Feinstein
CG	HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	100,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	HAINES BOAT HARBOR, AK	1,000,000	Senator Stevens
CG	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	4,900,000	The President, Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING STUDY, LOS ANGELES, CA	3,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	HERBERT HOOVER DIKE (SEEPAGE CONTROL) , FL	77,400,000	The President, Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
CG	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	500,000	The President, Senator Cornyn
CG	HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	19,700,000	The President, Senator Hutchison
CG	HOWARD HANSON DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA 1	15,000,000	The President, Senator Murray
CG	IAO STREAMS, HI	500,000	Senators Inouye, Akaka
CG	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, LOCKPORT LOCK AND DAM (REPLACEMENT), IL	28,600,000	The President
CG	INDIANA HARBOR (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY), IN 1	8,385,000	The President
CG	INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK REPLACEMENT, LA	2,000,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
CG	ISLAND CREEK BASIN IN AND AROUND LOGAN, WV	200,000	Senator Byrd
CG	J. BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	8,500,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
CG	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	3,500,000	Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
CG	JAMES RIVER DEEPWATER TURNING BASIN, VA	1,763,000	Senator Warner, Webb
CG	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR (REPLACEMENT), VA & NC	14,000,000	The President
CG	JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	2,000,000	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
CG	JOSEPH G MINISH HISTORIC WATERFRONT PARK, NJ	4,000,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	1,000,000	The President
CG	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	22,330,000	The President, Senator McConnell
CG	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	31,015,000	The President, Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
CG	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	4,782,000	Senators Specter, Casey
CG	LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED INITIATE, VT	2,000,000	Senator Leahy
CG	LAKE SAKAKAWEA PROJECT, ND	17,048,000	Senator Dorgan
CG	LAKE WORTH SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL 1	1,000,000	Senator Bill Nelson
CG	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (CG)	2,500,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
CG	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, VA & KY	16,500,000	Senators Byrd, Warner, Webb
CG	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	8,000,000	The President
CG	LLAGAS CREEK, CA	400,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	LOCK & DAM 27, MISSISSIPPI RIVER (REHABILITATION), IL 1	2,598,000	The President, Senators Durbin, Bond
CG	LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER (MAJOR REHAB), IA 1	2,750,000	The President, Senators Harkin, Grassley
CG	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER (MAJOR REHAB) , MN	2,000,000	Senator Coleman
CG	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3, AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	19,050,000	The President, Senators Specter, Casey
CG	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	5,700,000	The President
CG	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ 1	150,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	1,500,000	The President, Senator Murray

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
CG	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA		The President, Senator Murray
CG	LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WV	1,050,000	Senator Byrd
CG	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR 1	1,500,000	The President
CG	LYNCHBURG CSO, VA	300,000	Senator Warner, Webb
CG	MARKLAND LOCKS & DAM, KY & IL 1	10,600,000	The President
CG	MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	9,000,000	The President, Senator Byrd
CG	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	6,270,000	The President, Senator McConnell
CG	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	34,000,000	The President, Senator Durbin
CG	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	4,000,000	The President, Senator Brown
CG	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL DEEPENING, FL	500,000	Senator Martinez
CG	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELEN, NM	800,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
CG	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE RESTORATION, NM	24,016,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
CG	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	1,500,000	Senator Feinstein
CG	MILWAUKEE HARBOR CDF EXPANSION, WI	1,600,000	Senator Kohl
CG	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	5,011,000	The President, Senator Bond
CG	MISSISSIPPI ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, MS	18,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
CG	MISSOURI & MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT, MO	1,500,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley, Hagel
CG	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	1,000,000	Senator Hagel
CG	MISSOURI R FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA,KS,MO,MT,NE & ND 1	70,000,000	The President, Senators Harkin, Grassley, Baucus, Tester
CG	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM (L–385), MO, IA, NE & KS	2,600,000	Senator Bond
CG	MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, ND	1,000,000	Senator Conrad
CG	MOBILE HARBOR TURNING BASIN, AL	3,400,000	Senators Shelby, Sessions
CG	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	4,410,000	The President, Senator Murray
CG	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM (FISH PASSAGE), WA	1,000,000	The President, Senator Murray
CG	MUDDY RIVER, MA	5,000,000	The President, Senators Kennedy, Kerry
CG	MURRIETA CREEK, CA	5,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	NAPA RIVER, CA	11,000,000	The President, Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	NEGAUNEE, MI	500,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
CG	NEW MEXICO (Environmental Infrastructure), NM	7,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
CG	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	85,000,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer
CG	NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY	1,000,000	Senator Schumer
CG	NOGALES WASH, AZ (Chula Vista)	3,000,000	Senator Kyl
CG	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	1,000,000	Senator Warner, Webb
CG	NORTH DAKOTA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, ND	10,000,000	Senator Dorgan

CG	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	300,000	Senator Durbin
CG	OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	24,000,000	The President, Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	114,000,000	The President, Senator McConnell
CG	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA	1,600,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
CG	OZARK-JETA TAYLOR POWERHOUSE (MAJOR REHAB), AR	17,300,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor
CG	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL	1,000,000	Senator Bill Nelson
CG	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, NJ	1,500,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	PERRY CREEK, IA	3,800,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
CG	PETALUMA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, CA	350,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	PINHOOK CREEK, HUNTSVILLE, AL	1,400,000	Senator Shelby
CG	POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA & WV	150,000	The President
CG	POPLAR ISLAND, MD 1	12,000,000	The President, Senators Mikulski, Cardin
CG	PORT OF LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA	885,000	Senator Feinstein
CG	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	43,000,000	The President
CG	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA (PERMANENT), PA	1,000,000	Senators Specter, Casey
CG	PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS RESTORATION, WA	621,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
CG	RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, MAHWAH, NJ AND SUFFERN, NY	500,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer
CG	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, PORT MONMOUTH, NJ	2,000,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	10,000,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX & OK	1,500,000	Senator Inhofe
CG	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM AR, LA & TX	2,500,000	Senators Landrieu, Lincoln, Pryor, Vitter
CG	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA	4,000,000	Senators Landrieu, Lincoln, Pryor, Vitter
CG	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	1,450,000	The President
CG	RICHMOND CSO, VA	300,000	Senator Warner, Webb
CG	RIO DE FLAG FLAGSTAFF, AZ	3,000,000	Senator Kyl
CG	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE, NM	800,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
CG	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	12,000,000	The President
CG	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	1,075,000	The President, Senator Warner, Webb
CG	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	1,000,000	The President
CG	RURAL IDAHO, ID	4,000,000	Senators Craig, Crapo
CG	RURAL MONTANA, MT	5,000,000	Senators Baucus, Tester
CG	RURAL UTAH, UT (EI)	12,000,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
CG	RURAL, NV (EI)	18,000,000	Senators Reid, Ensign
CG	SACRAMENTO DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	900,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
CG	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	23,968,000	The President, Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, GRR, CA	500,000	Senator Feinstein
CG	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	500,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	10,000,000	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
CG	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	1,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	750,000	Senator Feinstein

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
CG	SAN RAMON VALLEY RECYCLED WATER, CA	3,500,000	Senator Feinstein
CG	SAND CREEK WATERSHED, SAUNDERS COUNTY, NE	2,400,000	Senators Ben Nelson, Hagel
CG	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	2,000,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	14,000,000	The President, Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	SANTA MARIA RIVER, CA	6,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	SAULT STE MARIE, MI	2,000,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
CG	SEWARD HARBOR BREAKWATER EXTENSION	1,000,000	Senator Stevens
CG	SHOALWATER BAY SHORELINE, WA	2,000,000	Senator Murray
CG	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	21,465,000	The President, Senator Cornyn
CG	SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	12,000,000	The President, Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	SOUTHWEST VALLEY ALBUQUERQUE, NM	8,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
CG	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	3,750,000	The President, Senator Bond
CG	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	2,000,000	Senator Stevens
CG	ST. LUCIE INLET, FL	4,000,000	The President, Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
CG	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	900,000	The President
CG	SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER (DAM SAFETY), CA	8,000,000	The President, Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER (ENLARGEMENT), CA	500,000	Senator Feinstein
CG	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	2,000,000	Senator Bond
CG	TAHOE BASIN RESTORATION, CA	3,000,000	Senators Reid, Feinstein, Ensign
CG	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	500,000	Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
CG	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX	3,000,000	Senator Hutchison
CG	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	3,000,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
CG	TRES RIOS, AZ	3,000,000	Senator Kyl
CG	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	10,000,000	The President, Senators Bond, Roberts
CG	TUSCALOOSA, AL	7,500,000	Senator Shelby
CG	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS (DAM SAFETY)	23,800,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
CG	UNALASKA, AK	6,000,000	Senators Stevens, Murkowski
CG	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	5,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	18,000,000	The President, Senators Harkin, Grassley, Coleman
CG	UPPER NEWPORT BAY, CA	3,000,000	Senator Feinstein
CG	VIRGINIA BEACH (HURRICANE PROTECTION), VA	3,000,000	Senator Warner, Webb
CG	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	2,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	WESTERN SARPY COUNTY AND CLEAR CREEK, NE	3,000,000	Senators Ben Nelson, Hagel
CG	WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOW, AR	2,000,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor
CG	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR 1	3,331,000	The President

CG	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	2,000,000	Senators Dole, Burr
CG	WOLF CREEK (SEEPAGE CONTROL), KY	57,000,000	The President, Senators McConnell, Alexander, Corker
CG	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	3,700,000	The President, Senator Durbin
CG	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC	300,000	Senators Dole, Burr
CG	WYOMING VALLEY (LEVEE RAISING), PA	3,000,000	Senators Specter, Casey
CG	YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	ABANDONED MINE RESTORATION	1,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
CG	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL	4,550,000	The President, Senators Leahy, Schumer, Dole
CG	DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	48,650,000	The President
CG	Dam Safety Assurance Studies	.....	
CG	Cherry Creek Dam, CO	.....	The President
CG	Dworshak Dam, ID	.....	The President
CG	Isabella Dam, CA	.....	The President, Senator Feinstein
CG	John Day Lock and Dam, OR & WA	.....	The President
CG	Martis Creek Dam, CA & NV	.....	The President, Senator Ensign
CG	Mississippi Lock and Dam 25, MO	.....	The President
CG	Seepage/Stability Correction Major Rehabilitation Studies	.....	
CG	Addicks Dam, Buffalo Bayou, TX	.....	The President
CG	Ball Mountain Dam, VT	.....	The President
CG	Beach City Dam, OH	.....	The President
CG	Bolivar Dam, OH	.....	The President
CG	East Branch Dam, Clarion River, PA	.....	The President
CG	Green River Lake Dam, KY	.....	The President
CG	Hidden Dam, CA	.....	The President
CG	Hop Brook Dam, CT	.....	The President
CG	J. Edward Roush Dam, KY	.....	The President
CG	Keystone lake Dam, OK	.....	The President
CG	Lake Shelbyville Dam, IL	.....	The President
CG	Lewisville Dam, TX	.....	The President
CG	Mansfield Hollow Dam, CT	.....	The President
CG	Mohawk Dam, OH	.....	The President
CG	Montgomery Locks and Dam, PA	.....	The President
CG	Nolin Lake dam, KY	.....	The President
CG	Rough River Lake Dam, KY	.....	The President
CG	Salamonie Lake Dam, KY	.....	The President
CG	Whittier Narrows Dam, CA	.....	The President
CG	Zoar Levee (Dover Dam), OH	.....	The President
CG	DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM (DMDF)	8,965,000	The President
CG	Charleston Harbor, SC 1	.....	The President, Senator Graham

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
CG	Green Bay Harbor, WI 1		The President, Senator Kohl
CG	Rouge River, MI 1		The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
CG	Savannah Harbor, GA 1		The President
CG	EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION FUND	21,000,000	The President
CG	ESTUARY RESTORATION PROGRAM (PUBLIC LAW 106–457)	1,000,000	The President
CG	INLAND WATERWAYS USER BOARD (BOARD EXPENSES)	50,000	The President
CG	INLAND WATERWAYS USER BOARD (COE EXP)	250,000	The President
CG	SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	875,000	Inouye
CG	CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM		
Section 14	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14)	10,000,000	The President
Section 208	SNAGGING AND CLEARING (SECTION 208)	500,000	The President
Section 208	Blackwell Lake, Blackwell, OK		The President
Section 208	Muscatatuck River Log Jam, Scott County, IN		The President
Section 208	Oran, MO		The President
Section 103	SHORE PROTECTION (SECTION 103)	7,500,000	The President
Section 103	Athol Springs, Lake Erie, NY		The President
Section 103	Bay Farm Dike, CA		Senator Feinstein
Section 103	Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Hampton, VA		The President
Section 103	Ft. San Geronimo, PR		The President
Section 103	Lake Erie at Painesville, OH		The President
Section 103	Lasalle Park, Buffalo, NY		The President
Section 103	Lincoln Park Beach, Seattle, WA		The President
Section 103	Old Lakeshore Road, NY		The President
Section 103	Philadelphia Shipyard Sea Wall, Philadelphia, PA		The President
Section 103	Pismo Beach, CA		Senator Feinstein
Section 103	Unalakleet Storm Damage Reduction, Unalakleet, AK		The President, Senator Stevens
Section 103	Veteran's Drive Shoreline, St. Thomas, USVI		The President
Section 107	NAVIGATION PROGRAM (SECTION 107)		The President
Section 107	Bass Harbor, ME		Snowe, Collins
Section 107	Charlestown Breachway and Inlet, RI		The President
Section 107	Fairless Hills Turning Basin, PA		Senators Specter, Casey
Section 107	Grand Marais Harbor of Refuge, MN		Senator Coleman
Section 107	Hampton Harbor, NH		Senator Gregg
Section 107	Mackinac Isle, Harbor Breakwall, MI		The President
Section 107	McQuade Road Harbor of Refuge, Duluth, MN		Senators Coleman, Klobuchar
Section 107	Nassawadox Creek, VA		The President

Section 107	North Kohala Navigation Improvements, HI		Senators Inouye, Akaka
Section 107	Northwest Tennessee Harbor, TN		Senators Alexander, Corker
Section 107	Northwestern Michigan, Traverse City, MI		Senators Levin, Stabenow
Section 107	Ontonagon Channel Extension, MI		Senators Levin, Stabenow
Section 107	Ottawa River Navigation, Toledo, OH		Senator Voinovich
Section 107	Port Fourchon Extension, Lafourche Parish, LA		Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Section 107	Round Pond, Bristol, ME		Snowe, Collins
Section 107	Savoonga Harbor, AK		The President
Section 107	St. Jerome Creek, MD		Senator Cardin
Section 111	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES (SECTION 111) 1	10,000,000	The President
Section 111	Camp Ellis Restoration Project, ME		The President, Senators Snowe, Collins
Section 111	Fairport Harbor, OH		The President, Senator Voinovich
Section 111	Mattituck Harbor, NY		The President, Senator Schumer
Section 111	Mobile Pass, AL		The President
Section 111	Tybee Island Channel Impacts, GA		The President
Section 111	Vermillion, OH		The President
Sections 204, 207, 933	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204, 207, 933) 1	7,187,000	The President
Sections 204, 207, 933	21st Avenue West Channel, Duluth, MN		The President
Sections 204, 207, 933	Atchafalaya River, Shell Island, St. Mary Parish, LA		Senator Landrieu
Sections 204, 207, 933	Barataria Bay Waterway, LA		Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Sections 204, 207, 933	Blackhawk Bottoms, IA		The President, Senators Harkin, Grassley
Sections 204, 207, 933	Calcasieu River, Cameron Parish, LA		The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Sections 204, 207, 933	Isle Aux Herbes, AL		The President
Sections 204, 207, 933	Maumee Bay Restoration, OH		The President
Sections 204, 207, 933	Newburyport Harbor, MA		Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Sections 204, 207, 933	Restoration of the Cat Islands Chain, Green Bay, WI		The President, Senator Kohl
Sections 204, 207, 933	Shell Island Pass, LA		The President
Sections 204, 207, 933	Wanchese Marsh Creation, NC		The President
Sections 204, 207, 933	Wynn Road, Oregon, OH		The President
Section 205	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	43,123,000	The President
Section 205	Ada, MN		Senators Coleman, Klobuchar
Section 205	Assunpink Creek, Hamiliton Township, Mercer County, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 205	Bayou Choupique, St Mary Parish, LA		Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Section 205	Bayou Queue de Tortue, Vermillion Parish, LA		Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Section 205	Beaver Creek & Tribs, Bristol, TN		The President, Senator Alexander
Section 205	Blacksnake Creek, St. Joseph, MO		The President, Senator Bond
Section 205	Concordia, KS		Senators Brownback, Roberts
Section 205	Cosgrove Creek, Calaveras County, CA		Senator Feinstein
Section 205	Crosscreek, Rossville, KS		Senators Brownback, Roberts
Section 205	Duck Creek Flood Warning System, OH		The President

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
Section 205	Elkton, MD		Senator Mikulski
Section 205	Eureka Creek, Mannhattan, KS		Senator Brownback
Section 205	Findley, OH		Senators Voinovich, Brown
Section 205	Granite Falls, MN		Senators Coleman, Klobuchar
Section 205	Hatch, NM		Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Section 205	Hopkinsville, Little River, KY		Senator McConnell
Section 205	Independence, OH		Senator Voinovich
Section 205	Indian/Dry Creek Cedar Rapids, IA		Senators Harkin, Grassley
Section 205	Jackson Brook, Morris County, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 205	Jewett Brook, Laconia, NH	(100,000)	Senator Gregg
Section 205	Keopu-Hienaloli Strm, HI		The President
Section 205	Kings Point, Warren County, MS		Senators Cochran, Wicker
Section 205	Kuliouou Stream, Oahu, HI		Senator Inouye
Section 205	Las Gallinas Creek/Santa Venetia Levee, CA		Senator Feinstein
Section 205	Little Mill Creek, Elsemere, DE		Senator Salazar
Section 205	Little River Diversion, Dutchtown, MO		The President, Senator Bond
Section 205	Livingston, MT		The President
Section 205	Mad Creek, Muscatine, IA		The President, Senators Harkin, Grassley
Section 205	McKinney Bayou, Tunica County, MS		Senators Cochran, Wicker
Section 205	Mill Brook, Highland Park, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 205	Montevideo, MN		Senator Coleman
Section 205	North River, Peabody, MA		Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Section 205	Oak Creek, Florence, Colorado		Senators Allard, Salazar
Section 205	Pailet Basin, Barataria, LA		Senator Vitter
Section 205	Palai Stream, Hawaii, HI		Senators Inouye, Akaka
Section 205	Pecan Creek, Gainesville, TX		The President, Senator Hutchison
Section 205	Pennsville, NJ		Senator Lautenberg
Section 205	Pennsylvania Avenue Improvement Project, Bethany Beach, DE		Senators Biden, Carper
Section 205	Philadelphia Shipyard Sea Wall, Philadelphia, PA		Senator Casey
Section 205	Platte River, Fremont, NE		The President, Senators Ben Nelson, Hagel
Section 205	Platte River, Schuyler, NE		Senators Ben Nelson, Hagel
Section 205	Poplar Brook, Deal and Ocean Township, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 205	Randolph, NE (Middle Logan Creek)		Senator Hagel
Section 205	Red Oak Creek, Red Oak, IA		Senator Grassley
Section 205	Rio Descalabrado, PR		The President
Section 205	Rio Guamani-Guaya, PR		The President

Section 205	Salisbury, MA		The President, Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Section 205	Swannanoa River Watershed, NC		Senator Dole
Section 205	Town of Carencro, Lafayette Parish, LA		Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Section 205	Turkey Creek, Ben Hill County, GA		Senators Biden, Carper
Section 205	Upper Passaic River and Tributaries, Long Hill Township, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 205	Wahpeton, ND		Senator Dorgan
Section 205	Wailele Strm, Oahu, HI		The President
Section 205	White Slough, CA		The President
Section 205	Winnebago River, Mason City, IA		Senator Grassley
Section 205	WV Statewide Flood Warning System, WV		The President, Senator Byrd
Section 205	Wynne, AR		Senators Lincoln, Pryor
Section 206	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	25,000,000	The President
Section 206	Arkansas River Habitat Restoration Project, CO		The President
Section 206	Arrowhead Creek, OR		Senators Wyden, Smith
Section 206	Asheville-Buncomb County, NC		Senator Dole
Section 206	Beaver Creek, OR		Senators Wyden, Smith
Section 206	Blue Hole Lake State Park, NM		Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Section 206	Blue River, CO		The President, Senator Salazar
Section 206	Bottomless Lakes State Park, NM		Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Section 206	Brownsville Branch, AR		Senators Lincoln, Pryor
Section 206	Buras Marina, LA		Senator Landrieu
Section 206	Camp Creek-Zumwalt Prairie, OR		Senators Wyden, Smith
Section 206	Carpenter Creek, WA		The President
Section 206	Chariton River/Rathbun Lake, IA		Senators Harkin, Grassley
Section 206	Chattahoochee Fall-Line Ecosystem Restoration, GA		Senators Shelby, Chambliss, Isakson
Section 206	Christine and Hickson Dams, ND		The President, Senator Dorgan
Section 206	Codorus Creek Watershed Restoration, PA		Senator Casey
Section 206	Concord Streams Restoration, NC		The President, Senator Dole
Section 206	Deep Run/Tiber Hudson, Howard County, MD		Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Section 206	Dents Run, Elk County, PA		The President, Senator Casey
Section 206	Dog Island Shoals, MD		Senator Cardin
Section 206	Drayton Dam, ND		The President, Senators Dorgan, Coleman
Section 206	Duck Creek, Davenport, IA		Senator Grassley
Section 206	Emiquon Preserve, Fulton County, IL		Senator Durbin
Section 206	Eugene Delta Ponds, OR		The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
Section 206	Eugene Field, IL		The President
Section 206	Gerritsen Creek, Brooklyn, NY		Senator Schumer
Section 206	Goose Creek, Boulder, CO		The President, Senator Salazar
Section 206	Greenbury Point, MD		Senator Cardin
Section 206	Heron Haven, NE		Senator Hagel

Account	Project	Funding	Member
Section 206	Hoffman Dam, IL		The President
Section 206	Incline and Third Creeks, NV		Senator Ensign
Section 206	Jackson Creek, GA		The President
Section 206	Janes-Wallace Memorial Dam, Santa Rosa, NM		Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Section 206	Kings Park, NY		Senator Schumer
Section 206	Lake Killarney, Louisiana State Penitentiary, LA		Senator Landrieu
Section 206	Lake Verret, Assumption Parish, LA		Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Section 206	Lower Boulder Creek, CO		Senator Salazar
Section 206	Lower Hempstead Harbor, NY		Senator Schumer
Section 206	Mandeville Ecosystem Restoration, LA		Senator Vitter
Section 206	Manhasset Bay, NY		Senator Schumer
Section 206	Marion Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, MI		Senators Levin, Stabenow
Section 206	Milford Pond, Milford, MA		Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Section 206	Mokuhinia/Mokuula Restoration, HI		Senators, Inouye, Akaka
Section 206	Mud Creek, Great South Bay, NY		Senator Schumer
Section 206	Musconetcong River Dam Removals, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 206	North Beach Wetland Restoration, MD		Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Section 206	North Fork Gunnison River, CO		Senator Salazar
Section 206	Northport Harbor, Huntington, NY		Senator Schumer
Section 206	Northwest Branch Anacostia River, MD		The President, Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Section 206	Ogden River Restoration, UT		Senator Bennett
Section 206	Olentangy 5th Avenue Dam, OH		Senator Voinovich
Section 206	Orland Park, IL		The President
Section 206	Painter Creek, MN		Senators Coleman, Klobuchar
Section 206	Pennsville, Salem County, NJ		Senator Menendez
Section 206	Pleasure Island, MD		Senator Cardin
Section 206	Rancocas Creek Fish Passage Restoration Project, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 206	Rose Bay Ecosystem Restoration Project, FL		The President
Section 206	Soundview Park, Bronx, NY		Senator Schumer
Section 206	Spring Lake, San Marcos, TX		Senator Hutchison
Section 206	Springfield Mill Race Stabilization and Protection, OR		Senators Wyden, Smith
Section 206	Squaw Creek, (Round Lake Drain), IL		Senator Durbin
Section 206	St. Helena-Napa River, CA		The President
Section 206	Stephenville WWTP, Meridian, TX		The President
Section 206	Storm Lake, IA		The President, Senators Harkin, Grassley
Section 206	Sweetwater Reservoir Ecosystem Restoration, CA		Senator Feinstein

Section 206	Swift Creek Asbestos Sediment Management, WA		Senator Cantwell
Section 206	Tamarisk Eradication, CO		Senator Salazar
Section 206	Tangier Island, Accomack County, VA		Senators Warner, Webb
Section 206	University Lakes, Baton Rouge, LA		Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Section 206	Upper York Creek, Dam Removal, CA		Senator Feinstein
Section 206	Urieville Lake, MD		Senator Cardin
Section 206	Ventura Marsh Habitat Restoration, Clear Lake, IA		The President, Senators Harkin, Grassley
Section 206	Vermillion River Ecosystem Restoration, LA		Senator Vitter
Section 206	Western Branch, Patuxent River, MD		Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Section 206	Whitebreast Creek Watershed, IA		Senator Grassley
Section 206	Wilson Bay Restoration, NC		The President
Section 206	Winneapaug Pond Restoration, RI		Senators Reed, Whitehouse
Section 206	Wright's Creek, Dorchester Creek, MD		Senator Cardin
Section 206	Zemurray Park Lake Restoration, Tangipahoa Parish, LA		Senator Vitter
Section 1135	PROJECT MODS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 1135)	25,000,000	The President
Section 1135	Assunpink Creek, Trenton, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 1135	Bayou Desiard, Monroe, LA		Senator Landrieu
Section 1135	Belhaven Harbor, NC		Senator Dole
Section 1135	Bloomington State Park, MO		The President
Section 1135	Blue Valley Wetlands, Jackson, MO		The President
Section 1135	Braided Reach, WA		The President
Section 1135	Duck Creek Conservation Area, Stoddard County, MO		The President
Section 1135	Eagleland Ecosystem, TX		The President
Section 1135	Frazier/Whitehorse Oxbow Lake Weir, LA		Senator Landrieu
Section 1135	Gerritsen Creek, NY		The President
Section 1135	Green River Dam Modifications, KY		The President
Section 1135	Indian Ridge Marsh, Chicago, IL		The President
Section 1135	Kanaha Pond Wildlife Sanctuary Restoration, HI		The President
Section 1135	Kaunakakai Stream Environmental Restoration, HI		The President, Senators Inouye, Akaka
Section 1135	Lake Champlain Lamprey Barriers, VT		Senator Leahy
Section 1135	Lake Fausse Pointe, Iberia Parish, LA		Senator Vitter
Section 1135	Lake St. Joseph, Tensas Parish, LA		Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Section 1135	Lake Whittington Weir, MS & AR		Senators Cochran, Wicker
Section 1135	Las Cruces Dam Environmental Restoration, Doña Ana County, NM		Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Section 1135	Lincoln Park West, Ecosystem Restoration Study, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 1135	Lower Assunpink Creek, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 1135	Lower Cache Restoration, AR		Senators Lincoln, Pryor
Section 1135	Lower Columbia Slough, OR		The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
Section 1135	Lower Kingman Island, DC		The President
Section 1135	Millwood Lake, Grassy Lake, AR		Senators Lincoln, Pryor

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
Section 1135	Mordecai Island Coastal Wetland Restoration, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 1135	Morganza Fore-Bay Restoration, LA		Senator Vitter
Section 1135	Pine Mount Creek, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 1135	Pond Creek Salt Marsh Restoration, Cape May County, NJ		Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Section 1135	Prison Farm, ND		The President, Senator Dorgan
Section 1135	Pueblo of Santa Ana Aquatic Restoration, NM		Senator Bingaman
Section 1135	Rathbun Lake, South Fork Restoration, IA		Senators Harkin, Grassley
Section 1135	Rock Creek at Boyle Park, Little Rock, AR		Senators Lincoln, Pryor
Section 1135	Route 66 Environmental Restoration, Albuquerque, NM		Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Section 1135	Sand Hill River, MN		The President
Section 1135	Shorty's Islands, WA		The President, Senators Murray, Cantwell
Section 1135	Spring Creek, NY		Senator Schumer
Section 1135	Tappan Lake, OH		The President, Senator Inhofe
Section 1135	Tujunga Wash Environmental Restoration, CA		Senator Feinstein
Section 1135	Village of Oyster, Northampton County, VA		Senators Warner, Webb
MR&T—GI	ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA	790,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—GI	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM LAND STUDY, LA		The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—GI	BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	43,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor
MR&T—GI	COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	130,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—GI	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	1,430,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Landrieu, Wicker
MR&T—GI	MEMPHIS METRO AREA, STORM WATER MGMT STUDY, TN	34,000	The President
MR&T—GI	MORGANZA TO THE GULF, LA	6,000,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—GI	QUIVER RIVER, MS	250,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—GI	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	400,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor
MR&T—GI	SPRING BAYOU, LA	300,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—CG	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,025,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—CG	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	15,500,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—CG	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	50,200,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Lincoln, Pryor
MR&T—CG	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, DIKES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN		The President
MR&T—CG	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, REVETMENT OPERATIONS, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN		The President
MR&T—CG	GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	9,000,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor
MR&T—CG	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	3,933,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—CG	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	63,823,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Landrieu, Wicker, Bond, Lincoln, Pryor, Vitter
MR&T—CG	ST. FRANCIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AR & MO	5,700,000	Senators Bond, Lincoln, Pryor

MR&T—CG	ST. JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	200,000	Senator Bond
MR&T—CG	YAZOO BASIN, BACKWATER LESS ROCKY BAYOU	50,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—CG	YAZOO BASIN—BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	2,275,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—CG	YAZOO BASIN—DELTA HEADWATERS PROJECT, MS	18,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—CG	YAZOO BASIN—MAIN STEM, MS	25,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—CG	YAZOO BASIN—REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	2,800,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—CG	YAZOO BASIN—UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	14,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—CG	YAZOO BASIN—YAZOO BACKWATER, MS	5,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,117,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—O&M	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	8,619,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—O&M	BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	162,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—O&M	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	42,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—O&M	BONNET CARRE, LA	2,346,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—O&M	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	70,000,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Landrieu, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	436,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	128,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor
MR&T—O&M	HICKMAN/MAGNOLIA BLUFF, KY	60,000	Senator McConnell
MR&T—O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	249,000	The President
MR&T—O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	135,000	The President
MR&T—O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	93,000	The President
MR&T—O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,927,000	The President, Senator Landrieu
MR&T—O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	185,000	The President
MR&T—O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	101,000	The President
MR&T—O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	81,000	The President
MR&T—O&M	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	256,000	The President
MR&T—O&M	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	161,000	The President
MR&T—O&M	LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	53,000	The President
MR&T—O&M	MAPPING	1,488,000	The President, Senator Landrieu
MR&T—O&M	MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	3,283,000	The President
MR&T—O&M	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	578,000	The President, Senator Landrieu
MR&T—O&M	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	16,368,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Landrieu, Wicker, Bond, Lincoln, Pryor, Vitter
MR&T—O&M	OLD RIVER, LA	13,882,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—O&M	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	8,200,000	The President, Senators Bond, Lincoln, Pryor
MR&T—O&M	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	1,880,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Lincoln, Pryor, Vitter
MR&T—O&M	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	2,501,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
MR&T—O&M	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	424,000	The President, Senator Wicker
MR&T—O&M	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	4,567,000	The President, Senator Bond

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
MR&T—O&M	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	1,000,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor
MR&T—O&M	YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	6,673,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	1,500,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS	7,417,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS	1,650,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS	7,166,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	2,237,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS	8,916,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	925,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	YAZOO BASIN, WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	285,000	The President
MR&T—O&M	YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	442,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
MR&T—O&M	YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS	534,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
O&M	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	2,220,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
O&M	ABSECON INLET, NJ	265,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL	15,672,000	The President, Senators Shelby, Sessions
O&M	ALABAMA—COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	375,000	The President
O&M	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,585,000	The President
O&M	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,539,000	The President
O&M	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	6,016,000	The President
O&M	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,578,000	The President
O&M	ALMOND LAKE, NY	424,000	The President
O&M	ALPENA HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	1,439,000	The President
O&M	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	591,000	The President
O&M	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	17,601,000	The President
O&M	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	3,418,000	The President, Senator Shelby
O&M	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	904,000	The President
O&M	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	500,000	Senators Warner, Webb
O&M	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	1,354,000	The President
O&M	ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	472,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	ARECIBO HARBOR, PR	100,000	The President
O&M	ARKANSAS—RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI	1,415,000	The President
O&M	ARKPORT DAM, NY	225,000	The President
O&M	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,850,000	The President, Senator Voinovich
O&M	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, LA	8,993,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter

O&M	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	1,000,000	The President, Senators Chambliss, Isakson
O&M	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	2,000,000	The President, Senator Dole
O&M	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	1,500,000	The President, Senator Graham
O&M	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA	1,823,000	The President
O&M	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA	967,000	The President
O&M	AU SABLE, MI		Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	215,000	The President
O&M	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,633,000	The President
O&M	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	719,000	The President, Senator Leahy
O&M	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	338,000	The President, Senators Mikulski, Cardin
O&M	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	16,193,000	The President, Senators Mikulski, Cardin
O&M	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	926,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	548,000	The President, Senator Inouye
O&M	BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	1,417,000	The President
O&M	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	2,162,000	The President
O&M	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	10,255,000	The President
O&M	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	225,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	580,000	The President
O&M	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	5,969,000	The President, Senator McConnell
O&M	BAY PORT HARBOR, MI		Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	809,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	BAYOU LACOMBE, LA	450,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	724,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	18,000	The President, Senator Landrieu
O&M	BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	321,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	14,000	The President, Senator Landrieu
O&M	BAYOU TECHE, LA	209,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,122,000	The President
O&M	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	332,000	The President
O&M	BEAVER LAKE, AR	5,270,000	The President
O&M	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	2,500,000	The President, Senator Byrd
O&M	BELTON LAKE, TX	3,567,000	The President
O&M	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,311,000	The President
O&M	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,302,000	The President
O&M	BERLIN LAKE, OH	4,867,000	The President
O&M	BIG BAY HARBOR, MI		Senator Levin
O&M	BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,799,000	The President
O&M	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,250,000	The President
O&M	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	172,000	The President
O&M	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	574,000	The President

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
O&M	BIRCH LAKE, OK	648,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,954,000	The President
O&M	BLACK RIVER (GOGEBIC), MI		Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,235,000	The President
O&M	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	416,000	The President
O&M	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	22,191,000	The President, Senators Shelby, Sessions
O&M	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	567,000	The President
O&M	BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	8,384,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor
O&M	BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR, RI (old Harbor)	500,000	The President, Senator Reed
O&M	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,736,000	The President
O&M	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,427,000	The President
O&M	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	427,000	The President
O&M	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,508,000	The President
O&M	BOGUE INLET, NC	400,000	Senator Dole
O&M	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	9,691,000	The President
O&M	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	6,000,000	The President, Senators Kennedy, Kerry
O&M	BOWMAN—HALEY LAKE, ND	153,000	The President
O&M	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	3,259,000	The President, Senator Cornyn
O&M	BRIDGEPORT HARBOR DREDGING, CT	2,000,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
O&M	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,903,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	BRONX RIVER, NY	250,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	1,649,000	The President
O&M	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	5,545,000	The President, Senators Chambliss, Isakson
O&M	BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,820,000	The President
O&M	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	2,433,000	The President
O&M	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,723,000	The President
O&M	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	50,000	The President
O&M	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	515,000	The President
O&M	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,946,000	The President
O&M	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	7,367,000	The President
O&M	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	160,000	The President
O&M	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,973,000	The President
O&M	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	220,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	CADDO LAKE, LA	181,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	2,149,000	The President
O&M	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	2,053,000	The President

O&M	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	14,968,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	4,780,000	The President
O&M	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	4,404,000	The President, Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
O&M	CANTON LAKE, OK	1,707,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	CANYON LAKE, TX	3,686,000	The President
O&M	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	11,546,000	The President
O&M	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	718,000	The President, Senator Dole
O&M	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,155,000	The President, Senator Durbin
O&M	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	600,000	Senator Dole
O&M	CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,797,000	The President
O&M	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	7,703,000	The President
O&M	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	500,000	The President, Senator Bond
O&M	CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI		Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	1,098,000	The President
O&M	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	1,226,000	The President
O&M	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	7,021,000	The President
O&M	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	13,234,000	The President
O&M	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	5,360,000	The President
O&M	CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX	348,000	The President
O&M	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	156,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	291,000	The President
O&M	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	9,947,000	The President, Senator Graham
O&M	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	197,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,509,000	The President, Senators Allard, Salazar
O&M	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,829,000	The President
O&M	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	2,225,000	The President
O&M	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	1,203,000	The President, Senators Allard, Salazar
O&M	CHETCO RIVER, OR	574,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	3,000,000	Senators Johnson, Thune
O&M	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,015,000	The President
O&M	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	475,000	The President
O&M	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	1,200,000	The President
O&M	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	785,000	The President
O&M	CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	266,000	The President
O&M	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	207,000	The President
O&M	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	60,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
O&M	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	6,449,000	The President, Senator Bond
O&M	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	2,520,000	The President
O&M	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,825,000	The President, Senator Bond
O&M	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	6,710,000	The President, Senator Voinovich

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
O&M	CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,042,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	CLINTON RIVER, MI		Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	COCHITI LAKE, NM	2,392,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
O&M	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	303,000	The President
O&M	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	243,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	547,000	The President
O&M	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLAND	18,052,000	The President, Senators Murray, Wyden, Smith
O&M	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	500,000	The President, Senators Murray, Cantwell
O&M	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	15,125,000	The President, Senators Murray, Wyden, Smith
O&M	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	500,000	The President, Senators Murray, Cantwell
O&M	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR	640,000	The President
O&M	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	232,000	The President
O&M	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,121,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
O&M	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,734,000	The President
O&M	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	350,000	The President
O&M	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	4,685,000	The President, Senator Graham
O&M	COOS BAY, OR	4,769,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	COPAN LAKE, OK	937,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	307,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,887,000	The President, Senators Harkin, Grassley
O&M	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	6,386,000	The President
O&M	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,398,000	The President
O&M	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	991,000	The President
O&M	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	223,000	The President
O&M	COUGAR LAKE, OR	5,380,000	The President
O&M	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,328,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,847,000	The President
O&M	COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,384,000	The President
O&M	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	2,530,000	The President
O&M	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	98,000	The President
O&M	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	625,000	The President
O&M	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	6,262,000	The President
O&M	DANA POINT HARBOR, CA	700,000	Senator Boxer
O&M	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	8,491,000	The President
O&M	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	1,359,000	The President
O&M	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	6,317,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor

O&M	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	1,445,000	The President
O&M	DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	15,000	The President
O&M	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	18,778,000	The President, Senators Specter, Lautenberg, Menendez, Casey
O&M	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	750,000	The President, Senators Specter, Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	6,393,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	DEPOE BAY, OR	124,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,286,000	The President
O&M	DETROIT LAKE, OR	2,564,000	The President
O&M	DETROIT RIVER, MI	5,327,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,768,000	The President
O&M	DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,354,000	The President
O&M	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	840,000	The President
O&M	DILLON LAKE, OH	1,454,000	The President
O&M	DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME	1,200,000	The President
O&M	DORENA LAKE, OR	831,000	The President
O&M	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	5,067,000	The President
O&M	DULUTH—SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	4,929,000	The President
O&M	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,404,000	The President
O&M	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	2,179,000	The President
O&M	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	398,000	The President
O&M	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	135,000	The President
O&M	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	2,044,000	The President
O&M	EAST RIVER, NY	500,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	4,220,000	The President
O&M	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	473,000	The President
O&M	EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	180,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	611,000	The President
O&M	EDIZ HOOK, WA	63,000	The President
O&M	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	514,000	The President
O&M	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	569,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	734,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	ELKINS, WV	14,000	The President
O&M	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	25,000	The President
O&M	ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	25,000	The President
O&M	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	38,000	The President
O&M	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	5,348,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,293,000	The President, Senator Murray
O&M	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA, SBC RESERVATION PLAN, FL	400,000	The President

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
O&M	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	2,026,000	The President
O&M	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	1,418,000	The President
O&M	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,284,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	FALLS LAKE, NC	1,683,000	The President
O&M	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	203,000	The President
O&M	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	443,000	The President
O&M	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	1,433,000	The President
O&M	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	2,025,000	The President
O&M	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	4,179,000	The President
O&M	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,830,000	The President
O&M	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	380,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	10,218,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	7,328,000	The President
O&M	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	742,000	The President
O&M	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	633,000	The President
O&M	FOX POINT HURRICANE BARRIER, RI	500,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
O&M	FOX RIVER, WI	3,775,000	The President, Senator Kohl
O&M	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	774,000	The President, Senator Casey
O&M	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	619,000	The President
O&M	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	7,020,000	The President
O&M	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,848,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,444,000	The President
O&M	GALISTEO DAM, NM	423,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
O&M	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	6,022,000	The President
O&M	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	11,789,000	The President, Senator Dorgan
O&M	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,022,000	The President
O&M	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	6,518,000	The President, Hagel
O&M	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	228,000	The President
O&M	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	690,000	The President, Senator Graham
O&M	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,156,000	The President
O&M	GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	2,706,000	The President
O&M	GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	2,926,000	The President
O&M	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,312,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow

O&M	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,225,000	The President
O&M	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,900,000	The President
O&M	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	9,180,000	The President
O&M	GRAYS REEF PASSAGE, MI	180,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,445,000	The President
O&M	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	256,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	GREAT SALT POND, BLOCK ISLAND, RI (new Harbor)	250,000	Senator Reed
O&M	GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	80,000	The President
O&M	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	3,698,000	The President, Senator McConnell
O&M	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	5,394,000	The President, Senator Kohl
O&M	GREEN PETER—FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,323,000	The President
O&M	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	4,942,000	The President
O&M	GREENS BAYOU, TX	850,000	The President
O&M	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	6,861,000	The President
O&M	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,230,000	The President, Senators Shelby, Sessions
O&M	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	17,769,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter, Wicker
O&M	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	31,874,000	The President, Senator Hutchison
O&M	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	10,000,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
O&M	HALEIWA HARBOR, OAHU, HI	1,000,000	Senator Inouye
O&M	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	1,108,000	The President
O&M	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	338,000	The President
O&M	HARBOR OF REFUGE, LEWES, DE	500,000	Senators Biden, Carper
O&M	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,786,000	The President, Senators Ben Nelson, Hagel
O&M	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,863,000	The President, Senator Bond
O&M	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	12,188,000	The President
O&M	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	400,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor
O&M	HERRING BAY AND ROCKHOLD, MD	500,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
O&M	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	555,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,786,000	The President
O&M	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	1,292,000	The President
O&M	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	764,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	503,000	The President
O&M	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	588,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	HOMER HARBOR, AK	620,000	The President
O&M	HOMME LAKE, ND	293,000	The President, Senator Dorgan
O&M	HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	500,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
O&M	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	919,000	The President
O&M	HOPKINTON—EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,081,000	The President
O&M	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,479,000	The President
O&M	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	1,000,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
O&M	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	14,854,000	The President, Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
O&M	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	2,627,000	The President
O&M	HUDSON RIVER (MAINT), NY	1,125,000	The President
O&M	HUDSON RIVER (O&C), NY	1,525,000	The President
O&M	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	500,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	HUGO LAKE, OK	1,493,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	HULAH LAKE, OK	476,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	5,144,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
O&M	HURON HARBOR, OH	1,530,000	The President
O&M	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,982,000	The President
O&M	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	36,287,000	The President
O&M	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,834,000	The President
O&M	INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, SUSSEX COUNTY, DE	500,000	Senators Biden, Carper
O&M	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	3,138,000	The President
O&M	INLAND ROUTE, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, GA	63,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, IL	65,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, OR	33,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WA	70,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	1,058,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	60,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	508,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	98,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	3,822,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	457,000	The President, Senator Salazar
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	316,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC25	62,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	300,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	142,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	659,000	The President, Senator Inouye
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	1,183,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	334,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	2,342,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	635,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	177,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	554,000	The President

O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,814,000	The President, Senator Vitter
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	381,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	89,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	29,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	230,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	623,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	1,688,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	223,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	54,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	250,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	360,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	508,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	37,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	253,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	811,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	127,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	1,031,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	452,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	177,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	413,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	592,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	43,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	65,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	49,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	85,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	1,936,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	75,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	226,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	70,000	The President, Senator Leahy
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	623,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	125,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	255,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	34,000	The President
O&M	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R, FL	1,000,000	Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
O&M	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE	14,065,000	Mikulski, Biden, Carper, Cardin
O&M	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	2,500,000	The President, Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
O&M	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, DE	40,000	The President
O&M	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,404,000	The President
O&M	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	10,555,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	2,842,000	The President

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
O&M	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,602,000	The President
O&M	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	11,066,000	The President
O&M	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	326,000	The President
O&M	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	6,000,000	The President, Senator Martinez
O&M	JAMAICA BAY, NY	250,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,667,000	The President
O&M	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	684,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
O&M	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,713,000	The President, Senator Mikulski
O&M	JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	2,001,000	The President
O&M	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	9,165,000	The President
O&M	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	1,771,000	The President
O&M	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	7,049,000	The President, Senator Murray
O&M	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	11,571,000	The President
O&M	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,418,000	The President, Senator Salazar
O&M	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,042,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,938,000	The President
O&M	JOHNSTOWN, PA	2,255,000	The President
O&M	JONES INLET, NY	350,000	The President
O&M	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	9,380,000	The President
O&M	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,418,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,903,000	The President
O&M	KAW LAKE, OK	2,574,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	10,000	The President
O&M	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	86,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	6,073,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	2,493,000	The President
O&M	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	526,000	The President
O&M	LAC LA BELLE HARBOR, MI		Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	431,000	The President
O&M	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,742,000	The President, Senator Dorgan
O&M	LAKE KEMP, TX	214,000	The President
O&M	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	860,000	The President
O&M	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	700,000	The President
O&M	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	440,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	4,761,000	The President, Senator Durbin
O&M	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	403,000	The President

O&M	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	7,554,000	The President, Senator Murray
O&M	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,748,000	The President
O&M	LAVON LAKE, TX	3,065,000	The President
O&M	LELAND HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	LES CHENEAUX ISLAND CHANNELS, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	4,110,000	The President
O&M	LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	1,712,000	The President
O&M	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	935,000	The President
O&M	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,360,000	The President, Senator Murray
O&M	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	10,000	The President
O&M	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	489,000	The President
O&M	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	200,000	Senator Dole
O&M	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	1,100,000	The President
O&M	LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	200,000	The President
O&M	LONG ISLAND SOUND DMMP, CT	1,000,000	The President
O&M	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	2,761,000	The President
O&M	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	2,423,000	The President
O&M	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,996,000	The President
O&M	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,560,000	The President
O&M	LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL, AK	500,000	Senator Stevens
O&M	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	6,874,000	The President
O&M	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,664,000	The President, Senator Murray
O&M	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	2,880,000	The President
O&M	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,801,000	The President
O&M	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	442,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	1,058,000	The President
O&M	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	85,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,823,000	The President
O&M	MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	160,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	2,675,000	The President, Senator Martinez
O&M	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	493,000	The President
O&M	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,100,000	The President, Senator Dole
O&M	MARINA DEL REY, CA	2,499,000	The President, Senators Feinstein, Boxer
O&M	MARION LAKE, KS	1,504,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	1,062,000	The President

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
O&M	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	737,000	The President
O&M	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	365,000	The President, Senator Dole
O&M	MASSILLON, OH	24,000	The President
O&M	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,173,000	The President, Senator Hutchison
O&M	MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	20,000	The President
O&M	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	28,395,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor
O&M	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	5,819,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	5,183,000	The President
O&M	MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,111,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	239,000	The President
O&M	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,969,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	MIAMI RIVER, FL	10,820,000	The President, Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
O&M	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	2,023,000	The President
O&M	MICHIGAN HARBOR DREDGING, MI	5,000,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM, NM (MRGESCP)	200,000	Senators Domenici Bingaman
O&M	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	102,000	The President
O&M	MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,133,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	2,437,000	The President
O&M	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,074,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor
O&M	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	650,000	The President
O&M	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	200,000	The President
O&M	MISPILLION RIVER, DE	500,000	The President, Senators Biden, Carper
O&M	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION), MN	44,904,000	The President
O&M	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION), IL	63,207,000	The President, Senators Durbin, Harkin, Bond, Grassley
O&M	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION), IL	20,004,000	The President, Senators Bond, Grassley
O&M	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (LOWER RIVER), MO	25,359,000	The President, Senator Bond
O&M	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,051,000	The President
O&M	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	3,136,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LA	55,325,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	166,000	The President
O&M	MISSOURI RIVER—RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO	5,106,000	The President, Senators Harkin, Bond, Grassley, Hagel
O&M	MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE	2,560,000	The President, Senators Grassley, Hagel
O&M	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	21,562,000	The President, Senator Shelby

O&M	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	285,000	The President
O&M	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	12,392,000	The President, Senator Casey
O&M	MONROE HARBOR, MI	1,018,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	MONROE LAKE, IN	1,326,000	The President
O&M	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	5,000,000	The President, Senators Dole, Burr
O&M	MORICHES INLET, NY	2,050,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,630,000	The President
O&M	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,383,000	The President
O&M	MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY	4,839,000	The President
O&M	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	160,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
O&M	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	257,000	The President
O&M	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	3,271,000	The President, Senator Murray
O&M	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	30,000	The President
O&M	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	350,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	8,275,000	The President
O&M	NARRAGUAGUS RIVER, ME	600,000	Senators Snowe, Collins
O&M	NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	4,591,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor
O&M	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	80,000	The President, Senator Leahy
O&M	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	3,542,000	The President
O&M	NEAH BAY, WA	308,000	The President
O&M	NEW BEDFORD AND FAIRHAVEN HARBOR, MA	250,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
O&M	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, MA	372,000	The President, Senators Kennedy, Kerry
O&M	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,115,000	The President
O&M	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	250,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	NEW MADRID HARBOR (MILE 889), MO	300,000	Senator Bond
O&M	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	400,000	The President, Senator Bond
O&M	NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,730,000	The President
O&M	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	800,000	The President, Senator Dole
O&M	NEW TOPSAIL INLET, NC	400,000	Senator Dole
O&M	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	6,750,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer
O&M	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	6,300,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer
O&M	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSIT), NY	950,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer
O&M	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	4,000,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer
O&M	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	300,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer
O&M	NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA	400,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
O&M	NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	220,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,609,000	The President
O&M	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	350,000	The President
O&M	NOLIN LAKE, KY	3,337,000	The President
O&M	NOME HARBOR, AK	780,000	The President, Senator Stevens
O&M	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	10,072,000	The President, Senators Warner, Webb
O&M	NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,920,000	The President
O&M	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	593,000	The President
O&M	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	656,000	The President
O&M	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	635,000	The President, Senator Leahy
O&M	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	2,066,000	The President
O&M	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	747,000	The President, Senator Leahy
O&M	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	385,000	The President
O&M	NOYO HARBOR, CA	750,000	Senator Feinstein
O&M	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	907,000	The President
O&M	OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	9,277,000	The President, Senator Dorgan
O&M	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	7,445,000	The President
O&M	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	450,000	The President, Senators Mikulski, Cardin
O&M	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,620,000	The President
O&M	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	39,419,000	The President
O&M	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	24,796,000	The President
O&M	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	30,292,000	The President
O&M	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH	4,485,000	The President
O&M	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	509,000	The President
O&M	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,700,000	The President
O&M	OHIO-MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL, OH	1,089,000	The President
O&M	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,900,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
O&M	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	4,530,000	The President
O&M	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	9,845,000	The President
O&M	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	655,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,923,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	164,000	The President
O&M	ORWELL LAKE, MN	256,000	The President
O&M	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	500,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor
O&M	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	598,000	The President

O&M	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	8,509,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Lincoln, Pryor, Vitter
O&M	OZARK—JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,287,000	The President
O&M	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	1,307,000	The President
O&M	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,206,000	The President
O&M	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	954,000	The President
O&M	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,385,000	The President, Senator Martinez
O&M	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	55,000	The President
O&M	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	531,000	The President, Hagel
O&M	PARISH CREEK, MD	500,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
O&M	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	7,511,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
O&M	PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	254,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,005,000	The President
O&M	PATOKA LAKE, IN	1,150,000	The President
O&M	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	193,000	The President, Senator Wicker
O&M	PEARSON—SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	1,048,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	67,000	The President
O&M	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	119,000	The President
O&M	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	PERRY LAKE, KS	2,516,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	PETERSBERG NORTH HARBOR PROJECT, AK	500,000	Senator Stevens
O&M	PETOSKEY HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	6,961,000	The President
O&M	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	204,000	The President
O&M	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,099,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,854,000	The President
O&M	PINOLE SHOAL MANAGEMENT STUDY, CA	500,000	Senator Feinstein
O&M	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	572,000	The President
O&M	POINT JUDITH HARBOR OF REUGE, RI	1,250,000	The President, Senator Reed
O&M	POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,108,000	The President
O&M	POMONA LAKE, KS	1,969,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	PORT HUENEME, CA	4,029,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
O&M	PORT ORFORD, OR	7,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	PORTAGE HARBOR, MI	.....	Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	150,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	PORTLAND HARBOR, ME	100,000	The President, Senators Snowe, Collins
O&M	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	805,000	The President

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
O&M	PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	312,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	2,155,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	550,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	100,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	8,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	2,422,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,100,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	28,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	147,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	1,265,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA	162,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	537,000	The President, Senator Inouye
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	111,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	185,000	The President
O&M	Project Condition Surveys, KY	7,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	1,200,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	376,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	750,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	276,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	95,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	14,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	82,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	675,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	300,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	1,363,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,830,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	295,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	220,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	70,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	400,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	624,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	9,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	304,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	870,000	The President
O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	338,000	The President

O&M	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	160,000	The President
O&M	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	505,000	The President
O&M	PROVIDENCE HARBOR SHIPPING CHANNEL, RI	300,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
O&M	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	997,000	The President
O&M	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	20,000	The President
O&M	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	1,572,000	The President
O&M	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	2,836,000	The President
O&M	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	200,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer
O&M	RARITAN RIVER, NJ	220,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer
O&M	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,277,000	The President, Senators Harkin, Grassley
O&M	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	1,456,000	The President
O&M	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,312,000	The President, Senator Specter
O&M	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	84,000	The President
O&M	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,278,000	The President, Senators Harkin, Grassley
O&M	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	4,420,000	The President
O&M	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,500,000	The President, Senator Landrieu
O&M	REND LAKE, IL	4,570,000	The President, Senator Durbin
O&M	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,170,000	The President
O&M	RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD	500,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
O&M	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	8,386,000	The President
O&M	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	6,950,000	The President
O&M	RIO GRANDE BOSQUE REHABILITATION, NM	4,000,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
O&M	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	6,599,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	1,605,000	The President
O&M	ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	587,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	300,000	The President, Senator Dole
O&M	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	500,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
O&M	ROSEVILLE, OH	35,000	The President
O&M	ROUGE RIVER, MI	1,161,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,832,000	The President
O&M	ROUSH RIVER MAJOR REHAB REPORT, IN	300,000	The President
O&M	RUDEE INLET, VA	370,000	The President, Senators Warner, Webb
O&M	SABINE—NECHES WATERWAY, TX	8,822,000	The President
O&M	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	5,582,000	The President
O&M	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,566,000	The President
O&M	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	175,000	The President
O&M	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	3,798,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	1,226,000	The President

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
O&M	SALEM RIVER, NJ	70,000	The President, Senator Lautenberg
O&M	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	702,000	The President, Hagel
O&M	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	5,820,000	The President
O&M	SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	1,106,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
O&M	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,805,000	The President
O&M	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,514,000	The President
O&M	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	5,411,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
O&M	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,140,000	The President
O&M	SANDY HOOK BAY AT LEONARDO, NJ	40,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,148,000	The President
O&M	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	2,090,000	The President
O&M	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	940,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
O&M	SARDIS LAKE, OK	912,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	.....	Senator Stabenow
O&M	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	13,895,000	The President
O&M	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	183,000	The President
O&M	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,908,000	The President, Senators Harkin, Grassley
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	94,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	39,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,639,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	720,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	30,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	469,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	30,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	64,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	327,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	88,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	119,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	502,000	The President, Senators Domenici Bingaman
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	520,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	82,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	46,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	52,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	101,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	598,000	The President
O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	506,000	The President

O&M	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	87,000	The President
O&M	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	3,000,000	The President, Senators Specter, Casey
O&M	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	913,000	The President
O&M	SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	75,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	SHARK RIVER, NJ	775,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,366,000	The President
O&M	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	200,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	SHOAL HARBOR AND COMPTON CREEK, NJ	300,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	120,000	The President, Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	400,000	The President
O&M	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	583,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,318,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	5,000	The President
O&M	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,203,000	The President
O&M	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	3,157,000	The President
O&M	SOURIS RIVER, ND	280,000	The President
O&M	SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	357,000	The President
O&M	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MO	8,000	The President
O&M	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	839,000	The President
O&M	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,791,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	595,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	18,836,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	374,000	The President
O&M	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	248,000	The President
O&M	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	2,210,000	The President
O&M	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	331,000	The President
O&M	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,828,000	The President, Senator Bond
O&M	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,039,000	The President
O&M	STURGEON BAY, WI	16,000	The President
O&M	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,791,000	The President
O&M	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	2,982,000	The President
O&M	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,044,000	The President
O&M	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	596,000	The President
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	565,000	The President
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	91,000	The President
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17,000	The President
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,444,000	The President, Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	323,000	The President
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	24,000	The President
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	551,000	The President

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	223,000	The President
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	93,000	The President
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	10,400,000	The President
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	53,000	The President
O&M	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	498,000	The President
O&M	SUTTON LAKE, WV	2,210,000	The President
O&M	SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	400,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
O&M	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	6,667,000	The President, Senator Bond
O&M	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	120,000	The President
O&M	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	4,550,000	The President, Senator Martinez
O&M	TANGIPAHOA RIVER, LA	321,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,312,000	The President
O&M	TCHEFUNCTE RIVER & BOGUE FALIA, LA	400,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,794,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	20,219,000	The President
O&M	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	2,350,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Shelby, Sessions, Wicker
O&M	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	22,009,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Shelby, Sessions, Wicker
O&M	TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,912,000	The President
O&M	TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,482,000	The President, Senator Cornyn
O&M	TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	1,000,000	The President, Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
O&M	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	7,696,000	The President
O&M	THOMASTON DAM, CT	615,000	The President
O&M	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	2,200,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,213,000	The President
O&M	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	3,115,000	The President
O&M	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	4,701,000	The President, Senator Voinovich
O&M	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	791,000	The President
O&M	TORONTO LAKE, KS	535,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	2,735,000	The President
O&M	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	681,000	The President, Senator Leahy
O&M	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,290,000	The President, Senators Allard, Salazar
O&M	TULLY LAKE, MA	543,000	The President
O&M	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,135,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	135,000	The President, Senators Mikulski, Cardin

O&M	TWO HARBORS, MN	300,000	The President
O&M	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	452,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
O&M	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	400,000	Senator Kohl
O&M	TYGART LAKE, WV	1,521,000	The President
O&M	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	635,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	1,017,000	The President
O&M	UNION LAKE, MO	10,000	The President
O&M	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	578,000	The President, Senator Leahy
O&M	UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM	1,201,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
O&M	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	3,095,000	The President
O&M	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	2,977,000	The President, Senator Dole
O&M	WACO LAKE, TX	3,090,000	The President
O&M	WAIANAE HARBOR, HI	1,000,000	Senator Inouye
O&M	WALLACE LAKE, LA	200,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,747,000	The President
O&M	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	8,417,000	The President
O&M	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	25,000	The President
O&M	WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, AL	120,000	The President
O&M	WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, FL	405,000	The President
O&M	WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, MS	30,000	The President
O&M	WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, VA	54,000	The President
O&M	WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	500,000	The President, Senators Landrieu, Vitter
O&M	WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	500,000	The President, Senator Landrieu
O&M	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	260,000	The President
O&M	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	1,099,000	The President
O&M	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,093,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	4,695,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	865,000	The President
O&M	WEST HILL DAM, MA	674,000	The President
O&M	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	7,446,000	The President
O&M	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	568,000	The President
O&M	WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	250,000	The President, Senator Schumer
O&M	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	497,000	The President
O&M	WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI		Senators Levin, Stabenow
O&M	WHITE RIVER, AR	52,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor
O&M	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	171,000	The President
O&M	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	8,559,000	The President
O&M	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	553,000	The President
O&M	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	1,400,000	The President, Senators Mikulski, Cardin
O&M	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	210,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
O&M	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	62,000	The President
O&M	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	34,000	The President
O&M	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	1,837,000	The President
O&M	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	610,000	The President
O&M	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,750,000	The President, Senators Biden, Carper
O&M	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	13,000,000	The President, Senators Dole, Burr
O&M	WILSON LAKE, KS	1,977,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
O&M	WISTER LAKE, OK	678,000	The President, Senator Inhofe
O&M	WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	7,834,000	The President, Senator McConnell
O&M	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	107,000	The President
O&M	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	1,033,000	The President
O&M	WOONSOCKET, RI	300,000	Senator Reed
O&M	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	4,532,000	The President
O&M	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,482,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	YAQUINA RIVER, OR	300,000	Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,180,000	The President
O&M	YAZOO RIVER, MS	26,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
O&M	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	160,000	The President, Senators Lincoln, Pryor
O&M	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	471,000	The President
O&M	YORK RIVER, VA	250,000	The President
O&M	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	2,908,000	The President
O&M	YUBA RIVER, CA	129,000	The President
O&M	ACTIONS FOR CHANGE TO IMPROVE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	5,000,000	The President
O&M	AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	690,000	The President
O&M	ASSET MANAGEMENT/FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	4,750,000	The President
O&M	BUDGET/MANAGEMENT SUPPORT FOR O&M BUSINESS LINES	5,865,000	The President
O&M	COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,475,000	The President
O&M	CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	1,500,000	The President
O&M	DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	12,000,000	The President
O&M	DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,062,000	The President
O&M	DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION (DOER)	6,080,000	The President
O&M	DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)	1,391,000	The President
O&M	EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	270,000	The President
O&M	FACILITY PROTECTION	12,000,000	The President
O&M	GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODEL	900,000	The President
O&M	INDEPENDENT (PART) ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENT—STEWARDSHIP	500,000	The President

O&M	INLAND NAVIGATION SAFETY INITIATIVE	3,000,000	The President
O&M	INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	3,708,000	The President
O&M	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	1,780,000	The President
O&M	MONITORING OFCOMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,575,000	The President
O&M	NATIONAL (LEVEE) FLOOD INVENTORY	10,000,000	The President
O&M	NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING	13,900,000	The President, Senators Cochran, Wicker
O&M	NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	15,000,000	The President
O&M	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS (NEPP)	6,000,000	The President
O&M	NATIONAL NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	3,326,000	The President
O&M	NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR REALLOCATION	300,000	The President
O&M	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT	300,000	The President
O&M	PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION:		
O&M	HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	725,000	The President
O&M	PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION—REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500,000	The President
O&M	PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION—STRAIGHTENING OF CHANNELS	50,000	The President
O&M	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,271,000	The President
O&M	RECREATION ONE STOP (R1S) NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVATION	1,130,000	The President
O&M	REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	4,500,000	The President, Senators Inouye, Lautenberg, Menendez, Schumer, Dole, Burr, Wyden, Smith, Reed, Whitehouse
O&M	Delaware Estuary RSM, NJ	(300,000)	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
O&M	Long Island Coastal Planning, NY	(500,000)	Senator Schumer
O&M	North Carolina RSM, NC	(600,000)	Senator Dole, Burr
O&M	South Coastal Rhode Island Regional Sediment Management Study, RI	(750,000)	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
O&M	South Jetty and Clatsop Spit, OR	(500,000)	Senators Wyden, Smith
O&M	Southeast Oahu Regional Sediment Management, HI	(500,000)	Senators Inouye, Akaka
O&M	RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHAB	608,000	The President
O&M	WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS)	653,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT, AZ	9,900,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER RECYCLING AND REUSE, NM	1,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Water and Related Resources	ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP, CO, NM, AZ	50,000,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Allard, Salazar
Water and Related Resources	ARBUCKLE PROJECT, OK	289,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT	1,000,000	Senator Kyl
Water and Related Resources	BALMORHEA PROJECT, TX	58,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	BOISE AREA PROJECTS, ID	5,284,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	BURNT, MALHEUR, OWYHEE, AND POWER RIVER BASIN WATER OPTIMIZATION FEASIBILITY STUDY, OR	300,000	Senators Wyden, Smith
Water and Related Resources	CACHUMA PROJECT, CA	2,118,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
Water and Related Resources	CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	352,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PLANT, CA	1,500,000	The President, Senators Feinstein, Boxer

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
Water and Related Resources	CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT, TX	145,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	CARLSBAD PROJECT, NM	3,784,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Water and Related Resources	CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER BASIN	28,350,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Kyl, Bingaman
Water and Related Resources	CENTRAL OKLAHOMA MASTER CONSERVATORY DISTRICT FEASIBILITY STUDY	250,000	Senator Inhofe
Water and Related Resources	CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECTS, CA	.....	
Water and Related Resources	AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	9,480,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	2,088,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	DELTA DIVISION	20,737,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	EAST SIDE DIVISION	4,534,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	FRIANT DIVISION	7,721,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
Water and Related Resources	MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	17,151,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
Water and Related Resources	REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT	24,091,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	9,428,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
Water and Related Resources	SAN FELIPE DIVISION	775,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	391,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SHASTA DIVISION	7,914,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	10,917,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
Water and Related Resources	WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	9,451,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	8,919,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	303,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	COLLBRAN PROJECT, CO	1,556,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	204,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	2,350,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
Water and Related Resources	COLORADO—BIG THOMPSON PROJECT, CO	13,292,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT, ID, OR, WA	18,000,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT, WA	13,548,000	The President, Senator Murray
Water and Related Resources	CROOKED RIVER PROJECT, OR	851,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT, OR	300,000	Senators Wyden, Smith
Water and Related Resources	DESCHUTES PROJECT, OR	1,166,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
Water and Related Resources	EASTERN NEW MEXICO RURAL WATER SUPPLY	500,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Water and Related Resources	EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	828,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	FORT PECK RESERVATION/DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM, MT	15,000,000	Senators Baucus, Tester
Water and Related Resources	FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT, CO	229,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, CO	8,295,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II, CO	1,445,000	The President

Water and Related Resources	HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY, NV	200,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT, MT	653,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	HUNTLEY PROJECT, MT	160,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	HYRUM PROJECT, UT	178,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	179,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	INLAND EMPIRE REGIONAL WATER RECYCLING PROJECT, CA	1,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
Water and Related Resources	IRVINE BASIN GROUND AND SURFACE WATER IMPROVEMENT, CA	1,000,000	Senator Feinstein
Water and Related Resources	JICARILLA APACHE RESERVATION RURAL WATER SYSTEM, NM	1,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Water and Related Resources	KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	73,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
Water and Related Resources	KENDRICK PROJECT, WY	3,333,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	KLAMATH PROJECT, OR, CA	25,000,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT, NV	10,205,000	The President, Senator Reid
Water and Related Resources	LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM, NV	2,725,000	The President, Senators Reid, Ensign
Water and Related Resources	LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDSCA, NV	100,000	The President, Senator Reid
Water and Related Resources	LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY, CO	3,095,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM, SD, IA, MN	30,000,000	Senators Johnson; Harkin; Grassley; Coleman, Klobuchar; Thune
Water and Related Resources	LEWISTON ORCHARDS PROJECTS	578,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT, CA	692,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
Water and Related Resources	LONG BEACH DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, CA	1,000,000	Senator Feinstein
Water and Related Resources	LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM, CO	243,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES, TX	4,050,000	The President, Senator Hutchison
Water and Related Resources	LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT, MT	46,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	MANCOS PROJECT, CO	146,000	The President, Senators Allard, Salazar
Water and Related Resources	MCGEE CREEK PROJECT, OK	676,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT, SD	15,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT, NM	25,700,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Water and Related Resources	MILK RIVER PROJECT, MT	1,648,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS, ID	5,558,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT, NE	170,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	MNI WICONI PROJECT, SD	37,182,000	The President, Senators Johnson, Thune
Water and Related Resources	MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	134,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	MOON LAKE PROJECT, UT	76,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OK	523,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM, NM	77,000	The President, Senators Domenici
Water and Related Resources	NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY, NM, UT, CO	1,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Water and Related Resources	NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	64,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	NEWTON PROJECT, UT	42,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	NORMAN PROJECT, OK	473,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	NORTH LAS VEGAS WATER REUSE, NV	3,000,000	Senators Reid, Ensign

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
Water and Related Resources	NORTH PLATTE PROJECT, WY	1,880,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	320,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	456,000	The President, Senator Bennett
Water and Related Resources	NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TX	558,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	ODESSA SUBAREA SPECIAL STUDY, WA	1,000,000	The President, Senator Murray
Water and Related Resources	OGDEN RIVER PROJECT, UT	368,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	128,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT, CA	558,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	444,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
Water and Related Resources	ORLAND PROJECT, CA	703,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II, CO	2,416,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	PARK CITY FEASIBILLTY STUDY, UT	500,000	Senator Bennett
Water and Related Resources	PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT, NM	203,000	The President, Senators Domenici
Water and Related Resources	PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER SYSTEM, SD	2,000,000	Senators Johnson, Thune
Water and Related Resources	PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER REUSE PROJECT, AZ	200,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN—GARRISON DIVERSION, ND	69,986,000	The President, Senator Dorgan
Water and Related Resources	PINE RIVER PROJECT, CO	335,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	PROVO RIVER PROJECT, UT	1,366,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM, SD	86,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	RIO GRANDE PROJECT, NM	4,342,000	The President, Senators Domenici
Water and Related Resources	ROCKY BOYS/NORTH CENTRAL MONTANA RURAL WATER SYSTEM	10,000,000	Senators Baucus, Tester
Water and Related Resources	ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION, OR	902,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SALT RIVER PROJECT, AZ	600,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT, CA	700,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SAN ANGELO PROJECT, TX	402,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT, AZ	325,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM, CA	3,000,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT, CA	700,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM, CA	250,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM, NM	59,000	The President, Senators Domenici
Water and Related Resources	SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CO	4,637,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SAVAGE RAPIDS DAM REMOVAL, OR	3,000,000	The President, Senators Wyden, Smith
Water and Related Resources	SCOFIELD PROJECT, UT	133,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SHOSHONE PROJECT, WY	749,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SOLANO PROJECT, CA	4,489,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	718,000	The President

Water and Related Resources	SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	2,969,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	260,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INV. PROGRAM	57,000	The President, Senators Domenici
Water and Related Resources	SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	121,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT, UT	223,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SUN RIVER PROJECT, MT	350,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	146,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	TUALATIN BASIN WATER SUPPLY PROJECT, OR	400,000	Senators Wyden, Smith
Water and Related Resources	TUALATIN PROJECT, OR	381,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	TUALATIN PROJECT TITLE TRANSFER AND FACILITY ASSESSMENT STUDY, OR	106,000	Senators Wyden, Smith
Water and Related Resources	TUCUMCARI PROJECT, NM	58,000	The President, Senators Domenici
Water and Related Resources	UMATILLA PROJECT, OR	3,932,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT, CO	264,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	UPPER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS, CO	250,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS, NM	29,000	The President, Senators Domenici
Water and Related Resources	VENTURA RIVER PROJECT, CA	420,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT, OK	481,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	WASHINGTON AREA PROJECTS	95,000	The President, Senator Murray
Water and Related Resources	WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	145,000	The President, Senator Murray
Water and Related Resources	WASHITA BASIN PROJECT, OK	1,426,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UT	1,748,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	WEBER RIVER PROJECT, UT	137,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	WICHITA PROJECT—EQUUS BEDS DIVISION, KS	1,050,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
Water and Related Resources	WICHITA-CHENEY PROJECT, KS	385,000	The President, Senators Brownback, Roberts
Water and Related Resources	WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	26,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	YAKIMA PROJECT, WA	8,500,000	The President, Senator Murray
Water and Related Resources	YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT, WA	8,503,000	The President, Senator Murray
Water and Related Resources	YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER STORAGE PROJECT, WA	500,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Water and Related Resources	YUMA AREA PROJECTS, AZ	21,863,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	YUMA EAST WETLANDS, AZ	1,500,000	Senator Kyl
Water and Related Resources	COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I	9,444,000	The President, Senator Kyl
Water and Related Resources	COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II	5,850,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECTION 5	5,913,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECTION 8	710,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	265,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:		
Water and Related Resources	DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	1,250,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	71,500,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SAFETY OF EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	18,500,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	500,000	The President, Senator Inouye

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
Water and Related Resources	EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	1,422,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	21,939,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bennett, Salazar, Bingaman, Hatch
Water and Related Resources	ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,739,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	973,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	6,254,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	1,384,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	2,163,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	7,481,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	16,400,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	714,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	7,020,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,658,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	OPERATIONS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,206,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN	40,740,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	1,097,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	796,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	2,132,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT (TITLE XXVII)	1,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Water and Related Resources	RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	951,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT		
Water and Related Resources	DESALINATION AND WATER PURIFICATION PROGRAM	3,975,000	The President, Senators Domenici, Bingaman
Water and Related Resources	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	9,000,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	RURAL WATER LEGISLATION TITLE I	1,000,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	SITE SECURITY	28,950,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	3,300,000	The President, Senators Reid, Domenici
Water and Related Resources	UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECHNICAL SUPPORT	93,000	The President
Water and Related Resources	WATER FOR AMERICA INITIATIVE	19,000,000	The President, Senators Reid; Domenici, Bingaman
California Bay-Delta Restoration	California Bay-Delta Restoration, CA	42,000,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
CUPCA	Central Utah Project Completion Act, UT	42,000,000	The President
CVPRF	Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, CA	56,079,000	The President, Senator Feinstein
DOE—EERC	Algal-Base Renewable Energy for Nevada, Desert Research Institute, Reno, NV for the development of algal-based energy system.	750,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EERE	Alternative Energy for Higher Education, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, for a solar energy project	1,200,000	Senators Nelson (Ben), Hagel

DOE—EERE	Alternative Energy School of the Future, Clark County, Andre Agassi Charitable Foundation, Las Vegas, NV, for a solar fuel cell system.	1,250,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EERE	Alternative Fuel Cell Membranes for National Energy Independence, University of Southern Mississippi, USM, MS, for advanced fuel cell membrane research.	1,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
DOE—EERE	Anaerobic Digester and Combined Heat Power Project, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, MD, for a study on anaerobic power generation.	600,000	Senator Cardin
DOE—EERE	Bioenergy and Bioproducts Laboratory, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, to conduct research on biofuel conversion, biofuel testing, and certification.	1,000,000	Senators Shelby, Sessions
DOE—EERE	Bioenergy Demonstration Project: Value-Added Products from Renewable Fuels, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE, for research on the byproducts of biofuel production.	2,000,000	Senators Nelson (Ben), Hagel
DOE—EERE	Biogas Center of Excellence, Michigan Economic Development Corporation, Flint, MI, for a center for the production of biogas.	1,000,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
DOE—EERE	Biomass Energy Resources Center, Biomass Energy Resource Center, Montpelier, VT, for the installation of new small scale technology.	1,500,000	Senator Leahy
DOE—EERE	Biomass Gasification Research and Development Project, Port of Benton, Richland, WA, for the gasification and research of biomass.	1,000,000	Senator Murray
DOE—EERE	Biorefinery for Ethanol, Chemicals, Animal Feed and Biomaterials from Sugarcane Bagasse, Louisiana State University Agricultural Center, Baton Rouge, LA, for a biomass conversion project.	1,000,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
DOE—EERE	Bipolar Wafer Cell NiMH Lithium Ion Battery, Electro Energy, Danbury, CT, to advance wafer cell battery technology.	2,000,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
DOE—EERC	Carbon Neutral Green Campus, Nevada State College, Clark County, NV for environmental sustainability.	250,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EERE	Center for Biomass Utilization, University of North Dakota Energy and Environmental Research Center, Grand Forks, ND, for research on biomass production and its byproducts.	2,000,000	Senator Dorgan
DOE—EERE	Center for Nanoscale Energy, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, for nanomaterials research	5,000,000	Senator Dorgan
DOE—EERE	Central Vermont Recovered Biomass Facility, Vermont Sustainable Jobs Fund, Montpelier, VT, for a digester system.	1,000,000	Senator Leahy
DOE—EERE	Chariton Valley Densification—Phase II, Chariton Valley RC&D, Inc, Centerville, IA, for research on switchgrass.	1,000,000	Senator Harkin
DOE—EERE	Christmas Valley Renewable Energy Development, Oregon Department of Energy, Salem, OR, for the development of a renewable energy-producing facility.	400,000	Senators Wyden, Smith
DOE—EERE	City of Miami Green Initiative, City of Miami, Miami, FL, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and fuel consumption in the city.	1,000,000	Senator Nelson (Bill)
DOE—EERE	Clean Power Energy Research Consortium, Nicholls State University, Louisiana State University, University of New Orleans, Tulane University, Southern University, University of Louisiana, Thibodeaux, LA, for a joint venture of Lousiana universities to promote alternative fuels.	2,000,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
DOE—EERE	Clean Technology Commercialization Initiative, Ben Franklin Technology Partners, Harrisburg, PA, to support clean and alternative energy technologies.	1,000,000	Senators Specter, Casey
DOE—EERE	Coastal Ohio Wind Project, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, for wind energy research.	1,000,000	Senators Brown, Voinovich

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
DOE—EERE	Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, The Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, Inc., St. Simons Island, N/A, to support university-industry research and technology transfer projects.	1,000,000	Senators Brown, Dorgan, Harkin, Inouye, Johnson, Klobuchar, Landrieu, Levin, Ben Nelson, Murray, Stabenow, McConnell, Chambliss
DOE—EERE	Cooling Heating and Power and Bio-Fuel Application Center, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, to conduct research on increased energy efficiency through the use of electric and thermal delivery systems.	2,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
DOE—EERC	Development of Biofuels Using Ionic Transfer Membranes, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Clark County, NV for biofuels research.	600,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EERE	Development of High Yield Tropical Feedstocks, University of Hawaii, College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, Honolulu, HI, for a tropical bioenergy project.	1,500,000	Senator Inouye
DOE—EERE	Dueco Plug-In Hybrid Engines, Dueco Inc., Waukesha, WI, for new plug-in hybrid electric propulsion technology.	2,000,000	Senator Kohl
DOE—EERE	Energy Production Through Anaerobic Digestion, New Jersey Department of Agriculture, Trenton, NJ, for anaerobic digester technology.	500,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
DOE—EERE	Fluid Flow Optimization of Aerogel Blanket Manufacturing Process, Aspen Aerogels, Northborough, MA, for energy-efficient insulation research.	1,500,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
DOE—EERE	Forestry biofuel statewide Collaboration Center, Michigan Economic Development Corporation, Upper Peninsula, MI, to improve the supply chain for woody biomass.	1,500,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
DOE—EERE	Genetic Improvements of Switchgrass, University of Rhode Island at Kingston, Kingston, RI, to improve switchgrass for use as a biofuel.	1,500,000	Senator Reed
DOE—EERE	Geothermal Power Generation Plant, Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT), Klamath Falls, OR, for a geothermal power plant.	1,600,000	Senators Wyden, Smith
DOE—EERE	Great Basin Center for Geothermal Energy, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, to continue and expand the Center's activities in promoting geothermal power.	650,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EERE	Great Plains Wind Power Test Facility, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, for the testing, characterization, and improvement of grid-connected wind turbines and wind-driven water desalination systems.	2,000,000	Senator Hutchison
DOE—EERE	Hawaii-New Mexico Sustainable Energy Security Partnership, Hawaii Natural Energy Institute, Honolulu, HI, to continue the analysis and technology efforts of the Partnership.	3,000,000	Senators Inouye, Domenici, Akaka
DOE—EERC	Hollow Glass Microspheres, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Clark County, NV for hydrogen storage methods research.	550,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EERE	Hydroelectric Power Generation, Quincy, City of Quincy, Quincy, IL, for Quincy's efforts to install hydroelectric plants at locks and dams.	500,000	Senator Durbin
DOE—EERE	Hydrogen Storage System for Vehicular Propulsion, Delaware State U., Dover, Delaware State University, Dover, DE, to develop a hydrogen storage system.	1,500,000	Senators Biden, Carper

DOE—EERE	Integrated Solar Energy Windows, PPG Industries, Pittsburgh, PA, for the development of next generation, transparent photovoltaic (PV) solar cells.	1,000,000	Senator Specter
DOE—EERE	Integrated Sustainability Initiative, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, to promote campus sustainability.	1,000,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EERE	Kansas Biofuels Certification Laboratory, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, for analysis of biofuels, measuring emissions of biofuels, and research of biofuel cells.	1,000,000	Senator Brownback
DOE—EERE	La Samilla Solar Trough Storage Project, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, for solar trough storage advancement.	2,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
DOE—EERE	Landfill Gas Utilization Plant, County of Chautauqua, Chautauqua County, NY, for landfill-gas power generation.	2,000,000	Senator Schumer
DOE—EERE	Lightweight Composites for Heavy-Duty Vehicles and Hydrogen Storage, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, to advance the use of lightweight composite materials for vehicles.	500,000	Senator Byrd
DOE—EERE	Maine Tidal Power Initiative, University of Maine, Orono, ME, to develop protocols that allow locations in northern New England to be prioritized for tidal energy development.	1,000,000	Senators Snowe, Collins
DOE—EERE	MidSouth/Southeast Bioenergy Consortium, MidSouth/Southeast Bioenergy Consortium, Fayetteville, AR, for research on the byproducts of biofuel production.	1,500,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor, Chambliss
DOE—EERE	Multifunctional Solar Energy Systems Research, Utah State University, Logan, UT, for research and development of multifunctional electricity-producing systems.	1,000,000	Senator Bennett
DOE—EERE	National Agriculture-Based Industrial Lubricants (NABL), Biomass (IA), University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA, for the advancement of biobased industrial and automotive lubricants and for biofuels services.	600,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
DOE—EERE	National Center for Commercialization of Bioenergy, Kansas State University, Olathe, KS, for the commercialization of near market bioenergy technologies to meet national renewable fuel mandates.	750,000	Senator Roberts
DOE—EERE	National Wind Energy Center, University of Houston, Houston, TX, to focus on developing advanced offshore wind technology for cost-effective, renewable clean energy production.	2,000,000	Senator Hutchison
DOE—EERC	Nevada Institute for Renewable Energy Commercialization, Incline Village, NV, for the promotion of renewable energy in business.	500,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EERE	New School Green Building, The New School, New York, NY, for an environmentaly-friendly school facility.	2,000,000	Senator Schumer
DOE—EERE	North Carolina Center for Automotive Research, North Carolina Center for Automotive Research, Jackson, NC, to equip the Chassis Dynamics Laboratory.	1,000,000	Senator Dole
DOE—EERE	Offshore Renewable Energy, Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council, Wakefield, RI, to develop an Ocean Special Area Management Plan.	700,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
DOE—EERE	Ohio Advanced Energy Manufacturing Center (OAEMC), Edison Welding Institute, Columbus, OH, for an advanced energy manufacturing program.	1,000,000	Senators Brown, Voinovich
DOE—EERE	Oregon Solar Highway, Oregon Department of Transportation, Salem, OR, to demonstrate the feasibility of large-scale deployment of solar photovoltaic technology.	1,000,000	Senators Smith, Wyden
DOE—EERE	Pecos Valley Biomass Energy Project, NM, Clark County School District, Roswell, NM, for a bio-methane gas system.	2,500,000	Senators Bingaman, Domenici
DOE—EERE	Placer County Biomass Utilization Pilot Project, Placer County, Auburn, CA, for a biomass facility	1,500,000	Senator Feinstein

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
DOE—EERE	Pope/Douglas Third Combuster Expansion, Pope/Douglas Solid Waste Management, Alexandria, MN, to increase waste to energy capacity.	1,000,000	Senators Coleman, Klobuchar
DOE—EERE	Power Grid Reliability and Security, Washington State University, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, to create solutions for grid reliability and security enhancements.	1,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
DOE—EERE	Renewable Energy Clean Air Project, County of Koochiching, International Falls, MN, for syn-gas energy production.	700,000	Senator Klobuchar
DOE—EERE	Renewable Energy Development Venture, Pacific International Center for High Technology Research, Honolulu, HI, to expand potential energy resources in the State of Hawaii.	2,500,000	Senator Inouye
DOE—EERE	Renewable Energy Feasibility Study, City of Trenton, Trenton, NJ, to examine possible renewable energy sources.	500,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
DOE—EERE	Renewable Energy Integration and Development, Clark and Washoe Counties, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), Las Vegas, NV, for a renewable energy center.	2,000,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EERE	Renewable/Sustainable Biomass Project, Alaska Village Initiatives, Alaska, AK, for use of biomass for energy generation in rural Alaska villages.	500,000	Senator Stevens
DOE—EERE	Sandia National Lab Concentrating Solar, Sandia National Lab, Albuquerque, NM, for concentrating solar activities.	3,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
DOE—EERE	Solar Panels and Environmental Education, County of Essex, Newark, NJ, for the installation of solar panels to further environmental education.	1,000,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
DOE—EERE	Solar Park Pilot Project, City of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, FL, to develop a renewable energy plan for the City's parks.	1,000,000	Senator Nelson (Bill)
DOE—EERE	Solar Power Generation, Township of Cherry Hill, Cherry Hill, NJ, for solar technology	300,000	Senator Lautenberg
DOE—EERE	Solar Thermal Demonstration Project, Clark County School District, Clark County, NV, for solar technology for schools.	1,250,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EERE	Southern Regional Center for Lightweight Innovative Design, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, to reduce emissions and posture the US for less reliance on foreign oil.	4,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
DOE—EERE	Southwest Alaska Regional Geothermal Energy Project, Naknek Electrical Association, Naknek, AK, for an exploratory well for a 25MW geothermal plant to serve villages in rural Alaska.	3,000,000	Senators Stevens, Murkowski
DOE—EERE	Stamford Waste-to-Energy Project (CT), City of Stamford, Stamford, CT, to convert dried sludge into clean, renewable energy.	2,000,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
DOE—EERE	Strategic Biomass Initiative, Mississippi Technology Alliance, Jackson, MS, to encourage bioenergy industry in the southeast.	500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
DOE—EERE	Sun Grant Initiative, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD, for regional biomass feedstock research and education.	4,000,000	Senators Johnson, Thune
DOE—EERE	Sustainable Energy for Homes and Businesses, Vermont Department of Public Service, Montpelier, VT, to support Vermont's wind and solar program.	750,000	Senator Sanders

DOE—EERE	Sustainable Energy for Vermont Schools Competition, Vermont Superintendents Association, Montpelier, VT, for school-based projects to highlight sustainable energy technologies.	900,000	Senator Sanders
DOE—EERE	Sustainable Energy Research Center, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, to develop new engineering and scientific knowledge and serve as a catalyst to create sustainable energy industries in the southeastern United States.	10,500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
DOE—EERC	Sustainable Las Vegas, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Clark County, NV to increase conservation and sustainability in Las Vegas.	1,000,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EERE	The Institute for Energy, Environment and Sustainability, Johnson County Community College, Overland Park, KS, to serve as a resource for local education, business and civic entities and would include education and training in renewable energy.	750,000	Senator Brownback
DOE—EERE	Thin Film Photovoltaic Research & Development, Omega Optical, Brattleboro, VT, to research solar panel technology.	1,000,000	Senator Leahy
DOE—EERE	Tidal Energy Study, Snohomish County PUD No. 1, Everett, WA, for environmental studies of possible tidal energy pilot plants.	500,000	Senator Murray
DOE—EERE	Transportable Emissions Testing Lab, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, for mobile labs that test bus emissions.	1,000,000	Senator Byrd
DOE—EERE	USD Catalysis Group for Alternative Energy, South Dakota Catalysis Group, Vermilion, SD, for the development of metal oxide and carbon catalyzed reactions technologies.	1,100,000	Senators Johnson, Thune
DOE—EERE	Vermont Biofuels Initiative, Vermont Sustainable Jobs Fund, Montpelier, VT, to test the feasibility of different uses of biodiesel.	1,500,000	Senator Leahy
DOE—EERE	Wind Turbine Model and Pilot Project for Alternative Energy, University of Delaware, Newark, DE, for a shore-side wind turbine.	1,500,000	Senators Biden, Carper
DOE—EM DEFENSE	Characteristics and Clean-up of US Nuclear Legacy, Institute for Clean Energy Technology, Mississippi State, MS, for renewal of the cooperative agreement with the DOE to help expedite the cleanup of the nuclear defense sites.	4,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
DOE—EM DEFENSE	Water Resources Data, Modeling, and Visualization Center, Desert Research Institute, Washoe County, NV for water research.	1,000,000	Senator Reid
DOE—EM DEFENSE	WIPP Records Archive, WIPP, Carlsbad, NM, for records archiving	4,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
DOE—EM NON-DEFENSE	Bioinformatics and Computational Biology Initiative, The University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, to provide data management support for research in genomics and metabolomic programs.	1,000,000	Senator McConnell
DOE—EM NON-DEFENSE	Southwest Experimental Fast Oxide Reactor Decommissioning (SEFOR), University of Arkansas in Fayetteville, Fayetteville, AR, for the decommissioning of SEFOR in Strickler, AR.	2,000,000	Senators Lincoln, Pryor
DOE—FE	Arctic Energy Office, Arctic Energy Office, Fairbanks, AK, for research in fossil energy, natural gas technologies, and oil technologies.	6,000,000	Senator Stevens
DOE—FE	Center for Zero Emissions Research and Technology, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, for research related to carbon sequestration, greenhouse gas emissions, and clean power generation.	4,500,000	Senators Baucus, Tester
DOE—FE	CO2 Capture/Sequestration Research, Pennsylvania State University, Centre County, PA, to study carbon capture and sequestration.	500,000	Senator Casey
DOE—FE	Fossil Fuel Research & Development, University of North Dakota Energy and Environmental Research Center, Grand Forks, ND, to address strategic national energy issues.	4,000,000	Senator Dorgan

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
DOE—FE	Gulf Of Mexico Hydrates Research Consortium, University of Mississippi, University of Mississippi, MS, to develop and deploy an integrated multi-sensor station on the seafloor in the Gulf of Mexico.	1,200,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
DOE—FE	Long Term Environmental and Economic Impacts of the Development of a Coal Liquefaction Sector in China, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, for the study of the development of commercial liquefaction plants.	500,000	Senator Byrd
DOE—FE	Multi-Year Demonstration of Carbon Sequestration in a Deep Saline Reservoir, Xcel Energy, Denver, CO, to determine the feasibility of geologic CO2 sequestration in a deep saline reservoir.	1,500,000	Senators Salazar, Allard
DOE—FE	National Center for Hydrogen Technology, University of North Dakota Energy and Environmental Research Center, Grand Forks, ND, for the development of hydrogen technologies.	3,000,000	Senator Dorgan
DOE—FE	Shale Oil Upgrading Utilizing Ionic Conductive Membranes, Ceramatec, Inc., Salt Lake City, UT, to develop processes for upgrading oil shale, making oil extract high quality and affordable.	1,000,000	Senators Hatch, Bennett
DOE—FE	Solid Oxide Fuel Cells, Siemens Power Generation, Pittsburgh, PA, to support development, construction, and testing of the fuel processing systems.	2,000,000	Senator Specter
DOE—FE	The Center for Advanced Separation Technology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, to support efforts to develop new technologies that reduce the cost of separations in coal, metals, and industrial mining operations.	3,000,000	Senators McConnell, Warner, Webb
DOE—FE	University of Kentucky Coal-Derived Low Energy Materials for Sustainable Construction Project, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, to research alternative uses for coal combustion byproducts.	1,000,000	Senators McConnell, Bunning
DOE—FE	Refining Capacity Study, North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, Mandan, ND, to study refining capacity.	500,000	Senator Dorgan
DOE—FE	Utah Center for Ultra Clean Coal Utilization & Heavy Oil Research, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, to continue research on the commercial viability and validity of unconventional and clean energy technologies.	4,000,000	Senator Bennett
DOE—NE	Technologies Ventures Corporation, Technologies Ventures Corporation, Albuquerque, NM, for technology transfer activities.	3,000,000	Senator Domenici
DOE—Nuclear Waste	Cooperative agreement between the Department of Energy and Inyo County, Inyo County, Independence, CA, to complete studies under the cooperative agreement.	1,600,000	Senator Feinstein
DOE—Nuclear Waste	Inyo County Affected Unit of Local Government, County of Inyo, Inyo County, CA, to conduct scientific oversight responsibilities and participate in licensing activities.	350,000	Senator Feinstein
DOE—ODA	Medical Monitoring at Paducah, KY, Portsmouth, OH, and Oak Ridge, TN, Paducah, Portsmouth, and Oak Ridge Medical Monitoring, Paducah, KY, Portsmouth, OH, and Oak Ridge, TN, to provide for continued conventional medical work-ups and lung scans and re-scans for current and former workers.	1,050,000	Senator McConnell
DOE—OE	Alternate Fuel for Cement Processing, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, to focus on the integration of the burning process into existing kiln systems in Lafarge plants, maximization of burn efficiency and minimization of waste/discharge.	1,500,000	Senator Shelby

DOE—OE	Center of Excellence Lab, Bismarck State College, Bismarck, ND, to develop a state-of-the art lab	1,400,000	Senator Dorgan
DOE—OE	Energy Development and Reliability, Bismarck State College, Bismarck, ND, to promote and advance the region's energy industry.	300,000	Senator Dorgan
DOE—OE	Integrated Distribution Management System, Southern Company, Birmingham, AL, to provide seamlessly integrated set of information systems providing all of the major functionality needed to operate an electric distribution system.	1,500,000	Senator Shelby
DOE—OE	Iowa Stored Energy Plant, Iowa Associations of Municipal Utilities, Ankeny, IA, for compressed air energy storage project.	1,500,000	Senator Harkin, Grassley
DOE—OE	Navajo Electrification Demonstration Program, Navajo Tribal Utility Authority, Fort Defiance, AZ, to provide electric power to homes on the reservation.	2,000,000	Senators Bingaman, Domenici
DOE—OE	North Dakota Energy Workforce Development, Bismarck State College, Bismarck, ND, for a workforce development programs.	1,900,000	Senator Dorgan
DOE—OE	San Mateo County Solar Genesis Project, County of San Mateo, Redwood City, CA, for a solar power electric generation facility.	1,500,000	Senator Boxer
DOE—OE	SmartGrid Integration Lab, Colorado State University, Ft Collins, CO, to demonstrate core smart grid capabilities.	1,000,000	Senators Allard, Salazar
DOE—OE	Technology Development, Red River Valley Research Corridor, Grand Forks, ND, to promote and advance the research, development and commercialization activities occurring in North Dakota's Red River Valley Research Corridor.	300,000	Senator Dorgan
DOE—SC	Antibodies Research, University of North Dakota Research Foundation, Grand Forks, ND, to research and develop antibodies for disease threats.	2,750,000	Senator Dorgan
DOE—SC	Bionanotechnology: Research and Commercialization, Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, LA, for bionanotechnology and biofuels research.	1,500,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
DOE—SC	Center for Advanced Energy Studies, Idaho National Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID, to conduct a pilot program to demonstrate the Nuclear Science Talent Expansion program.	3,000,000	Senators Craig, Crapo
DOE—SC	Center for Diagnostic Nanosystems, Marshall University, Huntington, WV, for disease detection and diagnosis research.	2,000,000	Senator Byrd
DOE—SC	Center for Nanomedicine and Cellular Delivery, School of Pharmacy, University of MD, Baltimore, MD, for research.	750,000	Senator Mikulski
DOE—SC	Center of Excellence and Hazardous Materials, Carlsbad, NM, for applied research	2,000,000	Senator Domenici
DOE—SC	Climate Change Modeling Capability, Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, NM, for climate change modeling.	5,000,000	Senator Domenici
DOE—SC	Computing Capability, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, to increase supercomputing power	5,000,000	Senator Dorgan
DOE—SC	Contrast Media and Wound Closure Reduction Study, University of Mississippi, University of Mississippi, MS, for efficiency in Iodine-based medical imaging for diagnostic procedures.	650,000	Senator Cochran
DOE—SC	Facilitating blood-brain barrier research, Seattle Science Foundation, Seattle, WA, for cooperative research.	1,500,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
DOE—SC	Former Workers Medical Surveillance Programs, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, for medical surveillance, needs assessment and former worker medical screenings.	1,000,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
DOE—SC	Functional MRI Research, University of Vermont College of Medicine, Burlington, VT, to support MRI research.	1,250,000	Senator Leahy
DOE—SC	Intermountain Center for River Restoration and Rehabilitation, Utah State University, Logan, UT, to continue researching river restoration and environmental management.	600,000	Senator Bennett
DOE—SC	Marine Systems Research, University of Massachusetts at Boston, Boston, MA, for research into aquatic ecosystems, marine biology, fisheries and mammal sustainability.	500,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
DOE—SC	Materials and Energy Research Development, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, for environmental and materials research.	1,000,000	Senator Landrieu, Vitter
DOE—SC	Matter-Radiation Interactions in Extremes, Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, NM, for advanced materials testing.	7,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
DOE—SC	Mind Institute, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, to advance the understanding of mental illness through advanced brain imaging.	12,000,000	Senators Domenici, Bingaman
DOE—SC	Neuroscience research, Dominican University, River Forest, IL, for research in to memory dysfunctions.	500,000	Senator Durbin
DOE—SC	Pioneer Valley Life Sciences Institute Biomedical Research, Pioneer Valley Life Science Institute, Springfield, MA, for research programs.	500,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
DOE—SC	Regenerative Medicine, Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science, North Chicago, IL, for regenerative medicine research.	500,000	Senator Durbin
DOE—SC	Research into Proton Beam Thearapy, Seattle Cancer Care Alliance, Seattle, WA, to research new uses for proton beam therapy.	1,500,000	Senator Murray
DOE—SC	Sandia Nanotechnology Engineering Center, Sandia National Lab, Albuquerque, NM, for nanotechnology engineering activities.	5,000,000	Senator Domenici
DOE—SC	Supercapacitors, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, for work to be done in Ostego, NY on supercapacitors.	1,500,000	Senator Schumer, Bingaman
DOE—SC	Sustainable Biofuels Development Center, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, to support research efforts in alternative energy technologies.	1,500,000	Senator Salazar
DOE—Weapons	Arrowhead Center, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM, to promote prosperity in New Mexico through economic development.	1,000,000	Senator Domenici
DOE–WEAPONS	Electronic Record for Worker Safety and Health, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Clark County to help the Nevada Site Office improve responses to DOE worker claims.	1,500,000	Senator Reid
DOE—Weapons	Renewable Energy Planning, National Nuclear Security Administration, Nevada Test Site, NV, for planning to maximize renewable energy production at the Site.	500,000	Senator Reid
DOE—Weapons	Restore Manhattan Project Sites, Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, NM, for historic preservation.	500,000	Senator Domenici

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
Investigations	167,261	91,000	166,000	−1,261	+75,000
Rescissions	−100			+100	
Total, Investigations	167,161	91,000	166,000	−1,161	+75,000
Construction	2,294,029	1,402,000	2,004,500	−289,529	+602,500
Rescissions	−4,688			+4,688	
Emergency appropriation					
Total, Construction	2,289,341	1,402,000	2,004,500	−284,841	+602,500
Mississippi River and tributaries	387,402	240,000	365,000	−22,402	+125,000
Operations and Maintenance	2,243,637	2,475,000	2,220,000	−23,637	−255,000
Regulatory program	180,000	180,000	183,000	+3,000	+3,000
FUSRAP	140,000	130,000	140,000		+10,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies		40,000	40,000	+40,000	
General Expenses	175,046	177,000	177,000	+1,954	
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	4,500	6,000	4,500		−1,500
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	5,587,087	4,741,000	5,300,000	−287,087	+559,000
Appropriations	(5,591,875)	(4,741,000)	(5,300,000)	(−291,875)	(+559,000)
Emergency appropriations					
Rescissions	(−4,788)			(+4,788)	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	40,404	39,373	39,373	−1,031	
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation andconservation	976	987	987	+11	
Subtotal	41,380	40,360	40,360	−1,020	
Program oversight and administration	1,620	1,640	1,640	+20	
Total, Central Utah project completion account	43,000	42,000	42,000	−1,000	
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	949,882	779,320	927,320	−22,562	+148,000
Rescission		−175,000			+175,000
Central Valley project restoration fund	59,122	56,079	56,079	−3,043	
California Bay-Delta restoration	40,098	32,000	42,000	+1,902	+10,000
Policy and administration	58,811	59,400	59,400	+589	
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	1,107,913	751,799	1,084,799	−23,114	+333,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	1,150,913	793,799	1,126,799	−24,114	+333,000
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Programs					
Energy efficiency and renewable energy	1,722,407	1,255,393	1,928,259	+205,852	+672,866
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	138,556	134,000	166,900	+28,344	+32,900
Nuclear energy	961,665	853,644	803,000	−158,665	−50,644
(Reallocation from Energy supply and conservation)	(682,877)			(−682,877)	

(Reallocation from Nuclear nonproliferation)	(278,789)	.....	.....	(−278,789)	.....
Office of Legacy Management	33,872	.....	.....	−33,872	.....
Clean coal technology:					
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2008	257,000	.....	.....	−257,000	.....
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2009	−149,000	149,000	149,000	+298,000	.....
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D	−164,489	−149,000	−149,000	+15,489	.....
Total, Clean coal technology	−56,489	.....	.....	+56,489	.....
Fossil Energy Research and Development	578,349	605,030	727,730	+149,381	+122,700
Transfer from Clean Coal Technology	164,489	149,000	149,000	−15,489	.....
Subtotal, Fossil Energy Research and Development	742,838	754,030	876,730	+133,892	+122,700
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	20,272	19,099	19,099	−1,173	.....
Strategic petroleum reserve	186,757	344,000	205,000	+18,243	−139,000
Northeast home heating oil reserve	12,335	9,800	9,800	−2,535	.....
Energy Information Administration	95,460	110,595	110,595	+15,135	.....
Non-defense environmental clean up	182,263	213,411	269,411	+87,148	+56,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	622,162	480,333	515,333	−106,829	+35,000
Science	4,017,711	4,721,969	4,640,469	+622,758	−81,500
Nuclear Waste Disposal	187,269	247,371	195,390	+8,121	−51,981
Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program	5,450	19,880	19,880	+14,430	.....
Offsetting collection	−991	−19,880	−19,880	−18,889	.....
Proposed change in subsidy cost	.....	355,000	355,000	+355,000	.....
Advance appropriation (Public Law 110–161)	42,000	.....	.....	−42,000	.....
Subtotal, Innovative Technology Guarantee Pgm	46,459	355,000	355,000	+308,541	.....
Departmental administration	309,662	272,144	272,144	−37,518	.....
Miscellaneous revenues	−161,247	−117,317	−117,317	+43,930	.....
Net appropriation	148,415	154,827	154,827	+6,412	.....
Office of the Inspector General	46,057	51,927	51,927	+5,870	.....
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	6,297,466	6,618,079	6,524,579	+227,113	−93,500
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,657,996	1,247,048	1,909,056	+251,060	+662,008

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
Rescissions	−322,000			+322,000	
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,335,996	1,247,048	1,909,056	+573,060	+662,008
Naval reactors	774,686	828,054	828,054	+53,368	
Office of the Administrator	402,137	404,081	404,081	+1,944	
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	8,810,285	9,097,262	9,665,770	+855,485	+568,508
Defense environmental cleanup	5,349,325	5,297,256	5,771,506	+422,181	+474,250
Other defense activities	754,359	1,313,461	827,503	+73,144	−485,958
Defense nuclear waste disposal	199,171	247,371	193,000	−6,171	−54,371
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	15,113,140	15,955,350	16,457,779	+1,344,639	+502,429
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	54,817	56,940	56,940	+2,123	
Offsetting collection	−48,413	−49,520	−49,520	−1,107	
Subtotal, O&M, Southeastern Power Administration	6,404	7,420	7,420	+1,016	
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	65,165	63,414	63,414	−1,751	
Offsetting collection	−35,000	−35,000	−35,000		
Subtotal, O&M, Southwestern Power Administration	30,165	28,414	28,414	−1,751	
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	541,546	524,830	624,830	+83,284	+100,000
Offsetting collection	−308,702	−328,118	−403,118	−94,416	−75,000
Offsetting collection Colorado River Dam Fund	−3,937	−3,366	−3,366	+571	
Subtotal, O&M, Western Area Power Administration	228,907	193,346	218,346	−10,561	+25,000

Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,477	2,959	2,959	+482	
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	267,953	232,139	257,139	−10,814	+25,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	260,425	273,400	273,400	+12,975	
Revenues applied	−260,425	−273,400	−273,400	−12,975	
Total, title III, Department of Energy	24,489,102	25,892,888	27,016,658	+2,527,556	+1,123,770
Appropriations	(24,661,102)	(25,743,888)	(26,867,658)	(+2,206,556)	(+1,123,770)
Rescissions	(−322,000)			(+322,000)	
Deferrals	(108,000)	(149,000)	(149,000)	(+41,000)	
Advance appropriations	(42,000)			(−42,000)	
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	73,032	65,000	85,000	+11,968	+20,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	21,909	25,499	25,499	+3,590	
Delta Regional Authority	11,685	6,000	20,000	+8,315	+14,000
Denali Commission	21,800	1,800	21,800		+20,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	917,334	1,007,956	1,022,956	+105,622	+15,000
Revenues	−771,220	−847,357	−860,857	−89,637	−13,500
Subtotal	146,114	160,599	162,099	+15,985	+1,500
Office of Inspector General	8,744	9,044	9,344	+600	+300
Revenues	−7,870	−8,140	−8,410	−540	−270
Subtotal	874	904	934	+60	+30
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	146,988	161,503	163,033	+16,045	+1,530
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,621	3,811	3,811	+190	
Tennessee Valley Authority: Office of Inspector General		17,000			−17,000
Offset		−17,000			+17,000
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska natural gas transportation projects	2,261	4,400	4,400	+2,139	
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	281,296	268,013	323,543	+42,247	+55,530

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
Grand total	31,508,398	31,695,700	33,767,000	+2,258,602	+2,071,300
Appropriations	(31,685,186)	(31,721,700)	(33,618,000)	(+1,932,814)	(+1,896,300)
Emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Rescissions	(−326,788)	(−175,000)	.....	(+326,788)	(+175,000)
Deferrals	(108,000)	(149,000)	(149,000)	(+41,000)	.....
Advance appropriations	(42,000)	.....	.....	(−42,000)	.....

○