

**ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION  
BILL, 2002**

\_\_\_\_\_  
JULY 13, 2001.—Ordered to be printed

Filed under authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2001

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. REID, from the Committee on Appropriations,  
submitted the following

**REPORT**

together with

**ADDITIONAL VIEWS**

[To accompany S. 1171]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1171) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

*Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2002*

Budget estimates considered by Senate .....	\$23,008,002,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate .....	25,450,485,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Above the budget estimate, 2002 .....	2,442,483,000
Over enacted bill, 2001 .....	1,404,173,000

# CONTENTS

## TITLE I

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:	
Corps of Engineers—Civil:	Page
General investigations .....	8
Construction, general .....	29
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries .....	49
Operation and maintenance, general .....	54
Regulatory program .....	76
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program .....	76
General expenses .....	77

## TITLE II

Department of the Interior:	
Central Utah project completion account .....	79
Bureau of Reclamation: Water and related resources .....	79
Bureau of Reclamation loan program account .....	91
Central Valley project restoration fund .....	91
California bay-delta ecosystem restoration .....	92
Policy and administrative expenses .....	93

## TITLE III

Department of Energy:	
Energy Supply .....	95
Renewable energy resources .....	95
Nuclear energy programs .....	99
Environment, safety, and health .....	102
Energy support activities .....	102
Environmental management (nondefense) .....	102
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation .....	103
Nuclear waste fund .....	104
Science .....	107
High energy physics .....	107
Nuclear physics .....	108
Biological and environmental research .....	108
Basic energy sciences .....	108
Other energy research programs .....	109
Fusion energy sciences .....	110
Departmental administration .....	110
Miscellaneous revenues .....	110
Inspector General .....	110
Atomic energy defense activities:	
National Nuclear Security Administration:	
Weapon activities .....	111
Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....	119
Naval reactors .....	122
Office of the Administrator .....	122
Other defense related activities:	
Defense environmental restoration and waste management .....	122
Defense facilities closure projects .....	127
Defense environmental management privatization .....	128
Other defense activities .....	128
Defense nuclear waste disposal .....	133

Department of Energy—Continued	
Power marketing administrations:	
Operations and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration .....	135
Operations and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration ....	135
Construction, rehabilitation, operations and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration .....	135
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission .....	136
General provisions .....	157

## TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:	
Appalachian Regional Commission .....	159
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....	159
Delta Regional Authority .....	160
Denali Commission .....	160
Nuclear Regulatory Commission .....	160
Office of Inspector General .....	162
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board .....	162

## TITLE V

General provisions .....	163
Compliance with paragraph 7, rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	164
Compliance with paragraph 7(c), rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	164
Compliance with paragraph 12, rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	165
Budgetary impact statement .....	167
Additional views of Senator Larry E. Craig .....	168

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2002 beginning October 1, 2001, and ending September 30, 2002, 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 (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), 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 2002 budget estimates for the bill total \$23,008,002,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals \$25,450,485,000. This is \$2,442,483,000 above the budget estimates and \$1,404,173,000 over the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

The bill, as recommended, is in compliance with the subcommittee allocation under section 302(b)(1) of the Budget Act.

## BILL HIGHLIGHTS

### ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes \$15,088,547,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Weapon activities .....	\$6,062,891,000
Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....	880,500,000
Naval reactors .....	688,045,000
Other defense activities .....	564,168,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration .....	5,389,868,000
Defense facilities closure projects .....	1,080,538,000
Defense environmental privatization .....	157,537,000

### ENERGY SUPPLY

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of \$741,139,000 for energy research programs including:

Renewable energy resources .....	\$435,600,000
Nuclear energy .....	264,069,000

## NONDEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

An appropriation of \$228,553,000 is recommended for nondefense environmental management activities of the Department of Energy.

## SCIENCE

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of \$3,268,816,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research .....	\$725,100,000
Nuclear physics .....	373,000,000
Basic energy sciences .....	1,040,705,000
Biological and environmental R&D .....	490,000,000
Fusion energy sciences .....	248,495,000
Other energy research .....	391,516,000

## REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is \$192,010,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission .....	\$66,290,000
Delta Regional Authority .....	20,000,000
Denali Commission .....	40,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission .....	181,155,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission .....	506,900,000

## WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Corps of Engineers:	
General Investigations .....	\$152,402,000
Construction, General .....	1,570,798,000
Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries .....	328,011,000
Operation and Maintenance, General .....	1,833,263,000
Regulatory Program .....	128,000,000
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program .....	140,000,000
General Expenses .....	153,000,000
Central Utah Project Completion Account .....	36,228,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
Water and Related resources .....	732,496,000
Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account .....	7,495,000
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund .....	55,039,000
Policy and Administration .....	52,968,000

The Committee has recommended appropriations totaling approximately \$5,050,000,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Water is our Nation's most precious and valuable resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy. There is only so much water available. Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

While many areas of the country suffer from severe shortages of water, others suffer from the other extreme—an excess of water which threatens both rural and urban areas with floods. Because water is a national asset, and because the availability and control of water affect and benefit all States and jurisdictions, the Federal Government has historically assumed much of the responsibility for financing of water resource development.

The existing national water resource infrastructure in America is an impressive system of dams, locks, harbors, canals, irrigation systems, reservoirs, and recreation sites with a central purpose—to serve the public's needs.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient, and economical transportation of fuels for energy generation and agricultural production, and making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

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

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development. Flood control projects prevent an average \$22,000,000,000 per year in damages, and U.S. ports and harbors annually handle about \$600,000,000,000 in international cargo generating over \$14,500,000,000 in tax revenues, nearly \$515,000,000,000 in personal income, contributing \$783,000,000,000 to the Nation's gross domestic product, and \$1,600,000,000,000 in business sales.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held four sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2002 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

In addition, the subcommittee received numerous statements and letters from Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life throughout the United States. Information, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 2002 therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

#### VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of 29 to 0 the Committee on July 12, 2001, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

### TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Title III provides for the Department of Energy's defense and nondefense functions, the power marketing administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

#### CONTRACTOR TRAVEL

The Committee believes that earlier statutory restrictions on contractor travel established new appreciation by contractors for propriety and cost effectiveness in their travel expenditures. For fiscal year 2002, no statutory travel restrictions are included. Nevertheless, the Committee directs the Department to maintain contractor travel summaries adequate for periodic reviews of programmatic relevance and costs of contractor travel.

#### LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee believes that Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) is essential to maintaining scientific and engineering excellence in the technical areas of effort undertaken by the laboratories in support of the Department's missions. The Committee therefore directs that no more than 6 percent of funding to the laboratories be made available for LDRD.

In fiscal year 2001, the Committee established at the nuclear weapons production plants a program analogous to the LDRD program at the laboratories. This provision for the production plants is provided to attract and retain the highest quality work force through investments in new production and design concepts and the establishment of intern and cooperative student programs. The Committee recognizes the value derived from this activity and directs the Department to permit similar investment for the future by the Nevada Test Site. All of these efforts will be critical to maintaining the Department's most valuable assets—its people.

#### ENERGY SUPPLY

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$659,918,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	544,245,000
Committee recommendation .....	741,139,000

#### RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$375,785,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	276,653,000
Committee recommendation .....	435,600,000

The Committee recommendation provides \$435,600,000, for renewable energy resources, an increase of \$59,815,000 over the current year appropriation, and \$158,947,000 over the administration's request.

The recommendation for Renewable Energy Resources reflects the Committee's strong belief that only a balanced portfolio of production and distribution technologies and strategies will fulfill our Nation's long-term needs and goals for both energy and the environment. For that reason, the Committee recommendation includes substantial investments in renewable energy resources above the Administration's request. While the Administration's Report of the National Energy Policy Development Group recognized the importance of a clean and diverse portfolio of renewable domestic energy supplies, the Administration's budget, even as amended, provides inadequate resources to accomplish these goals.

The Committee agrees that the Secretaries of Energy and Interior need to re-evaluate access limitations to Federal lands in order to increase renewable energy production, such as geothermal, solar, wind, and biomass. The Committee is encouraged by the inter-departmental cooperation demonstrated by these Departments in facilitating the privately-funded large wind turbine project at the Nevada Test Site. Our Nation's vast holdings of public land are, in many cases, ideally suited to the deployment of renewable technologies. The Administration is encouraged to enhance these opportunities.

The Committee has modified the request for low emission energy technologies; including hydro, renewable, and nuclear, with the view toward post 2010 application of new technologies. As a result, with few exceptions, the Committee recommends basic research that will provide significant improvements over existing technologies. The Committee is well aware of the proposition that appropriated funds can demonstrate the reliable operation of low emission technologies before they become commercially attractive. In a few cases, the Committee has provided funds for just such demonstrations. However, in general, the Committee expects non-Federal financing to support the final stages of product development and all stages of market development.

*Solar building technology research.*—The Committee recommends \$7,000,000 to fund solar building technology development.

*Photovoltaic energy systems.*—The Committee recommends \$70,000,000 for photovoltaic energy systems. The Committee recommendation includes \$3,000,000 for continuation of the Million Solar Roofs program at current year levels and \$2,500,000 for the Southeast and Southwest photovoltaic experiments stations. Additionally, the Committee recommends \$3,000,000 for the Navajo electrification project.

*Concentrating solar power.*—The Committee recommends \$15,300,000 for concentrating solar power. Within these amounts the Department is directed to continue with deployment of the 1.0 MW dish engine and to continue activities associated with the 25 kW dish system. Additionally, the Committee directs the Department to develop and scope out an initiative to fulfill the goal of having 1,000 MW of new solar capacity supplying the Southwestern United States by the year 2006. A report is due to the House and Senate Committees by March 1, 2002.

*Biomass/biofuels—power systems.*—The Committee recommends \$53,000,000 for biomass/bio-fuels—power systems.



The Iowa switch grass project is funded at \$4,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

The recommendation includes \$4,000,000 for the McNeil biomass plant in Burlington, Vermont, and \$1,000,000 for the for methane energy and agriculture development project in Tillamook Bay, Oregon.

*Biomass/biofuels—transportation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$50,000,000 for biomass/biofuels transportation. Within available funds, \$300,000 is provided for the continuation and expansion of the on-going demonstration of the oxygenated diesel fuel particulate matter emission reduction project in Clark County, Nevada; \$3,000,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Initiative; \$3,000,000 for the Prime LLC, of South Dakota integrated ethanol complex, including an ethanol unit, waste treatment system, and enclosed cattle feed lot; \$300,000 for the Biomass Energy Resource Center project in Vermont; \$2,000,000 to continue the Sealaska ethanol project (subject to a non-federal match) at the fiscal year 2001 level; \$3,000,000 for the Biomass Gasification Research Center in Birmingham, Alabama; and \$3,000,000 for the Winona, Mississippi, biomass project. Additionally, the Committee directs the Department to continue funding for the Energy and Environment Research Center at last year's level.

Biomass demonstration projects may be funded from within the totals available under biomass/biofuels energy systems account. The Committee recommendation includes \$18,000,000 to continue the Integrated Biomass Research and Development Program.

*Wind.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$45,000,000 for wind. Within this amount, \$500,000 is provided for the Turtle Mountain Community College project in North Dakota; \$1,000,000 is provided for the Kotzebue project in Alaska; \$250,000 is provided to the Wind Technology Center for a feasibility study for a wind power generation facility to serve St. Paul and Unalaska, Alaska. The Wind Powering America initiative is to be continued at last year's funding level. The Committee continues to recognize the need for a set-aside for small wind programs, such as the one being developed by the Vermont Department of Public Service and the Department, in the Federal wind energy research and development budget. The Committee recommends \$500,000 for this project.

*Renewable energy production incentive.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$4,000,000 for the renewable energy production incentive.

*Renewable program support.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$3,000,000 for technical analysis and assistance within renewable program support.

*Departmental Energy Management.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,000,000 for departmental energy management. The Committee directs the Department to provide a report by January 1, 2002, detailing the potential energy savings to be derived from this program, if fully implemented.

*International renewable programs.*—The Committee strongly supports the U.S. international joint implementation program funded in this account and recommends \$3,000,000 for that purpose. The Committee supports efforts to increase international market opportunities for the export and deployment of advanced clean energy

technologies—end-use efficiency, fossil, renewable, and nuclear energy technologies.

*National Renewable Energy Laboratory.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$12,000,000, for capital equipment and general plant projects at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Of this amount, \$1,000,000 is provided to reduce the maintenance backlog. The Committee recommendation includes \$5,000,000 for technical analysis, technical assistance, and the harmonization of multi-program activities that address the resource opportunities and electric power needs in the Southwest United States. The expertise of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) is to be made available through a site office in Nevada. NREL will provide expertise through a virtual laboratory concept, serving as a portal for electronic communications, information sharing, data warehousing, and partnerships among universities, researchers, technology developers, and those interested in deployment.

*Geothermal.*—The Committee recommends \$32,000,000 for geothermal technology development, including \$2,500,000 for GeoPowering the West. The Committee is concerned that the Department appears to be cutting funds for these important research efforts prematurely. The Committee has provided a substantial increase and expects the Department to use the additional funds, in part, to foster university research and public private partnerships. Within available funds, the Committee provides \$1,000,000 for the UNR Geothermal Energy Center's demonstration project.

*Hydrogen research.*—The Committee strongly supports research and development of hydrogen technology and recognizes it to be a highly promising and cost effective energy carrier. The Committee recommends \$35,000,000. The recommendation includes \$350,000 for the Montana Trade Port Authority in Billings, MT to continue the ongoing resource inventory, feasibility study, and development of a Solid Waste Hydrogen Fuel Cell manufacturing capability, \$1,000,000 for the gasification of Iowa switch grass and its use in fuel cells, \$1,500,000 for the ITM Syngas project, \$1,500,000 for the fuel cell installation project at Gallatin County, Montana, and \$2,000,000 for continued demonstration of the hydrogen locomotive and front-end loader projects.

The Committee continues to encourage demonstration of a dedicated fleet of vehicles, including buses, powered by hydrogen.

*Hydropower.*—The Committee recommends \$9,300,000 for hydropower. The Committee commends the Department of Energy for recognizing the benefits of and developing advanced “fish-friendly” turbines for hydro-electric generation. The Committee recommendation includes \$7,000,000 for that effort. Within available funds, the Committee recommends \$400,000 to plan a hydroelectric power generation facility at Gustavus, Alaska, subject to a local match for construction. Additionally, the Committee recommends \$1,900,000 for the completion of the Power Creek hydroelectric project in Alaska. No additional funds will be made available for this project.

*Renewable Indian energy resources.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$4,000,000 for Indian renewable energy resource development. The Committee expects these funds to be ad-

ministered as competitively awarded grants to federally-recognized tribes throughout the United States.

*Electric energy systems and storage.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$71,000,000 for electric energy systems and storage.

This program provides funding for transmission reliability, energy storage systems and high temperature superconductivity research and development.

Within available funds under electric energy systems and storage, the Committee recommends \$1,000,000 to initiate development of a bipolar wafer-cell nickel metal hydride battery storage system; \$2,000,000 for Glenallen power generation upgrades, including extension of electricity to residents of Lake Louise; and \$2,000,000 for the Kachemak Bay Power System to extend and upgrade marine power cabling to provide power to the villages of Seldovia, Nanwalek, and Port Graham, Alaska. The Committee also recommends \$3,000,000 for the Swan Lake-Lake Tyee electrical intertie pursuant to the Southeast Alaska intertie authorization enacted into law last year. Additionally, the Committee recommends \$3,000,000 to complete the Prince of Wales Island electrical intertie. The Committee notes that \$20,000,000 has been provided in State and local funds and this Federal amount represents the final installment needed to complete the project. The Committee recommendation also includes \$3,000,000, within available funds, for NREL for research, development, and demonstration of advanced thermal energy storage technology integrated with renewable thermal energy technology.

In view of the Department's goal of obtaining a minimum of 20 percent of new generation through distributed generation technologies by 2010, the Committee supports the joint effort between New Mexico Tech and the Natural Energy Laboratory of Hawaii to integrate, demonstrate, and ultimately deploy distributed energy systems that make full use of conventional and renewable technologies and recommends \$1,000,000 for this purpose.

The Committee urges the Department to expand its partnership with and funding support to the University of California-Irvine's Advanced Power and Energy Program (APEP), the only nationally university-based public-private collaborative involving major gas turbine, micro turbine, fuel cell and renewable manufacturers, California utilities and Federal, regional and State government agencies. APEP's energy and information related technology demonstrations are accelerating the deployment of affordable and reliable energy products and systems, essential to helping the nation and Western States respond to current and future energy requirements.

*Renewable program direction.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$21,000,000 for program direction within this account.

#### NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$259,925,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	223,122,000
Committee recommendation .....	264,069,000

The Committee recommendation provides \$264,069,000 for nuclear energy, an increase of \$4,144,000 from the current year appropriation.

Nuclear energy presently contributes about 21 percent of our nation's electrical power and emits no atmospheric pollutants. The United States has not yet determined how to handle spent nuclear fuel, and the Committee does not underestimate the technical and social challenges entailed in this challenge. Although geologic repository characterization activities continue at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, this "bury and forget" concept for dealing with spent nuclear fuel continues to encounter obstacles to its implementation, both domestically and internationally. While the Committee supports continued nuclear power research and development activities as part of a balanced approach to meeting our Nation's energy needs, industry and the Department are strongly encouraged to focus their research efforts on a broader array of disposal options, including reprocessing, transmutation, and dry cask storage, all of which reduce or eliminate the need for a geologic repository.

*Advanced radioisotope power systems.*—The Committee recommends \$29,094,000 for advanced radioisotope power systems.

*Isotopes.*—The Committee recommends \$24,683,000 for isotope support and production. Within this amount, the Committee recommends an additional \$1,000,000 for medical applications. Additionally, the Committee recommends \$2,494,000 for the Isotope Production Facility at LANSCE. The amount recommended is reduced by offsetting collections of \$9,000,000 to be received in fiscal year 2002, resulting in a net recommended appropriation of \$18,177,000.

*University reactor fuel assistance and support.*—The Committee recommends a total of \$19,000,000, an increase of \$7,206,000 over the budget request, for university reactor fuel assistance and support. University nuclear engineering programs and university research reactors represent a fundamental and key capability in supporting our national policy goals in health care, materials science and energy technology.

The Committee strongly supports both the University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support program's efforts to provide fellowships, scholarships, and grants to students enrolled in science and engineering programs at U.S. universities, as well as efforts to provide fuel assistance and reactor upgrade funding for university-owned research reactors, such as the TRIGA reactor at Oregon State University.

The Committee is very concerned about the long-term viability of nuclear engineering programs in the United States and the continued loss of university research reactors. In 1988, the United States had 40 university reactors. Today, only 27 exist, and of those, several are under consideration for closing. To address this growing problem, the additional resources shall be used to initiate the establishment of (1) geographically distributed regional university research reactor user facilities, and (2) geographically distributed training and education reactor facilities in a manner consistent with the Final Report of the Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee University Research Reactor Task Force. The program

should also include substantial financial support from the nuclear industry.

*Nuclear energy plant optimization.*—The Committee recommends a total of \$9,000,000, an increase of \$4,500,000 over the budget request. The Department is encouraged to expand this cost-shared research and development program to improve the reliability, availability, and productivity of existing nuclear power plants.

*Nuclear Energy Research Initiative.*—The Committee recommends a total of \$38,000,000, an increase of \$19,921,000 over the budget request and \$3,000,000 over the current year enacted level. The Department's budget request would only marginally support existing NERI projects and would not allow for any new projects in the coming year. The proposed increase is necessary to grow the scope of the technology and the people for a growing nuclear industry. The recommendation includes \$4,000,000 for the Department to pursue reactor-based transmutation in coordination with studies of accelerator-based transmutation.

*Nuclear Energy Technologies.*—The Committee recommends a total of \$14,000,000, an increase of \$9,500,000 over the budget request and \$6,500,000 over the current year level. The Committee recommendation includes \$4,000,000 for completion of the Generation IV Technology Roadmap; \$7,000,000 for advanced reactor development consistent with the longer term recommendations of the Generation IV Technology Roadmap and to continue research begun in the current fiscal year on small, modular nuclear reactors; and \$3,000,000 to support, on a cost-shared basis, the generic/industry-wide proposals from the report of the Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee's Near-Term Deployment Group.

*Infrastructure.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$81,279,000 for infrastructure, the amount of the request.

*ANL—West Operations.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$34,107,000, the amount of the request and \$5,043,000 less than the current year, for ANL—West operations.

*Fast flux test facility.*—The Committee has provided the budget request of \$38,439,000 for the FFTF. Since the FFTF was shut down in 1992, the Department has spent a total of \$473,700,000 to begin deactivation and then to maintain it in a safe standby condition while seeking other missions. Had this amount of funding been spent to decontaminate and decommission (D&D) the reactor, the job would have been finished.

In April, the Secretary of Energy granted a 90-day delay in shut-down for yet another review of possible missions. The Committee is not optimistic that the results of this review will be any different than previous reviews. If the review determines that the reactor should be shut down, the Department is directed to immediately submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a plan detailing how the Department intends to shut down and begin the decommissioning and decontamination of the FFTF. If the review determines that the reactor should be restarted, the Department must submit a detailed project plan with a validated baseline cost, scope and schedule for restart to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. No funds may be obligated for restart activities until 60 days after submission of this report and approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

*Nuclear facilities management.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$30,457,000 for nuclear facilities management, the amount of the request. Within this amount, the Committee directs that \$4,200,000 be used to complete deactivation of EBR-II.

*Program direction.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$25,062,000 for program direction, the amount of the request.

#### ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$35,998,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	35,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	33,500,000

The Committee recommendation includes \$33,500,000 for non-defense environment, safety, and health which includes \$19,527,000 for program direction.

#### ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$8,600,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	8,970,000
Committee recommendation .....	7,970,000

*Technical information management.*—The Committee recommendation for the technical information management program is \$1,600,000.

*Program direction.*—The Committee recommendation for program direction is \$6,370,000.

*General reduction.*—The Committee recommendation includes a general reduction of \$5,000,000, to be applied uniformly across Nuclear Energy.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

##### (NONDEFENSE)

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$277,200,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	228,553,000
Committee recommendation .....	228,553,000

The Committee recommendation provides \$228,553,000 for non-defense environmental management.

The non-defense environmental management program is responsible for managing and addressing the environmental legacy resulting from nuclear energy and civilian energy research programs, primarily the Office of Science within the Department of Energy. Research and development activities of DOE and predecessor agencies generated waste and other contaminants which pose unique problems, including unprecedented volumes of contaminated soils, water and facilities. The funding requested and provided here supports the Department's goal of cleaning up as many of its contaminated sites as possible by 2006 in a safe and cost-effective manner. The Committee is concerned that a growing number of projects within the closure account will not, in fact, be closed out by 2006. The closure accounts were created to focus attention and resources on clean-up projects that were considered the most likely candidates for timely closure. To the extent that several projects now appear likely to miss the 2006 deadline, the Department should consider moving them back to the post-2006 list. The Committee directs the Department to provide to the Committee by March 1,

2002, a report that aligns projects appropriately among site closure, site completion, and post-2006 completion.

*Site Closure.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$43,000,000 for site closure.

*Site completion.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$64,119,000 for site completion. Within available funds, the Committee recommends \$1,800,000 to support accelerating clean-up along the Columbia River in Hanford's 300 Area.

*Post 2006 completion.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$120,053,000, the amount of the request.

*Excess Facilities.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$1,381,000 for the transfer of excess facilities at the Brookhaven National Laboratory and Oak Ridge from other DOE organizations.

#### URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$392,502,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	363,425,000
Committee recommendation .....	408,725,000

*Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$286,941,000 for the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund, an increase of \$45,300,000 above the requested level. Of this amount, \$14,300,000 is provided for continued critical soil remediations at East Tennessee Technology Park and \$30,000,000 is provided for continued clean-up at Paducah, Kentucky. Within the amount provided to Paducah, the Committee directs that \$3,000,000 be set aside for the purpose of depleted uranium cylinder yard construction. Total funding for Paducah under the Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation account for fiscal year 2002 is \$102,982,000.

The Committee directs the Secretary to provide a detailed accounting of the \$373,000,000 fund created under Public Law 105–204 and reserved exclusively for DUF6 activities. The report is due to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on or before January 31, 2002, and should cover all activities since the fund's inception in 1998. The uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund was established in accordance with title XI of Public Law 102–486, the National Energy Policy Act of 1992. The funds provided for the environmental cleanup of the Department's uranium enrichment plants, two of which are currently leased to the USEC, and the cleanup of uranium mill tailings and thorium piles resulting from production and sales to the Federal Government for the Manhattan Project and other national security purposes.

The Committee remains concerned by the growing backlog and gap between the amount of claims approved for payment and the funding requested by the Department to pay those claims. Since these payments go to reimburse operating uranium and thorium licensees for their costs of cleanup related to Federal activities, the Committee continues to believe the Department should be doing more to ensure additional funds are available to make timely payments for approved claims.

Within the funds provided, the Committee recommends \$800,000 for the Secretary to contract with the nation's sole remaining ura-

mium converter for the purpose of performing research and development to improve the environmental and economic performance of U.S. uranium conversion operations. The Committee is aware of a December 2000 report to Congress—"Report to Congress on Maintenance of Viable Domestic Uranium, Conversion and Enrichment Industries"—that documents the negative impact of the privatization of the U.S. Enrichment Corporation on the U.S. conversion industry. Although the Department recommended a more ambitious proposal to assist the industry involving price supports, the Committee finds a modest research and development program to be more appropriate at this time.

*Other Uranium Activities.*—The Committee recommends \$120,784,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 over the budget request. The additional funds reflect the transfer of DUF<sub>6</sub> activities from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund subaccount to the Other Uranium Activities subaccount.

#### NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$190,654,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	134,979,000
Committee recommendation .....	25,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes \$275,000,000 for nuclear waste disposal. Of that amount, \$25,000,000 is derived from the nuclear waste fund, and \$250,000,000 shall be available from the "Defense nuclear waste disposal" account.

The Committee is concerned about the failure of the Nation's nuclear waste policy to define an acceptable solution to the problem of disposing of the growing inventories of spent nuclear fuel and other high level radioactive waste. More than two decades ago, the Nation determined that permanent disposal in a geologic repository was the only acceptable path. That decision was based, in part, on another policy that prohibited the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel into its constituent materials, each of which represents different hazardous properties and raises nuclear non-proliferation issues. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, further restricted disposal options by prohibiting the characterization of any potential repository site other than Yucca Mountain, Nevada, because the technical investigation was more costly than anticipated.

These efforts to accelerate the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive waste appear to have accomplished just the opposite. The decision to prohibit the consideration of any sites other than Yucca Mountain, Nevada, engendered strong and unified opposition by the State of Nevada and its citizens, with obvious consequence. The decision to pursue only a "bury it all and forget it" policy at a single site closed off many avenues of investigation and research into alternative disposal concepts that might better serve our Nation's needs.

Since the enactment of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the Department has spent \$8,000,000,000 on investigating a geologic repository for the nation's nuclear waste. However, the Department still has not demonstrated that the proposed site at Yucca Mountain will be suitable. There are still many significant unresolved technical and socioeconomic issues that may prevent the site from



being developed as a repository. The Committee expects the Department to focus all its resources on resolving the remaining technical issues prior to site recommendation and initiating any actions on performance confirmation or license application.

The Committee is also concerned with what is apparently unwarranted confidence on the part of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management that its current concept for the repository will stand the tests of time and inquiry. For example, surface water was assumed to take thousands of years to penetrate to the repository level, assuring a "dry and non-corrosive" environment for repository canisters containing millions of tons of spent nuclear fuel. The earliest studies making use of the excavated test facility disproved this assumption. Subsequently, it was assumed that radioactivity that escaped the canisters because of the corrosive effects of water would be "immobilized" within the rock, would not penetrate to the ground water, and even if it did, would move with excruciating slowness through the ground water matrix. Observations of migration of radioactive contaminants from underground nuclear test cavities disproved these assumptions.

Until quite recently, the repository operational concept entailed backfilling and sealing chambers within the repository that had been filled with waste canisters. The concept relied on the assumption that the heat generated by radioactive decay would prevent surface water from entering the repository level. Subsequent studies suggested that the repository levels could become wet as the radioactivity (heat) decreased over time. So the latest current concept is to ventilate the repository to prevent the accumulation of liquid water as the waste decays. Presently, the repository concept appears to be a "monitored, retrievable" storage site with the possibility of transition to a sealed permanent repository some time in the future. Such significant variance with founding assumptions of geologic disposal is damaging to public confidence in site characterization findings, especially when these changes are made so close to the expected decision on site suitability.

The Department has an ambitious schedule to complete action this year on the site suitability determination. The Committee is concerned that work which should be completed as part of the site characterization of Yucca Mountain is being postponed for the performance confirmation period between site recommendation and closure. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act requires the Department to apply for a license within 90 days of the finalization of site recommendation. The expectation is that the Department will have all necessary science and technical information for the license application. To guide the program, the Department has agreed on nine Key Technical Issues that must be addressed or planned to be addressed to ensure the completeness of the Department's license application. To restore confidence in the site characterization process, the Committee recommends that the Department fulfill commitments pursuant to all Key Technical Issue agreements prior to a decision about site suitability.

Furthermore, the Committee is concerned that the performance assessment, the Total System Performance Assessment, used by the Department suffers from poor quality assurance. An independent review of the program by the Nuclear Regulatory Commis-

sion found technical errors and/or inconsistencies. Since the performance assessment will provide important information for a decision about site suitability, the Committee recommends the Department place a greater emphasis on identifying and fixing these problems. The Committee recommends the Department review the Quality Assurance Requirements Description document and its implementing procedures. The Committee recommends including the results of this review with the material the Secretary prepares for a decision about site suitability.

The Committee is concerned the Department intends to finalize proposed changes to the regulations that prescribe the criteria for a decision about site suitability. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act directs the Department to establish these criteria in the Site Characterization Plan developed pursuant to section 112(a) of the Act. The proposed rule changes would eliminate the specific factors to qualify or disqualify the site contrary to the requirements of the Nuclear Waste Policy and replace them with a single performance evaluation. The Committee is concerned that the Department has no statutory authority for modifying these regulations. In addition, these changes would place a greater emphasis on the expected performance of engineered barriers over the natural barriers. The Committee notes that the existing regulations allow for a performance assessment in addition to the other qualifying and disqualifying factors. With significant site characterization activities remaining to be completed and budget resources limited, the Committee recommends the Department use existing regulations to determine site suitability.

The Committee is concerned that the program suffers from poor management and as a result has had significant cost overruns and has postponed necessary site characterization work. The Committee understands the General Accounting Office is investigating allegations of waste, fraud and abuse in the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management made in an anonymous letter to the Inspector General. The Committee expects to receive the results of the GAO investigation later this year and intends to reexamine the allocation for the Office in light of the findings of that investigation.

The draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the Department indicates thousands of shipments of commercial spent nuclear fuel and Department of Defense waste would be made to the proposed repository at Yucca Mountain. The Committee is concerned that communities in at least 43 States would be near the transportation routes. The Committee recommends the Department determine the specific shipment methods and routes, make that information available to the communities along those routes, and hold hearings in the affected communities. These hearings should allow a reasonable period for public comment for the affected communities. The comments should be included in the information the Secretary provides to the President for a decision about site suitability.

The Committee also believes the massive interstate transportation of spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive waste constitutes a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment for purposes of the National Environ-

mental Policy Act. According to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the final environmental impact statement and any associated comments must be included with the Secretary's determination of site recommendation. The Committee is concerned that the Department has not dedicated sufficient resources to address this issue. Furthermore, the Committee is concerned that a failure to incorporate this information into a possible decision about site suitability will lead to additional delays and cost overruns in the Yucca Mountain site characterization program. The Committee recommends the Department allocate appropriate funds to complete the environment impact statement on transportation of nuclear waste.

Finally, the Committee is concerned that the costs of the repository, which have clearly escalated, are still not well understood by the Department. To say the least, it is disturbing that overall costs have nearly doubled (from \$30,000,000,000 to \$58,000,000,000) since the early 1990's. More troubling is the \$12,000,000,000 increase in costs during just the last 3 years. It is difficult, for example, to understand the implications to design, licensing, construction, and operational costs of such dramatic differences in concepts as represented by the change from a sealed repository to a monitored, retrievable storage facility. The Department is encouraged to maintain current construction and operational cost assessments for the proposed repository that provide comparable costs of the design and operational concepts that remain viable options as the site characterization and performance assessments proceed.

The Committee has provided \$2,500,000 for the State of Nevada and \$6,000,000 for affected units of local government in accordance with the statutory restrictions contained in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

#### SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$3,180,341,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	3,159,890,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,268,116,000

The Committee recognizes that the relatively small funding increases provided to the Office of Science are inadequate. While most programs are funded above the Administration's request, the severe non-defense spending constraints that the Committee operates under have made it impossible to do justice to many of these outstanding programs and initiatives. Unlike the Administration's request, the Committee recommendation is sufficient to avoid any staff reductions at labs or universities.

#### HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$726,130,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	716,100,000
Committee recommendation .....	725,100,000

The Committee recommendation includes \$725,100,000 for high energy physics, an increase of \$9,000,000 over the request. Within the amounts provided, the Committee recommends \$2,000,000 for materials development of low temperature superconductors to support future high energy physics requirements; and an additional \$7,000,000 for university support. Within available funds, the Com-

mittee recommends \$1,000,000 for research, development, and initial demonstration in support of an experiment, to be conducted underground at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, to evaluate the mass of the neutrino through study of double beta decay of xenon-136. These funds may be used for extraction of the xenon-136 in a Russian nuclear city in coordination with the NNSA/Non-Proliferation programs.

#### NUCLEAR PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$369,890,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	360,510,000
Committee recommendation .....	373,000,000

The Committee recommends \$373,000,000 for nuclear physics, an increase of \$12,490,000 above the request and an increase of \$3,110,000 above current year levels. The Committee recommends that the additional funds be used to enhance operation of the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) at Brookhaven National Laboratory and the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility at the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility in Virginia.

#### BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$501,260,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	442,970,000
Committee recommendation .....	490,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes \$490,000,000 for biological and environmental research, including \$10,000,000 for construction of the laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The recommendation includes an additional \$16,000,000 above the requested level for the Genomes to Life program and \$10,000,000 in additional funding above the requested level for the low dose effects program. Within the recommended amount, the Committee also recommends \$7,000,000 in additional funding for computer upgrades and capital equipment costs at the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory (EMSL); \$11,500,000 to complete the positron emission tomography facility at West Virginia University; and funding to continue the following on-going projects: the Natural Energy Laboratory in Hawaii, and the biological effects of exposure to low-level radioactivity. The recommendation also continues the free air carbon dioxide experiments at the current year level.

#### BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$1,013,370,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	1,004,705,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,040,705,000

The Committee recommendation includes \$1,040,705,000, an increase of \$36,000,000 above the request and an increase of \$27,335,000 over current year levels. For purposes of reprogramming in fiscal year 2002, the Department may allocate funding among all operating accounts within basic energy sciences upon written notice to the appropriate Congressional Committees.

The Committee recommendation includes \$12,000,000 for the Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Re-

search and \$4,000,000 for programmatic activities at the National Center of Excellence in Photonics and Microsystems. The Committee's recommendation also includes \$8,300,000 for the SPEAR 3 upgrade at the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory.

Additionally, the Committee recommends that the additional funds be used to support the following important activities: facility operations user support; completion of the Nanoscience Research Center project engineering and design; and additional work in computational sciences in materials and chemistry.

*Nanoscale Science Research Centers.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$4,000,000 for project engineering design work for three of five planned user centers for nanoscale science, engineering, and technology research. The Committee strongly supports this new initiative.

*Construction.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$291,000,000 to continue the Spallation Neutron Source, including \$276,300,000 for construction (under Project 99–E–334) and \$15,100,000 for other activities related to the project. The amount represents a \$23,000,000 increase over current year funding. The Committee recommends \$4,000,000 in project engineering and design funding at various locations (under Project 02–SC–002). The Committee also authorizes construction of the Nanoscience Research Center upon completion of the project engineering and design.

The Committee recognizes the importance the SNS offers in advancing the frontiers of science and technology and the opportunities it will provide for future scientific and industrial research and development for the United States. The design and construction of this next-generation, accelerator-based, neutron scattering facility, located at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, is a collaborative effort involving six DOE national laboratories (Argonne, Brookhaven, Jefferson, Lawrence Berkeley, Los Alamos, and Oak Ridge).

#### SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation provides \$49,818,000 for safeguards and security. This is the amount of the current year level and \$5,594,000 less than the Administration's request. The Committee remains unconvinced that such a large 1-year increase is warranted.

#### SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation provides \$142,385,000 for science program direction, the amount of the request and \$3,140,000 above the current year.

#### OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$171,000,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	164,050,000
Committee recommendation .....	163,050,000

The Committee recommendation provides \$163,050,000 for other energy research programs, an increase of \$18,050,000 over the current year appropriation.

*Advanced Scientific Computing Research.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$163,050,000 for advanced scientific computing research. This amount is the amount of the request. The Committee directs that \$15,000,000 of available funds be used to support the Scientific Discovery Through Advanced Computing (SciDAC) program and that \$10,000,000 of available funds be used for terascale operating systems development.

#### MULTI-PROGRAM ENERGY LABORATORIES FACILITIES SUPPORT

The Committee recommends \$30,175,000, the amount of the request, for multi-program energy laboratories facilities support. The amount recommended is \$3,755,000 less than the current year. The program supports infrastructure activities at the five national labs under the direction of the Office of Science.

The recommendation includes construction funding for two projects, 02-SC-001 and MEL-001, at the level of the request.

#### FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$255,000,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	248,495,000
Committee recommendation .....	248,495,000

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is \$248,495,000, the amount of the request.

#### DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$225,942,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	221,618,000
Committee recommendation .....	208,948,000

#### (MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2001 .....	-\$151,000,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	-137,810,000
Committee recommendation .....	-137,810,000

The Department recommends \$208,948,000 for departmental administration, a decrease of \$12,670,000 from the Administration's request.

#### INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$31,430,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	31,430,000
Committee recommendation .....	30,000,000

The Committee has provided \$30,000,000 for the Office of the Inspector General.

#### RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

#### ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy are provided for in two categories—the National Nuclear Security Ad-

ministration and Other Defense Related Activities. Appropriation accounts under the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) are weapons activities, defense nuclear non-proliferation, naval reactors, and the Office of the Administrator. Other defense related activities include appropriation accounts for defense environmental restoration and waste management, defense facilities closure projects, defense environmental management privatization, other defense activities and defense nuclear waste disposal.

## NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

### WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$5,006,153,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	5,300,025,000
Committee recommendation .....	6,062,891,000

Weapons activities provide for the continuing assurance of safety, reliability, and security of the nuclear weapons in our enduring nuclear weapons stockpile while adhering to the terms of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Necessary ingredients for success in this important mission include a highly skilled and motivated workforce, advanced experimental and computational facilities and equipment, adequately invested and maintained physical plants and supporting infrastructure, and exceptionally focused and dedicated management.

The Committee is concerned about several of these necessary ingredients for success. Whereas significant progress can be cited with respect to the development of advanced experimental and computational capabilities, the Committee notes that the capability to certify the safety and reliability of new components for our aging nuclear weapons stockpile is still many years in the future. Moreover, the initial emphasis on developing these new computational and experimental capabilities has contributed to an unacceptable decline in the physical plants and supporting infrastructure of the nuclear weapons enterprise. Finally, the Committee is deeply concerned with the lack of progress toward the definition and establishment of an enduring production complex capable of providing cost-effective, scalable production of all necessary nuclear weapon components. In response to the Committee's concerns, recommended appropriations in many categories exceed the amounts requested by the President.

### DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

An appropriation of \$1,081,337,000 is recommended for directed stockpile work of the NNSA, an increase of \$37,546,000 over the budget request.

Directed stockpile work encompasses all activities that directly support specific weapons in the nuclear stockpile as directed by the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Plan. These activities include current maintenance and day-to-day care of the stockpile as well as planned refurbishments as outlined by the stockpile life extension program (SLEP). This category also includes research, development and certification activities in direct support of each weapon system, and long-term future-oriented research and development to solve either current or projected stockpile problems.

*Stockpile research and development.*—The Committee recommends \$365,145,000, an increase of \$59,685,000 over the request, providing for assessment, certification, surveillance and maintenance research and development for systems comprising our enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. The increased appropriation above the requested amount is meant to support acceleration in stockpile life extension research and development activities for the W80 and W76 weapons systems, and necessary additional sub-critical experiments at the Nevada Test Site.

*Stockpile maintenance.*—The Committee recommends \$367,223,000, an increase of \$4,730,000 over the request, to provide for stockpile maintenance and production and exchange of limited life components in the enduring stockpile, as well as major refurbishment activities to extend the stockpile life of the W87, W76, W80, and B61 weapons systems.

*Stockpile evaluation.*—The Committee recommends \$178,589,000, a reduction of \$2,245,000 over the request, to support the implementation of changes recommended by the 150-day study, reduction of the surveillance backlogs at the Savannah River Site and the Y-12 Plant, and reinstatement of the shelf life program at the Pantex and Y-12 Plants.

*Dismantlement/disposal.*—The Committee recommends \$29,066,000, a decrease of \$6,348,000 below the request. From the funds provided, a single combined line at the Pantex Plant servicing dismantlement of the W56 and W79 weapons systems will be expanded to one full line for the W56 and two full lines for the W79.

*Production Support.*—The Committee recommends \$134,896,000, a decrease of \$17,994,000 from the request, for production support.

#### CAMPAIGNS

An appropriation of \$2,259,505,000 is recommended for the campaigns of the NNSA, an increase of \$263,092,000 over the budget request.

The stockpile stewardship campaigns program establishes and applies a number of highly focused and integrated scientific and technical capabilities to maintain indefinitely the safety, security, and reliability of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile without nuclear testing. The present structure of the campaigns program reflects the current investment in developing advanced facilities and capabilities while simultaneously applying existing and developing capabilities to important stewardship tasks.

*Primary certification.*—The Committee recommends \$52,661,000, a decrease of \$2,869,000 from the request, to support sub-critical experiments and other activities necessary to support the required delivery date for a certified pit.

*Dynamic materials properties.*—The Committee recommends \$93,644,000, a decrease of \$4,166,000 above the request. Within the available funds, the Administration is directed to make full use of existing and developing capabilities for materials properties studies, including the Joint Actinide Shock Physics Experimental Research facility at the Nevada Test Site, and the High Pressure Collaborative Access Team facility at the synchrotron light source at Argonne National Laboratory.



*Advanced radiography.*—The Committee recommends \$85,803,000, an increase of \$25,293,000 over the request. The recommendation includes \$25,000,000 to continue research, development, and conceptual design for an advanced hydrodynamic test facility, including further development and evaluation of proton radiography techniques. It is the intent of the Committee to continue this important effort even though any decision on whether to proceed to construction is still several years away. Additional funds are provided to fund other experiments that might be conducted in the Contained Firing Facility, the U1-A tunnel complex, or other appropriate experimental facilities.

*Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins.*—The Committee recommends \$44,524,000, a decrease of \$2,746,000 over the budget request for radiation source development, radiation case dynamics studies, radiation transport and the effects of aging and refurbishment on secondary performance. From the funds available, the Administration is encouraged to continue, and expand as appropriate, its investments in high energy density physics research through university grants and partnerships.

*Enhanced surety.*—The Committee recommends \$39,298,000, an increase of \$4,501,000 over the request, to develop and demonstrate advanced initiation concepts and enhanced use denial concepts, and to enhance efforts to establish high precision, micro system technologies for enhanced surety of future weapon systems.

*Weapons systems engineering certification.*—The Committee recommends \$26,665,000, an increase of \$2,622,000 over the request, to accelerate the acquisition of experimental data necessary to validate new models and simulation tools being developed in the Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign.

*Nuclear survivability.*—The Committee recommends \$23,694,000, an increase of \$4,644,000 over the request, to develop and validate tools to simulate nuclear environments for survivability assessments and certification; restore the capability to provide nuclear-hardened microelectronics and microsystem components for the enduring stockpile; and accelerate the qualification and certification of the neutron generator and the arming, fusing and firing system for the refurbished W76.

*ICF ignition and high yield, Project 96-D-111 National Ignition Facility.*—The Committee recommends \$492,443,000, an increase of \$24,500,000 over the budget request.

Within the available funds, the Committee provides \$59,259,000 for ICF/NIF Experimental Support Activities, an increase of \$24,500,000 over the budget request. Of this increase, \$10,000,000 is provided to enhance NIF diagnostics and cryogenic target activities; and \$7,000,000 is provided to supplement the base program.

The Committee understands that a “National Petawatt Laser Strategic Plan” has been commissioned by the Administration. The Administrator is encouraged to pursue this initiative, including, within the strategic planning, the research and development of supporting technologies necessary to ensure that the Nation retains and maintains its leadership in ultra-short pulse laser technology. Guided by the strategic plan, and from available funds within the ICF/NIF Experimental Support Activities, \$3,000,000 is provided for conceptual and preliminary engineering design studies for the

realization of a petawatt-class laser at the Sandia National Laboratory's Z-Machine, and \$2,000,000 is provided to initiate development of critical short-pulse laser technologies, like damage resistant gratings.

The Committee recommendation provides \$7,886,000 for University Grants/Other ICF Support, an increase of \$2,500,000 above the budget request, to complete the transfer and initiate operations of a petawatt laser or high-power, short-pulse laser at the University of Nevada-Reno. The Committee believes that early access to an operating petawatt-class laser will provide valuable opportunities for exploring technology options for incorporation in the next generation of petawatt lasers. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department to complete this primary activity before undertaking next-generation petawatt laser development at other universities.

The Committee is aware of interest in next-generation short-pulse laser technology expressed by the University of Rochester and the University of Texas. Within available funds, the Committee recommends the support of conceptual and engineering design studies of the capabilities proposed by the University of Rochester and the University of Texas. Finally, the Administrator is encouraged to promote and facilitate access by university scientists and others to short-pulse laser facilities for research and exploration of high density physics phenomena.

The Committee recommendation includes \$33,450,000, the amount of the budget request, for the Omega laser at the University of Rochester and \$10,000,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory.

The Committee recommendation provides \$245,000,000 for NIF construction, Project 96-D-111, the same as the budget request. While the Administrator has certified continued fidelity with the re-structured cost and deliverable schedule, the Committee notes that a high level of vigilance and extraordinary management attention is warranted to maintain confidence in satisfactory progress of this important project. The Committee agrees with a recent General Accounting Office review that highlighted, among other things, persistent DOE oversight problems. The Committee continues to be concerned that the same individuals who have performed oversight of NIF since 1999, when costs and schedules grew unnoticed, continue to have that role.

*Advanced simulation and computing.*—The Committee recommends \$711,185,000, the amount of the budget request. The Committee recommends the following amounts for ASCI construction projects:

*Project 01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA.*—The Committee recommends \$12,400,000, an increase of \$7,000,000 over the request.

*Project 00-D-103 Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA.*—The Committee recommends \$22,000,000, an increase of \$17,000,000 over the request.

*Project 00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM.*—The Committee recommends \$15,377,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 over the request.

*Pit manufacturing and certification.*—The Committee recommends \$237,713,000, an increase of \$109,168,000 over the budg-

et request, to fully fund all activities necessary for engineering certification and subcritical experiments that maintain the revised certification schedule.

The Committee notes that the Administration's schedule of accomplishments proposed under the recommended increase would delay the availability of a certified pit until fiscal year 2009. Circumstances make such a delay unacceptable. The Administrator shall carefully reconsider his pit-manufacturing plan to reestablish the full capability to manufacture all pit types before successful certification of a manufactured pit validates the manufacturing process.

The Committee notes that in spite of repeated encouragement to accelerate the acquisition of essential certification data by making use of subcritical experiments at the Nevada Test Site, the originally promised average of 4 subcritical experiments per year has never been achieved. The Administrator shall direct his new pit manufacturing and certification oversight office to ensure that the most productive and cost effective means are emphasized as the program attempts to reduce the intervening period between pit manufacturing capability and pit certification.

*High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness.*—The Committee recommends \$6,846,000, an increase of \$2,886,000 above the request, to establish production-scale high explosives manufacturing and qualification; to deploy and validate technologies and facilities for production re-qualification; and, to demonstrate and validate Enterprise Integration and Collaborative Manufacturing.

*Non-nuclear readiness.*—The Committee recommends \$18,187,000, an increase of \$5,983,000 above the request, to deploy commercial products and processes for components supporting the B61, W80, and W76 stockpile life extension programs; to modify existing tritium loading and cleaning facilities to support stockpile life extension programs; and, to support neutron target loading and detonator production.

*Materials readiness.*—The Committee recommends \$1,209,000, the same as the budget request.

*Secondary Readiness.*—The Committee recommends \$68,445,000, an increase of \$45,276,000 over the request, to support modernization of secondary manufacturing facilities and infrastructure at Y-12 and to ensure readiness to meet near-term stockpile life extension requirements.

*Tritium readiness.*—The Committee recommends \$138,475,000, an increase of \$14,000,000 above the request, to provide funding required for establishing commercial light water reactor production of tritium, construction of the Tritium Extraction Facility at Savannah River Site, and to complete the APT demonstration and design preparatory to its close out. The Committee recommends \$42,350,000 for tritium readiness and \$81,125,000 for construction of the tritium extraction facility at Savannah River.

*Cooperative agreements.*—The Committee recognizes that cooperative agreements with universities are important resources for developing essential technical data for stockpile stewardship. Additionally, such long-term relationships with universities allow considerable opportunity for promoting advanced studies and recruit-

ing the future workforce in technical areas that are critical to the continuing stewardship enterprise. The Committee understands that the NNSA is establishing a new office to be responsible for administering university partnerships, cooperative agreements and/or other long-term university relationships. The Committee applauds this initiative and encourages the Administrator to review the benefits to the program and the Department of delegating much of the day-to-day management and administration to offices in the regions containing the participating universities.

#### READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

An appropriation of \$1,607,716,000 is recommended for readiness in technical base and facilities, an increase of \$160,728,000 over the original budget request. Readiness in technical base and facilities encompasses efforts to provide for the physical infrastructure and operational readiness required to conduct the directed stockpile work and campaign activities at the laboratories, the test site and the production plants.

*Operations of facilities.*—The Committee recommends \$939,479,000, an increase of \$109,052,000 over the budget request, to maintain warm standby readiness for all RTBF facilities with some allowance for inflation. The recommendation includes an additional \$10,000,000 for the operation of pulsed-power facilities at Sandia National Laboratory and an additional \$10,000,000 for the Z machine refurbishment.

*Technology transfer and industrial partnerships.*—The Committee recognizes that partnerships with industry may enable the weapons complex to accomplish its mission more efficiently. Such partnership can provide access to new technologies, processes and expertise that improve NNSA's mission capabilities. One of the most successful technology transfer and commercialization efforts in the Department of Energy has occurred around Sandia National Laboratories, resulting in over 30 start-up ventures and thousands of jobs created. The Committee has included an additional \$3,000,000 and directs the NNSA to follow this successful public/private partnership model at the other NNSA laboratories and the Nevada Test Site.

*Uranium 233.*—The Committee commends the Department for issuing a draft Request for Proposal to process Uranium 233 stored in building 3019 in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, to obtain Thorium-229 needed for cancer treatment and recommends a total program funding of \$21,000,000 in fiscal year 2002. This should fully support the scope necessary to meet the quality, cost, and schedule requirements associated with providing for the medical use of the extremely short half-life Actinium-225 and includes \$6,000,000 to address necessary security at building 3019. The Department should limit the scope of the Request for Proposal to the processing of U-233 already in Oak Ridge, or provide additional resources for expanded scope. The Committee recommends that the Department assign responsibility as soon as possible for Actinium-25 production to a contractor clearly capable of achieving the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) required Good Manufacturers Practice (GMP). The Committee further recommends that the expanded scope of the

Request for Proposal include the shutdown of building 3019 making it read for decontamination by the Department.

*Program readiness.*—The Committee recommends \$197,220,000, an increase of \$9,094,000 above the budget request, to enhance Nevada Test Site readiness and maintain materials processing and component manufacturing readiness.

*Special projects.*—The Committee recommends \$60,385,000, a decrease of \$4,108,000 over the request.

Within funds available from the appropriation: \$2,000,000 is provided to the Remote Sensing Laboratory to enhance pilot proficiency, aircraft safety, and to enhance aviation support elements that have experienced greater operational demands than earlier expected; \$1,000,000 is provided for improvements to the Tumor Registry in the State of Nevada to improve the accuracy and completeness of health records of a population with significant potential radiation exposure; \$2,500,000 to implement Departmental strategy to preserve the history of the Manhattan Project at sites to be determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Federal Preservation Office within the Department; and, \$2,000,000 for the installation of exhibits at the Atomic Testing History Institute.

*Material recycle and recovery.*—The Committee recommends \$90,310,000, a decrease of \$11,001,000 below the budget request.

*Nuclear weapons incident response.*—The Committee recommends \$88,923,000, a decrease of \$202,000 below the request, to enhance the state of response readiness at various locations. Within the available funds, the Administrator is directed to conduct a study and report to the Committee by March 1, 2002, on the status of planning for remediation and disposition of a weapon in various states of disrepair that could result from credible accidents or incidents.

*Construction projects.*—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$212,557,000, an increase of \$57,893,000, for construction projects under Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities.

The following list details changes in appropriations for construction projects under Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities:

*Project 02-D-101 Microsystems and engineering science applications, SNL.*—The Committee recommends \$67,000,000, an increase of \$65,000,000 above the budget request.

*Project 02-D-103 Project engineering and design, various locations.*—The Committee recommends \$31,130,000, an increase of \$21,950,000 above the budget request. Of this amount, \$4,000,000 is provided for architecture and engineering services (Title I and Title II) for modernization of the surface support facilities for the UIA complex.

*Project 02-D-105 Engineering technology complex upgrade, LLNL.*—The Committee recommends \$4,750,000, an increase of \$4,750,000 above the budget request.

*Project 02-D-107 Electrical power systems safety, communications, and bus upgrades, NV.*—The Committee recommends \$6,200,000, and increase of \$2,693,000 above the budget request.

*Project 01-D-103 Preliminary project engineering and design, various locations.*—The Committee recommends \$16,379,000, a decrease of \$29,000,000 below the budget request.

*Project 99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site.*—The Committee recommends \$2,000,000, an increase of \$2,000,000 above the budget request.

#### FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommends \$300,000,000, an increase of \$300,000,000 above the request, to establish a new program line dedicated to re-capitalization of existing operational facilities to halt their deterioration and restore the robust and enduring mission readiness that relies on them.

The Committee is aware of the need for funding a facilities and infrastructure program, but is concerned the Administration has not established a facilities management structure adequate to ensure the funds are used to address those items that will be most effective in reducing long-term costs and risk. The Committee directs the Administrator to provide a semi-annual report to the Committee on the status of the facilities and infrastructure program. The report should include the current priority list of proposed facilities and infrastructure projects, including cost and schedule requirements. For each site, the report should include: a current 10-year site plan that demonstrates the reconfiguration of its facilities and infrastructure to meet its missions and to address its long-term operational costs and return on investment; the current budget for all facilities and infrastructure funding in this program as well as all funding for maintenance and infrastructure upgrades funded through other parts of the budget; and the current status of each facilities and infrastructure project compared to the original baseline cost, schedule, and scope.

#### SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Committee recommends \$123,300,000, an increase of \$1,500,000 over the budget request. Of the amount appropriated, \$79,071,000 is provided for operations and equipment, and \$44,229,000 is provided for program direction.

#### SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$448,881,000, an increase of \$71,285,000 over the current year enacted level.

The security budget request has increased dramatically over the last several years and again this year. The Committee recommendation includes \$364,323,000 for physical security, an increase of \$33,783,000 over the current year enacted level; \$58,000,000 for cyber security, an increase of \$29,156,000 over the current year enacted level; and \$16,958,000 for personnel security, an increase of \$2,338,00 over the current year enacted level.

The Committee has provided the full budget request but remains very concerned about the safeguards and security operations at the NNSA and the relevant imbalance of physical verses cyber security. The Committee strongly urges the Administrator to find more efficient and effective ways to conduct physical security operations in order to free-up resources to address the evolving cyber security threats.

The Congress provided \$20,000,000 in supplemental appropriations in fiscal year 2000 for the NNSA to perform planning, analysis, testing and evaluation necessary to develop the highest value alternatives for improving cyber security throughout the nuclear weapons complex. Congress further directed that NNSA should submit to Congress by January 15, 2001, a detailed plan with an estimated cost and schedules for a reasonable program that defends the highest value targets. On February 22, the Integrated Cyber Security Initiative plan was submitted to Congress. The plan did not have an estimated cost but indicated that the cost estimates for each of the 4 years in the implementation phase would be developed and validated by a panel of cyber security and network experts. The Committee looks forward to receiving this information and considering a request in the future for resources to support the initiative.

#### PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$271,137,000 for program direction, the amount of the budget request.

#### DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$872,273,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	773,700,000
Committee recommendation .....	880,500,000

The Committee recommendation provides \$880,500,000, an increase of \$106,800,000 over the original budget request.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation activities of the NNSA are directed to reducing the serious global danger of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The NNSA utilizes the highly specialized scientific, technical, analytical, and operational capabilities of the NNSA and its national laboratories as well as other Department of Energy laboratories. Its mission is to prevent the spread of WMD materials, technology and expertise; detect the proliferation of WMD worldwide; reverse the proliferation of nuclear weapons capabilities; dispose of surplus materials in accordance with terms set forth in agreements between the United States and Russia; and store surplus fissile materials in a safe manner pending disposition. The Committee continues to strongly support these important national security programs.

The Committee is concerned that the proposed budget would seriously erode progress made at great expense to assure the Nation's capability to detect and mitigate global proliferation activities. Accordingly, the Committee recommends restoration of much of the funds, especially in the accounts supporting research and development, arms control activities, and materials protection and accountability. The Committee supports the proposed increases in surplus nuclear materials disposition and safe storage.

*Nonproliferation and verification research and development.*—The Committee recommends \$222,355,000, an increase of \$52,059,000 over the original budget request.

The recommended increase is provided to continue the important remote sensing and verification technology research, development and deployment, and to continue to invest in the development of

essential technologies for responding to the growing threat of chemical or biological terrorism.

The Nonproliferation and Verification, Research and Development program is essential for stable long-term research and the development of unique science and technology competencies needed for the increasing demands of arms control, nonproliferation, domestic nuclear safeguards and security, energy security, and emergency management. Within available funds, \$5,000,000 is provided to establish the Remote Systems Test and Engineering Center at the Remote Sensing Laboratory (RSL) to provide Department-wide support for prototype engineering design, development, test, and evaluation of remote sensing and data acquisition missions of the Department. The Committee recommends \$2,500,000 in support for the 3-year research effort by the Caucasus Seismic Information Network. The Committee recommendation includes \$4,000,000 for the Incorporate Research Institutions for Seismology PASSCAL Instrument Center.

*Project 00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), Los Alamos National laboratory.*—The Committee recommends \$35,806,000, the same as the budget request.

*Arms Control.*—The Committee recommends \$138,000,000 for arms control and nonproliferation, an increase of \$36,500,000 over the original budget request.

The Arms Control and Nonproliferation program is the focal point within the Department of Energy which supports the U.S. arms control and nonproliferation policies, and provides leadership and representation within the Department in the international arms control and nonproliferation community. The goal is to reduce the threat of nuclear proliferation by integrating the Department's assets and efforts, including those of the national laboratories and contractors, to provide technical support to the U.S. Government's foreign policy and national security objectives.

The increase recommended by the Committee is meant to continue important activities that would be curtailed or significantly reduced under the budget request. From within the additional funds recommended, the Committee restores \$14,500,000 for the Nuclear Cities Initiative (NCI), \$15,000,000 for Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP), \$7,000,000 for continuing the efforts for disposition of spent nuclear fuel in Kazakhstan, and \$1,000,000 to continue activities in support of spent nuclear fuel storage and a geologic repository in Russia. The Committee directs that a portion of the additional resources recommended for IPP be expended in projects within the Russian nuclear cities in coordination with the Nuclear Cities Initiative.

*International materials protection, control, and accounting.*—The recommendation provides \$143,800,000 for international material protection, control, and accounting [MPC&A] activities, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the original budget request. The Committee continues to consider these activities extremely important to reducing the threat created by the breakup of the former Soviet Union. The increased funding will allow for additional material consolidation and control work, an expanded program of MPC&A at several Russian Navy sites, and expanded MPC&A efforts within defense-related and important civilian and regulatory sites in Russia. The



Committee continues to believe that these activities are critical elements of the United States non-proliferation efforts.

*HEU (Highly Enriched Uranium) Transparency Implementation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$13,950,000, the amount of the budget request for the HEU Transparency Implementation program of the Department of Energy. This program is responsible for ensuring that the non-proliferation aspects of the February 1993 agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation are met. This Agreement covers the purchase over 20 years of low enriched uranium [LEU] derived from at least 500 metric tons of HEU removed from dismantled Russian nuclear weapons. Under the Agreement, conversion of the HEU components into LEU is performed in Russian facilities. The purpose of this program is to put into place those measures agreed to by both sides, that permit the United States to have confidence that the Russian side is abiding by the Agreement.

*International nuclear safety.*—The Committee recommends \$19,500,000, and increase of \$5,700,000 above the budget request, to implement permanent improvements in Russian nuclear safety culture as well as improvements in the regulatory framework for Soviet-design reactor operations in nine former Soviet Union countries.

*Fissile materials disposition.*—The Committee recommends \$299,089,000, an increase of \$9,000,000 above the budget request, to maintain operations in the United States and in Russia according to the plan under the budget request. Planned construction projects are slowed to accommodate the shortfall in the disposition account.

Excess weapons grade plutonium in Russia is a clear and present danger to the security of the United States because of the possibility that it will fall into the hands of non-Russian entities or provide Russia with the ability to rebuild its nuclear arsenal at a rate the United States may be unable to equal. For that reason, the Committee considers the Department's material disposition program of comparable importance to weapons activities; both are integral components of our national effort to reduce any threat posed to the United States and to deter the threat that remains.

The Committee recommendation includes \$130,089,000 for U.S. surplus materials disposition, the same as the original budget request.

The Committee recommendation includes \$10,000,000 to support the joint United States-Russian program to develop an advanced reactor to consume large quantities of excess weapons plutonium. The primary purpose of the joint United States-Russian program for the development of an advanced reactor is the design and eventual construction of a demonstration reactor in Russia for the purpose of surplus weapons plutonium disposition. However, the United States must take full advantage of the development of this attractive technology for a possible next generation nuclear power reactor for United States and foreign markets. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to explore opportunities to develop and exploit this technology for commercial purposes.

## PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation includes \$50,000,000 for program direction within Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, a decrease of \$1,459,000 below the budget request

## NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$688,645,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	\$688,045,000
Committee recommendation .....	\$688,045,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Naval Reactors Program within the NNSA provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores having long fuel life, high reliability, improved performances, and simplified operating and maintenance requirements. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combat vessels varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships. The Committee recommendation is \$688,045,000, the amount of the budget request.

## OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$9,978,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	15,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	15,000,000

The Committee has included \$15,000,000 to cover the expenses of the Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).

## RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

## OTHER DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES

## DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$4,963,533,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	4,548,708,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,389,868,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,389,868,000 for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management programs for fiscal year 2002. This is \$841,160,000 over the budget request.

The Department's environmental management program is responsible for identifying and reducing health and safety risks, and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out defense nuclear energy or weapons research and production activities which resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination. The environmental management program goals are to eliminate and manage the urgent risk in the system; emphasize health and safety for workers and the public; establish a system that increases managerial and financial control; and establish a stronger partnership between DOE and its stakeholders. The "De-

fense environmental restoration and waste management” appropriation is organized into two program accounts, site/project completion and post-2006 completion to reflect the emphasis on project completion and site closures.

Fiscal year 1999 budget request was the first fiscal year that the environmental management program structure was aligned with DOE’s 2006 plan. All activities have been organized into projects, which have more defined scopes, schedules, and costs that support a defined end state at each specific site. In addition, the environmental management budget is organized into program decision units that focus on the end-date of the project. Those decision units are site closure, site/project completion, post-2006 completion; science and technology; and program direction.

The Committee believes that the environmental management program of the Department of Energy is beginning to turn the corner in the cleanup effort. Leadership within the Department has put in place initiatives which have produced greater efficiencies, reduced cost growth on many projects, and resulted in moving the program from the study phase to the cleanup of facilities. The Committee believes that the program recommended for fiscal year 2002 is within the acceptable range and will meet all legal requirements and other agreements.

Budget constraints will check future large increases and additional efficiencies will be required. However, even with these constraints, tremendous progress continues to be made both in tangible, on-the-ground results and in the business practices within the program. The Committee expects the Department to continue to seek every opportunity to bring about more efficiencies and tough businesslike approaches to program execution. The Department should continue the critical review of the need and requirement for each individual support service contract, and duplicative and overlapping organizational arrangements and functions.

While it is imperative that the Department’s cleanup costs be brought down, there are instances where relatively small amounts of additional funding invested in the near-term offer the potential for significant reductions in long-term budgetary requirements. The Committee continues to be concerned with growing landlord costs required to maintain buildings and facilities that are ready for demolition, and the high costs associated with temporarily storing and monitoring wastes that are ready for permanent disposal. In order to reduce these costs in the future, it is important that the Department expedite demolition work, waste shipments, and permanent storage whenever possible.

Finally, the Committee notes that the Department’s budget request is not sufficient to satisfy both the existing State-imposed legal requirements in place at several sites and maintain prompt and efficient cleanup at other sites not subject to such requirements. The effect of these budget shortcomings will be to force States to seek legally binding agreements with the Department. The Department should recognize that these legal agreements, while negotiated with the best information available to all parties at the time of their finalization, may lock the Department into cleanup paths that are not optimized as further information and technologies become available. For this reason, it is strongly in the

Government's interest to avoid imposition of additional legal requirements by States. The Committee strongly urges the Department to request budget levels that maintain significant annual progress at each site and thus avoid the need for States to seek new legal requirements to ensure that sites within their borders are adequately considered in budget requests.

#### SITE AND PROJECT COMPLETION

An appropriation of \$1,003,646,000 is recommended for site and project completion activities, including \$979,480,000 for operation and maintenance, and \$24,166,000 for construction.

This account will provide funding for projects that will be completed by fiscal year 2006 at sites or facilities where a DOE mission (for example, environmental management, nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship, or scientific research) will continue beyond 2006. These activities are focused on completing projects by 2006 and distinguishes these projects from the long-term projects or activities at the sites, such as high level waste vitrification or the Department's other enduring missions. The largest amount of funding requested is for activities at the Hanford, WA, Savannah River, SC, and Idaho sites. A significant amount of work is expected to be completed at these sites by 2006, although environmental management and other stewardship activities will continue beyond 2006.

For construction, the Committee recommendation includes all requested projects except for Project 92-D-140, the F and H canyon exhaust upgrades at Savannah River. The Committee reduces the recommendation for this project by \$15,790,000 due to the Department's decision to eliminate some activities and defer others.

The Committee recommendation includes additional funding for the following activities above the level of the Administration's request: \$34,300,000 for clean-up activities at Hanford; \$20,000,000 in additional funding at Idaho to ensure Settlement Agreement and legal requirements for the shipping of waste out-of-state are met; \$28,500,000 in additional funding for clean-up activities at Savannah River; \$10,000,000 in enhanced funding for remediation at South Valley, Kansas City, Pantex, and Sandia; and \$5,100,000 in enhanced funding for remediation at ETEC and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

The Committee is aware that the Department provides approximately \$500,000 per year to the State of Oregon each year to cover costs of its clean-up effort, including emergency drills, planning activities, technical review of DOE's waste management and clean-up plans, participation in the Hanford Advisory Board meetings and other meetings at Hanford. The Committee recommends that this DOE contribution be increased to \$1,000,000 to pay for increased costs.

The Committee is aware of a pending MOU between the University of Georgia and the University of South Carolina with respect to the Savannah River Ecology Lab and expects the Department of Energy to provide adequate funding to support this long-term partnership. Within available funds, the Committee also recommends that the Department's on-going relationship with the University of South Carolina's Center for Water Resources be continued at \$800,000, an increase of \$50,000 over last year's level.

The Committee understands the Department is prepared to transfer up to 2,000 acres for the use of Pueblo of San Ildefonso and approximately 100 acres to the County of Los Alamos. The Committee recommendation includes an additional \$9,000,000 to expedite the remediation and conveyance of the land consistent with the direction of section 632 of Public Law 105-119.

#### POST-2006 COMPLETION

The Committee recommendation for post-2006 completion activities is \$3,574,001,000, which includes \$2,133,779,000 in operating expenses for post-2006 completion, \$1,033,468,000 in operating expenses for the Office of River Protection, a \$420,000,000 contribution to the UED&D fund, and \$705,317,000 for construction.

The Post-2006 completion request supports projects that are projected to continue well beyond 2006. As cleanup is completed, it will be necessary for environmental management to maintain a presence at most sites to monitor, maintain, and provide information on the continued residual contamination. These activities are required to ensure the reduction in risk to human health is maintained.

*Post-2006 construction.*—The Committee recommends the amount of the Administration's request.

*Post-2006 operation and maintenance.*—The Committee recommendation includes additional funding for the following activities above the level of the Administration's request: \$125,200,000 for clean-up activities at Hanford; \$146,500,000 for clean-up activities at Savannah River; \$100,000,000 for clean-up activities at Idaho; \$4,400,000 in restored funding for the Nevada Test Site; \$4,000,000 to continue the Underground Test Area groundwater flow characterization drilling program at an accelerated pace; \$14,300,000 to continue remediation, waste management, and nuclear materials stewardship activities at Los Alamos National Lab in New Mexico; \$14,000,000 to continue remediation, waste management, and nuclear materials stewardship at Lawrence Livermore National Lab in California. Within available funds, the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program and the HAMMER program are to be funded at current year levels.

The Committee expects that portions of the additional \$105,200,000 for Hanford will support the River Corridor Initiative, including the continued cocooning of the four former plutonium production reactors and the removal and disposal of hazardous and radiologically contaminated soil along the shoreline of the Hanford Reach portion of the Columbia River.

Additionally, the Committee expects that, within the additional \$100,000,000 provided for Idaho, \$15,000,000 will be used to initiate activities associated with the demonstration of waste retrieval at the subsurface disposal area at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory.

The Committee recommends that the current cooperative agreement with the Waste-management Education and Research Consortium be extended for a 5 year period at a level of \$2,500,000 annually to continue its support for environmental education and technology development.

*Carlsbad Field Office.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$201,170,000, an increase of \$36,600,000 above the budget request and \$10,284,000 above the current year level. The recommendation includes an additional \$21,600,000 for operations of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). The additional resources are required in order to increase the transportation capabilities required to meet the Department's commitments at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site and to correct for unjustified regulatory assumptions used in the development of the Department's budget request. The recommendation includes an additional \$5,000,000 to continue the U.S. Mexico Border Health Commission/Materials Corridor Partnership Initiative. The Committee recommendation includes \$10,000,000 to begin implementing program-wide best practices to optimize waste processing, developing new technology solutions, and developing a mobile/modular approach for small quantity sites.

Regulatory requirements dictate that characterization data for each drum of waste shipped to WIPP must be reviewed multiple times to insure compliance. The Committee recognizes that the process could be streamlined and improved with more comprehensive and timely data review and reporting. The Committee encourages the Department to work through the Carlsbad Field Office to implement a standardized, automated program for TRU waste characterization throughout the DOE complex using a secure web-based system that allows user access and regulatory transparency without regard to the location of the user, and includes interfaces between all existing site operation databases.

*Office of River Protection.*—The Committee recommendation includes additional funding for the following activities above the level of the President's request: \$165,000,000 for the Hanford Waste Treatment Plant and \$56,000,000 for tank farm operations. Total recommended fiscal year 2002 funding for the waste treatment plant construction is \$665,000,000. The Department is expected to continue making PILT payments to counties that have the Hanford reservation within their boundaries at last year's level.

#### SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

An appropriation of \$271,700,000 is recommended for science and technology activities related to the environmental waste cleanup program, an increase of \$75,700,000 over the original budget request.

The Science and Technology Program provides new or improved technologies and research results that reduce risks to workers, the public and the environment; reduce cleanup costs; and/or provide solutions to environmental problems that currently have no solutions. New and improved technologies have the potential to reduce environmental restoration and cleanup costs by an estimated several billion dollars. The Committee continues to be impressed with the ability of the Department's Deactivation and Decommissioning Focus Area Program to deploy cost effective new technologies that both help to reduce the overall D&D mortgage and protect workers, communities, and the environment. The Committee provides \$27,100,000 in total funding to the D&D focus area program, the same as the current year. The Committee also provides total fund-

ing of \$33,800,000 for the Industry and University programs managed by the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

The Committee recommendation includes additional funding for the following activities above the level of the Administration's request: \$20,000,000 for Idaho Environmental Systems research and analysis; \$5,000,000 for work within the University Involvement in Science and Technology program; \$7,000,000 for the Western Environmental Technology Office; \$4,000,000 for new basic science awards; and \$6,000,000 for new research and development projects; \$6,000,000 to continue evaluation, development, and demonstration of the Advanced Vitrification System; \$3,000,000 to continue the engineering, development, and deployment of prototypical monitoring systems and microsensor systems for the remote monitoring of the Underground Test Area; \$5,000,000 for the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory (DIAL); and \$4,350,000 for the university robotics research program.

Within available funds, \$4,000,000 is provided for the Subsurface Science Research Institute, operated by the Inland Northwest Research Alliance and the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. Within available funds, \$350,000 above the level of the Administration's request is provided to complete the conceptual design of the Subsurface Geosciences Laboratory in Idaho.

#### EXCESS FACILITIES

The Committee recommendation for excess facilities is \$1,300,000, which is the same as the budget request. These funds are provided to manage the transfer for the final disposition of excess contaminated physical facilities leading to significant risk and cost reductions. In fiscal year 2002 these funds are to be used for the transfer of excess facilities at the Pantex Plant, Savannah River Site, and the Y-12 Plant from other DOE organizations.

#### SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation for safeguards and security is \$205,621,000, which is the same as the budget request.

#### PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation for program direction totals \$355,761,000, which is the same as the budget request.

Program direction provides the overall direction and administrative support for the environmental management programs of the Department of Energy.

#### DEFENSE FACILITY CLOSURE PROJECTS

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$1,080,331,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	1,050,538,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,080,538,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,080,538,000 for the site closure program, an increase of \$30,000,000 over the request.

The "Site closure" account includes funding for sites where the environmental management program has established a goal of com-

pleting the cleanup mission by the end of fiscal year 2006. After the cleanup mission is complete at a site, no further DOE mission is envisioned, except for limited long-term surveillance and maintenance. This account provides funding to cleanup the Rocky Flats, Fernald, Mound, Ashtabula, and Battelle Columbus sites. The additional \$30,000,000 is provided for clean-up activities at the Fernald, Ashtabula, and Columbus sites.

The Committee continues to believe that a closure fund, which targets funding at specific facilities whose accelerated closure in the near-term results in significantly reduced out-year costs, is important in freeing up budgetary resources in the longer term. However, the Committee remains concerned that several projects in both the defense and non-defense closure accounts are in danger of not meeting 2006 closure goals. Once it becomes clear that a closure deadline cannot be met prior to 2006, the Department should propose moving the project into a post-2006 account. Such a move would ensure adequate attention and resources for the projects that remain in the closure account.

#### DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$65,000,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	141,537,000
Committee recommendation .....	157,537,000

An appropriation of \$157,537,000 is recommended for the environmental management privatization initiative. The Committee recommendation includes \$10,826,000 for a construction contingency fund for the Transuranic Waste Treatment Facility at Oak Ridge in Tennessee; \$49,332,000 for Spent Nuclear Fuel Dry Storage in Idaho; \$26,050,000 for environmental/waste management at Oak Ridge in Tennessee; \$13,329,000 for the privatization of the Paducah Disposal Facility in Kentucky; and \$2,000,000 for the on-site disposal cell at Portsmouth, Ohio.

The Committee recommendation also includes \$56,000,000 for the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project, an increase of \$16,000,000 over the budget request. This recommended amount, together with the expected fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriation of \$29,600,000, is sufficient to cover the Department's obligations on this project in fiscal year 2002. The Committee notes the existence of an ongoing Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) audit to review the project contractor's cost management to date and whether the Department is meeting its obligation requirements. If the DCAA audit indicates the Department is not meeting its obligation responsibilities, the Committee will expect an appropriate supplemental appropriation request in fiscal year 2002.

#### RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

#### OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$582,466,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	527,614,000
Committee recommendation .....	564,168,000



## INTELLIGENCE

The Committee recommendation totals \$40,844,000, an increase of \$4,785,000 over the current year appropriation.

The Office of Intelligence provides information and technical analysis on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy-related matters to policymakers in the NNSA, the Department and other U.S. Government agencies. The focus of the Department's intelligence analysis and reporting is on emerging proliferant nations, nuclear technology transfers, foreign nuclear materials production, and proliferation implications of the breakup of the former Soviet Union.

## SECURITY AND EMERGENCY OPERATIONS

The Committee recommendation for security and emergency operations is \$247,565,000, a decrease of \$21,685,000 from the current year appropriation.

*Nuclear Safeguards.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$121,188,000 for nuclear safeguards, an increase of \$4,779,000 from the current year appropriation.

*Security Investigations.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$44,927,000, the amount of the budget request.

*Corporate Management Information Program.*—The Committee recommendation includes no funding for the corporate management information program. If the Department wishes to undertake the activities envisioned for this program in fiscal year 2002, the Committee directs that they be paid for using available funds within the Departmental Administration account or from program direction accounts of beneficiary programs. The Committee sees no apparent connection to the specific mission of the Security and Emergency Operations program or even the broader mission of Other Defense Activities. The Committee is concerned that the Department is attempting to disguise large increases in departmental administration costs by dispersing department-wide activities to individual program offices.

*Self-Protecting Data.*—The Committee is aware of self-protecting data software that allows for the encryption, control and management of any electronic document, web page or e-mail message even after distribution. The Committee strongly urges the Department to use available funds in fiscal year 2002 to review such capabilities and incorporate them into the Department's cyber security activities.

*Program Direction.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$81,450,000 for program direction, a decrease of \$1,685,000 from the budget request.

## INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Committee recommendation provides \$14,904,000 for independent oversight and performance assurance, the amount of the budget request.

The independent oversight and performance assurance program provides independent evaluation and oversight of safeguards, security, emergency management and cyber security for the Department at the Secretary's direction.

## COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

An appropriation of \$46,389,000, the amount of the request, is provided for the counterintelligence activities of the Department of Energy. This is an increase of \$1,189,000 over the current years appropriation.

The Counterintelligence program has the mission of enhancing the protection of sensitive technologies, information, and expertise against foreign intelligence, industrial intelligence, and terrorist attempts to acquire nuclear weapons information or advanced technologies from the National Laboratories.

## ADVANCED ACCELERATOR APPLICATIONS

The Committee recommendation includes a total of \$70,000,000 for Advanced Accelerator Applications, including \$15,000,000 provided in Project 98-D-126 Accelerator Production of Tritium. The recommended amount includes \$6,000,000 for research and development of technologies for economic and environmentally-sound refinement of spent nuclear fuel at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas; and \$2,000,000 for the Idaho Accelerator Center.

The Department provided the Report to Congress: The Advanced Accelerator Applications Program Plan as required by House Report 106-988 accompanying the Fiscal Year 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. This Report outlined a program plan to build an Accelerator-Driven Test Facility (ADTF) as part of achieving four central objectives: (1) providing proof-of-principle demonstration of an accelerator-driven sub-critical multiplier; (2) conducting research on the viability of transmutation for waste and spent fuel management; (3) enhancing the Nation's nuclear science and technology education infrastructure; and (4) providing a more robust back-up tritium production capability for national security. The cost estimate for the ADTF, plus additional information now available to the Committee, leads to the Committee's recommendation that the Advanced Accelerator Applications program should not move towards construction of the ADTF in the near future.

The Committee directs the Department to instead broaden the program's research efforts into optimized waste management strategies leading towards combination of reprocessing with transmutation and energy extraction involving both a new generation of reactors (either liquid-metal or helium cooled) with safety features comparable to Generation IV reactors and an accelerator-based system. The Department is directed to explore research and development for comprehensive spent fuel management strategies, which emphasize avoidance of proliferation issues and have minimal environmental impact, along with reasonable economic projections that include efficient utilization of the energy resource of the spent fuel. The Department should develop goals for the overall program that combine these attributes with final waste forms that significantly decrease the long-term toxicity to levels far below that of spent fuel. As part of the program, the Department should evaluate the benefits and costs realized from only reprocessing as well as each additional treatment step. Finally, the Department is directed to close-out the Accelerator Production of Tritium project in fiscal

year 2002 and document all information pertinent to its utility as a back-up source of tritium for the stockpile.

The Department is directed to utilize existing facilities to accomplish short-term research and demonstrations. The Committee anticipates that test facilities added to the LANSCE facility and/or the Fast Flux Test Facility may provide opportunities for the most rapid progress, and is encouraged to consider such facilities. In addition, the Department is directed to seek out and utilize cooperation with international partners who share common goals. Utilization of international research facilities is encouraged where it advances program goals.

The Department is directed to prepare a report for Congress by March 1, 2003, outlining a long-term program plan which may include construction of new facilities required by the program.

The Committee is encouraged by the possibilities for leveraging the work accomplished thus far in the accelerator production of tritium (APT) program to accomplish a wide range of science and technology missions. Importantly, advanced, high-energy accelerators could be central to a future strategy to transmute spent nuclear fuel into less toxic, shorter-lived materials, thereby ensuring greater public confidence in a national strategy to manage spent nuclear fuel of a nuclear waste repository.

In order to pursue these important technology opportunities while still completing necessary design work for a facility capable of producing tritium to meet possible future defense requirements, the Committee directs the Department to establish an Office of Advanced Accelerator Applications (AAA) within the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology. The mission of the AAA program shall include conducting scientific, engineering research, development and demonstrations on: (1) accelerator production of tritium as a back-up technology; (2) transmutation of spent nuclear fuel and waste; (3) material science; and (4) other advanced accelerator applications. The Committee further directs that the Department transfer the APT program from the Office of Defense Programs within the NNSA to the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology for integration into the AAA office. The AAA program shall assure the accelerator-based back-up capability of producing tritium for the Nation's nuclear stockpile, based on requirements defined by the Office of Defense Programs. The Committee encourages the participation of international collaborators, industrial partners, and support for new graduate engineering and science students and professors at U.S. universities.

#### ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation provided \$122,285,000 for Environmental, Safety and Health activities including \$23,293,000 for program direction. The mission of the Office of Environmental, Safety and Health is to protect the health and safety of Department of Energy workers, the public, and the environment and is to be the Department's independent advocate for safety, health and the environment.

The Committee notes that the effective management, storage, retrieval, and integration of environmental, scientific and medical records is important to ensuring public health and safety through-

out the Department of Energy complex. Current Department record keeping is managed at local offices using a variety of methods and formats. Furthermore, current approaches to digitization contain overlapping functions, are not standardized, and may result in records with a very short useful life. Integrated management of these records would ensure data preservation and access, and may result in substantial savings through reduced information technology operations and maintenance costs. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes \$6,000,000 to establish a program at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas for Department-wide management of electronic records.

The Committee is concerned that the Department's current program of medical screening and education at the gaseous diffusion plants will not be sufficient to complete all necessary screening and evaluation under the current contract period. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to ensure that all necessary screening and evaluation of workers, both current and former, is adequate and that those workers with an elevated risk of lung cancer will receive a lung scan. The Committee recommendation also provides \$2,500,000 for the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky to undertake epidemiological studies of workers to identify exposure pathways; and \$1,000,000 to provide medical screening for workers employed at the Amchitka Nuclear Weapons Test Site; and not less than \$1,000,000 for health studies of workers at the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant.

*Energy Employees Compensation Initiative.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$15,000,000, the amount of the request, for the Energy Employees Compensation Initiative. Title 36 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2001 (Public Law 106-398) established the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program to provide benefits to DOE contractor workers made ill as a result of exposures from nuclear weapons production. The Department is responsible for establishing procedures to assist workers in filing compensation claims.

#### WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The Committee has provided an appropriation of \$20,000,000 for these activities for fiscal year 2002. This is the same as the budget request.

The Worker and Community Transition budget provides funding for activities associated with enhanced benefits beyond those required by contract, existing company policy or collective bargaining agreements at defense nuclear facilities. The goals of the program are to mitigate the impacts on workers and communities from contractor work force restructuring, and to assist community planning for all site conversions, while managing the transition to the reduced work force that will better meet ongoing mission requirements through the application of best business practices.

The Committee urges the Department to improve the manner in which it deals with the communities the Worker and Community Transition program serves. The Committee reminds the Department that the communities and community re-use organizations that rely on these funds are generally small. Slow release of funds

or, worse, renegeing on previously promised funding, can be devastating to these communities and organizations.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes \$25,000,000 for national security programs administrative support. This is the amount of the request and the same as the current year. This fund pays for departmental services that are provided in support of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

#### OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

An appropriation of \$2,893,000 is recommended for the Office of Hearings and Appeals. The Office of Hearings and Appeals conduct all of the Department's adjudicative process and provides various administrative remedies as may be required. The goal is to promote successful and uninterrupted DOE operations through the deliberate, expeditious and equitable resolution of all claims of adverse impact emanating from the operations of the Department.

#### DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	310,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	250,000,000

The Committee recommends \$250,000,000 for defense nuclear waste disposal.

#### RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

#### POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Public Law 95-91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

All power marketing administrations except Bonneville are funded annually with appropriations, and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury. Bonneville operations are self-financed under authority of Public Law 93-454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, which authorizes Bonneville to use its revenues to finance operating costs, maintenance and capital construction, and sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements.

The fiscal year 2002 budget request provides authority for the use of offsetting collections from the sale of electricity to finance purchase of power and wheeling expenses previously funded by direct appropriations.

## BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000-square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent Western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets hydroelectric power from 31 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also markets and exchanges surplus electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

Bonneville constructs, operates, and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system, consisting of over 15,000 circuit-miles of transmission line and 324 substations with an installed capacity of 21,500 megawatts. BPA is the largest power wholesaler in the northwest and provides about 46 percent of the region's electric energy supply and about three-fourths of the region's electric power transmission capacity.

Public Law 93-454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, placed Bonneville on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96-501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, Bonneville's responsibilities were expanded to include meeting the net firm load growth of the region, investing in cost-effective, regionwide energy conservation, and acquiring generating resources to meet these requirements.

The Committee is aware that BPA and many of its transmission customers have agreed to form a technical review committee to assure that BPA's transmission investments are prioritized to ensure cost-effective and reliable service for the consumers of the Northwest. The Committee fully supports the formation of this committee.

*Borrowing authority.*—A total of \$3,750,000,000 has been made available to Bonneville as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts Bonneville plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation on these borrowing requirements. For fiscal year 2002, the Committee recommends an additional increment of \$374,500,000 in new borrowing authority, the same as the budget request, for transmission system construction, system replacement, energy resources, fish and wildlife, and capital equipment programs.

The Committee recommendation includes language that provides Bonneville with a \$2,000,000,000 increase in borrowing authority to address critical infrastructure needs arising from anticipated increases in generation within Bonneville's service area. Bonneville is not permitted to obligate any funds from this additional obligation authority in fiscal year 2002 and, as previously noted, may not obligate more than \$374,500,000 of its permanent borrowing authority in fiscal year 2002.

*Limitation on direct loans.*—The Committee recommends that no new direct loans be made in fiscal year 2002.

*Budget revisions and notification.*—The Committee expects Bonneville to adhere to the borrowing authority estimates recommended by the Congress and promptly inform the Committee of any exceptional circumstances which would necessitate the need for Bonneville to obligate borrowing authority in excess of such amounts.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER  
ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$3,891,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	4,891,000
Committee recommendation .....	4,891,000

The Southeastern Power Administration markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers projects in 11 Southeastern States. There are 23 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092 megawatts. 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.

The Committee concurs with the financing of purchased power and wheeling costs as proposed in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER  
ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$28,038,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	28,038,000
Committee recommendation .....	28,038,000

The Southwestern Power Administration is the marketing agent for the power generated at 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.

The Committee concurs with the financing of purchased power and wheeling costs as proposed in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$165,465,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	169,465,000
Committee recommendation .....	169,465,000

The Western Area Power Administration is responsible for marketing electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water

Commission which operate hydropower generating plants in 15 Central and Western States encompassing a 1.3-million-square-mile geographic area. Western is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of almost 17,000 miles of high-voltage transmission lines with 258 substations. Western distributes power generated by 55 plants with a maximum operating capacity of 10,576 megawatts.

Western, through its power marketing program, must secure revenues sufficient to meet the annual costs of operation and maintenance of the generating and transmission facilities, purchased power, wheeling, and other expenses, in order to repay all of the power investment with interest, and to repay that portion of the Government's irrigation and other nonpower investments which are beyond the water users' repayment capability. Under the Colorado River Basin power marketing fund, which encompasses the Colorado River Basin, Fort Peck, and Colorado River storage facilities, all operation and maintenance and power marketing expenses are financed from revenues.

Of the total resources available to the Western Power Administration, \$6,092,000 shall be transferred to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission.

The Committee concurs with the financing of purchased power and wheeling costs as proposed in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

#### FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Creation of the Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund was directed by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994–95. This legislation also directed that the fund be administered by the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission to defray operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams in Texas.

The Committee recommendation is \$2,663,000, the same as the budget request.

#### RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

#### FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$175,200,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	181,155,000
Committee recommendation .....	181,155,000

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2001 .....	–\$175,200,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	–181,155,000
Committee recommendation .....	–181,155,000

The Committee recommendation provides \$181,155,000, the amount of the budget request, for the Federal Energy Regulatory



Commission (FERC). Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regulates key interstate aspects of the electric power, natural gas, oil pipeline, and hydroelectric industries.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee's detailed funding recommendation for programs in Title III, Department of Energy, are contained in the following table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
<b>ENERGY SUPPLY</b>					
<b>RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES</b>					
Renewable energy technologies:					
Biomass/biofuels energy systems:					
Power systems .....	40,800	37,754	53,000	+ 12,200	+ 15,246
Transportation .....	46,160	44,201	50,000	+ 3,840	+ 5,799
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems .....	86,960	81,955	103,000	+ 16,040	+ 21,045
Geothermal technology development .....	27,000	13,900	32,000	+ 5,000	+ 18,100
Hydrogen research .....	27,000	26,881	35,000	+ 8,000	+ 8,119
Hydropower .....	5,000	4,989	9,300	+ 4,300	+ 4,311
Solar energy:					
Concentrating solar power .....	13,800	1,932	15,300	+ 1,500	+ 13,368
Photovoltaic energy systems .....	75,775	39,000	70,000	- 5,775	+ 31,000
Solar building technology research .....	3,950	2,000	7,000	+ 3,050	+ 5,000
Subtotal, Solar energy .....	93,525	42,932	92,300	- 1,225	+ 49,368
Wind energy systems .....	40,000	20,500	45,000	+ 5,000	+ 24,500
Total, Renewable energy technologies .....	279,485	191,157	316,600	+ 37,115	+ 125,443
Electric energy systems and storage:					
High temperature superconducting R&D .....	37,000	36,819	43,000	+ 6,000	+ 6,181
Energy storage systems .....	6,000	5,987	12,000	+ 6,000	+ 6,013
Transmission reliability .....	9,000	8,940	16,000	+ 7,000	+ 7,060
Total, Electric energy systems and storage .....	52,000	51,746	71,000	+ 19,000	+ 19,254

Renewable support and implementation:					
Departmental energy management .....	2,000	1,000	1,000	-1,000	.....
International renewable energy program .....	5,000	2,500	3,000	-2,000	+ 500
Renewable energy production incentive program .....	4,000	3,991	4,000	.....	+ 9
Renewable Indian energy resources .....	6,600	.....	4,000	-2,600	+ 4,000
Renewable program support .....	4,000	2,059	3,000	-1,000	+ 941
Total, Renewable support and implementation .....	21,600	9,550	15,000	-6,600	+ 5,450
National renewable energy laboratory .....	4,000	5,000	12,000	+ 8,000	+ 7,000
Program direction .....	18,700	19,200	21,000	+ 2,300	+ 1,800
TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES .....	375,785	276,653	435,600	+ 59,815	+ 158,947
<b>NUCLEAR ENERGY</b>					
Advanced radioisotope power system .....	32,200	29,094	29,094	-3,106	.....
Isotopes: Isotope support and production .....	24,715	24,683	24,683	-32	.....
Construction: 99-E-201 Isotope production facility (LANL) .....	2,500	2,494	2,494	-6	.....
Subtotal, Isotope support and production .....	27,215	27,177	27,177	-38	.....
Offsetting collections .....	-8,000	-9,000	-9,000	-1,000	.....
Total, Isotopes .....	19,215	18,177	18,177	-1,038	.....
University reactor fuel assistance and support .....	12,000	11,974	19,000	+ 7,000	+ 7,026
Research and development:					
Nuclear energy plant optimization .....	5,000	4,500	9,000	+ 4,000	+ 4,500
Nuclear energy research initiative .....	35,000	18,079	38,000	+ 3,000	+ 19,921
Nuclear energy technologies .....	7,500	4,500	14,000	+ 6,500	+ 9,500
Total, Research and development .....	47,500	27,079	61,000	+ 13,500	+ 33,921
Infrastructure:					
ANL-West operations .....	39,150	34,107	34,107	-5,043	.....
Fast flux test facility (FFTF) .....	44,010	38,439	38,439	-5,571	.....
Test reactor area landlord .....	7,575	7,283	7,283	-292	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
Construction:					
99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID .....	925	950	950	+ 25	.....
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID .....	500	500	500	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction .....	1,425	1,450	1,450	+ 25	.....
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord .....	9,000	8,733	8,733	- 267	.....
Total, Infrastructure .....	92,160	81,279	81,279	- 10,881	.....
Nuclear facilities management:					
EBR-II shutdown .....	8,800	4,200	4,200	- 4,600	.....
Disposition of spent fuel and legacy materials .....	16,200	16,267	16,267	+ 67	.....
Disposition technology activities .....	9,850	9,990	9,990	+ 140	.....
Total, Nuclear facilities management .....	34,850	30,457	30,457	- 4,393	.....
Program direction .....	22,000	25,062	25,062	+ 3,062	.....
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY .....	259,925	223,122	264,069	+ 4,144	+ 40,947
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH					
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense) .....	16,000	14,973	13,973	- 2,027	- 1,000
Program direction .....	19,998	20,527	19,527	- 471	- 1,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH .....	35,998	35,500	33,500	- 2,498	- 2,000
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES					
Technical information management program .....	1,600	1,600	1,600	.....	.....

Program direction .....	7,000	7,370	6,370	- 630	- 1,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES .....	8,600	8,970	7,970	- 630	- 1,000
Subtotal, Energy supply .....	680,308	544,245	741,139	+ 60,831	+ 196,894
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 1,456			+ 1,456	
General reduction .....			- 5,000	- 5,000	- 5,000
Offset from nuclear energy royalties .....	- 2,352			+ 2,352	
Reduction for safeguards and security .....	- 16,582			+ 16,582	
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY .....	659,918	544,245	736,139	+ 76,221	+ 191,894
<b>NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT</b>					
Site closure .....	81,636	43,000	43,000	- 38,636	
Site/project completion .....	61,621	64,119	64,119	+ 2,498	
Post 2006 completion .....	137,744	120,053	120,053	- 17,691	
Excess facilities .....		1,381	1,381	+ 1,381	
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 612			+ 612	
Reduction for safeguards and security .....	- 3,189			+ 3,189	
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT .....	277,200	228,553	228,553	- 48,647	
<b>URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION</b>					
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund:					
Decontamination and decommissioning .....	273,038	241,641	286,941	+ 13,903	+ 45,300
Uranium/thorium reimbursement .....	72,000	1,000	1,000	- 71,000	
Depleted UF6 conversion project .....		10,000			- 10,000
Total, Uranium enrichment D&D fund .....	345,038	252,641	287,941	- 57,097	+ 35,300
Other Uranium Activities:					
Maintenance of facilities and inventories .....	29,193	99,000	99,000	+ 69,807	
Pre-existing liabilities .....	11,330	11,784	11,784	+ 454	
Depleted UF6 conversion project .....	21,877		10,000	- 11,877	+ 10,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
Total, Other uranium activities .....	62,400	110,784	120,784	+ 58,384	+ 10,000
Reduction for safeguards and security .....	– 14,071	.....	.....	+ 14,071	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554) .....	– 865	.....	.....	+ 865	.....
<b>TOTAL, URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION .....</b>	<b>392,502</b>	<b>363,425</b>	<b>408,725</b>	<b>+ 16,223</b>	<b>+ 45,300</b>
<b>SCIENCE</b>					
High energy physics:					
Research and technology .....	234,720	247,870	256,870	+ 22,150	+ 9,000
Facility operations .....	459,010	456,830	456,830	– 2,180	.....
Construction:					
00–G–307 SLAC office building .....	5,200	.....	.....	– 5,200	.....
99–G–306 Wilson hall safety improvements, Fermilab .....	4,200	.....	.....	– 4,200	.....
98–G–304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab .....	23,000	11,400	11,400	– 11,600	.....
Subtotal, Construction .....	32,400	11,400	11,400	– 21,000	.....
Subtotal, Facility operations .....	491,410	468,230	468,230	– 23,180	.....
Total, High energy physics .....	726,130	716,100	725,100	– 1,030	+ 9,000
Nuclear physics .....	369,890	360,510	373,000	+ 3,110	+ 12,490
Biological and environmental research .....	498,760	432,970	480,000	– 18,760	+ 47,030
Construction: 01–E–300 Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics, ORNL .....	2,500	10,000	10,000	+ 7,500	.....
Total, Biological and environmental research .....	501,260	442,970	490,000	– 11,260	+ 47,030

Basic energy sciences program:					
Materials sciences .....	456,111	434,353	454,353	- 1,758	+ 20,000
Chemical sciences .....	223,229	218,714	228,714	+ 5,485	+ 10,000
Engineering and geosciences .....	40,816	38,938	42,938	+ 2,122	+ 4,000
Energy biosciences .....	33,714	32,400	34,400	+ 686	+ 2,000
Construction:					
02-SC-002 Project engineering and design (VL) .....		4,000	4,000	+ 4,000	.....
99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL) .....	259,500	276,300	276,300	+ 16,800	.....
Subtotal, Construction .....	259,500	280,300	280,300	+ 20,800	.....
Total, Basic energy sciences .....	1,013,370	1,004,705	1,040,705	+ 27,335	+ 36,000
Advanced scientific computing research .....	170,000	163,050	163,050	- 6,950	.....
Energy research analyses .....	1,000	1,000	1,000	.....	.....
Multiprogram energy labs—facility support:					
Infrastructure support .....	1,160	1,020	1,020	- 140	.....
Oak Ridge landlord .....	10,711	7,359	7,359	- 3,352	.....
Construction:					
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations .....	22,059	18,613	18,613	- 3,446	.....
02-SC-001 Multiprogram energy laboratories, project engineering design, various locations .....		3,183	3,183	+ 3,183	.....
Subtotal, Construction .....	22,059	21,796	21,796	- 263	.....
Total, Multiprogram energy labs—fac. support .....	33,930	30,175	30,175	- 3,755	.....
Fusion energy sciences program .....	255,000	248,495	248,495	- 6,505	.....
Facilities and infrastructure .....			10,000	+ 10,000	+ 10,000
Safeguards and security .....	49,818	55,412	49,818	.....	- 5,594
Program direction:					
Field offices .....	83,307	64,400	63,000	- 20,307	- 1,400
Headquarters .....	51,438	73,525	74,385	+ 22,947	+ 860
Science education .....	4,500	4,460	5,000	+ 500	+ 540
Total, Program direction .....	139,245	142,385	142,385	+ 3,140	.....
Subtotal, Science .....	3,259,643	3,164,802	3,273,728	+ 14,085	+ 108,926

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554) .....	– 7,011	.....	.....	+ 7,011	.....
General reduction .....	– 34,047	.....	.....	+ 34,047	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security .....	– 38,244	.....	.....	+ 38,244	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work .....	.....	– 4,912	– 4,912	– 4,912	.....
<b>TOTAL, SCIENCE .....</b>	<b>3,180,341</b>	<b>3,159,890</b>	<b>3,268,816</b>	<b>+ 88,475</b>	<b>+ 108,926</b>
<b>NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL</b>					
Repository program .....	135,200	70,577	15,000	– 120,200	– 55,577
Program direction .....	62,800	64,402	10,000	– 52,800	– 54,402
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554) .....	– 420	.....	.....	+ 420	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security .....	– 6,926	.....	.....	+ 6,926	.....
<b>TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL .....</b>	<b>190,654</b>	<b>134,979</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>– 165,654</b>	<b>– 109,979</b>
<b>DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION</b>					
Administrative operations:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Office of the Secretary .....	5,000	4,700	4,700	– 300	.....
Board of Contract Appeals .....	878	911	911	+ 33	.....
Chief financial officer .....	32,148	36,464	34,000	+ 1,852	– 2,464
Contract reform and privatization .....	2,500	.....	.....	– 2,500	.....
Engineering and project management .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs .....	5,000	5,478	4,500	– 500	– 978
Economic impact and diversity .....	5,126	5,230	5,000	– 126	– 230
General counsel .....	22,724	23,058	22,000	– 724	– 1,058
International affairs .....	8,500	8,481	8,500	.....	+ 19
Management and administration .....	77,800	76,392	69,000	– 8,800	– 7,392
Policy office .....	6,600	6,649	6,600	.....	– 49



Public affairs .....	3,900	4,581	4,000	+ 100	- 581
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses .....	170,176	171,944	159,211	- 10,965	- 12,733
Program support:					
Minority economic impact .....	1,500	1,498	1,500	.....	+ 2
Policy analysis and system studies .....	422	420	400	- 22	- 20
Environmental policy studies .....	1,000	919	1,000	.....	+ 81
Corporate management information program .....	12,000	.....	.....	- 12,000	.....
Subtotal, Program support .....	14,922	2,837	2,900	- 12,022	+ 63
Total, Administrative operations .....	185,098	174,781	162,111	- 22,987	- 12,670
Cost of work for others .....	74,027	71,837	71,837	- 2,190	.....
Subtotal, Departmental Administration .....	259,125	246,618	233,948	- 25,177	- 12,670
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 165	.....	.....	+ 165	.....
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments .....	- 8,000	.....	.....	+ 8,000	.....
Funding from other defense activities .....	- 25,000	- 25,000	- 25,000	.....	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security .....	- 18	.....	.....	+ 18	.....
Total, Departmental administration (gross) .....	225,942	221,618	208,948	- 16,994	- 12,670
Miscellaneous revenues .....	- 151,000	- 137,810	- 137,810	+ 13,190	.....
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net) .....	74,942	83,808	71,138	- 3,804	- 12,670
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL					
Office of Inspector General .....	31,500	31,430	30,000	- 1,500	- 1,430
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 70	.....	.....	+ 70	.....
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL .....	31,430	31,430	30,000	- 1,430	- 1,430
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES					
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES					
Directed stockpile work:					
Stockpile research and development .....	272,300	305,460	365,145	+ 92,845	+ 59,685

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
Stockpile maintenance .....	279,994	362,493	367,223	+ 87,229	+ 4,730
Stockpile evaluation .....	174,710	180,834	178,589	+ 3,879	- 2,245
Dismantlement/disposal .....	29,260	35,414	29,066	- 194	- 6,348
Production support .....	149,939	152,890	134,896	- 15,043	- 17,994
Field engineering, training and manuals .....	4,400	6,700	6,418	+ 2,018	- 282
Total, Directed stockpile work .....	910,603	1,043,791	1,081,337	+ 170,734	+ 37,546
<b>Campaigns:</b>					
Primary certification .....	41,400	55,530	52,661	+ 11,261	- 2,869
Dynamic materials properties .....	74,408	97,810	93,644	+ 19,236	- 4,166
Advanced radiography .....	58,000	60,510	85,803	+ 27,803	+ 25,293
Construction: 97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility (LANL), Los Alamos, NM .....	35,232	.....	.....	- 35,232	.....
Subtotal, Advanced radiography .....	93,232	60,510	85,803	- 7,429	+ 25,293
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins .....	52,964	47,270	44,524	- 8,440	- 2,746
Enhanced surety .....	40,600	34,797	39,298	- 1,302	+ 4,501
Weapons system engineering certification .....	16,300	24,043	26,665	+ 10,365	+ 2,622
Nuclear survivability .....	15,400	19,050	23,694	+ 8,294	+ 4,644
Enhanced surveillance .....	106,651	82,333	82,333	- 24,318	.....
Advanced design and production technologies .....	75,735	75,533	75,533	- 202	.....
Inertial confinement fusion and high yield .....	250,500	222,943	247,443	- 3,057	+ 24,500
Construction: 96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL .....	199,100	245,000	245,000	+ 45,900	.....
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion .....	449,600	467,943	492,443	+ 42,843	+ 24,500
Advanced simulation and computing .....	716,175	711,185	711,185	- 4,990	.....
<b>Construction:</b>					
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA .....	2,300	5,400	12,400	+ 10,100	+ 7,000
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA .....	5,000	5,000	22,000	+ 17,000	+ 17,000
00-D-105 Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM .....	56,000	11,070	11,070	- 44,930	.....

00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM .....	6,700	5,377	15,377	+ 8,677	+ 10,000
Subtotal, Construction .....	70,000	26,847	60,847	- 9,153	+ 34,000
Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing .....	786,175	738,032	772,032	- 14,143	+ 34,000
Pit manufacturing and certification .....	125,038	128,545	237,713	+ 112,675	+ 109,168
Secondary readiness .....	20,000	23,169	68,445	+ 48,445	+ 45,276
High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness .....		3,960	6,846	+ 6,846	+ 2,886
Non-nuclear readiness .....		12,204	18,187	+ 18,187	+ 5,983
Materials readiness .....	40,511	1,209	1,209	- 39,302	
Tritium readiness .....	77,000	43,350	42,350	- 34,650	- 1,000
Construction:					
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR .....	75,000	81,125	81,125	+ 6,125	
98-D-126 Accelerator production of Tritium, various locations .....	15,000		15,000		+ 15,000
Subtotal, Construction .....	90,000	81,125	96,125	+ 6,125	+ 15,000
Subtotal, Tritium readiness .....	167,000	124,475	138,475	- 28,525	+ 14,000
Total, Campaigns .....	2,105,014	1,996,413	2,259,505	+ 154,491	+ 263,092
Readiness in technical base and facilities:					
Operations of facilities .....	1,252,232	830,427	939,479	- 312,753	+ 109,052
Program readiness .....	74,500	188,126	197,220	+ 122,720	+ 9,094
Special projects .....	48,297	64,493	60,385	+ 12,088	- 4,108
Material recycle and recovery .....	30,018	101,311	90,310	+ 60,292	- 11,001
Containers .....	11,876	8,199	8,199	- 3,677	
Storage .....	9,075	10,643	10,643	+ 1,568	
Nuclear weapons incident response .....	56,289	89,125	88,923	+ 32,634	- 202
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac .....	1,482,287	1,292,324	1,395,159	- 87,128	+ 102,835
Construction:					
02-D-101 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL .....		2,000	67,000	+ 67,000	+ 65,000
02-D-103 Project engineering and design, various locations .....		9,180	31,130	+ 31,130	+ 21,950
02-D-105 ETCU upgrade, LLNL .....			4,750	+ 4,750	+ 4,750
02-D-107 Electrical power systems safety communications and bus upgrades, NV .....		3,507	6,200	+ 6,200	+ 2,693
01-D-103 Preliminary project engineering and design (PE&D), various locations .....	35,500	45,379	16,379	- 19,121	- 29,000
01-D-124 HEU storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN .....	17,800	9,500		- 17,800	- 9,500
01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX .....	3,000	7,700	7,700	+ 4,700	

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
01–D–800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL .....	2,000	12,993	12,993	+ 10,993	.....
99–D–103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA .....	5,000	4,400	4,400	– 600	.....
99–D–104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase I), LLNL, Livermore, CA .....	2,800	2,800	2,800	.....	.....
99–D–106 Model validation and system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM .....	5,200	4,955	4,955	– 245	.....
99–D–108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV .....	2,000	.....	2,000	.....	+ 2,000
99–D–125 Replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO .....	13,000	300	300	– 12,700	.....
99–D–127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO .....	23,765	22,200	22,200	– 1,565	.....
99–D–128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX .....	4,998	3,300	3,300	– 1,698	.....
98–D–123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC .....	30,767	13,700	13,700	– 17,067	.....
98–D–124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y–12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN .....	.....	6,850	6,850	+ 6,850	.....
97–D–123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS .....	2,918	3,000	3,000	+ 82	.....
96–D–102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations .....	.....	2,900	2,900	+ 2,900	.....
95–D–102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project (LANL) .....	13,337	.....	.....	– 13,337	.....
93–d–122 Life safety upgrades, Y–12 .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
88–D–125 HE Machining facility, Panter .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
88–D–122 FCAP .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction .....	162,085	154,664	212,557	+ 50,472	+ 57,893
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities .....	1,644,372	1,446,988	1,607,716	– 36,656	+ 160,728
Facilities and infrastructure .....	.....	.....	300,000	+ 300,000	+ 300,000
Secure transportation asset:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Operations and equipment .....	79,357	77,571	79,071	– 286	+ 1,500
Program direction .....	36,316	44,229	44,229	+ 7,913	.....
Total, Secure transportation asset .....	115,673	121,800	123,300	+ 7,627	+ 1,500
Safeguards and security .....	356,840	439,281	439,281	+ 82,441	.....

Construction:					
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM .....	18,043	9,600	9,600	- 8,443	.....
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX .....	2,713	.....	.....	- 2,713	.....
Subtotal, Construction .....	20,756	9,600	9,600	- 11,156	.....
Total, Safeguards and security .....	377,596	448,881	448,881	+ 71,285	.....
Program direction .....	224,071	271,137	271,137	+ 47,066	.....
Subtotal, Weapons activities .....	5,377,329	5,329,010	6,091,876	+ 714,547	+ 762,866
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) Public Law 106-554) .....	- 11,033	.....	.....	+ 11,033	.....
Use of prior year balances .....	- 13,647	.....	.....	+ 13,647	.....
General reduction .....	- 35,700	.....	.....	+ 35,700	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security .....	- 310,796	.....	.....	+ 310,796	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work .....	.....	- 28,985	- 28,985	- 28,985	.....
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES .....	5,006,153	5,300,025	6,062,891	+ 1,056,738	+ 762,866
<b>DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION</b>					
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D .....	235,990	170,296	222,355	- 13,635	+ 52,059
Construction: 00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL .....	17,000	35,806	35,806	+ 18,806	.....
Total, Nonproliferation and verification, R&D .....	252,990	206,102	258,161	+ 5,171	+ 52,059
Arms control .....	152,014	101,500	138,000	- 14,014	+ 36,500
Nonproliferation programs with Russia:					
International materials protection, control, and accounting .....	173,856	138,800	143,800	- 30,056	+ 5,000
Russian transition assistance .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
HEU transparency implementation .....	15,190	13,950	13,950	- 1,240	.....
International nuclear safety .....	20,000	13,800	19,500	- 500	+ 5,700
Fissile materials disposition:					
U.S. surplus materials disposition .....	139,517	130,089	130,089	- 9,428	.....
Russian surplus materials disposition .....	40,000	57,000	66,000	+ 26,000	+ 9,000
Construction:					
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend dow Savannah River, SC .....	20,932	24,000	24,000	+ 3,068	.....
01-D-142 Immobilization and associated processin facility, various locations .....	3,000	.....	.....	- 3,000	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
99–D–141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility various locations .....	20,000	16,000	16,000	– 4,000	.....
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility various locations .....	26,000	63,000	63,000	+ 37,000	.....
Subtotal, Construction .....	69,932	103,000	103,000	+ 33,068	.....
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition .....	249,449	290,089	299,089	+ 49,640	+ 9,000
Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia .....	458,495	456,639	476,339	+ 17,844	+ 19,700
Program direction .....	51,468	51,459	50,000	– 1,468	– 1,459
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....	914,967	815,700	922,500	+ 7,533	+ 106,800
Use of prior year balances .....	– 526	– 42,000	– 42,000	– 41,474	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) Public Law 106–554 .....	– 1,923	.....	.....	+ 1,923	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security .....	– 40,245	.....	.....	+ 40,245	.....
<b>TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION .....</b>	<b>872,273</b>	<b>773,700</b>	<b>880,500</b>	<b>+ 8,227</b>	<b>+ 106,800</b>
<b>NAVAL REACTORS</b>					
Naval reactors development .....	644,500	652,245	652,245	+ 7,745	.....
Construction:					
GPN–101 General plant projects, various locations .....	11,400	.....	.....	– 11,400	.....
01–D–200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY .....	1,300	9,000	9,000	+ 7,700	.....
90–N–102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID .....	16,000	4,200	4,200	– 11,800	.....
Subtotal, Construction .....	28,700	13,200	13,200	– 15,500	.....
Total, Naval reactors development .....	673,200	665,445	665,445	– 7,755	.....

Program direction .....	21,400	22,600	22,600	+ 1,200	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security .....	- 4,437	.....	.....	+ 4,437	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 1,518	.....	.....	+ 1,518	.....
<b>TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS .....</b>	<b>688,645</b>	<b>688,045</b>	<b>688,045</b>	<b>- 600</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR</b>					
Office of the Administrator .....	10,000	15,000	15,000	+ 5,000	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 22	.....	.....	+ 22	.....
<b>TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR .....</b>	<b>9,978</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>+ 5,022</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION .....</b>	<b>6,577,049</b>	<b>6,776,770</b>	<b>7,646,436</b>	<b>+ 1,069,387</b>	<b>+ 869,666</b>
<b>DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.</b>					
Site/project completion:					
Operation and maintenance .....	919,167	872,030	979,480	+ 60,313	+ 107,450
Construction:					
02-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, INEEL, Idaho Falls, ID .....		3,256	3,256	+ 3,256	.....
01-D-414 Preliminary project, engineering and design (PE&D), various locations .....	17,300	6,254	6,254	- 11,046	.....
01-D-415 235-F packaging and stabilization project, Savannah River, SC .....	4,000	.....	.....	- 4,000	.....
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC .....	7,714	5,040	5,040	- 2,674	.....
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID .....	4,300	2,700	2,700	- 1,600	.....
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA .....	1,690	1,910	1,910	+ 220	.....
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC .....	3,949	.....	.....	- 3,949	.....
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC .....	12,512	4,244	4,244	- 8,268	.....
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC .....	8,879	15,790	.....	- 8,879	- 15,790
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility (LLNL), Livermore, CA .....	2,000	762	762	- 1,238	.....
Subtotal, Construction .....	62,344	39,956	24,166	- 38,178	- 15,790
Total, Site/project completion .....	981,511	911,986	1,003,646	+ 22,135	+ 91,660
Post 2006 completion:					
Operation and maintenance .....	2,251,514	1,680,979	2,133,779	- 117,735	+ 452,800
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution .....	420,000	420,000	420,000	.....	.....
Construction: 93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC .....	27,212	6,754	6,754	- 20,458	.....
Office of River Protection:					
Operation and maintenance .....	309,619	272,151	328,151	+ 18,532	+ 56,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
Construction:					
01–D–416 Hanford waste treatment plant, Richland, WA .....	377,000	500,000	665,000	+ 288,000	+ 165,000
99–D–403 Infrastructure support, Richland, WA .....	7,812	.....	.....	– 7,812	.....
97–D–402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA and 94–D–407 Initial tank retrieval systems .....	46,023	33,473	33,473	– 12,550	.....
94–D–407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA .....	17,385	6,844	6,844	– 10,541	.....
Subtotal, Construction .....	448,220	540,317	705,317	+ 257,097	+ 165,000
Subtotal, Office of River Protection .....	757,839	812,468	1,033,468	+ 275,629	+ 221,000
Total, Post 2006 completion .....	3,456,565	2,920,201	3,594,001	+ 137,436	+ 673,800
Science and technology .....	256,898	196,000	271,700	+ 14,802	+ 75,700
Excess facilities .....	.....	1,300	1,300	+ 1,300	.....
Safeguards and security .....	203,748	205,621	205,621	+ 1,873	.....
Program direction .....	363,988	355,761	355,761	– 8,227	.....
Subtotal, Defense environmental management .....	5,262,710	4,590,869	5,432,029	+ 169,319	+ 841,160
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554) .....	– 10,943	.....	.....	+ 10,943	.....
Use of prior year balances .....	– 34,317	– 36,770	– 36,770	– 2,453	.....
Pension refund .....	– 50,000	.....	.....	+ 50,000	.....
General reduction .....	– 10,700	.....	.....	+ 10,700	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security .....	– 193,217	.....	.....	+ 193,217	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work .....	.....	– 5,391	– 5,391	– 5,391	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT .....	4,963,533	4,548,708	5,389,868	+ 426,335	+ 841,160



<b>DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS</b>					
Site closure .....	1,027,942	1,004,636	1,034,636	+ 6,694	+ 30,000
Safeguards and security .....	54,772	45,902	45,902	- 8,870	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 2,383	.....	.....	+ 2,383	.....
<b>TOTAL, DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS .....</b>	<b>1,080,331</b>	<b>1,050,538</b>	<b>1,080,538</b>	<b>+ 207</b>	<b>+ 30,000</b>
<b>DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION</b>					
Privatization initiatives, various locations .....	90,092	141,537	157,537	+ 67,445	+ 16,000
Use of prior year balances .....	- 25,092	.....	.....	+ 25,092	.....
<b>TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION .....</b>	<b>65,000</b>	<b>141,537</b>	<b>157,537</b>	<b>+ 92,537</b>	<b>+ 16,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT .....</b>	<b>6,108,864</b>	<b>5,740,783</b>	<b>6,627,943</b>	<b>+ 519,079</b>	<b>+ 887,160</b>
<b>OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES</b>					
Other national security programs:					
Security and emergency operations:					
Nuclear safeguards and security .....	116,409	121,188	121,188	+ 4,779	.....
Security investigations .....	33,000	44,927	44,927	+ 11,927	.....
Corporate management information program .....	.....	20,000	.....	.....	- 20,000
Emergency management .....	33,711	.....	.....	- 33,711	.....
Program direction .....	92,967	83,135	81,450	- 11,517	- 1,685
Subtotal, Security and emergency operations .....	276,087	269,250	247,565	- 28,522	- 21,685
Intelligence .....	36,059	40,844	40,844	+ 4,785	.....
Counterintelligence .....	45,200	46,389	46,389	+ 1,189	.....
Advanced accelerator applications .....	34,000	.....	55,000	+ 21,000	+ 55,000
Independent oversight and performance assurance Program direction .....	14,937	14,904	14,904	- 33	.....
Environment, safety and health (Defense) .....	102,963	91,307	98,992	- 3,971	+ 7,685
Program direction—EH .....	22,604	23,293	23,293	+ 689	.....
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health (Defense) .....	125,567	114,600	122,285	- 3,282	+ 7,685
Worker and community transition .....	21,500	21,246	18,000	- 3,500	- 3,246
Program direction—WT .....	3,000	3,200	2,000	- 1,000	- 1,200
Subtotal, Worker and community transition .....	24,500	24,446	20,000	- 4,500	- 4,446

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
National Security programs administrative support .....	25,000	25,000	25,000	.....	.....
Office of Hearings and Appeals .....	3,000	2,893	2,893	- 107	.....
Subtotal, Other defense activities .....	584,350	538,326	574,880	- 9,470	+ 36,554
Use of prior year balances .....		- 10,000	- 10,000	- 10,000	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security .....	- 595	.....	.....	+ 595	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 1,289	.....	.....	+ 1,289	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work .....	.....	- 712	- 712	- 712	.....
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES .....	582,466	527,614	564,168	- 18,298	+ 36,554
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL					
Defense nuclear waste disposal .....	200,000	310,000	250,000	+ 50,000	- 60,000
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 275	.....	.....	+ 275	.....
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES .....	13,468,104	13,355,167	15,088,547	+ 1,620,443	+ 1,733,380
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS					
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance:					
Purchase power and wheeling .....	34,463	34,463	34,463	.....	.....
Program direction .....	5,000	4,891	4,891	- 109	.....
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance .....	39,463	39,354	39,354	- 109	.....
Offsetting collections .....	- 34,463	- 34,463	- 34,463	.....	.....
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106-377) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 9	.....	.....	+ 9	.....

Use of prior year balances .....	- 1,100			+ 1,100	
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION .....	3,891	4,891	4,891	+ 1,000	
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance:					
Operating expenses .....	3,795	3,339	3,339	- 456	
Purchase power and wheeling .....	288	1,800	1,800	+ 1,512	
Program direction .....	18,388	18,668	18,668	+ 280	
Construction .....	6,817	6,031	6,031	- 786	
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance .....	29,288	29,838	29,838	+ 550	
Offsetting collections .....	- 288	- 1,800	- 1,800	- 1,512	
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106-377) .....					
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 62			+ 62	
Use of prior year balances .....	- 900			+ 900	
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION .....	28,038	28,038	28,038		
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance:					
Construction and rehabilitation .....	23,115	16,064	16,064	- 7,051	
System operation and maintenance .....	36,104	37,796	37,796	+ 1,692	
Purchase power and wheeling .....	65,224	186,124	186,124	+ 120,900	
Program direction .....	106,644	114,378	114,378	+ 7,734	
Utah mitigation and conservation .....	5,950	1,227	6,092	+ 142	+ 4,865
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance .....	237,037	355,589	360,454	+ 123,417	+ 4,865
Offsetting collections .....	- 65,224	- 186,124	- 190,989	- 125,765	- 4,865
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106-377) .....					
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) Public Law 106-554) .....	- 365			+ 365	
Use of prior year balances .....	- 5,983			+ 5,983	
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION .....	165,465	169,465	169,465	+ 4,000	
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND					
Operation and maintenance .....	2,670	2,663	2,663	- 7	

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106-554) .....	- 7	.....	.....	+ 7	.....
TOTAL, FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING FUND .....	2,663	2,663	2,663	.....	.....
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS .....	200,057	205,057	205,057	+ 5,000	.....
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION					
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission .....	175,200	181,155	181,155	+ 5,955	.....
FERC revenues .....	- 175,200	- 181,155	- 181,155	- 5,955	.....
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission) .....	- 75,000	.....	.....	+ 75,000	.....
Defense environmental privatization (rescission) .....	- 97,000	.....	.....	+ 97,000	.....
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY .....	18,303,148	18,106,554	20,061,975	+ 1,758,827	+ 1,955,421

## GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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

Language under section 301 prohibits the use of funds to award, amend or modify a contract in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulations unless on a case-by-case basis, a waiver is granted by the Secretary of Energy or the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration. Similar language was contained in last year's Energy and Water Development Act, Public Law 106-377. The recommendation contained herein, provides waiver authority for Atomic Energy Defense Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration to the Administrator. Waiver authority for all other programs shall be provided by the Secretary of Energy.

Language is included under section 302 which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to develop or implement a workforce restructuring plan or enhanced severance payments and other benefits for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 484. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-377.

Language is included under section 303 which prohibits the use of funds for severance payments under the worker and community transition program.

Language is included under section 304 which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to initiate requests for proposals or 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. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-377.

Language is included under section 305 which permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-377.

Language is included under section 306 which provides that up to 6 percent of funds appropriated in this Act, including Environmental Management programs, may be used for Laboratory Directed Research and Development. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-377.

Language is included under section 307 which provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to dispose of transuranic waste in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant which contains concentrations of plutonium in excess of 20 percent by weight for the aggregate of any material category on the date of enactment of this Act, or generated after such date. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2001, Public Law 106-377.

Language is included under section 308 which provides that the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration may authorize 2 percent of the amount allocated to a nuclear weapons production plant for the production plant to engage in research, development, and demonstration activities with respect to the Engineering and manufacturing capabilities of the plant in order to maintain and enhance such capabilities at the plant. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2001, Public Law 106-377.

Language is included under section 309 which allows the Power Marketing Administrations to engage in activities and solicit, undertake and review studies and proposals relating to the formation and operation of a regional transmission organization.

Language is included under section 310 which provides that the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration may authorize 2 percent of the amount allocated for national security operations at the Nevada Test Site for investment in innovative research, development, and demonstration activities with respect to the development, test, and evaluation capabilities necessary for operations and readiness of the Nevada Test Site.

Language is included under section 311 to extend the authorization for withdrawals from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund from fiscal year 2002 to fiscal year 2005.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

## GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$5,500,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	6,180,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,500,000

## REVENUES

Appropriations, 2001 .....	-\$5,390,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	-5,432,000
Committee recommendation .....	-5,432,000

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,500,000 for fiscal year 2002.

## NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2001 .....	\$2,894,000
Budget estimate, 2002 .....	3,100,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,500,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy.

## TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

Language is included under section 501 which provides that none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of Title 18, United States Code. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60.

Language is included under section 502 which requires that American-made equipment and goods be purchased to the greatest extent practicable. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60.



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 recommended appropriations in title III, Department of Energy, generally are subject to annual authorization. However, the Congress has not enacted an annual Department of Energy authorization bill for several years, with the exception of the programs funded within the atomic energy defense activities which are authorized in annual defense authorization acts. The authorization for the atomic energy defense activities, contained in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2001, is currently being considered by the Senate.

Also, contained in title III, Department of Energy, in connection with the appropriation under the heading “Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund,” the recommended item of appropriation is brought to the attention of the Senate.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(C), RULE XXVI, OF THE  
STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, the Committee ordered reported, en bloc, S. 1171, an original fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development appropriations bill, S. 1172, an original fiscal year 2002 Legislative Branch appropriations bill, and an original fiscal year 2002 Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill, each subject to amendment and each subject to its 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. Hollings  
Mr. Leahy  
Mr. Harkin  
Ms. Mikulski  
Mr. Reid  
Mr. Kohl  
Mrs. Murray  
Mr. Dorgan  
Mrs. Feinstein  
Mr. Durbin  
Mr. Johnson

Mrs. Landrieu  
 Mr. Reed  
 Mr. Stevens  
 Mr. Cochran  
 Mr. Specter  
 Mr. Domenici  
 Mr. Bond  
 Mr. McConnell  
 Mr. Burns  
 Mr. Shelby  
 Mr. Gregg  
 Mr. Bennett  
 Mr. Campbell  
 Mr. Craig  
 Mrs. Hutchison  
 Mr. DeWine

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.

**RECLAMATION STATES EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF  
 ACT OF 1991, PUBLIC LAW 102-250**

\* \* \* \* \*

TITLE III—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

**SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

Except as otherwise provided in section 303 of this Act (relating to temperature control devices at Shasta Dam, California), there is authorized to be appropriated not more the \$90,000,000 in total for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1999, 2000, [and 2001] *2001, and 2002.*

\* \* \* \* \*

**PUBLIC LAW 105-204**

## AN ACT

To require the Secretary of Energy to submit to Congress a plan to ensure that all amounts accrued on the books of the United States Enrichment Corporation for the disposition of depleted uranium hexafluoride will be used to treat and recycle depleted uranium hexafluoride.

\* \* \* \* \*

**SECTION 1. UNITED STATES ENRICHMENT CORPORATION.**

(a) \* \* \*

(b) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding the privatization of the United States Enrichment Corporation and notwithstanding any other provision of law (including the repeal of chapters 22 through 26 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297 et seq.) made by section 3116(a)(1) of the United States Enrichment Corporation Privatization Act (104 Stat. 1321–349), *except as provided in subsection (c)*, no amounts described in subsection (a) shall be withdrawn from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund established by section 1308 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297b–7) or the Working Capital Account established under section 1316 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297b–15) until the date that is 1 year after the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget request for **[fiscal year 2002]** *fiscal year 2005*.

\* \* \* \* \*

## 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	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 2002: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
General purpose, defense .....	15,247	15,247	NA	NA
General purpose, non-defense .....	9,713	.....	NA	NA
General purpose, total .....	24,960	15,247	24,916	<sup>1</sup> 24,690
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2002 .....	.....	.....	.....	<sup>2</sup> 16,182
2003 .....	.....	.....	.....	7,577
2004 .....	.....	.....	.....	1,159
2005 .....	.....	.....	.....	30
2006 and future years .....	.....	.....	.....	19
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2002 .....	NA	109	NA	34

<sup>1</sup> Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR LARRY E. CRAIG

### NUCLEAR WASTE FUND

I am providing additional views with respect to both the funding level for the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management and the Committee report recommendations regarding the Yucca Mountain project. The funding level of \$275,000,000 represents an unwarranted cut from the Department of Energy's request of \$445,000,000 and jeopardizes the ultimate success of the project. Furthermore, this blow to the Yucca Mountain project comes just months before the President is expected to make a decision about whether to move forward with Yucca Mountain's development as a geologic repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste from commercial reactors and defense activities. His decision will be based on the many volumes of data compiled during over two decades of scientific study of the site.

A central repository for spent nuclear fuel is vital to maintain nuclear energy's role as our Nation's largest source of non-emitting electricity generation. Although spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste is currently being safely stored at approximately 150 locations around the country, those sites were never intended to be permanent storage facilities. The Department of Energy has a legal obligation to begin managing the fuel as of January 31, 1998. The urgent need for a permanent repository for spent nuclear fuel is why the Yucca Mountain site has been subjected to extensive scientific study over a period of years.

The Committee report, in my view, misrepresents the ongoing process of scientific investigation at Yucca Mountain and adds redundant and contradictory processes to those already in place to determine if the site is suitable.

The Committee report asserts that our Nation's reluctance to reprocess used nuclear fuel made a geologic repository our only option. Such an assertion ignores the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences and ignores the international consensus for deep geologic disposal. The fact is that reprocessing does not eliminate the need for a repository. Every time spent fuel is reprocessed, there are radioactive byproducts that require disposal. In fact, 16 nations are studying geologic repositories, including every nation that currently reprocesses its spent nuclear fuel.

The cost of continued technical investigation of other potential sites did not make Yucca Mountain the designated repository site by default. A total of nine sites were studied between 1982 and 1987. A comparison of the sites pointed clearly to Yucca Mountain as the best repository site, which is why scientific attention has been focused on Yucca Mountain since then.

Opponents of Yucca Mountain have also mischaracterized national policy toward used nuclear fuel as "bury it all and forget it."

The fact is that provisions are in place for continual study of Yucca Mountain for 50 to 300 years after spent fuel disposal commences, and future generations have the freedom to opt for further study.

The report mischaracterizes the ongoing, scientific studies of Yucca Mountain by stating that the Department of Energy "has not demonstrated that the proposed site at Yucca Mountain is suitable." This assertion contradicts the numerous scientific studies that have already been released nearly all of which indicate that Yucca Mountain will be suitable, based on the evidence to date.

The Committee report decries changes in the repository's operational concept from a sealed and backfilled approach to a monitored and retrievable approach by saying the changes undermine public confidence in the safety of the repository. Precisely the opposite is true. Having a repository that is more easily monitored can only strengthen public confidence in Yucca Mountain, because the public can have more assurance that rigorous scientific inquiry can easily and regularly be applied to the site.

The Committee report recommendations place an onerous burden on Yucca Mountain by upholding contradictory positions and mandating redundant processes on top of those already in place. The report language calls upon the Department of Energy to "use existing regulations to determine site suitability," even though those regulations are contradictory to the recommendation of scientific experts at the National Academy of Sciences. Those same regulations are, in fact, being revised to reflect the Environmental Protection Agency's recently issued radiation protection standard.

Additionally, the comments call for mandating an extensive process of public hearings in each of the 43 States through which spent fuel could be transported to Yucca Mountain. An extensive process for public hearings already exists, whereby States, local communities, and emergency response authorities can express concerns, have questions answered, and receive appropriate training. It is not useful to conduct the training and hearings now, when this program is at least a decade away from transporting spent fuel to Yucca Mountain and the Department of Energy has not yet selected transportation routes. These routes must also be selected in accordance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Department of Transportation regulations.

Proponents and opponents of the Yucca Mountain project alike agree that the decision about the site's suitability as a geologic repository should be based on sound and thorough science. Unfortunately, both the funding level of \$275,000,000 and the report language regarding this program frustrate a scientifically-based approach to the decision in favor of an attempt to starve the program with a lack of resources and delay it with unnecessary or duplicative processes. Our Nation's energy future, however, demands that we evaluate Yucca Mountain on its scientific merits alone.

LARRY E. CRAIG.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2001 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2001 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
General investigations .....	160,584	130,000	152,402	- 8,182	+ 22,402
Construction, general .....	1,716,165	1,324,000	1,570,798	- 145,367	+ 246,798
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee .....	350,458	280,000	328,011	- 22,447	+ 48,011
Operation and maintenance, general .....	1,897,775	1,745,000	1,833,263	- 64,512	+ 88,263
Regulatory program .....	124,725	128,000	128,000	+ 3,275	.....
FUSRAP .....	139,692	140,000	140,000	+ 308	.....
General expenses .....	151,666	153,000	153,000	+ 1,334	.....
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil .....	4,541,065	3,900,000	4,305,474	- 235,591	+ 405,474
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction .....	19,524	24,169	24,169	+ 4,645	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation .....	14,136	10,749	10,749	- 3,387	.....
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account .....	4,989	.....	.....	- 4,989	.....
Subtotal .....	38,649	34,918	34,918	- 3,731	.....
Program oversight and administration .....	1,213	1,310	1,310	+ 97	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account .....	39,862	36,228	36,228	- 3,634	.....
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources .....	678,953	647,997	732,496	+ 53,543	+ 84,499

Loan program .....	9,348	7,495	7,495	- 1,853	.....
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(26,941)	(26,000)	(26,000)	(- 941)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund .....	38,360	55,039	55,039	+ 16,679	.....
California Bay-Delta restoration .....	.....	20,000	.....	.....	- 20,000
Policy and administration .....	50,114	52,968	52,968	+ 2,854	.....
Total, Bureau of Reclamation .....	776,775	783,499	847,998	+ 71,223	+ 64,499
Total, title II, Department of the Interior .....	816,637	819,727	884,226	+ 67,589	+ 64,499
<b>TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</b>					
Energy supply .....	659,918	544,245	736,139	+ 76,221	+ 191,894
Non-defense environmental management .....	277,200	228,553	228,553	- 48,647	.....
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation .....	392,502	363,425	408,725	+ 16,223	+ 45,300
Science .....	3,180,341	3,159,890	3,268,816	+ 88,475	+ 108,926
Nuclear Waste Disposal .....	190,654	134,979	25,000	- 165,654	- 109,979
Departmental administration .....	225,942	221,618	208,948	- 16,994	- 12,670
Miscellaneous revenues .....	- 151,000	- 137,810	- 137,810	+ 13,190	.....
Net appropriation .....	74,942	83,808	71,138	- 3,804	- 12,670
Office of the Inspector General .....	31,430	31,430	30,000	- 1,430	- 1,430
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function .....	(6,108,864)	(5,740,783)	(6,638,539)	(+ 529,675)	(+ 897,756)
Non-defense function .....	(669,702)	(591,978)	(637,278)	(- 32,424)	(+ 45,300)
Total .....	(6,778,566)	(6,332,761)	(7,275,817)	(+ 497,251)	(+ 943,056)
<b>Atomic Energy Defense Activities</b>					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities .....	5,006,153	5,300,025	6,062,891	+ 1,056,738	+ 762,866
Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....	872,273	773,700	880,500	+ 8,227	+ 106,800
Naval reactors .....	688,645	688,045	688,045	- 600	.....
Office of the Administrator .....	9,978	15,000	15,000	+ 5,022	.....
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration .....	6,577,049	6,776,770	7,646,436	+ 1,069,387	+ 869,666
Defense environmental restoration and waste management .....	4,963,533	4,548,708	5,389,868	+ 426,335	+ 841,160
Defense facilities closure projects .....	1,080,331	1,050,538	1,080,538	+ 207	+ 30,000



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2001 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2001 appropriation	Budget estimate
Defense environmental management privatization .....	65,000	141,537	157,537	+ 92,537	+ 16,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management .....	6,108,864	5,740,783	6,627,943	+ 519,079	+ 887,160
Other defense activities .....	582,466	527,614	564,168	- 18,298	+ 36,554
Defense nuclear waste disposal .....	199,725	310,000	250,000	+ 50,275	- 60,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities .....	13,468,104	13,355,167	15,088,547	+ 1,620,443	+ 1,733,380
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration .....	3,891	4,891	4,891	+ 1,000	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration .....	28,038	28,038	29,838	+ 1,800	+ 1,800
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration .....	165,465	169,465	169,465	+ 4,000	.....
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund .....	2,663	2,663	2,663	.....	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations .....	200,057	205,057	206,857	+ 6,800	+ 1,800
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses .....	175,200	181,155	181,155	+ 5,955	.....
Revenues applied .....	- 175,200	- 181,155	- 181,155	- 5,955	.....
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission) .....	- 75,000	.....	.....	+ 75,000	.....
Defense environmental privatization (rescission) .....	- 97,000	.....	.....	+ 97,000	.....
Total, title III, Department of Energy .....	18,303,148	18,106,554	20,063,775	+ 1,760,627	+ 1,957,221
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission .....	66,254	66,290	66,290	+ 36	.....
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....	18,459	18,500	18,500	+ 41	.....
Delta Regional Authority .....	19,956	19,992	20,000	+ 44	+ 8

Denali Commission .....	29,934	29,939	40,000	+ 10,066	+ 10,061
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses .....	481,825	506,900	516,900	+ 35,075	+ 10,000
Revenues .....	-447,958	-463,248	-468,248	-20,290	-5,000
Subtotal .....	33,867	43,652	48,652	+ 14,785	+ 5,000
Office of Inspector General .....	5,500	6,180	5,500		- 680
Revenues .....	- 5,390	- 5,932	- 5,432	- 42	+ 500
Subtotal .....	110	248	68	- 42	- 180
Total .....	33,977	43,900	48,720	+ 14,743	+ 4,820
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board .....	2,894	3,100	3,500	+ 606	+ 400
Total, title IV, Independent agencies .....	171,474	181,721	197,010	+ 25,536	+ 15,289
TITLE V—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL					
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Cerro Grande fire activities (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	203,012			- 203,012	
Appalachian Regional Commission (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	10,976			- 10,976	
Total, title V, Emergency Supplemental .....	213,988			- 213,988	
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority .....	24,046,312	23,008,002	25,450,485	+ 1,404,173	+ 2,442,483
Appropriations .....	(24,004,324)	(23,008,002)	(25,450,485)	(+ 1,446,161)	(+ 2,442,483)
Contingent emergency appropriations .....	(213,988)			(- 213,988)	
Rescissions .....	(- 172,000)			(+ 172,000)	
(By transfer) .....					