Calendar No. 130

109TH CONGRESS *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 109–84

ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2006

JUNE 16, 2005.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2419]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2419) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2006

Total of bill as reported to the Senate	$31,245,000,000
Amount of 2005 appropriations	29,832,280,000
Amount of 2006 budget estimate	29,746,728,000
Amount of House allowance	29,746,000,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2005 appropriations	+1,412,720,000
2006 budget estimate	+1,498,272,000
House allowance	+1,499,000,000

CONTENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2006 beginning October 1, 2005, and ending September 30, 2006, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities, including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, Delta Regional Authority, Denali Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 2006 budget estimates for the bill total $31,245,000,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $31,245,000,000. This is $1,498,272,000 above the budget estimates and $1,412,720,000 over the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water held four sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2006 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

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 2006 therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of 28 to 0 the Committee on June 16, 2005, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

In 1802, responding to the need for engineering talent to support both the defense of the young United States and its civilian infrastructure, President Thomas Jefferson proposed a body of engineers within the U.S. Army, readily available to tackle assignments of national importance. To train them, he opened the first engineering school in the United States—the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, NY.

In the two centuries since, the expertise the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has gained, especially in water resources, has led administrations and Congress to assign it missions in navigation, flood control, shore protection, hydropower, water supply, recreation, and, most recently, environmental stewardship, cleanup and restoration work. The public has also relied on the Corps to respond rapidly with engineering services when disaster strikes.

Still, the question has often arisen why the Army of today carries out a Civil Works mission that appears, at first glance, far removed from its primary mission of deterring and winning wars. In fact, in the past 80 years there have been at least eight proposals to transfer the Civil Works mission to other Government agencies. All have been rejected after more careful consideration.

The Army has traditionally relied on its Civil Works mission to train combat engineers, and to complement and augment its warfighting competencies, providing the capability to respond to situations across the spectrum of conflict. Specifically, Civil Works provides the Army:

—A force in being of about 24,000 engineers and other professionals, familiar with the Army culture and responsive to the chain of command. The program provides attractive careers and professional challenges to maintain this force. This is a no cost asset to the Army until needed for warfighting.

—Established relationships with Federal, State and local officials, and with the Nation's engineering and construction industries—a force multiplier of hundreds of thousands. "On the shelf" contracts are available for emergencies.

—*Deployability.*—Corps members engaged in Civil Works activities are available where needed. Today scores of Civil Works personnel are deployed in Afghanistan and Iraq. Specialists in such activities as real estate were sent before the main force to secure needed facilities. Meanwhile, Corps "tele-engineering" systems link combat commanders to Corps labs and other stateside experts for immediate on-the-ground feedback.

—*Support to Combat Forces.*—Corps of Engineers knowledge of beach dynamics helps determine sites for landings over the shore, while expertise in soil mechanics determines the best routes for armored vehicles with technologies developed in the Civil Works program. Corps' work on winter navigation helps the Army cross frozen rivers—and was a major factor in its crossing of the Sava River in Bosnia. Its experience with roller compacted concrete for dams was used for runways and hardstands. Civil Works experience with harbors allows the Army to build ports to support U.S. forces in places such as Somalia where facilities are primitive to non-existent.

—Expertise in natural and cultural resources, water quality, flood plain management or toxic waste control, helping the Army comply with more than 70 Federal environmental statutes, and a breadth of experience and workload in dozens of specialized fields that would not otherwise be possible.

—*A Power Projection Platform.*—Nearly all military equipment deployed overseas passes through ports maintained by the Civil Works program. So do most Navy ships. Corps flood control projects also play a role in force projection by protecting key highway and rail links.

—*International Goodwill.*—Army Engineers experienced in Civil Works play a major role in infrastructure in developing nations. They help to improve economic conditions and strengthen democratic institutions in these nations; allow the Army a presence in politically sensitive areas; and foster good will through contact between governments and armed forces. Today Corps personnel are working in more than 90 nations around the world. In most of these nations, no other U.S. forces are present.

Army management of the Nation's water resources, in turn, benefits the program and the Nation in a number of ways:

—*Responsiveness.*—Corps members and contractors are available to deploy, often within hours, wherever the need arises. This was dramatically demonstrated in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks. Civil Works personnel were on the scene within hours. Corps vessels operated a ferry service taking survivors to New Jersey and bringing rescue workers into the city. Corps personnel assisted with rescue and recovery operations. Structural engineers evaluated which buildings were safe for re-entry. The 249th Engineer Battalion (Prime Power) provided the expertise necessary to set up emergency generators that had New York's financial district back in business the following Monday. The Corps also developed the plan for disposal of debris from "Ground Zero" and managed the Staten Island disposal site so that 1.35 million tons of material were safely disposed of months ahead of schedule and $55,000,000 under budget.

—*A Bias For Action.*—A unique mix of Army officers with a "can do" attitude working alongside world class engineering and scientific civilian expertise makes the Corps arguably the most positive and proactive agency in the Federal Government.

—*National Security Consideration in Planning for Infrastructure.*—The Corps recently completed security assessments for

more than 300 of its key projects. It also led the establishment in March 2002 of The Infrastructure Security Partnership [TISP], bringing together government and private organizations representing about 1.6 million engineers and other professionals to focus on securing the infrastructure necessary to maintain normal American life. Corps "hardening" measures, meanwhile, were credited with saving hundreds of lives in the 9/11 attack on the Pentagon.

—*Impartiality in Recommendations for Projects, Permits, Etc.*—Administrations and Congresses rely on the Corps to base investment recommendations on the best engineering, economic and environmental science available, not political considerations.

—*Concentration of Water Resources Expertise in One Agency.*—The Corps, with the great majority of its civil works personnel located throughout the 50 States rather than in Washington, DC, is unique in the world in that it provides a common arena for water resources issues in the United States to be debated and solutions vetted. Governments of other countries study the Corps as they begin to understand the need for integrated solutions and seek to build the capability to achieve them by combining previously separate agency responsibilities. The Corps provides synergy among various uses of water, balance among uses and geographic areas, and the ability to plan water resources for watersheds as a whole instead of single projects for specific locations. Water resource planners and the public are increasingly coming to understand that water problems cannot be considered in isolation—the solution to one problem often generates others. Uses and protection of water resources cannot be separated, but require an integrated, watershed approach. Having different agencies in charge of water resource uses would guarantee conflicts among uses, while having all uses under the auspices of one agency is a major step in creating a balanced, holistic approach to the Nation's water needs—a step that was taken 200 years ago.

FISCAL YEAR 2006 BUDGET OVERVIEW

The fiscal year 2006 budget request for the Corps of Engineers is composed of $4,332,000,000 in new budgetary authority and $181,000,000 in offsetting collections from the Power Marketing Authorities for a total program of $4,513,000,000. The Committee is unable to take advantage of the offsetting collections due to budgetary scoring impacts and therefore rejects this proposal for the fourth year in a row.

The Committee recommends a total of $5,298,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers, an increase of $612,452,000 from fiscal year 2005 enacted levels (adjusted for one-time emergency spending of $372,400,000). The Committee recommendation is $966,000,000 above the request. The Committee recommendation provides for a robust planning program as well as providing significant increases to the construction and operation and maintenance accounts. Unfortunately, even with this large increase the Committee recommendation falls short of what is actually needed to provide efficient levels of funding for all on-going work.

The Corps' budget proposal is a departure from previous years. This budget is the first to be developed as a full business line program prioritization and then cross-walked to the traditional accounts summary. Projects compete in each of the three main mission areas (Flood Damage Reduction, Navigation and Environmental Restoration) and are classified as follows:

—Coastal Navigation,
—Inland Navigation,
—Flood Damage reduction,
—Storm Damage reduction,
—Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, and
—Other (including all major rehabilitation and Hydropower).

Categories 1–4 comprise 70 percent or more of the Construction, General Program; Category 5 is 25 percent or less; and Category 6 is 5 percent or more. Projects were ranked on two performance criteria—Remaining Benefits to Remaining Costs Ratio or effective use of resources to address significant ecological problems. Lower ranking projects are proposed for contract deferral, suspension or termination. The budget proposed another new shore protection policy, the fourth in 4 years. Additionally, the budget proposed repealing the current continuing contract language and replacing it with new multiple year contracting. Finally, the budget included a proposal that $200,000,000 of the construction funds should be contingent upon Congress accepting the administration's budgetary prioritization criteria.

The Committee is disappointed that the administration has included another "new" beach policy. Beaches are the leading tourist destination in the United States. California beaches alone receive nearly 600 million tourist visits annually. This is more tourist visits than to all of the lands controlled by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management combined. Beach tourists contribute $260,000,000,000 to the U.S. economy and $60,000,000,000 in Federal taxes. Last year Congress provided legislation that beach policies will not be changed except by congressional direction. Congress has repeatedly demonstrated that the current beach policy is satisfactory. The Committee has attempted to provide sufficient funding for a number of the most critical shore protection projects.

The Committee has chosen to reject all of these budget proposals. The Committee believes that this is no way to run a robust national infrastructure program. The Corps needs to seriously reexamine its "business line" budget model. The Corps program has always been a "big tent" where all aspects of water resource development were jointly discussed and budgeted. The business line approach segregates these interests and promotes discord among various water resource interests. There is already evidence of some "business lines" attempting to find ways to take funding from "business lines" with smaller constituent bases. This lack of unity will further the downward spiral of recent budget proposals.

The Committee believes that the budget proposal's blind emphasis on remaining benefits to remaining costs ratios to determine funding priorities is misplaced. The strict adherence to the metric of Remaining Benefit to Remaining Cost Ratio to the exclusion of all other possible metrics that could have been utilized such as

widespread project net benefits, inclusion of system-wide values, acknowledgement of regional benefits, recognition of a wider set of benefits over a longer planning period than just 1 year, calculations using other interest rates that are more in accordance with the projects authorizations, as well as the GI metric of 3.0 RBRCR for the PED projects, is indeed narrow.

Also, funding only the "highest potential return" studies to the detriment of many other studies that provide a future vision or address far-reaching problems while not yet showing any BCR data, can also be considered "penny wise and pound foolish." These studies still add value and importance and have a place in the problem solving needs of the overall Nation's water community.

While this process may have led to a very focused performance-based set of final projects to study, design and construct, the metrics used led to a very skewed set of results with a few strong regional winners and many losers. Consideration of a more encompassing set of factors including those mentioned above, as well as a number still under development, would have provided a more comprehensive set of projects, yet continuing to deliver needed, effective, national water benefits.

These ratios provide a "snapshot" view of a project. They tell you nothing of the relative value of one project to another, projects in rural areas with fewer beneficiaries are penalized and no consideration is given to the workforce. Congress has repeatedly demonstrated that it desires to keep the structure of the Corps of Engineers as it is currently configured. Yet if the budget were enacted, there would be no way to maintain this workforce, due to how the ratios skewed the projects to certain areas of the country.

The program proposed in the budget is very unbalanced among planning, construction and maintenance. The planning program is decimated. The proposed program slows down the number of projects reaching construction by limiting funding for new study phases. The planning program is vital to a healthy Corps of Engineers; without a steady supply of new studies, eventually there will be no new construction projects, and then the Corps would gradually become an operation and maintenance organization with no real national capabilities. There is no shortage of water resource needs in the country today, and the Corps needs to maintain a robust planning program to be able to continue to address these needs.

Continuing Contracts

The Corps needs flexibility to manage their program. Unlike building a hospital or a barracks or a post office where the site is relatively contained, flood free, and accessible, water resource projects are constructed in physically challenging locations. By their nature, these projects involve large mobilization costs and great uncertainties. The Corps of Engineers has been tasked with providing hundreds of water infrastructure projects in challenging locations throughout the country. Historically, the Corps has done an outstanding job of managing these great water resource projects and has provided the water infrastructure that has greatly contributed to our economic security.

One of the greatest tools that the Corps of Engineers has for managing its nationwide water resources infrastructure program is the ability to award multiyear continuing contracts. When an agency is managing, literally, hundreds of construction projects throughout the country, problems are inevitable. These can range from flood, to drought, to funding shortfalls, to unanticipated hazardous wastes encountered in the construction site, or discovery of unanticipated cultural resources. Any one of these items can bring a project to a temporary halt or slow construction. By the same token, projects can be accelerated due to mild winters or below average flows on a river allowing a longer construction season with more work to be done and more funds to be utilized.

Water resources projects, because of the nature of the work involved, are funded on an incremental annual basis. As far back as 1922, the Congress recognized the need for flexibility in management and execution of the Civil Works program and provided the Army Corps of Engineers with legislation that allowed the use of continuing contracts for specifically authorized projects. In a 1977 decision, the Comptroller General confirmed that the authority found in the 1922 law constituted an exception to the Anti-deficiency Act. Accordingly, the Corps has had the discretion to use continuing contracts to execute any of its specifically authorized water resources projects since at least 1977.

In the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. § 2331), the Congress enacted another provision of law relating to continuing contracts. This legislation requires the Corps to award a continuing contract for a water resources project for which initiation of construction has occurred, but for which sufficient funds are not available to complete the project. The statute defines initiation of construction as the date of the enactment of an appropriations act in which the project receives funds from either the Construction, General, Operation and Maintenance, General or Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries lump sum appropriations. Since Congress rarely appropriates sufficient funds for each project, the practical effect of the statute is that it requires the use of continuing contracts for the majority of civil works water resource projects.

Continuing contracts allow the Corps to award large construction elements of a project to take advantage of the economies of scale available to construction contractors. Allowing these large construction elements to be managed over several years without requiring contracts to be fully funded before construction begins affords the Corps the ability to more efficiently manage multiple construction contracts. Multiyear funding, and the ability to reprogram funds, are tools that have allowed the Corps to maximize scarce resources to try to do as much as possible with the resources available to them; they also left the Corps open to charges that it has put contractors in charge of managing its funds.

The Congress has expressed its concerns in the past that Corps of Engineers construction projects may have used the continuing contracts clause and the ability to reprogram funds to award some construction contracts that may not have been fiscally prudent in light of current budget realities. However, many of these construction contracts were awarded when surplus funds were available al-

lowing reprogramming of funds to make up for budget shortfalls. This process has resulted in most surplus funds being expended, leaving the Corps with very little flexibility to cover the financial obligations of the construction contracts. As a result, an increased number of reprogrammings are necessary to satisfy as many of the Corps' financial obligations as possible.

In the Conference Report accompanying the fiscal year 2005 Consolidated Appropriations Act (House Report 108–792), the Congress expressed its belief that the Corps had made great strides in resolving these financial issues by applying more stringent controls on financial obligations allowed on continuing contracts and allowed the Corps to continue to resolve the situation. The Congress also cautioned the Corps that it must regain control of all aspects of program execution and execute the program which Congress appropriates. The Committee believes that the Corps has made progress in tightening controls on the use of continuing contracts. For example, these types of contracts have traditionally been executed at a district level. However, the decision has been elevated to Corps headquarters on whether or not to award a continuing contract. The Committee sees this as an appropriate but temporary necessity and expects continuing contracts to remain a generally available contracting tool for program execution.

The continuing contract clause has adequate controls to limit the future obligations of the Federal Government. The Committee expects the Corps to utilize these controls to limit Government exposure. The Committee expects the Corps to develop specific execution guidance to control and manage the implementation of continuing contracts, consistent with law and prudent fiscal policy, and to carry out the Civil Works program accordingly.

Reprogramming

The Committee expects the Corps to execute the Civil Works program following congressional direction. This includes moving individual projects forward in accordance with the funds annually appropriated. However, the Committee realizes that many factors outside the Corps' control may dictate the progress of any given project or study. Therefore, the Committee believes that it is imperative to allow the Corps ample flexibility to manage the program and to utilize excess funds as they become available on a particular project to move the entire program forward. With this flexibility comes a responsibility to insure that appropriated funds are available for projects when necessary. The Committee expects the Corps to develop specific execution guidance to control and manage the reprogramming of funds, which is consistent with law and prudent fiscal policy, and to carry out the Civil Works program accordingly. As there were some ambiguities in the reprogramming guidance provided with the fiscal year 2005 Omnibus Report, the Committee has elected to redraft that guidance and present it here.

Reprogramming is also to be used in very benign, fiscally responsible ways. The Corps financial management system uses thousands of work item codes to supply funding for everything from purchasing a screwdriver to ordering a computer to buying a miter gate for a lock and dam. As the Government cannot fund purchases in arrears, adequate funding estimates must be supplied into these

work items prior to purchases being made. Rarely are these estimates an exact match for these purchases. Often funding is left in these work items that must be cleaned up at the end of the fiscal year. The remaining funds from these accounts must be reprogrammed to other accounts in order to be used. These remaining funds can range from a few pennies to thousands of dollars. The same is true when a cost shared project is completed with a local sponsor. A final accounting must be made and all of the old work items must be cleaned out in order to dispose of leftover project funding.

Reprogramming Guidance

A reprogramming action may not be used to eliminate or initiate a program, project or activity.

General Investigations.—Reprogramming a cumulative total of up to 25 percent of the total General Investigations appropriation funding is permitted. Such reprogramming between studies and programs within the preceding limitation are permitted without approval of either House of Congress. However, the Chief of Engineers shall provide a quarterly report to both House and Senate Appropriations Committees of all reprogrammings for individual studies or programs with increases in excess of $250,000 but less than or equal to $500,000. Approval of both House and Senate Appropriations Committees is required for cumulative reprogramming increases greater than $500,000. Restoration of all savings and slippage shall not count toward the cumulative total. The Committee does not object to reprogramming up to $50,000 to any continuing study or program that did not receive an appropriation in the current year. All funds used to source reprogrammings described above should be surplus to current year needs for that effort. For the purpose of this section, the cumulative total is derived by summing the net increases of reprogrammings for only the gaining projects or programs.

Construction, General.—Reprogramming a cumulative total of up to 15 percent of the total Construction, General appropriation funding is permitted. Such reprogramming between projects and programs within the preceding limitation are permitted without approval of either House of Congress. However, the Chief of Engineers shall provide a quarterly report to both House and Senate Appropriations Committees of all reprogrammings for individual projects or programs with increases in excess of $4,000,000 but less than or equal to $7,000,000. Approval of both House and Senate Appropriations Committees is required for cumulative reprogramming increases greater than $7,000,000. Restoration of all savings and slippage and prior year revocations shall not count toward the cumulative total. The Committee does not object to the restoration of prior year revocations or the additional reprogramming of up to $500,000 to any continuing project or program that did not receive an appropriation in the current year. All funds used to source reprogrammings described above should be surplus to current year needs for that effort. For the purpose of this section, the cumulative total is derived by summing the net increases of reprogrammings for only the gaining projects or programs.

Operations and Maintenance.—Unlimited reprogramming authority is granted in order for the Corps to be able to respond to emergencies. The Chief of Engineers must notify the House and Senate Appropriations Committees as soon as practicable of these emergency situations. For all other situations, reprogramming a cumulative total of up to 50 percent of the total Operations and Maintenance appropriation funding is permitted. Such reprogramming between projects and programs within the preceding limitation are permitted without approval of either House of Congress. However, the Chief of Engineers shall provide a quarterly report to both House and Senate Appropriations Committees of all reprogrammings for individual projects or programs with increases in excess of $5,000,000 but less than or equal to $10,000,000. Approval of both House and Senate Appropriations Committees is required for cumulative reprogramming increases greater than $10,000,000. All funds used to source reprogrammings described above should be surplus to current year needs for that effort. For the purpose of this section, the cumulative total is derived by summing the net increases of reprogrammings for only the gaining projects or programs.

Mississippi River and Tributaries.—The Corps should follow the same reprogramming guidelines for the General Investigations, Construction, and Operation and Maintenance portions of the Mississippi River and Tributaries Account as listed above.

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program.—The Corps may reprogram up to 15 percent of the appropriated funding level between FUSRAP projects without Committee approval. Restoration of prior year reprogramming amounts shall not count towards the cumulative total.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT

The Committee is extremely disappointed in the general lack of leadership being exhibited by the Chief of Engineers, the Director of Civil Works and the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) in execution of the Civil Works program. The Corps of Engineers has been provided clear guidance on program execution in a number of Acts of Congress over the years and is provided annual direction and guidance through the Energy and Water Appropriations Act. The ASA[CW] provides the Chief of Engineers advice about policy matters and is generally the political spokesperson for the administration's policies; however, the Chief of Engineers is responsible for carrying out the program. The Chief of Engineers receives his orders from the Army Chief of Staff and those orders flow through him to the Director of Civil Works and through the rest of the Civil Works hierarchy to carry out those orders. The Committee expects the Chief of Engineers to prepare management and execution plans in accordance with this guidance and to aggressively carry out those plans. The Committee has twice reminded the Chief of Engineers, in writing, of his obligations to execute the program for fiscal year 2005 contained in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2005 (Public Law 108–447). The Committee also directed that all guidance provided by the Congress should be adhered to in carrying out his responsibilities. It is a simple matter to determine the consensus judgments of the Congress as to how

executive branch programs should be administered. All one must do is look at the law and the accompanying reports as enacted. Any other congressional guidance should be viewed as suggestive and weighed in context with guidance that the Congress provided. The Committee expects the Chief of Engineers regain control and leadership over the Corps of Engineers and the Civil Works program immediately.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2005	[1] $143,344,000
Budget estimate, 2006	95,000,000
House allowance	100,000,000
Committee recommendation	180,000,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $400,000.

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

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
ALABAMA						
BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL	189				189	
VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	253				253	
ALASKA						
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK						500
ATKA HARBOR, AK					200	
ALASKA REGIONAL PORTS, AK					100	
ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK					1,000	
BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE DEEPENING, AK					800	
CRAIG HARBOR, AK					100	
DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK					490	760
EKLUTNA WATERSHED, AK					100	
HAINES HARBOR, AK					300	
HOMER HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK					100	
KENAI RIVER BLUFF EROSION,AK					500	
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK					100	
KLANOCK HARBOR, AK					100	
KNIK BRIDGE CROSSING, AK					1,000	
KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK					500	
LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK					400	
MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED, AK					100	
MCGRATH, AK					300	
MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK					200	
PORT GRAHAM, AK					200	
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK					100	
SAINT GEORGE HARBOR IMPROVEMENT, AK					100	
UNALAKLEET, AK					500	
UNALASKA, AK					100	500
VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK					100	
WHITTIER BREAKWATER,AK					100	
YAKUTAT HARBOR, AK	300				300	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
ARIZONA						
PIMA COUNTY, AZ	488		488		488	
RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ		618		618		618
RIO SALADO OESTA, SALT RIVER, AZ					475	
SANTA CRUZ RIVER, GRANT RD TO FT LOWELL RD, AZ	400		400		400	
SANTA CRUZ RIVER, PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS, AZ						100
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION, AZ		400		500		400
ARKANSAS						
HOT SPRINGS CREEK, AR	200				200	
LITTLE RIVER COUNTY (OGDEN LEVEE), AR						100
NORTH LITTLE ROCK, DARK HOLLOW, AR						200
PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR						400
RED RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, SW ARKANSAS, AR						400
SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS, AR					200	
WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR AND MO	1,000		900		1,000	
WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOWS, AR						100
WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR						100
CALIFORNIA						
ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA	350		450		350	
ARANA GULCH WATERSHED, CA	100				100	
ARROYO SECO WATERSHED, CA					300	
BALLONA CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA					450	
BOLINAS LAGOON, CA			200		200	
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA	600		900		600	
CARPINTERIA SHORELINE STUDY, CA					200	
CITY ON INGLEWOOD, CA					275	
CITY OF NORWALK, CA					160	
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA					200	
COAST OF CA, SOUTH COAST REGION (LA COUNTY)					300	
COYOTE CREEK, CA	100		100		100	

COYOTE DAM, CA					250	
DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CA			200			
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, CA			1,000			
ESTUDILLO CANAL, CA	600		900		600	
GRAYSON AND MURDERER'S CREEK, CA					200	
HAMILITON CITY, CA						750
HUMBOLT BAY LONG TERM SHOAL MGMT, CA					250	
LAGUNA CREEK WATERSHED					200	
LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	300		400		300	
LAGUNA CREEK, CA					900	
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CORNFIELDS, CA	600		1,300		600	
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	850		850		850	
MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	167				167	
MATILIJA DAM, CA		800		1,100		800
MORRO BAY ESTUARY						348
MUGU LAGOON, CA	82		82		82	
NAPA RIVER SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA				250		
NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	500		500			
OCEAN BEACH, SANFRANCISCO, CA			350			
ORANGE COUNTY SAMP					169	
PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA		477		1,000		477
PENINSULA BEACH, CA	308		308		308	
REDWOOD CITY NAVIGATION CHANNEL, CA					250	
RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	400		600		400	
SACRAMENTO—SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, DELTA ISLANDS AND LEVEES CA	200				900	
SAN BERNARDO LAKES AND STREAMS, CA				250		
SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA	188		188		188	
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA					200	
SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK, CA	200		300		200	
SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA			50			
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY REGION, CA					100	
SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA			350		350	
SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	300		600		300	
SANTA ANA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BIG BEAR LAKE, CA	900		1,400		900	
SANTA CLARA RIVER WATERSHED, CA					500	
SANTA ROSA CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	400		400		400	
SOLANA-ENCINITAS SHORELINE, CA				750		
SONOMA CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	300				300	
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO SHORELINE, CA	600		600		800	
SUN VALLEY WATERSHED, CA			100		250	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
SUTTER COUNTY, CA	361		361		361	
TAHOE BASIN, CA AND NV						1,720
THE COYOTE CREEK—LOWER SAN GABRIEL WATERSHED, CA	500		500		500	
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	628		628		628	
VENTURA AND SANTA BARBARA, CA					200	
WESTMINSTER, EAST GARDEN GROVE, CA	650		650		650	
WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, ORESTIMBA CREEK, CA			200			
WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA					150	
WILSON AND OAK GLEN CREEKS, SAN BERNADINO COUNTY, CA			400			
COLORADO						
ADAMS COUNTY, CO	300				300	
CACHE LA POUDRE, CO	316				316	
CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO	276				276	
FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO					250	
SOUTH BOULDER CREEK, CO					100	
ROARING FORK RIVER, BASALT, CO					50	
CONNECTICUT						
MYSTIC SEAPORT HARBOR, CT					100	
DELAWARE						
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, DE, NJ, NY, PA					250	
DELAWARE CANAL ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DE					100	
FLORIDA						
DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FL					325	
EGMONT KEY SHORELINE STABILIZATION, FL			200			
LIDO KEY SARASOTA COUNTY, FL					250	
MILE POINT, FL			500		235	
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL			125		250	
ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL					225	

ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FL					200	
ST. PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL				500		
WALTON COUNTY, FL			200	500		
GEORGIA						
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	750				750	
AUGUSTA, GA	200		200	100	200	
INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS	680				680	
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	676				676	
NORTH BEACH, GA			100			
SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA	400				400	
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA		800		800		800
TYBEE ISLAND NORTH BEACH SHORE PROTECTION PROJECT, GA					250	
GUAM						
HAGATNA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, GUAM	100				100	
HAWAII						
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	400		600		600	
BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HA					200	
KAHUKU, HI	250				250	
KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HI					225	
LAUPAHOEHOE HARBOR PROJECT, HI					200	
MOANALUA STREAM FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, HI					100	
NAWILIWILI HARBOR MODIFICATION, KAUAI, HI					225	
WAILUPE STREAM, OAHU, HI					860	
WEST MAUI WATERSHED RESTORATION PROJECT, HI					300	
IDAHO						
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID					200	
IOWA						
CLEAR LAKE WATERSHED, IA			400			
DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA				100		400
FOURMILE CREEK WATERSHED, IA					100	
GRAND RIVER BASIN COMP STUDY, IA AND MO					100	
ILLINOIS						
DES PLAINES RIVER, ILLINOIS, PHASE 2, IL			200			1,200
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	1,160		1,160		1,160	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	350		350		350	
KEITH CREEK, ROCKFORD, IL	2				2	
UPPER MISSISSIPPI COMPREHENSIVE, IL			200			
PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL						250
UPPER MISS AND ILLINOIS NAV IMPROVEMENTS, IL, IA, MN, MO, WI						20,000
UPPER MISS RVR COMP PLAN, IL, IA MN, MO, AND WI						500
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL				185		
INDIANA						
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	1,000		300		300	
ROCKY RIPPLE, FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECT, IN					100	
KANSAS						
BRUSH CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO					175	
MANHATTAN, KS					155	
MISSOURI RIVER DEGRADATION STUDY, KS AND MO					1,000	
TOPEKA, KS	100		100		100	
UPPER ARKANSAS RIVER, KS					100	
UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS					300	
WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS	200		200		200	
KENTUCKY						
BARREN RIVER LAKE, GLASGOW, KY					100	
GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY AND OH					450	
LICKING RIVER, KY			200			
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY	130		130		130	
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	132		132		132	
SALT LICK CREEK, KY					100	
LOUISIANA						
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA					425	
AMITA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BAYOU MANCHAC, LA					275	

ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, LA	585				585	
BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA		1,500		1,500		1,500
BOSSIER PARISH, LA					150	
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA					450	
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	612				612	
CALCASIEU RIVER PASS SHIP CHANNEL ENLARGEMENT, LA	700		700		700	
CROSS LAKE WATER SUPPLY ENHANCEMENT, LA			200			
GRAND BAYOU, PLAQUEMINES PARISH, LA					100	
HURRICANE PROTESCTION, LA					250	
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY STUDY, LA					100	
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYST REST, LA (SCIENCE AND TEC	5,000				5,000	
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	15,000				15,000	
PLAQUEMINES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA					250	
PORT OF IBERIA					750	
ST. BERNARD PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	656				636	
ST. CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA					450	
WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA					150	
WEST PEARL NAVIGATION, LA AND MS					100	
WEST SHORE LAKE PONCHARTRAIN, LA					250	
MAINE						
SEARSPORT HARBOR, ME					250	
MARYLAND						
ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD AND DC			400			
ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD &	180				180	
BALTIMORE METRO WTR RES-PATAPSCO AND BACK RIVERS, MD					500	
CHESAPEAKE BAY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD					200	
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, MARYLAND COASTAL MANAGEMENT	525		1,000		525	
CHES BAY SHORELINE—SEDI BUDG, MODEL					900	
EASTERN SHORE, MID CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND, MD	500		500		500	
MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER GREATER SENECA/MUDDY BRANCH, MD					500	
MASSACHUSETTS						
BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA AND RI	170				170	
COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM REST, MA					100	
BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA	650				650	
MICHIGAN						
DETROIT RIVER MASTERPLAN, MI					150	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
DETROIT RIVER SEAWALL IMPROVEMENTS, MI	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	.....
GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	315	.....	2,400	.....	315	.....
ROUGE RIVER SUPPLEMENTAL STUDY, MI	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
MINNESOTA						
BLUE EARTH RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MN, SD, IA, ND	.....	.....	.....	.....	160	.....
CROOKSTON	.....	.....	.....	.....	125	.....
MINNEHAHA CREEK WATERSHED UMR LAKE ITASCA TO L&D 2, MN	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....
MINNESOTA RIVER BASIN, MN AND SD	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD,& MANITOBA CN	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
ROSEAU RIVER, MN	.....	.....	.....	.....	244	.....
WILD RICE RIVER, MN	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
MISSISSIPPI						
HANCOCK COUNTY SEAWALL RESTORATION, MS	308	.....	.....	.....	308	.....
PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	650	.....
SHEAR'S CREEK AND DOWNTOWN DRAINAGE STUDY, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	.....
MISSOURI						
KANSAS CITYS, MO AND KS	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
LITTLE BLUE RIVER BASIN, JACKSON COUNTY, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 AND R460–471, MO	350	.....	.....	.....	350	.....
RIVER DES PERES, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
SPRINGFIELD, MO	250	.....	250	500	250	.....
ST. LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	.....	609	.....	609	.....	609
ST. LOUIS MISSISSIPPI RIVERFRONT, MO AND IL	150	.....	.....	.....	150	.....
ST. LOUIS, MO (WATERSHED)	400	.....	.....	.....	400	.....
SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	200
WEARS CREEK, JEFFERSON CITY, MO	150	.....	.....	.....	150	.....
MONTANA						
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	800	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....

NEBRASKA						
LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	131				131	
SALT CREEK WATERSHED, LINCOLN, NE					100	
NEVADA						
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING, NV AND CA					500	
TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV						3,500
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH AND MA	200		200		200	
PISCATAQUA RIVER AND PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, NH					50	
NEW JERSEY						
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	300		800		300	
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	400		1,000		400	
LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGON COUNTY, NJ					250	
MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ						200
NJ INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY ENV. RESTORATION, NJ					75	
NJ SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT, NJ					150	
NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLE	400		400		400	
PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ						375
PECKMAN RIVER BASIN, NJ					375	
RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ					175	
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ					200	
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, KEYPORT, NJ					200	
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ	100		100		100	
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ						125
SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ					125	
SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ						375
STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ					250	
UPPER ROCKWAY RIVER, NJ						250
NEW MEXICO						
EAST MESA, LAS CAUCES, NM					400	
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	250		250		500	
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE BOSQUE, NM	250		250		250	
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO, AND TX					250	
SANTA FE, NM					250	
SOUTHWEST VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, ALBBUQUERGUE, NM				180		500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
NEW YORK						
BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY	250	.....	500	.....	250	.....
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	200	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
EAST RIVERS SEAWALLS, NY	.....	.....	175	.....	.....	.....
EIGHTEEN MILE CREEK, NIAGRA COUNTY, NY	.....	.....	.....	.....	125	.....
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	.....	.....	.....	170	.....	.....
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, GOWANUS CANAL, NY	400	.....	600	.....	400	.....
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, NY AND NJ	800	.....	1,000	.....	800	.....
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMP BEACH, NY	.....	.....	.....	.....	50	.....
LAKE CHAMPLAIN CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, NY AND VT	.....	.....	.....	.....	50	.....
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
MONTAUK POINT, NY	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY	30	.....	30	.....	30	.....
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	200	.....	1,500	.....	200	.....
SAW MILL RIVER, NY	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, CATAONK CREEK, NY	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
NORTH CAROLINA						
BOUGUE BANKS, NC	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....
CAPE FEAR RIVER LOCKS AND DAM, NC	.....	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	300	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	260	.....	.....	.....	260	.....
SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC	.....	.....	.....	.....	350	.....
OHIO						
COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	53	.....	.....	.....	53	.....
EUCLID LAKEFRONT, HARBOR TOWN, OH	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
OHIO RIVERFRONT, CINCINNATI, OH	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	.....
WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH, IN, AND MI	560	.....	650	.....	560	.....

OKLAHOMA						
GRAND LAKE COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, OK					100	
GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER BASIN, OK, KS, MO, AND AR					300	
OOLOGAH LAKE WATERSHED, OK AND KS	328		328		328	
RED RIVER BRUSH MGMT ABOVE DENISON DAM, TX AND OK					100	
SE OKLAHOMA STUDY, OK					80	
SPAVINAW CREEK WATERSHED, OK AND AR					133	
WASHITA RIVER BASIN, OK					100	
WISTER LAKE WATERSHED, OK					100	
OREGON						
AMAZON CREEK, OR	264		264		264	
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA	300				300	
WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR AND WA	500		600			
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR					100	
WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR	325				325	
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	436		436		436	
PENNSYLVANIA						
BLOOMSBURG, PA					100	
CHRISTINA RIVER WATERSHED, PA, DE, AND MD					300	
MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, PA	250				250	
SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN ESTUARINE, PA	250				100	
SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN, WISSAHICKON CREEK BASIN, PA	200				100	
SUSQUEHANNA AND DELAWARE RIVER BASINS, PA			170			
UPPER OHIO NAVIGATION STUDY, PA					2,550	
PUERTO RICO						
GUYANES RIVER, YABUCOA, PR					100	
SOUTH CAROLINA						
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC					100	
EDISTO ISLAND, SC	100				100	
PAWLEYS ISLAND,SC						181
REEDY RIVER, SC	300				300	
SANTEE DELTA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, SC					100	
SOUTH DAKOTA						
JAMES RIVER, SD AND ND					600	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
TENNESSEE						
MILL CREEK WATERSHED, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	450				450	
TEXAS						
ABILENE, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)					200	
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX	2,500		2,000			
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBS, TX (MAINSTEM)					50	
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX			100			
CEDAR BAYOU, TX					100	
COLONIAS-LWR RIO GRANDE BASIN ALONG TEX-MEX BORDORS					100	
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	500		750		750	
GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX					100	
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX (REALIGNMENTS)					100	
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX		500		500		500
GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPS CHRISTIE BAY, TX					700	
GIWW, VICINITY OF PORT ISABEL, TX					700	
GREENS BAYOU, TX				150		
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	300		1,000		300	
HARRIS GULLY, TX					500	
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	300		400		1,000	
LOWER GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TX					100	
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX					200	
MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	300		400		300	
NECHES RIVER BASIN, TX	500				500	
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	500		575		500	
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX				300		450
RESACAS AT BROWNSVILLE, TX	150				150	
RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	50		50		250	
SABINE—NECHES WATERWAY, TX	419		800		419	
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	788		788		788	
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX	198		198		198	
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX		900		900		900

UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	700		1,000		700	
UTAH						
VIRGIN AND SEVIER WATERSHEDS, UT					100	
VIRGINIA						
AIWW BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA					104	
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE EROSION, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	40				40	
DISMAL SWAMP AND DISMAL SWAMP CANAL, VA	150		150		150	
ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENV RESTORATION, VA (PHASE II)	200				200	
ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA		500				500
FOUR MILE RUN RESTORATION, VA			800			
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (SECTION 216)	600				600	
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	400		400		400	
MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN, CAMERON/HOLMES RUN, VA			800			
NEW RIVER BASIN, CLAYTOR LAKE STATE PARK, VA	200		200		200	
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA					100	
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA			200			
POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	400				400	
VICINITY OF WILLOUGHBY SPIT, VA					400	
WASHINGTON						
CENTRALIA, WA					50	
CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	340				100	
ELLIOT BAY SEWALL, WA					1,500	
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA					150	
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	470		470			
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	470		500		1,500	
SKAGIT RIVER,WA					600	
SKOKOMISH RIVER, WA			200			
WEST VIRGINIA						
CHERRY RIVER BASIN, WV					100	
LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV	110				110	
PARKERSBURG/VIENNA RIVERFRONT PARK, WV				400		
WISCONSIN						
BARABOO RIVER, WI					135	
FOX RIVER, WI					200	
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI					100	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
ST. CROIX RIVER, WI	.....	.....	120	.....	120	.....
ST. CROIX RIVER RELOCATION OF ENDANGERED MUSSELS, WI	.....	.....	500	.....	.....	.....
WYOMING						
BEAR RIVER FEASIBILITY STUDY, WY	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
MISCELLANEOUS						
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	1,875	.....	1,875	.....	6,375	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	94	.....	94	.....	94	.....
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	248	.....	248	.....	248	.....
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	5,625	.....	5,625	.....	8,935	.....
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
NATIONAL SHORELINE	375	.....	375	.....	375	.....
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	3,899	.....	.....	.....	4,300	.....
AMERICAN HERITAGE RIVERS	.....	.....	150	.....	.....	.....
CALFED	.....	.....	94	.....	.....	.....
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM	.....	.....	75	.....	.....	.....
COORDINATION WITH OTHER WATER RESOURCES AGENCIES	.....	.....	246	.....	.....	.....
FERC LICENSING	.....	.....	150	.....	.....	.....
GULF OF MEXICO	.....	.....	131	.....	.....	.....
INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	.....	.....	113	.....	.....	.....
INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	.....	.....	750	.....	.....	.....
INVENTORY OF DAMS	.....	.....	222	.....	.....	.....
LAKE TAHOE	.....	.....	94	.....	.....	.....
NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM	.....	.....	75	.....	.....	.....
NORTH AMERICAN WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT PLAN	.....	.....	75	.....	.....	.....
PACIFIC NORTHWEST FOREST CASE	.....	.....	75	.....	.....	.....
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS AND REPORTS	.....	.....	1,649	.....	.....	.....
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	4,650	.....	4,650	.....	7,550	.....
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	225	.....	225	.....	225	.....
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	152	.....	152	.....	152	.....
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	22,000	.....	19,643	.....	34,500	.....

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	78	.....	78	.....	78	.....
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	600	.....	600	.....	600	.....
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	375	.....	375	.....	375	.....
TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	402	.....	402	.....	402	.....
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−20,911	.....	.....	.....	−40,126	.....
Total, General Investigations	87,896	7,104	88,597	12,362	138,662	41,338
	95,000		100,000		180,000	

Knik Bridge Crossing, AK.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 to initiate this technical study of the Federal channel.

Kotzebue Harbor, AK.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to initiate this technical study to improve safety at the harbor.

Little Diomede Harbor, AK.—The Committee has included $400,000 to initate the technical study of navigation improvements.

Little River County (Ogden Levee), AR.—The Committee has included $100,000 to initiate Preconstruction Engineering and Design [PED] studies. It is the Committee's understanding that Federal interest has been previously determined and that this project should proceed directly to PED.

Pine Mountain Dam, AR.—$400,000 is provided to continue the General Reevaluation Report for the authorized project.

Red River Navigation, Southwest Arkansas, AR and LA.—The Committee has included $400,000 to complete feasibility and initiate PED.

White River Minimum Flows, AR and MO.—The Committee recognizes the importance of providing minimum flows from various Corps projects as vital to aquatic ecosystem restoration efforts along the river. However, the Committee understands that there are serious issues that need to be resolved prior to significant progress being made on this project. Therefore, the Committee has provided $100,000 to allow the Corps to continue to negotiate these contentious issues with the local sponsor.

Coyote, CA.—$100,000 has been provided for this new reconnaissance study as provided in the budget request.

Napa Valley Watershed Management, CA.—The Committee has deleted funding for this study as local interests have indicated a desire to terminate the study in fiscal year 2005.

Orange County Special Area Management Plan [SAMP], CA.—$169,000 has been provided to complete the SAMP.

San Joaquin Valley Area, CA.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate a reconnaissance study of the San Joaquin Valley in California (consisting of Stanislaus, Madera, Merced, Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern Counties).

Tahoe Basin, CA and NV.—$1,700,000 has been provided for continuation of PED.

Chesapeake and Delaware Canal Environmental Restoration, DE.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for this reconnaissance study.

Daytona Beach Shores, Volusia County, FL.—The Committee has provided $325,000 to continue the feasibility study.

Tybee Island, GA.—$250,000 has been included to continue this storm damage reduction project.

Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers, IA.—$400,000 has been included PED.

Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers Navigation Improvements, IL, IA, MN, MO, and WI.—The Committee recognizes the importance of modernizing our Nation's waterways and has provided $20,000,000 for the continued PED on this important project.

Rocky Ripple, IN.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for this feasibility study.

Missouri River Degradation Study, KS and MO.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to initiate this study to investigate the scour problems and degradation of the riverbed.

Salt Lick Creek, KY.—$100,000 is provided for this reconnaissance study.

Louisiana Coastal Area, LA.—The Committee recognizes the tremendous value of these coastal wetlands to the Nation. Much of our national oil and gas infrastructure is protected by these wetlands which are being lost at an alarming rate. The Committee has provided the full budget request of $20,000,000 to further studies to determine ways to stop and reverse wetland loss.

Pearl River Navigation, LA and MS.—The committee has provided $100,000 for reconnaissance studies directed towards deauthorization of this outdated project and to determine appropriate disposal of project facilities.

Great Lakes Navigation Study, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA, and WI.—$315,000 has been provided to continue this study. These funds are to be used to complete the supplement to the reconnaissance report of Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway Navigation Study, which, based on previous agreement between the secretary, the ministry of transportation Canada, and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation, is to be limited in scope to evaluating the economic, engineering and environmental impacts of maintaining the great lakes St. Lawrence Seaway at current size draft and length of locks. The Secretary is directed to complete the supplemental report by September 2006, after which Congress, interested State and Federal agencies, and the public shall review the report for 1 year to determine whether additional study is warranted.

Pearl River Watershed, MS.—$650,000 is provided to complete the feasibility study.

St. Louis Watershed, MO.—The Committee has included the budget request for this new reconnaissance study.

Salt Creek Watershed, Lincoln, NE.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for this reconnaissance study.

Truckee Meadows, NV.—The Committee has provided $3,500,000 to continue PED for this important flood control project and encourages the Corps to complete the necessary studies as soon as possible.

Piscataqua River and Portsmouth Harbor, NH.—$50,000 is provided to initiate the feasibility study.

East Mesa, Las Cruces, NM.—The Committee has included $400,000 to pursue flood control and safety studies associated with aging flood control structures.

Espanola Valley, Rio Grande and Tributaries, NM.—The Committee has provided an additional $250,000 to accelerate development of the environmental programs and other activities associated with the Espanola diversion project consistent with the cost-share agreement signed May 2005.

Rio Grande Basin, NM, CO & TX.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the feasibility study.

Santa Fe, NM.—The Committee has provided $250,000 to continue on-going projects.

SW Valley Flood Damage Reduction, Albuquerque, NM.—The Committee has provided $500,000 toward completion of this project.

Upper Ohio Navigation Study, PA.—The Committee has provided $2,550,000 for this navigation feasibility study.

Lower Colorado River, TX.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to continue the feasibility study.

Neches River Basin, TX.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for this new reconnaissance study as proposed in the budget request.

Virgin and Sevier Watersheds, UT.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study to investigate solutions to the devastating floods that recently occurred in these watersheds.

AIWW Bridges at Deep Creek, VA.—The Committee has provided $104,000 to complete the PED studies for this project.

Coastal Field Data Collection.—The Committee has provided $6,375,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, $1,000,000 is for the Coastal Data Information Program, $1,000,000 is for the Southern California Beach Processes Study, $1,500,000 is for the Pacific Island Land Ocean Typhoon Experiment [PILOT] and $1,000,000 is for the Surge and Wave Island Modeling Studies [SWIMS].

Other Coordination Studies.—The Committee has provided $4,300,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, $500,000 is to continue work associated with the Lake Tahoe Interagency Partnership.

Flood Plain Management Services.—The Committee has provided $8,935,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, $1,000,000 is for Hurricane Evacuation Studies in HI; $1,250,000 for Livingston Parish, LA, GIS; $160,000 to complete the East Baton Rouge Parish, LA, GIS; $400,000 for Rancocas Creek, NJ; and $500,000 for the Navajo Nation, NM, Flood Plain Delineation.

Planning Assistance to States.—The Committee has included $7,550,000 for the program. Within the funds provided $150,000 is for the Delaware Recreation Supply and Demand study; $150,000 is for the Delaware Groundwater Investigation; $250,000 is for the Hilo Bay, HI, Water Quality Model; $100,000 is for Lafayette/West Lafayette, IN; $400,000 is for the Rock Creek, KS, Basin Stormwater project; $350,000 is for the Assabet River, MA, Sediment Remediation Study; $1,000,000 is for New Mexico Photogrammetric Mapping; $100,000 for the Bartlesville, OK, Water Supply Study; $100,000 for the Mangum, OK, Lake Phase V study; $50,000 is for the Waccamaw River Watershed Modeling, SC; $50,000 is for the Surfside Beach, SC, Stormwater Drainage Study; and $200,000 is for the Memphis Riverfront Development, TN.

Research and Development.—The Committee has provided $34,500,000 for the Corps R&D program. Within the funds provided, $1,000,000 is for Chesapeake Bay submerged aquatic vegetation research, $1,000,000 is for the National Cooperative Modeling Demonstration Program (model based negotiation process piloted by the Institute for Water Resources), and $3,500,000 is provided for innovative technology demonstrations for urban flooding and channel restoration in New Mexico and Nevada. These demonstrations will be conducted in close coordination and cooperation with

the Urban Water Research Program of the Desert Research Institute and the University of New Mexico. $750,000 is provided for the Southwest Urban Flood Damage Program research in New Mexico. $750,000 is provided for implementation of the Collaborative Planning and Management Demonstration Program within the Institute for Water Resources in collaboration with Sandia National Laboratories and the Idaho National Laboratory. An additional $5,000,000 has been provided to counter declining research and development budgets.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2005	[1] $1,781,720,000
Budget estimate, 2006	1,637,000,000
House allowance	1,900,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,086,664,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $62,600,000.

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

The appropriation provides funds for the Continuing Authorities Program (projects which do not require specific authorizing legislation), which includes projects for flood control (Section 205), emergency streambank and shoreline protection (Section 14), beach erosion control (Section 103), mitigation of shore damages (Section 111), navigation projects (Section 107), snagging and clearing (Section 208), aquatic ecosystem restoration (Section 206), beneficial uses of dredged material (Section 204), and project modifications for improvement of the environment (Section 1135).

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA			
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	.....	2,000	.....
TUSCALOOSA, AL	.....	.....	4,000
WALTER F. GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL AND GA (MAJOR REHAB)	4,121	3,915	4,121
ALASKA			
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	.....	.....	1,000
ALASKA COASTAL EROSION, AK	.....	.....	2,400
BETHEL BANK STABILIZATION	.....	.....	5,000
CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	2,000	1,900	2,000
COFFMAN COVE, AK	.....	.....	600
DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR	.....	.....	3,000
DILLINGHAM EMERGENCY BANK STABILIZATION, AK	.....	.....	4,000
FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK	.....	.....	7,000
HAINES HARBOR, AK	.....	.....	1,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
KAKE DAM, AK			5,000
NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK			13,000
SAND POINT HARBOR, AK			6,000
ST. PAUL HARBOR, AK			8,000
UNALASKA HARBOR, AK			1,000
ARIZONA			
NOGALES WASH, AZ			4,500
RIO DE FLAG, AZ		2,500	4,000
RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMP REACHES, AZ		8,000	8,000
TRES RIOS, AZ		3,000	6,000
TUCSON, ARIZONA DRAINAGE AREA, AZ		10,000	5,000
ARKANSAS			
FOUCH BAYOU BASIN, LITTLE ROCK, AR			800
MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	20,000	20,000	20,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR POWERHOUSE			4,500
RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LA, AR, OK AND TX			4,000
RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR AND LA			6,000
CALIFORNIA			
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	28,960	28,960	
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA			3,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), CA			15,850
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MINI RAISE), CA			12,000
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA (EI)			500
CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA		200	250
COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA			500
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	5,600	5,600	5,600
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	13,000	13,000	13,000
HARBOR/SOUTH BAYWATER RECYCLING PROJECTS, LOS ANGELES		4,000	4,000
KAWEAH RIVER, CA	4,300	4,085	4,800
LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA	2,700	2,700	2,732
LOWER WALNUT CREEK BASIN STUDY, CA		250	
MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA			372
MURRIETA CREEK, CA			5,000
NAPA RIVER, CA	6,000	6,000	16,000
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	48,000	48,000	42,000
SACRAMENTO AREA, CA		6,000	
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA		6,300	
SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA		250	
SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA			1,000
SAN RAMON VALLY RECYCLED WATER, CA			3,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	50,000	61,650	42,500
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	2,852	2,852	5,000
SURFSIDE, SUNSET AND NEWPORT BEACHES, CA			400
STOCKTON METROPOLITIAN FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSEMENT, CA	5,000	5,000	5,000
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	8,000	8,000	8,000
UPPER GUDADALUPE RIVER, CA			3,250
UPPER NEWPORT BAY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA		2,000	7,000
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA		200	1,200
DELAWARE			
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES BEACH	10		60
DELAWARE COAST, BETHANY BEACH TO SOUTH BETHANY BEACH			4,000
DELAWARE COAST, CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK IS, DE		1,700	1,000
DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE			320
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, BROADKILL BEACH, DE			500
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, PORT MAHON, DE			1,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
WASHINGTON, DC AND VICINITY	400		400

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
FLORIDA			
BREVARD COUNTY, PROTECTION, FL	.....	500	500
BROWARD COUNTY, REIMBURSEMENT, FL	.....	1,000	.....
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	.....	1,500	.....
CEDAR HAMMOCK/WARES CREEK, FL	.....	.....	1,000
CENTRAL AND SOUTH FLORIDA, FL	.....	.....	76,826
DADE COUNTY, FL	.....	.....	1,800
EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM PESTORATION	.....	.....	12,000
FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS, FL	.....	1,300	3,000
FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL	.....	200	.....
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (MAJOR REHAB)	16,900	16,055	16,900
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL (GRR)	.....	.....	500
KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	.....	.....	13,174
LEE COUNTY, FL	.....	750	1,500
NASSAU COUNTY, SHORE PRTECTION, FL	.....	3,000	.....
PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	.....	2,450	.....
PONCE DE LEON INLET	.....	.....	1,750
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	.....	500	500
SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	137,000	137,000	.....
ST. LUCIE INLET, FL	.....	.....	2,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL (GRR)	.....	.....	200
TAMPA HARBOR, BIG BEND, FL	5,000	4,000	5,000
TAMPA HARBOR, SUTTON CHANNEL, FL	.....	1,000	.....
GEORGIA			
ATLANTA, GA (EI)	.....	.....	2,000
BRUNSWICK, GA	.....	19,100	19,100
BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	5,812	.....	5,812
HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	733	696	733
OATE CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, CA (DEF CORK)	.....	.....	500
TYBEE ISLAND, GA (LRR)	.....	.....	18
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	1,300	1,300	1,300
THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	5,700	5,415	5,700
HAWAII			
HAWAII WATER MANAGEMENT, HI	.....	.....	2,000
IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	.....	.....	500
KAUMALAPAU HARBOR, LANAI, HI	.....	.....	13,000
KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	3,550	3,550	3,550
IDAHO			
RURAL IDAHO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, ID	.....	2,000	5,500
ILLINOIS			
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	5,495	.....	5,495
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIOR, IL	.....	.....	4,000
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	20,000	15,000	21,500
COOK COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, IL	.....	500	.....
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	.....	5,000	4,000
EAST ST. LOUIS, IL	760	722	760
EAST ST. LOUIS (INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL), IL	.....	.....	400
LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	4,300	4,300	4,300
LOCK NO. 27, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO	.....	.....	1,000
MADISON AND CLAIRE COUNTIES ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTUR	.....	1,000	.....
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	.....	25,000	30,000
MELVIN PRICE L&D, IL AND MO	.....	.....	750
NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	.....	.....	300
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL AND KY	90,000	90,000	85,000
SOUTHERN ILLINIOS SHORELINE PROJECT, IL	.....	200	.....
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO &	33,500	33,500	20,000
WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	.....	590	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
INDIANA			
CALUMET REGION, ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, IN	.....	3,500	.....
INDIANA HARBOR (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY), IN	8,000	7,600	7,600
INDIANAN SHORELINE EROSION, IN	.....	500	.....
INDIANA UNIVERSITY, SOUTH BEND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE, IN	.....	715	.....
INDIANAPOLIS COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, IN	.....	500	.....
INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	3,200	3,040	3,040
JOHN T. MEYERS LOCK AND DAM, IN	.....	700	.....
LITTLE CALAMET RIVER, IN	.....	6,500	.....
LITTLE CALAMET RIVER BASIN, CADY MARSH DITCH, IN	.....	4,000	.....
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	4,481	4,257	4,257
OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	.....	3,100	.....
IOWA			
DAVENPORT, IA	.....	.....	400
DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	.....	.....	400
DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA	.....	5,000	3,500
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	7,580	7,202	7,580
LOCK AND DAM 19, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	17,502	17,502	17,502
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE	82,800	72,627	60,000
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS, AND MO	.....	.....	750
PERRY CREEK, IA	10,000	10,000	10,000
KANSAS			
ARKANSAS CITY, KS	2,619	2,619	2,619
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	.....	.....	4,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS (DAM SAFETY)	27,000	25,650	27,000
KENTUCKY			
KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	.....	21,750	32,000
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY AND IN	70,000	70,000	65,000
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	3,670	3,670	3,670
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	2,500	2,375	2,500
LOUISIANA			
ASCENSION PARISH, LA (EI)	.....	.....	500
COMITE RIVER, LA	6,254	6,254	6,254
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA (EI)	.....	.....	500
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA (FC)	.....	.....	1,000
GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	.....	.....	900
IBERIA PARISH, LA (EI)	.....	.....	500
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	.....	9,038	15,000
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	1,500	1,500	15,000
LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	2,977	2,977	7,500
LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	.....	.....	1,000
LIVINGSTON PARISH, LA (EI)	.....	.....	500
MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE	.....	.....	229
NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	.....	.....	3,600
OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA	.....	.....	1,000
SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	10,491	10,491	37,000
WEST BANK AND VICINITY, NEW ORLEANS, LA	28,000	28,000	25,000
MARYLAND			
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	.....	.....	1,020
ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	.....	.....	4,900
BALTIMORE METRO-WYNNS FALLS, MD	.....	.....	3,000
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD AND VA	.....	1,000	3,000
CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM, MD, VA AND PA	.....	.....	2,950
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	.....	.....	1,200
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV (DAM SAFETY)	400	380	400
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	13,400	13,400	13,400

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MASSACHUSETTS			
MUDDY RIVER ECOSYSTEM AND FLOOD DAMAGE, MA	.....	1,500	1,500
MICHIGAN			
GENESEE COUNTY, MI (KEARSLYE CREEK INTERCEPTOR)	.....	.....	450
GEORGE W. KUHN DRAIN RETENTION FACILITY, MI	.....	50	.....
GREAT LAKE FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	.....	.....	500
NEGAUNEE, MI	.....	.....	464
SAULT ST. MARIE REPLACEMENT LOCK, MI	.....	2,000	.....
MINNESOTA			
BRECKENRIDGE, MN	.....	.....	1,500
L&D 3 NAVIGATION SAFETY AND EMBANKMENT REEVALUATION	.....	.....	2,000
MILLE LACS REGIONAL SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT, MN	.....	1,500	.....
NORTHEAST, MN	.....	5,000	.....
MISSISSIPPI			
COASTAL MISSISSIPPI WETLANDS RESTORATION	.....	.....	2,500
DESOTO COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI WASTEWATER TREATMENT, MS	.....	3,000	20,000
GULFPORT, MS	.....	.....	1,200
MISSISSIPPI, MS (EI)	.....	.....	25,000
NATCHEZ, MS	.....	.....	250
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	.....	.....	3,500
MISSOURI			
BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	.....	4,000	.....
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	5,000	5,000	5,000
BOIS BRULE, MO	.....	.....	2,413
CAPE GIRARDEAU (FLOODWALL), MO	.....	300	.....
CHESTERFIELD, MO	.....	.....	1,200
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO (MAJOR REHAB)	22,000	22,000	22,000
MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	7,582	7,582	7,582
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	4,000	3,800	3,800
MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT, MO	.....	.....	1,750
STE GENEVIEVE, MO	.....	.....	550
MONTANA			
FT. PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	.....	.....	700
RURAL MONTANA, MT (EI)	.....	.....	5,000
NEBRASKA			
ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	.....	1,000	3,250
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD	.....	648	.....
SAND CREEK WATERSHED, NE	.....	.....	4,000
WESTERN SARPY AND CLEAR CREEK, NE	.....	.....	3,000
NEVADA			
RURAL NEVADA, NV	.....	.....	25,000
TAHOE BASIN RESTORATION, NV AND CA (EI)	.....	.....	5,200
TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	13,000	13,000	18,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
OTTER BROOK DAM, NH (DAM SAFETY)	1,430	1,359	1,430
NEW JERSEY			
BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	.....	5,000	5,000
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	1,900	1,900	1,900
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, OAKWOOD BEACH, NJ	.....	.....	250
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE AND NJ, REEDS BEACH TO PIERCE	.....	.....	1,100
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE AND NJ VILLAS AND VICINITY	.....	.....	2,450
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA AND DE	.....	.....	3,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	.....	.....	600
HUDSON-RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	.....	1,500	.....
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	7,000	5,500	7,000
MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	.....	400	.....
MOLLY ANN'S BROOK, NJ	.....	3,000	1,500
PASSAIC RIVER BASIN FLOOD MANAGEMENT, NJ	.....	.....	500
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE, NJ	.....	3,000	.....
PASSAIC RIVER STREAMBANK PRESERVATION, NJ(MINISH PARK)	.....	.....	3,000
RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	.....	.....	1,750
RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, NEW JERSEY AND SUFFERN, NY	.....	250	.....
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	.....	.....	250
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ (PORT MONMOUTH)	.....	.....	2,000
RARITAN RIVER BASIN GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	.....	5,000	5,000
SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	.....	.....	4,000
TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	11,600	11,600	11,600
NEW MEXICO			
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	1,800	.....	3,100
ALAMOGORDO, NM	4,200	4,200	4,200
CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM (EI)	.....	.....	5,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	.....	.....	600
NEW MEXICO, NM (EI)	.....	.....	5,000
RIO GRANDE FLOODWY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE APACHE, NM	.....	.....	700
SW VALLEY, ALBUQUERQUE, NM	.....	.....	100
NEW YORK			
ATLANTIC COAST OF LONG ISLAND, LONG ISLAND BEACH, NY	.....	200	.....
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	800	1,000	2,500
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ	101,000	101,000	90,000
NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY	.....	.....	1,000
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	.....	3,500	.....
ORCHARD BEACH, NY	.....	300	.....
NORTH CAROLINA			
BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	.....	300	300
DARE COUNTY BECHES, NC	.....	.....	2,500
WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND RIVER INLET, NC	.....	.....	600
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	19,900	19,900	19,900
WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC	890	890	890
NORTH DAKOTA			
BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION ND	.....	500	1,500
GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	3,582	3,403	3,582
GRAND FORKS, ND—EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	40,000	35,000	40,000
MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION	.....	.....	250
SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	550	523	550
OHIO			
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	1,650	1,568	1,650
OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	.....	13,000	.....
OKLAHOMA			
CANTON LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	6,000	6,000	6,000
ELM FORK, RED RIVER, OK (CHLORIDE CONTROL)	.....	.....	500
LAWTON, OK	.....	.....	50
TAR CREEK, OK	.....	.....	5,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	5,200	5,200	5,200
WEBBER FALLS LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE (MAJOR REHAB)	.....	.....	4,000
OREGON			
BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR AND WA (MAJOR REHAB)	5,000	4,750	5,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR AND WA	15,000	15,000	15,000
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR AND WA	4,000	.....	4,000
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	300	.....	300
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA	.....	.....	2,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	1,000	950	1,000
PENNSYLVANIA			
EMSWORTH LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	15,000	15,000	15,000
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	50,800	50,800	46,000
NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA INFRASTRUCTURE, PA	.....	2,600	.....
PRESQUE ISLE, PA (PERMANENT)	.....	.....	620
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	8,480	8,056	8,480
SAW MILL RIVER RUN, PA	.....	1,000	.....
SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	.....	10,000	.....
SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA COBBS CREEK PARK PHILADELPHIA	.....	310	.....
SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA TACONY CREEK, PA	.....	500	.....
THREE RIVERS WET WEATHER DEMO PROGRAM, PA	.....	.....	1,000
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	10,496	10,496	10,496
PUERTO RICO			
ARECIBO RIVER, PR	3,800	4,000	3,800
PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	14,000	14,000	14,000
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	20,000	20,000	20,000
RHODE ISLAND			
FOX POINT HURRICANE BARRIER, RI	.....	.....	700
SOUTH CAROLINA			
FOLLY BEACH, SC	.....	.....	80
LAKE MARION, SOUTH CAROLINA REGIONAL WATER AGENCY	.....	6,000	.....
MYRTLE BEACH, SC (RENOURISHMENT)	.....	.....	100
PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	.....	.....	2,420
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	.....	.....	2,000
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	.....	.....	5,000
MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, SD	.....	.....	100
TENNESSEE			
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	.....	10,000	10,000
TEXAS			
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	11,800	11,800	11,800
CLEAR CREEK, TX	.....	1,500	.....
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	.....	.....	523
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TX	.....	2,000	15,000
GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	.....	.....	1,000
HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	24,800	26,000	35,000
HUNTING BAYOU, TX	.....	500	.....
JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	500	500	500
LOWER SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASIN, TX	.....	300	.....
NORTH PADRE ISLAND, PACKERY CHANNEL, TX	.....	.....	5,438
RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, OK, TX, AR AND LA	.....	.....	1,500
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	.....	3,640	1,820
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	18,000	15,000	15,000
WHITNEY LAKE POWERHOUSE, TX (MAJOR REHAB)	.....	.....	4,551
UTAH			
RURAL UTAH, UT (EI)	.....	.....	10,000
VERMONT			
BURLINGTON HARBOR, VT	.....	.....	500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED, VT	.....	.....	2,000
VERMONT DAMS REMEDIATION, VT	.....	.....	130
VIRGINIA			
EMBREY DAM, VA	.....	.....	2,000
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	.....	.....	1,300
JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (MAJOR REHAB)	14,000	13,300	14,000
LAKE MERRIWEATHER, GOSHEN DAN AND SPILLWAY, VA	.....	.....	4,000
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA (DEEPENING)	.....	.....	4,295
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	5,000	5,000	5,000
SANDBRIDGE, VA	.....	.....	4,000
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	4,000	4,000	11,395
WASHINGTON			
CHEIF JOSEPH DAM GAS ABATEMENT, VA	.....	.....	8,000
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR, ID	.....	.....	85,000
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH RECOVERY, WA, OR AND ID	102,000	90,000	.....
DUNAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	.....	.....	2,500
HOWARD HANSON DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA	14,100	14,100	14,100
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	900	.....	900
MT ST. HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	360	360	660
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	4,400	4,400	4,400
PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS RESTORATION	.....	.....	2,000
SHOALWATER BAY, WA	.....	.....	2,000
WEST VIRGINIA			
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	21,500	20,425	21,500
CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA, WV	.....	750	.....
GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	.....	.....	3,000
ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV	.....	.....	305
LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	.....	20,000	14,100
LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	.....	.....	1,250
MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	68,830	68,830	73,500
ROBERT C. BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV AND OH	914	914	914
SOUTHERN WEST VIRIGINIA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	.....	1,000	.....
WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV	.....	1,000	.....
WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	2,400	.....	2,400
WISCONSIN			
NORTHERN WISCONSIN, WI	.....	9,000	.....
MISCELLANEOUS			
ABANDONED MINE RESTORATION	.....	.....	1,705
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	15,000	18,000	25,000
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	3,000	4,500	4,500
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL(SEC 204,SEC 207,SE	3,000	4,000	6,200
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	11,000	10,500	15,000
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM	12,000	8,800	12,000
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION	4,000	8,000	15,000
EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION	21,000	21,000	21,000
ESTUARY RESTORATION PROGRAM (PUBLIC LAW 106–457)	5,000	.....	5,000
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	13,000	25,000	41,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE	40	40	40
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE	170	170	170
MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES (SECTION 111)	1,500	500	2,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT	15,000	17,400	25,000
SHORE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	500	1,000	7,000
SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT AND DEMO (SEC. 227)	.....	.....	3,800
SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208)	400	400	400
SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS, SECTION 107	.....	4,000	15,000
SUSPENSION FUND	80,000	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	.....	.....	800
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−1,441	.....	−202,833
Total, Construction General	1,637,000	1,900,000	2,086,664

Tuscaloosa, AL.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the relocation project at Tuscaloosa, AL.

Akutan Harbor, AK.—The Committee has provided funding to initiate construction of this project.

Alaska Coastal Erosion, AK.—The Committee has provided $2,400,000 for Alaska Coastal Erosion. The following communities are eligible recipients of these funds: Kivalina, Newtok, Shishmaref, Koyukuk, Barrow, Kaktovik, Point Hope, Unalakleet, and Bethel. Section 117 of Public Law 108–447 will apply to this project.

Chignik Harbor, AK.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 to complete the project.

Coffman Cove, AK.—The Committee has provided funding to prepare the decision document for design of a dock system.

Delong Mountain Harbor, AK.—The Committee has provided funding to complete the environmental documentation, plans and specifications and geotechnical investigations.

Nome Harbor, AK.—The Committee has included $13,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Sand Point Harbor, AK.—The Committee has included $6,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

St. Paul Harbor, AK.—The Committee has included $8,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Rio Salado, Phoenix and Tempe Reaches, AZ.—The Committee has provided $8,000,000 for construction of this project. The Committee encourages the Corps to reprogram previously revoked funds in fiscal year 2006 to complete this project if possible.

Ozark-Jeta Taylor Powerhouse, AR.—The Committee has provided $4,500,000 to continue the rehab of the powerhouse.

Red River Below Denison Dam, AR, LA, OK and TX.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 to continue levee rehabilitation work in Arkansas and Louisiana.

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, AR and LA.—The Committee has provided $6,000,000 for bank stabilization along the Red River below Index, Arkansas.

American River Watershed, CA.—The Committee has chosen not to combine the various, separately authorized, components of the project into a single line item as was proposed in the budget. The Committee believes that it is prudent to maintain visibility of the various project elements in the budget process. However, for purposes of reprogramming actions, the three elements should be treated as a single project when considering the reprogramming guidance provided in an earlier section of this report.

American River Watershed (Folsom Dam Miniraise), CA.—The Committee has provided $12,000,000. Within the funds provided, $7,000,000 is for construction of the bridge.

Kaweah River, CA.—The Committee has provided $4,800,000 to complete this project.

Oakland Harbor, CA.—The Committee has provided $42,000,000 to continue construction of this project. The reduction made to this project should not be viewed as any diminution of support for this project, rather an attempt to balance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

Santa Ana River Mainstem, CA.—The Committee has provided $42,500,000 to continue construction of this project. No funds are included for the San Timoteo reach of the project. The reduction made to this project should not be viewed as any diminution of support for this project, rather an attempt to balance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

Upper Guadalupe River, CA.—The Committee has included $3,500,000 to initiate construction of this project.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Bethany Beach to South Bethany Beach, DE.—$4,000,000 is provided for construction of this shore protection project.

Delaware Coast, Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, DE.—The Committee has included $1,700,000 to continue construction of this project.

Washington, DC and Vicinity, DC.—The Committee has provided $400,000 to initiate construction as proposed in the budget request.

Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem Restoration, FL.—The Committee has chosen not to combine the various, separately authorized, components of the project into a single line item as was proposed in the budget. The Committee believes that it is prudent to maintain visibility of the various project elements in the budget process. However, for purposes of reprogramming actions, the Central and South Florida Project, the Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Project and the Kissimmee River Project should be treated as a single project when considering the reprogramming guidance provided in an earlier section of this report.

The Committee has chosen not to fund the $35,000,000 request for the Modified Waters Delivery Plan as proposed in the budget. The Committee does not believe sufficient current authorization exists for the Corps to fund this work. As the work involved primarily benefits Everglades National Park, budgeting for this work should be continued by the Interior Department as has been past practice. The Committee is unsure why this funding decision was made; however, much has been made of the increase in costs of the Modified Waters Delivery Plan since its authorization. The Committee understands that over 43 percent of cost growth is due to the extraordinary increase in real estate values in the Miami-Dade area. Prices for land and houses have been rising as much as 5 percent per month over the last 2 years. Another significant cost increase has been due to overseas demand for cement and high fuel prices that have driven up construction costs.

The other major contributor to the cost increase is the inclusion of bridge work for the Tamiami Trail. The 1992 design which Con-

gress approved was based on a determination that existing culverts under the Trail could carry the flow expected for the Modified Waters Delivery Plan without overtopping the Tamiami Trail. Since then, the Corps has worked with the sponsor, the South Florida Water Management District, and the United States Geological Survey to determine actual capacities of these culverts based on actual conditions that exist. The Corps has also worked with the Florida Department of Transportation on ensuring a safe design for the roadway. Based on these analyses and design refinements, the Tamiami Trail fix is much more involved than originally conceived. In order to provide appropriate water deliveries to Everglades National Park, both the Corps and the Department of Interior believe building a bridge of some length, as well as raising the roadway, is required to allow the design flows to pass as well as ensure a safe highway. This is a significant part of the cost increase as well. Over $130,000,000 of the current estimate of $398,000,000 is for the Trail work.

The Committee encourages the administration to include the Modified Waters Delivery Plan funding in the Interior budget in future budget submissions.

Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem Restoration, FL.—Within the funds provided, the Corps may initiate construction of the Aquifer Storage and Recovery pilot projects.

Florida Keys Water Quality Improvements, FL.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for continued implementation of this project. The Committee urges the administration to budget for this project due to the interrelationship of this work to the Everglades Restoration project, Biscayne Bay and all of the nearshore waters.

Jacksonville Harbor, FL.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to continue work on the General Reevaluation Report.

Tampa Harbor, FL.—$200,000 is provided to continue the General Reevaluation Report.

Atlanta, GA.—The Committee has included $2,000,000 to initiate this project.

Brunswick Harbor, GA.—The Committee has included $19,900,000 to continue construction of this project.

Oates Creek, Richmond County, GA.—The Committee has included $500,000 to continue construction of this project.

Tybee Island, GA.—The Committee has provided $18,000 to complete the Limited Reevaluation Report for the shore protection project in preparation for the next scheduled renourishment.

Kaumalapau Harbor, Lanai, HI.—The Committee has provided $13,000,000 to complete construction of this project.

Rural Idaho Environmental Infrastructure, ID.—The Committee has provided $5,500,000 for this project. Within the funds provided the Corps should give consideration to projects at Emmett, Burley, Rupert, Bonners Ferry, Donnelly, Eastern Idaho Regional Water Authority, Driggs, and Smelterville. Other communities that meet the program criteria should be considered as funding allows.

Des Plaines River, IL.—The Committee has included $4,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, IL.—The Committee has included $30,000,000 for continued construction of this project.

Olmsted Locks and Dam, Ohio River, IL and KY.—The Committee has provided $85,000,000 to continue construction of this project. The reduction made to this project should not be viewed as any diminution of support for this project, rather an attempt to balance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps. None of the funds provided for the Olmsted Locks and Dam Project are to be used to reimburse the Claims and Judgment Fund.

Missouri Fish and Wildlife Recovery, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND and SD.—The Committee has provided $60,000,000 for this project. This is a significant increase from fiscal year 2005 funding but considerably less than the request. The Committee is frustrated that the administration has not forwarded a legislative proposal to authorize endangered species recovery work along the Missouri River. Fish and Wildlife Mitigation for the lower river has been authorized for several years; however, habitat recovery for the upper river has yet to be addressed in authorization language. Estimates for recovery of species along the Missouri River are in excess of $3,500,000,000. The Committee would not fund a $3,500,000,000 construction project without a specific authorization and we do not believe it prudent for the budget to continue asking for annual budget increases to this project without clear authorization as to the actions necessary for recovery.

Missouri River Levee System, IA, NE, KS and MO.—The Committee has included $750,000 to continue construction of this project.

Turkey Creek, KS and MO.—The Committee has included $4,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, KY.—The Committee has included $32,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

McAlpine Locks and Dam, Ohio River, KY and IN.—The Committee has provided $65,000,000 to continue construction of this project. The reduction made to this project should not be viewed as any diminution of support for this project, rather an attempt to balance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

Inner Harbor Lock and Dam, LA.—The Committee has included $15,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA.—The Committee has provided $15,000 for navigation channel refinement features, land purchases and development for mitigation of project impacts, and construction of project recreation and appurtenant features.

Larose to Golden Meadow, LA.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

New Orleans to Venice, LA.—The Committee has included $3,600,000 to continue construction of this project.

West Bank and Vicinity, New Orleans, LA.—The Committee has provided $25,000,000 to continue construction of this project. The reduction made to this project should not be viewed as any diminution of support for this project, rather an attempt to balance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

Chesapeake Bay Environmental Program, MD, PA and VA.—The Committee has included $2950 for continuation of this project.

Within the funds provided, $273,000 is included to continue the environmental studies concerning non-native oysters.

Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery, MD and VA.—The Committee has included $3,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Rural Montana, MT.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for this project. Within the funds provided the Corps should give consideration to projects at Livingston, Missoula (Grant Creek), Meagher County, Stevensville, Helena, Wisdom, Bigfork, Sheridan, Butte and Drummond. Other communities that meet the program criteria should be considered as funding allows.

Sand Creek, NE.—The Committee has included $4,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Rural Nevada, NV.—The Committee has provided $25,000,000 for this project. Within the funds provided the Corps should give consideration to projects at North Lemmon Valley, Spanish Springs Valley, Phase II, Huffaker Hills Water Conservation, Lawton-Verdi, Boulder City, Lyon County, Gerlach, Searchlight, Incline Village, Esmeralda County, Churchill County, West Wendover, Yearington, Virgin Valley Water District, Lovelock, and Carson City. Other communities that meet the program criteria should be considered as funding allows.

Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, NV.—The Committee has provided $18,000,000 to continue construction of this flood control project. Within the funds provided $3,000,000 is provided for work performed in accordance with Section 211 of Public Law 104–303.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Villas and Vicinity, NJ and DE.—The Committee has provided $2,450,000 to initiate construction of this project.

Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-Basin, NJ.—The Committee has included $5,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, NJ.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 to initiate construction of this project.

Acequias Irrigation System, NM.—The Committee has provided $3,100,000 to continue restoration of these historic irrigation distribution systems.

Central New Mexico, NM.—The Committee has included $5,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

New Mexico [EI], NM.—The Committee has included $5,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Fire Island to Montauk Point, NY.—Additional funds above the budget request have been provided for the reformulation study.

Dare County Beaches, NC.—$2,500,000 is included for construction for this project.

Buford Trenton Irrigation District, ND.—The Committee has included $1,500,000 to continue construction of this project.

Webber Falls Lock and Dam Powerhouse, OK.—The Committee has included $4,000,000 for construction of the powerhouse major rehabilitation project.

Locks and Dams 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River, PA.—The Committee has provided $46,000,000 to continue construction of this project. The reduction made to this project should not be viewed as any dimunition of support for this project, rather an attempt to bal-

ance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

Presque Isle, PA.—The Committee has provided $620,000 to continue this project.

Big Sioux River, SD.—The Committee has included $2,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, SD.—The Committee notes that Title IV of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, Public Law 106–53 as amended, authorizes funding to pay administrative expenses, implementation of terrestrial wildlife plans, activities associated with land transferred or to be transferred, and annual expenses for operating recreational areas. The Committee has included $5,000,000 for this effort. Within the funds provided, the Committee directs that not more than $1,000,000 shall be provided for administrative expenses, and that the Corps is to distribute the remaining funds as directed by Title IV to the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe.

Chickamauga Lock, TN.—The Committee has provided $10,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, TX.—The Committee has provided $35,000,000 for continued construction of this project.

North Padre Island, Packery Channel, TX.—The Committee has provided $5,438,000 to complete this project.

Red River Basin Chloride Control, TX, OK, AR and LA.—The Committee has included $1,500,000 to continue construction.

Whitney Lake Powerhouse, TX.—The Committee has included $4,551,000 to continue construction of the powerhouse rehabilitation.

Rural Utah. UT.—The Committee has included $10,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Burlington Harbor, VT.—The Committee has included $500,000 to initiate removal of Oil bollards in the harbor.

The Committee has included $$2,000,000 for continued deconstruction and environmental restoration efforts at the Embrey Dam project.

Virginia Beach, VA.—The Committee has included $11,395,000 to complete initial construction.

Columbia River Fish Recovery, WA, OR, and ID.—The Committee has chosen not to combine the various, separately authorized, components of the project into a single line item as was proposed in the budget. The Committee believes that it is prudent to maintain visibility of the various project elements in the budget process and has therefore funded the three traditional line items combined in this heading.

Mt. St. Helens Sediment Control, WA.—The Committee has included additional funds for the Corps to begin investigations for restoration actions in the Cowlitz and Toutle watersheds.

Mud Mountain, Washington.—Out of the funds provided, the Corps is directed to use up to $600,000 to study fish passage.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Cumberland River, WV, KY and VA.—The Committee has provided $14,100,000 for the continuation of the project. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommendation includes $9,500,000 for the Buchanan

County, Dickenson County, and Grundy, VA elements. Further, the recommendation includes $4,600,000 for Kermit, Lower Mingo County, McDowell County, Upper Mingo and Wayne County, WV.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—The Committee has provided $4,500,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, the Committee has provided $850,000 for a cost shared program for Lake Gaston, NC and $400,000 for a cost shared program for Lake Champlain, VT.

Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,200,000 for the program. Within the funds provided, $200,000 is provided for Dauphin Island, AL, and $3,000,000 for Morehead City Harbor, NC.

Dam Safety and Seepage/Stability Correction Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 to complete the Waterbury dam repairs.

Shore Line Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program.—The Committee has provided $3,800,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, $2,300,000 is for an Alternative Sand Test Beach and Breakwater Project in Florida and $1,500,000 is for the Sacred Falls Demonstration project in Hawaii.

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

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM

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

Congressionally directed projects now dominate all sections of the CAP Program. Congressionally directed projects have proliferated to such an extent that several of the sections are over-subscribed. Below are the various CAP sections, their congressionally authorized appropriation limit and the current estimate of outstanding obligations:

CAP Section	Program Limit	Current Obligations
Section 103	$30,000,000	$6,000,000
Section 107	35,000,000	17,000,000
Section 1135	25,000,000	49,500,000
Section 14	15,000,000	19,000,000
Sections 204, 207, 933	15,000,000	9,000,000
Section 205	50,000,000	42,500,000
Section 206	25,000,000	50,500,000

The Committee directs that the Corps should prioritize projects in the following manner to try to get the backlog of these projects reduced. The first priority for funding should be for construction projects that already have an executed Project Cooperation Agreement. The next priority should be for projects with executed design agreements. Third priority would be for those with executed feasibility agreement. The last priority should be new starts. To further this end, the Committee directs a moratorium on execution of new cost share agreements during fiscal year 2006. Work should continue on all phases as funding and priority allows, but no project should advance to the next stage during fiscal year 2006, except, of course, project completions.

The Committee is aware that there are funding requirements for ongoing, continuing authorities projects that may not be accommodated within the funds provided for each program. It is not the Committee's intent that ongoing projects should be terminated. If additional funds are needed to keep ongoing work in any program on schedule, the Committee urges the Corps to reprogram the necessary funds.

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGAM

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Small Beach Erosion Control Projects—Section 103	
Unalakleet Seawall, AK	1,000
North Shore of Indian River Inlet, DE	600
Pleasure Island, MD	500
St. Mary's River, MD	630
Morris Island Lighthouse, SC	2,234
Small Navigation Projects—Section 107	
Gustavis Harbor, AK	100
Kokhanok Harbor, AK	34
Nanwalek Harbor, AK	100
Blytheville Harbor, AR	500
Kahoolawe Small Boat Harbor, HI	250
Laupahoehoe Harbor Project, HI	400
North Kohala Navigation Improvements, HI	150
Port Fuchon, LA	88
Nanticoke Harbor, MD	250

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGAM—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Yazoo Diversion Canal, MS	2,900
Hampton Harbor, NH	55
Charlestown Breachway and Ninigret Pond, RI	90
Point Judith Harbor, Narragansett, RI	100
Northwest Tennessee Regional Harbor, TN	490
Wisconsin Lakeshore State Park Breakwater, WI	2,000
Project Modifications for the Improvement of the Environment—Section 1135	
Ditch 28, AR	130
Horseshoe Lake, AR	160
Millwood Lake, Grassy Lake, AR	114.8
Rock Creek, Little Rock, AR	150
Bellaview Wetlands, CO	377
Chatfield Downstream, South Platte River, CO	138.5
Oyster Revitilization in the Delaware Bay, DE and NJ	2,000
Kanaha Pond Wildlife Sanctuary Restoration Project, HI	200
Kawainui Marsh Environmental Restoration Project, HI	700
Pelekane Bay Ecosystem Restoration Project, HI	400
Bayou Macon, LA	187
Frazier/Whitehorse Oxbow Lake Weir, LA	375
Lake St. Joseph, Tensas Parish, LA	130
Old River North, Concordia Parish, LA	10
Wild Cow Bayou, Concordia Parish, LA	10
Hart Miller Island, MD	200
Duck Creek, Stoddard County, MO	125
Kansas City Riverfront, Kansas City, Jackson County, MO	998
Lower Decatur Bend Environmental Improvement, NE	3,552
Salt Cedar Invasive Species Eradication/Restoration, NE	150
Albuquerque Biological Park Wetland Restoration Project, NM	400
Ecosystem Revitalization at Route 66, NM	465
Carlsbad, Pecos River, NM	150
Las Cruces Dam Environmental Restoration, Dona Ana County, NM	300
Pecos River, Chaves County	279
Riparian Wetland Restoration, Pueblo of Santa Ana Reservation, NM	200
Socorro County Floodplain Restoration, NM	210
Lower Truckee River, McCarran Ranch, NV	3,037
Fairmount Dam Fishladder Project, PA	820
Upper Tioga River Watershed, PA	430
Allin's Cove, RI	300
Village of Oyster, VA Ecosystem Restoration, VA	165
City of Richland Ecosystem Restoration, WA	400
Mapes Creek Habitat Enhancement Project, WA	270
Battle Island, Desoto, WI	40
Kaunakakai Stream Environmental Restoration, HI	300
Streambank and Shoreline Protection for Public Facilities—Section 14	
Deering Shoreline Protection, AK	900
Kwethluk, AK	55
27th Street Bridge (Glenwood Springs, CO)	353
Powers Boulevard (Colorado Springs, CO)	500
Coal Creek, Monroe County, IA	60
Iowa River, Sac and Fox Tribe, IA	378
Raccoon River, Panora County, IA	92.3
Bayou Macon, Poverty Point, LA	469
Ouachita River, City of Monroe, LA	80
Patuxent River, Patuxent Beach Road, MD	700
Sturgeon River, Houghton County, MI	120
Water Treatment Plant, St. Joseph, MI	177
Red Lake River Bank Stabilization, MN	40
Eubanks Creek, Jackson, MS	275
Elizabeth River, Valleyview Road, Hillside, NJ	576
South Branch Rahway River, Woodbridge, NJ	500

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGAM—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
I–40 Bridge, Rio Puerco, NM	850
Shoreland Avenue Embankment Restoration, Toledo, OH	660
Stayton Riverfront Park Bank Stabilization, OR	250
Mt. Moriah Culvert, TN	305
Kenosha Harbor Retaining Wall, WI	281
Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material—Sections 204, 207 and 933	
Dauphin Island Aquatic Restoration Project, AL	439
Morehead City Harbor, NC	4,625
Small Flood Control Projects—Section 205	
Fort Yukon, AK	200
Salcha, AK	400
Bono, AR	80
Grubbs, AR	50
Wynne, AR	75
Heacock and Cactus Channels, CA	4,000
New Hogan Lake Reoperation, CA	600
Santa Venetia Flood Control, CA	91.5
Salmon River, CT	650
Delaware City Dragon Run Flood Mitigation Project, DE	300
Elsmere Stormwater Infrastructure, DE	250
Little Mill Creek, New Castle County, DE	2,018
Rutherford, New Castle County, DE	150
Kuliouou Stream Flood Damage Reduction, HI	250
Palai Stream Flood Damage Reduction, HI	100
Waiakea Stream Flood Damage Reduction Project, HI	200
Wailele Stream Flood Damage Reduction Project, HI	150
Cedar River (Time Check Area), Cedar Rapids, IA	300
Denison, IA	1,400
Delphi, IN	100
Fort Wayne, St. Marys and Maumee Rivers, IN	200
Braithwaite Park, LA	1,681
Jean Lafitte, Fisher School Basin, Jefferson Parish, LA	2,900
Oakville to LaReussite, LA	88
Red Chute Bayou, Bossier Parish, LA	425
Town of Carenco, Lafayette, LA	160
Elkton, MD	174
Canisteo Outflow Project, MN	100
Montevideo, MN	2,828
Rockford Levee Upgrade, MN	100
Blacksnake Creek, St. Joseph, MO	244
Little River Diversion, Ducthtown, MO	175
Wilson, NC (Hominy Swamp Flood Control)	100
Fargo Ridgewood Addition, ND	1,245.9
Gila River, Grants and Hidalgo Counties, NM	100
Hatch, NM	158
Little Puerco River, Gallup, NM	100
Little Puerco Wash, Gallup, NM	100
Battle Mountain, NV	1,111.5
City of Las Vegas, NV	300
North Spanish Springs, NV	140
Reno Flood Warning System, NV	3
North Park Lake, Flood Control Project	200
Sandy Creek, TN	50
Passumpsic River, Lyndonville, VT	42
West Virginia Statewide Flood Warning System	200
Henderson, WY Drainage Improvements	100
Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Projects—Section 206	
Eklutna, AK	300
Northway, AK	350

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGAM—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Chattahoochee Fall Line Ecosystem Restoration Project, AL and GA	250
St Helena-Napa River Restoration, CA	600
York Creek Dam Removal, CA	350
Bear Creek Reservoir, CO	100
Bow Tie Wetlands, CO	300
Goose Creek, CO	200
Kingfisher Point, CO	191
Lower Boulder Creek, CO	240
North Fork, Gunnison River, CO	2,201
Tamarisk Eradication, CO	400
Red Clay Creek Dam Realignment, DE	250
Rose Bay, FL	250
Mokuhinia/Mokuula Ecosystem Restoration, HI	220
Indian Creek, Caldwell, ID	3,300
Paradise Creek Ecosystem Restoration Project, ID	250
Salmon River, Challis, ID	611
Emiquon Preserve, IL	313
South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River (Bubbly Creek), IL	600
Squaw Creek Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, IL	160
Cocodrie Bayou, LA	10
University Lakes, Baton Rouge, LA	200
University Lakes, East Baton Rouge Parish, LA	200
Blackwater Refuge, MD	500
Paint Branch Fish Passage, MD	282
Tidal Middle Branch, MD	250
Western Branch, Patuxent River, MD	1,158
Painter Creek, MN	300
Confluence Point State Park, MO	100
Missouri Stream Restoration Pilot, MO	200
Central Bath Branch Tributary, Winston-Salem, NC	100
Ore Knob, NC	510
Heron Haven Wetland Restoration Project, NE	645
Bottomless Lakes State Park, Roswell, NM	350
Jemez River Aquatic and Riparian Habitat Restoration, Zia Pueblo, NM	211
Las Cruces Wetland Restoration, NM	300
Carson River, NV	75
Incline, Third, and Rosewood Creeks, NV	90
Arcola Creek Ecosystem Restoration, OH	528
Arrowhead Creek, OR	250
Camp Creek-Zumwalt Prairie, OR	333
Coffee Lake, OR	250
Ingham Spring Dam and Lake Reconstruction, PA	300
Neshannock Creek, PA	600
Sheradon Park and Chartiers Creek, PA	300
Blackstone Fisheries Restoration, RI	150
Brush Neck Cove, Warwick, RI	150
Lower Blackstone River Fish Passage, RI	250
Narrow, Narragansett, RI	150
Ten Mile River, East Providence, RI	250
Winnipaug Pond, Westerly, RI	104
Potash Brook, South Burlington, VT	350
West Branch of the Little River, Stowe, Lamoille County, VT	200
Wild Branch of the Lamoille River, Town of Craftsbury, Orleans County and Town of Wolcott, Lamoille County, VT	200
Carpenter Creek, WA	300
Issaquah Salmon Hatchery, WA	300
Great Pierce Meadows, Essex and Morris Counties, NJ	460

Tribal Partnership Program.—The Committee has also included $400,000 for Nevada to initiate cultural resource restoration on his-

toric Washoe lands; and $400,000 for New Mexico to further the tribal assistance efforts by the Corps in New Mexico.

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

Appropriations, 2005	[1] $321,904,000
Budget estimate, 2006	270,000,000
House allowance	290,000,000
Committee recommendation	433,336,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriation of $6,000,000.

This appropriation funds planning, construction, and operation and maintenance activities associated with water resource projects located in the lower Mississippi River Valley from Cape Girardeau, Missouri to the Gulf of Mexico.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
BAYOU METO, AR	.....	1,640	.....
SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	.....	.....	350
ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA	450	428	500
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM LAND STUDY, LA	100	.....	150
DONALDSON TO THE GULF, LA	.....	.....	400
MORGANZA TO THE GULF, LA	.....	1,000	5,000
POINTE COUPEE TO ST. MARY PARISH, LA	.....	.....	100
SPRING BAYOU, LA	.....	.....	500
TENSAS RIVER BASIN, LA	.....	.....	250
BEAR CREEK, MS	.....	.....	500
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	500	475	750
QUIVER RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, MS	.....	.....	150
MILLINGTON AND VICINITY, TN	112	107	112
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, STORM WATER MGMT STUDY, TN AND MS	.....	.....	150
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	720	685	720
UNSPECIFIED REDUCTION	.....	−1,640	
Subtotal, General Investigations	1,882	2,695	9,632
CONSTRUCTION			
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	42,500	40,413	42,500
FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR	3,446	3,277	.....
GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	.....	.....	10,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	39,200	37,275	59,000
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO	.....	6,800	6,800
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,324	2,210	7,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	21,000	19,969	21,000
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	2,244	2,134	2,244
HORN LAKE CREEK MODIFICATIONS, MS	.....	.....	200
YAZOO BACKWATER, LESS ROCKY BAYOU, YAZOO F AND WL MITIGATION LANDS	.....	.....	300
YAZOO BASIN—BACKWATER PUMPING PLANT, MS	.....	.....	25,000
YAZOO BASIN—BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	.....	.....	2,000
YAZOO BASIN—DELTA HEADWATERS PROJECT, MS	.....	.....	25,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
YAZOO BASIN—MAINSTEM, MS	.....	.....	25
YAZOO BASIN—REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	.....	.....	2,200
YAZOO BASIN/UPPER YAZOO PROJECT, MS	.....	5,600	20,000
ST. JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	.....	5,500	5,500
NONCONNAH CREEK, TN AND MS	500	475	800
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	.....	.....	500
WOLF RIVER, TN	.....	3,500	3,500
SUSPENSION FUND	8,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	119,214	127,153	233,569
MAINTENANCE			
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	70,609	67,142	70,609
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	172	164	402
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	611	581	611
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	560	533	560
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	310	295	310
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, AND TN	9,256	9,902	21,191
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO	6,600	8,800	6,600
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR AND LA	2,600	2,472	2,600
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	1,400	1,331	1,400
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	55	52	55
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	37	35	37
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,860	2,720	2,860
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	13,400	12,742	13,400
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	.....	.....	420
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	65	62	65
BONNET CARRE, LA	2,713	2,580	2,713
INSPECTION OF COMPELTED WORKS, LA	538	512	538
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	66	63	66
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	239	227	239
OLD RIVER, LA	10,200	9,699	10,200
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	3,950	3,756	3,950
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	.....	.....	500

INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	317	301	317
YAZOO BASIN:			
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	6,151	5,849	14,810
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	210	200	2,210
ENID LAKE, MS	5,232	4,975	12,300
GREENWOOD, MS	620	590	2,070
GRENADA LAKE, MS	5,674	5,395	12,278
MAIN STEM, MS	1,080	1,027	4,033
SARDIS LAKE, MS	7,153	5,802	16,500
TRIBUTARIES, MS	1,130	1,075	1,130
WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	430	409	430
YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	470	447	956
YAZOO CITY, MS	770	732	770
Subtotal, YAZOO BASIN	28,920	26,501	67,487
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	.....	.....	387
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	182	173	182
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	4,676	4,446	4,676
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	110	105	110
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	992	943	992
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	.....	.....	540
EMERGENCY REPAIR RESERVES	.....	1,700	.....
MAPPING	1,384	1,316	1,384
UNSPECIFIED REDUCTION	.....	−1,000	.....
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−13,918	.....	−25,266
Subtotal, Maintenance	148,904	158,512	190,135
Total, Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries	270,000	290,000	433,336

The Committee believes that it is essential to provide adequate resources and funding to the Mississippi River and Tributaries program in order to protect the large investment in flood control facilities. Although much progress has been made, considerable work remains to be done for the protection and economic development of the rich natural resources in the Valley. The Committee expects the additional funds to be used to advance ongoing studies, initiate new studies, and advance important construction and maintenance work.

General Investigations

Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System Land Study, LA.—The Committee has provided $150,000 to initiate this study as recommended in the budget request.

Morganza to the Gulf, LA.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 to continue Preconstruction Engineering and Design for this study.

Quiver River, MS.—The Committee has provided $150,000 to initiate this study.

Memphis Metro, Storm Water Management Study, TN and MS.—The Committee has provided $150,000 to initiate this study.

Construction

Grand Prairie, AR.—The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for continued construction of the project.

Mississippi River Levees, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO and TN.—The Committee has provided $59,000,000 to continue construction of this project. Within the funds provided, $19,800,000 could be used to continue construction on St. Johns-New Madrid Levee Closure/Box Culvert, MO ($3,000,000); Carlisle-Tallula, MS Item 488–L ($6,000,000); and Above Cairo, IL Slurry Trench P–4 ($600,000) and initiate construction on Willow Point-Youngs Point, LA Items 445–R ($1,300,000); Pecan Point, AR, Relief Wells P–2 ($200,000); Trotters, MS Berm P–2 ($100,000); Council Bend, AR Relief Wells ($200,000); Willow Point-Youngs Point, LA Items 450–R ($1,500,000); Farrell, MS Relief Wells ($200,000); Badger-Cottonwood Point, MO Seepage Control ($200,000); Tallula-Magna Vista, LA Items 474–R ($1,500,000) and ($5,000,000) could be used to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Lower Mississippi River Museum and Riverfront Interpretive Site.

Yazoo Basin, Backwater Pumping Plant, MS.—The Committee has provided $25,000,000 to continue construction of the project. Within the funds provided, $150,000 is provided for the Teddy Roosevelt Environment Education Center.

Yazoo Basin, Delta Headwaters Project, MS.—The Committee has provided $25,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Yazoo Basin, Upper Yazoo Project, MS.—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 to accelerate completion of this project. Within the funds provided, $1,000,000 is for bank stabilization.

Maintenance

Mississippi River Levees, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO and TN.—The Committee has provided $21,191,000 to continue construction of this project. Funds are provided to complete Levee Restoration,

Mellwood, AR; initiate and complete Levee Repairs, Torras, LA; Levee Slide Repairs, Above Old River, LA; initiate Slope Pavement Repairs, Various Locations, LA; Floodwall Renovations, Mound City, IL; Replacement of Cache Levee Culvert, IL; Provide Levee Gravel, AR, LA and MS; Provide Levee Gravel, Commerce to Birds Point, MO; Provide Levee Gravel, Below Helena, AR and Provide Levee Gravel, Main Line Levee, LA.

Atchafalaya Basin, LA.—The Committee has provided $13,400,000 for maintenance of this project. Additional funds are provided for levee gravel.

The Committee has provided funding for necessary maintenance dredging for the harbor projects located along the main stem of the Mississippi River.

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2005	[1] $1,943,428,000
Budget estimate, 2006	1,979,000,000
House allowance	2,000,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,100,000,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriation of $155,400,000.

The Committee continues to believe that it is essential to provide adequate resources and attention to operation and maintenance requirements in order to protect the large Federal investment. Yet, current and projected budgetary constraints require the Committee to limit the amount of work that can be accomplished in the fiscal year. In order to cope with the current situation, the Corps has had to defer or delay scheduled maintenance activities.

Maintenance backlogs continue to grow, with much of the backlog being essential maintenance dredging needed to keep the Nation's ports, harbors, and waterways open and able to efficiently handle important national and international trade activities. Yet, the Committee is aware that out-year budget planning guidance for the Corps of Engineers projects is such that the current appropriations for their critical operation and maintenance activities will continue to decline for the foreseeable future. If additional resources are not made available, the Corps will be forced to cut back on services, and begin to terminate and close many projects and activities.

The Committee is aware of the Corps' efforts to stretch the limited resources to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of means. With an increasing number of projects entering the inventory, and budgetary constraints increasing, it is clear that the Corps will have to find innovative ways of accomplishing required maintenance work, while reducing operational and other costs.

The budget request has proposed that no navigation project with less than 1 billion ton-miles of cargo be eligible for maintenance dredging. The Committee believes that this is in direct conflict with the way projects are evaluated, authorized, and analyzed. Project analysis is based upon Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation

Studies (1983), the Corps of Engineers Planning Guidance Notebook (2000), and other polices and procedures. For navigation studies, the analysis centers on transportation savings to the Nation considering the ultimate origins and destinations of commodities to be moved. Operation and maintenance costs are considered as a part of this analysis and are figured into the benefit to cost ratio utilized to make the investment decision. By applying an arbitrary ton-mile figure to determine O&M funding decisions, the budget request has essentially obviated the need for any of the previous studies undertaken to determine the investment decision.

The Committee is concerned about the annual proposals for reductions of maintenance funding for "low use waterways and ports". These tributary waterways naturally do not enjoy the same level of relative efficiencies as mainstem waterways. The Mississippi and Ohio Rivers handle tremendous volumes of traffic over long distances and so generate impressive ton-mile statistics. Tributaries, by nature, provide generally short, smaller channels with lower traffic densities. Consequently, "ton-mile" statistics for tributary waterways are dwarfed by statistics for the mainstem waterways. It is important to recognize that the commerce on the tributaries is usually only a small part of the total journey between producer and consumer. When these statistics are compared on a system basis, nearly all of these waterways appear to "pay their way" and are performing as the economic analysis indicated when they were originally authorized.

Uncertainties in maintenance funding for lower use projects seriously impacts their ability to compete and become higher use facilities. Without funding to provide a stable channel and authorized depths and widths, industries and shippers are reluctant to make the necessary investments in using these projects. The Committee believes that proposed elimination of maintenance funding for authorized projects is not only a serious disservice to the public, but it demonstrates a profound lack of respect for the Congressional oversight committees that have jurisdiction for authorization and deauthorization of such projects.

The Committee is not in favor of funding projects which are no longer economically viable nor environmentally sustainable. Unfortunately, the administration has chosen a path of underfunding, or an entire lack of funding, for projects in an effort to achieve de facto deauthorization through the appropriations process by utilizing the billion-ton-mile model.

Further, the Committee believes much could be learned by the open exchange of how "low-use" waterways and ports are calculated, for the billion-ton-mile does not adequately reflect the flow of commerce today. The Committee remains concerned about the economic impacts of not maintaining all of our waterways and ports at their authorized depths. As a result of waterways not being maintained at the authorized depths, shippers are forced to divide their cargo and place it on a number of smaller ships in order to make passage to the final destination. This adds significantly to the cost and time of the movement of products in and around our waterways, something which the administration does not appropriately take into account when formulating the budget for the Corps. Therefore, the Committee strongly encourages the

administration to put forth a proposal for a model which better reflects the flow of goods along all of our ports and waterways, including lightering. Until then, however, the Committee believes the administration has the responsibility to budget for each and every project such that the authorized widths and depths are maintained.

CORPS HOPPER DREDGE FLEET

During fiscal year 2002, the Committee requested the General Accounting Office [GAO] to review the benefits and effects of current and proposed restrictions on the Corps' hopper dredge fleet. The Committee faces significant future investments in the Corps hopper dredge fleet, as it is rapidly aging. The Committee believes that the investment decisions must take into consideration the subsequent use of the fleet. The final GAO report, released March, 2003, reviewed the impacts of operational changes to the fleet since fiscal year 1993. GAO's findings made it clear to the Committee that additional costs have been imposed upon the Corps with the decreased use of the fleet, but that the benefits have not been realized. Additionally, the GAO found that the Corps' contracting process for hopper dredges was not effective. Most importantly, the GAO reported that the Corps of Engineers did not have even a limited system to evaluate the costs and benefits of the varying operational levels of its hopper dredge fleet, nor did it have a means to make maintenance and repair decisions of the fleet taking operational use into consideration. The Committee remains concerned that since 2000, the Corps has provided a report to Congress which has been found to have no analytical basis, thus calling into question the ready reserve policy. Therefore, the Committee has provided legislative language which changes the current dredge policy.

DIRECT FUNDING OF OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE WORK AND THE PMAS

The President's Budget includes user charge proposals to offset discretionary spending. In particular, the Administration proposes that, starting in 2006, receipts from the sale of hydroelectric power generated at certain Federal dams operated by the Corps of Engineers be used to finance the operation and maintenance of those facilities. This direct financing arrangement already exists for the Bonneville Power Administration. However, due to budgetary scoring impacts the Committee is unable to extend this proposal to the Southeastern, Southwestern, and Western Power Administrations in the Department of Energy.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
ALABAMA					
ALABAMA—COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	180	180	180	.....	.....
ALABAMA—COOSA RIVER, AL	1,591	1,591	3,091	+1,500	+1,500
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	22,117	22,117	22,117	.....	.....
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	4,050	4,050	4,050	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	50	50	50	.....	.....
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM	7,315	7,315	7,315	.....	.....
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	20,248	20,248	20,248	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	100	100	100	.....	.....
ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	7,125	7,125	7,125	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	140	140	140	.....	.....
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	1,400	1,400	2,000	+600	+600
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL AND MS	20,103	20,103	24,000	+3,897	+3,897
WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA	7,171	7,171	7,171	.....	.....
ALASKA					
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	11,470	11,470	11,470	.....	.....
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	3,051	3,051	3,051	.....	.....
CORDOVA HARBOR, AK	.....	.....	600	+600	+600
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	622	622	622	.....	.....
HOMER HARBOR, AK	299	299	299	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	45	45	45	.....	.....
LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL, AK	.....	.....	100	+100	+100
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	248	248	248	.....	.....
NOME HARBOR, AK	2,496	2,496	2,496	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	588	588	588	.....	.....
AMERICAN SAMOA					
OFU HARBOR, AMERICAN SAMOA	1,480	1,480	1,480	.....	.....
TAU HARBOR, AMERICAN SAMOA	1,372	1,372	1,372	.....	.....

ARIZONA					
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,280	1,280	1,730	+450	+450
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	92	92	92	.....	.....
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,220	1,220	1,220	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	37	37	37	.....	.....
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	190	190	190	.....	.....
ARKANSAS					
BEAVER LAKE, AR	5,744	5,744	5,744	.....	.....
BLAKELY MT. DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	10,084	10,084	10,084	.....	.....
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,292	1,292	1,292	.....	.....
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	6,392	6,392	6,392	.....	.....
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	6,524	6,524	6,524	.....	.....
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	6,828	6,828	6,828	.....	.....
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,193	1,193	1,193	.....	.....
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,161	1,161	1,161	.....	.....
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,093	1,093	1,093	.....	.....
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	5,608	5,608	5,608	.....	.....
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	30	30	430	+400	+400
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	199	199	199	.....	.....
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	35,065	34,230	35,065	.....	+835
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,782	1,782	1,782	.....	.....
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	4,342	4,342	4,342	.....	.....
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,656	1,656	1,656	.....	.....
NORFORK LAKE, AR	4,540	4,540	4,540	.....	.....
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	29	299	29	.....	−270
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR AND LA	8,500	10,400	10,400	+1,900	.....
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,151	5,151	5,151	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	7	7	7	.....	.....
WHITE RIVER, AR	215	215	1,000	+785	+785
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	.....	.....	176	+176	+176
CALIFORNIA					
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,989	1,989	1,989	.....	.....
BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,781	1,781	1,781	.....	.....
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	310	310	310	.....	.....
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	4,084	4,000	4,084	.....	+84
CRESENT CITY HARBOR	.....	.....	500	+500	+500
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	5,272	5,825	5,272	.....	−553
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	202	202	202	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	2,090	2,090	2,090	.....	.....
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	5,069	5,000	5,069	.....	+69
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,396	1,396	1,396	.....	.....
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	2,291	2,291	2,291	.....	.....
JACK D. MALTESTER CHANNEL, CA (SAN LEANDRO)	.....	.....	750	+750	+750
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	4,287	4,287	4,287	.....	.....
LOWER PETALUMA RIVER, CA	.....	.....	750	+750	+750
MARINA DEL REY, CA	.....	.....	1,000	+1,000	+1,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	251	251	251	.....	.....
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	290	290	290	.....	.....
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,616	1,616	1,616	.....	.....
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	.....	1,475	.....	.....	−1,475
NAPA RIVER, CA	.....	.....	750	+750	+750
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,994	1,994	1,994	.....	.....
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,634	1,634	1,634	.....	.....
NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR, CA	28	28	250	+222	+222
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	6,205	6,205	6,205	.....	.....
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,040	1,040	1,040	.....	.....
PILLAR POINT HARBOR	.....	.....	500	+500	+500
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,831	2,831	2,831	.....	.....
PINOLE SHOAL MANAGEMENT STUDY, CA	.....	250	.....	.....	−250
PORT HUENEME, CA	.....	.....	500	+500	+500
PORT SAN LUIS, CA	.....	.....	500	+500	+500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,891	1,891	1,891	.....	.....
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	4,967	4,967	4,967	.....	.....
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	7,972	7,972	7,972	.....	.....
SACRAMENTO RIVER (BASULE BRIDGE), CA	.....	.....	1,000	+1,000	+1,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,790	2,790	2,790	.....	.....
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,299	1,299	1,299	.....	.....
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	119	119	119	.....	.....
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,185	1,185	1,185	.....	.....
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STUDY, CA	.....	1,600	.....	.....	−1,6000

SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	2,000	2,000	2,000	.....	.....
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,223	2,223	2,223	.....	.....
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	2,886	2,886	2,886	.....	.....
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	3,320	3,320	3,320	.....	.....
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,321	3,321	3,321	.....	.....
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,408	1,408	1,408	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,499	1,499	1,499	.....	.....
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,809	1,809	1,809	.....	.....
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	5,132	5,132	5,132	.....	.....
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,692	1,692	1,692	.....	.....
UPPER PETALUMA RIVER,CA	.....	.....	300	+300	+300
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,200	2,200	2,900	+700	+700
YUBA RIVER, CA	29	29	29	.....	.....
COLORADO					
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	407	407	407	.....	.....
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,233	1,233	1,900	+667	+667
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	1,941	1,941	2,607	+666	+666
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	107	107	107	.....	.....
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,926	2,926	2,926	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	590	590	590	.....	.....
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,021	1,021	1,688	+667	+667
COMMONWEALTH OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS ROTA HARBOR, CNMI	260	260	260	.....	.....
CONNECTICUT					
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	592	592	592	.....	.....
BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CT	.....	.....	1,500	+1,500	+1,500
CLINTON HARBOR, CT	.....	100	250	+250	+150
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	583	583	583	.....	.....
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	599	599	599	.....	.....
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	1,005	1,005	1,005	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	79	79	79	.....	.....
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	535	535	535	.....	.....
NORTH COVE HARBOR, CT	.....	.....	2,000	+2,000	+2,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	527	527	527	.....	.....
NORWALK FEDERAL NAVIGATION PROJECT, CT	.....	500	1,000	+1,000	+500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,000	1,000	1,000	.....	.....
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	417	417	417	.....	.....
THOMASTON DAM, CT	951	951	951	.....	.....
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	724	724	724	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
DELAWARE					
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY	11,475	11,475	12,475	+1,000	+1,000
MISPILLION RIVER, DE	20	20	20	.....	.....
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	20	20	20	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	86	86	86	.....	.....
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,860	3,800	3,860	.....	+60
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	9	9	9	.....	.....
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL)	744	744	744	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	37	37	37	.....	.....
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	600	600	600	.....	.....
FLORIDA					
AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST. JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC, VA	.....	.....	500	+500	+500
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,828	6,000	3,000	−828	−3,000
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	14,213	14,213	14,213	.....	.....
ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	1,000	1,000	1,000	.....	.....
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,513	1,513	1,513	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	300	300	300	.....	.....
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE TO ANCLOTE, FL	.....	.....	1,000	+1,000	+1,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	250	250	4,000	+3,750	+3,750
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	3,637	3,637	3,637	.....	.....
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL, AND GA	8,188	8,188	8,188	.....	.....
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	2,000	2,000	2,000	.....	.....
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	1,530	1,530	1,530	.....	.....
MIAMI RIVER, FL	.....	1,000	3,500	+3,500	+2,500
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,060	2,060	2,060	.....	.....
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	1,183	1,183	1,183	.....	.....
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	906	906	906	.....	.....
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	1,315	1,315	1,315	.....	.....

PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	1,325	1,325	1,325	.....	.....
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	2,306	2,306	2,306	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	30	30	30	.....	.....
SUWANEE RIVER, FL	.....	500	.....	.....	−500
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	4,500	10,000	4,000	−500	−6,000
GEORGIA					
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	7,322	7,322	7,322	.....	.....
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	1,050	1,050	6,500	+5,450	+5,450
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	286	286	286	.....	.....
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	2,396	2,396	2,396	.....	.....
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	8,519	8,519	8,519	.....	.....
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	10,637	10,637	10,637	.....	.....
HARTWELL LAKE, GA AND SC	16,619	16,619	16,619	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	41	41	41	.....	.....
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA AND SC	11,047	11,047	11,047	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA	90	90	90	.....	.....
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	12,283	12,283	12,283	.....	.....
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	13,521	13,521	13,521	.....	.....
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL	11,449	11,449	11,449	.....	.....
HAWAII					
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	231	231	231	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	189	189	189	.....	.....
POHIKI BAY HAWAII, HI	.....	.....	100	+100	+100
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	200	200	200	.....	.....
IDAHO					
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,792	1,792	1,792	.....	.....
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,464	2,464	2,464	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	78	78	78	.....	.....
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	2,567	2,567	2,567	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	430	430	430	.....	.....
ILLINOIS					
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL AND IN	2,900	2,900	2,900	.....	.....
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	6,745	6,745	6,745	.....	.....
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	3,499	3,499	3,499	.....	.....
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	385	385	385	.....	.....
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	214	214	214	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL AND IN	24,702	25,767	24,702	.....	−1,065
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL AND IN	1,065	1,065	1,065	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	631	631	631	.....	.....
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,189	1,189	1,189	.....	.....
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	547	547	547	.....	.....
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,186	5,186	6,186	+1,000	+1,000
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS	.....	67,030	.....	.....	.....
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	48,107	.....	50,407	+2,300	+2,300
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	18,923	.....	18,923	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	33	33	33	.....	.....
REND LAKE, IL	5,254	5,254	5,254	.....	.....
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	114	114	114	.....	.....
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	680	2,680	680	.....	−2,000
INDIANA					
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	872	872	872	.....	.....
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	.....	800	.....	.....	−800
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	600	600	600	.....	.....
CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE, IN	687	687	687	.....	.....
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	.....	300	.....	.....	−300
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	370	370	370	.....	.....
J. EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	643	643	643	.....	.....
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	.....	.....	500	+500	+500
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	751	751	751	.....	.....
MONROE LAKE, IN	689	689	689	.....	.....
PATOKA LAKE, IN	619	619	619	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	59	59	59	.....	.....
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	637	637	637	.....	.....
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	111	111	111	.....	.....
IOWA					
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,537	2,537	2,537	.....	.....

INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	202	202	202	.....	.....
MISSOURI RIVER-KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	152	152	152	.....	.....
MISSOURI RIVER-RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS, AND MO	6,475	6,475	6,475	.....	.....
MISSOURI RIVER-SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA AND NE	2,417	2,417	2,417	.....	.....
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,081	2,081	2,081	.....	.....
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,415	3,415	3,415	.....	.....
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,952	4,202	4,202	+250	.....
KANSAS					
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,987	1,987	1,987	.....	.....
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,544	1,544	1,544	.....	.....
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	339	339	339	.....	.....
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	692	692	692	.....	.....
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	2,154	2,154	2,154	.....	.....
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	703	703	703	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	85	85	85	.....	.....
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,081	1,081	1,081	.....	.....
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,634	1,634	1,634	.....	.....
MARION LAKE, KS	1,551	1,551	1,551	.....	.....
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,828	1,828	1,828	.....	.....
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,903	2,903	2,903	.....	.....
PEARSON-KUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	1,052	1,052	1,052	.....	.....
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,211	2,211	2,211	.....	.....
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,810	1,810	1,810	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	32	32	32	.....	.....
TORONTO LAKE, KS	402	402	402	.....	.....
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,189	2,189	2,189	.....	.....
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,509	1,509	1,609	+100	+100
KENTUCKY					
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY, AND TN	9,507	9,507	9,507	.....	.....
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,102	2,102	3,000	+898	+898
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,091	1,091	1,091	.....	.....
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,195	1,195	1,195	.....	.....
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,252	1,652	1,252	.....	−400
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	733	733	733	.....	.....
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,245	1,245	1,245	.....	.....
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	40	40	40	.....	.....
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,621	1,621	1,621	.....	.....
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,140	1,140	1,140	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,178	1,178	1,178	.....	.....
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,882	1,882	1,882	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	98	98	98	.....	.....
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,814	1,814	1,814	.....	.....
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	599	599	599	.....	.....
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	62	62	62	.....	.....
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,817	1,817	1,817	.....	.....
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, AND OH	32,210	32,210	32,210	.....	.....
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, AND OH	3,928	3,928	3,928	.....	.....
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	912	912	912	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	7	7	7	.....	.....
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,945	1,945	1,945	.....	.....
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,149	1,149	1,149	.....	.....
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	5,902	5,902	5,902	.....	.....
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,070	1,070	1,070	.....	.....
LOUISIANA					
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, LA	15,948	15,948	24,948	+9,000	+9,000
BARATARIA BAY	.....	.....	1,300	+1,300	+1,300
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	1,402	1,402	1,402	.....	.....
BAYOU LACOMBE	.....	.....	500	+500	+500
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	.....	.....	1,000	+1,000	+1,000
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	32	32	32	.....	.....
BAYOU SEGNETTE, LA	.....	.....	1,450	+1,450	+1,450
BAYOU TECHE	.....	.....	800	+800	+800
CADDO LAKE, LA	330	330	330	.....	.....
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	9,032	9,032	14,032	+5,000	+5,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,466	1,466	1,466	.....	.....
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	19,614	19,000	19,614	.....	+614
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	253	253	253	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	856	856	856	.....	.....
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	10,115	10,115	13,115	+3,000	+3,000

LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	.....	.....	491	+491	+491
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	.....	.....	86	+86	+86
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,538	2,538	2,538	.....	.....
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	54,053	54,053	54,053	.....	.....
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	14,111	13,500	14,111	.....	+611
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	.....	.....	2,500	+2,500	+2,500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	60	60	60	.....	.....
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,000	2,000	2,000	.....	.....
WALLACE LAKE, LA	291	291	291	.....	.....
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	.....	.....	240	+240	+240
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	.....	.....	200	+200	+200
MAINE					
BASS HARBOR, ME	95	95	95	.....	.....
CARVERS HARBOR, ME	270	270	270	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	21	21	21	.....	.....
INTERNATIONAL ST. CROIX RIVER BOARD OF CONTROL, ME	17	17	17	.....	.....
KENNEBUNK RIVER, ME	.....	700	.....	.....	−700
PORTLAND HARBOR, ME	520	520	520	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	866	866	866	.....	.....
MARYLAND					
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	15,214	15,214	19,214	+4,000	+4,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)	326	326	326	.....	.....
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	126	126	750	+624	+624
HERRING CREEK, TALL TIMBERS, MD	.....	.....	450	+450	+450
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	36	36	36	.....	.....
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV	1,907	1,907	1,907	.....	.....
KANPPS NARROWS, MD	.....	.....	700	+700	+700
NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD	240	240	240	.....	.....
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	220	220	1,900	+1,680	+1,680
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	379	379	379	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	97	97	97	.....	.....
ST. JEROME CREEK, MD	.....	.....	850	+850	+850
TILGHMAN ISLAND HARBOR,MD	.....	.....	450	+450	+450
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	500	500	500	.....	.....
MASSACHUSETTS					
AUNT LYDIA'S COVE, MA	.....	250	.....	.....	−250
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	637	637	637	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	607	607	607	.....	.....
BOSTON HARBOR, MA	.....	.....	7,500	+7,500	+7,500
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	592	592	592	.....	.....
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,896	8,750	8,896	.....	+146
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	312	312	312	.....	.....
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	362	362	362	.....	.....
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	458	458	458	.....	.....
GREEN HARBOR, MA	.....	.....	350	+350	+350
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	591	591	591	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	114	114	114	.....	.....
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	677	677	677	.....	.....
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	541	541	541	.....	.....
MERRIMACK RIVER, MA	.....	.....	200	+200	+200
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	337	337	337	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	1,300	1,300	1,300	.....	.....
TULLY LAKE, MA	595	595	595	.....	.....
WEST HILL DAM, MA	798	798	798	.....	.....
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	579	579	579	.....	.....
WEYMOUTH-FORE RIVER, MA	3,774	3,700	3,774	.....	+74
MICHIGAN					
ALPENA HARBOR, MI	.....	.....	290	+290	+290
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	.....	.....	80	+80	+80
CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI	.....	.....	128	+128	+128
CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI	.....	.....	550	+550	+550
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI	183	183	183	.....	.....
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	89	89	89	.....	.....
DETROIT RIVER, MI	4,347	4,347	4,347	.....	.....
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	37	37	37	.....	.....
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,879	1,879	1,879	.....	.....
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI	14	14	1,714	+1,700	+1,700
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI	.....	100	500	+500	+400

HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	1,354	1,354	1,354	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	144	144	144	.....	.....
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	370	370	370	.....	.....
LAC LA BELLE, MI	92	92	92	.....	.....
LELAND HARBOR, MI	.....	.....	88	+88	+88
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	.....	.....	186	+186	+186
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	500	500	500	.....	.....
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI AND HI	.....	400	400	+400	.....
MONROE HARBOR, MI	550	550	550	.....	.....
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	525	525	525	.....	.....
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	.....	.....	79	+79	+79
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	.....	.....	300	+300	+300
PENTWATER, MI	.....	100	100	+100	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	178	178	178	.....	.....
ROUGE RIVER, MI	1,161	1,161	1,161	.....	.....
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	2,427	2,427	2,427	.....	.....
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	.....	.....	360	+360	+360
ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI	920	920	920	.....	.....
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	470	470	1,085	+615	+615
ST. MARYS RIVER, MI	17,134	17,134	17,134	.....	.....
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,314	2,314	2,314	.....	.....
MINNESOTA					
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN AND SD	164	164	164	.....	.....
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN AND WI	5,081	5,381	5,081	.....	−300
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	129	129	129	.....	.....
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	363	363	363	.....	.....
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	58,073	58,073	57,073	−1,000	−1,000
ORWELL LAKE, MN	261	261	261	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	67	67	67	.....	.....
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	320	320	320	.....	.....
RESERVOIR PLAN OPERATING EVALUATION, MN	.....	400	.....	.....	−400
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	2,263	2,263	2,263	.....	.....
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	310	310	310	.....	.....
WARROAD HARBOR, MN	.....	.....	250	+250	+250
MISSISSIPPI					
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	.....	.....	62	+62	+62
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	102	102	170	+68	+68
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,500	2,500	4,000	+1,500	+1,500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	57	57	57	.....	.....
MOUTH OF THE YAZOO RIVER, MS	.....	.....	110	+110	+110
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,680	1,680	2,300	+620	+620
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	5,156	5,156	5,156	.....	.....
PEARL RIVER, MS AND LA	276	276	276	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	181	181	181	.....	.....
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	.....	.....	580	+580	+580
YAZOO RIVER, MS	.....	.....	140	+140	+140
MISSOURI					
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	23	23	350	+327	+327
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	6,107	6,107	6,107	.....	.....
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,677	2,600	2,677	.....	+77
HANNIBAL, MO	.....	.....	76	+76	+76
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	9,140	9,140	9,140	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	768	768	768	.....	.....
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	730	730	730	.....	.....
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	848	848	848	.....	.....
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	29,559	29,559	29,559	.....	.....
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	.....	.....	360	+360	+360
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,963	1,963	1,963	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	7	7	7	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	319	319	319	.....	.....
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,237	1,237	1,237	.....	.....
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	.....	.....	350	+350	+350
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,742	3,742	3,742	.....	.....
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	7,556	7,556	7,556	.....	.....
UNION LAKE, MO	6	6	6	.....	.....
MONTANA					
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,154	4,154	4,154	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	19	19	19	.....	.....

LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	2,189	2,189	2,189	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	87	87	87	.....	.....
NEBRASKA					
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE AND SD	8,231	8,231	8,231	.....	.....
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,863	1,863	1,863	.....	.....
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE DAM SAFETY STUDY, NE	.....	355	.....	.....	−355
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	102	102	102	.....	.....
MISSOURI R. MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	203	203	203	.....	.....
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	625	625	.....	.....	.....
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	845	845	845	.....	.....
NEVADA					
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	46	46	46	.....	.....
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV AND CA	586	586	586	.....	.....
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	214	214	214	.....	.....
NEW HAMPSHIRE					
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	644	644	644	.....	.....
COCHECO RIVER	.....	.....	2,000	+2,000	+2,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	555	555	555	.....	.....
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	768	768	768	.....	.....
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,228	1,228	1,228	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	12	12	12	.....	.....
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	806	806	806	.....	.....
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR/PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH	.....	.....	500	+500	+500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	300	300	300	.....	.....
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	736	736	736	.....	.....
NEW JERSEY					
ABSECON INLET	.....	.....	110	+110	+110
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	95	95	500	+405	+405
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	540	540	540	.....	.....
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	10	10	10	.....	.....
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA, AND DE	20,465	20,465	20,465	.....	.....
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	720	720	720	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	106	106	106	.....	.....
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	510	510	510	.....	.....
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	8,120	8,120	8,120	.....	.....
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	.....	.....	1,250	+1,250	+1,250

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	450	450	450	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	1,675	1,675	1,675	.....	.....
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	150	150	150	.....	.....
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	2,500	2,400	2,500	.....	+100
SALEM RIVER, NJ	.....	.....	965	+965	+965
SAVOY HOOK AT LEONARDO, NJ	.....	.....	150	+150	+150
SHARK RIVER, NJ	80	80	230	+150	+150
SHREWSBURY RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	.....	.....	400	+400	+400
NEW MEXICO					
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	3,168	3,168	3,168	.....	.....
ALBUQUERQUE LEVEES, NM	.....	.....	2,000	+1,000	+1,000
COCHITI LAKE, NM	3,726	3,726	4,426	+700	+700
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,579	1,579	2,579	+1,000	+1,000
GALISTEO DAM, NM	779	750	779	.....	+29
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	221	221	221	.....	.....
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	3,561	3,561	5,061	+1,500	+1,500
RIO GRANDE BOSQUE REHABILITATION, NM	.....	.....	4,000	+4,000	+4,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,213	1,213	1,213	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	1,221	1,221	1,221	.....	.....
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	552	552	552	.....	.....
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL	.....	.....	2,000	+2,000	+2,000
NEW YORK					
ALMOND LAKE, NY	509	509	509	.....	.....
ARKPORT DAM, NY	294	294	294	.....	.....
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,308	1,308	1,308	.....	.....
BROWNS CREEK, NY	100	100	100	.....	.....
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,030	1,030	1,030	.....	.....
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	60	60	60	.....	.....
EAST RIVER, NY	1,350	1,350	1,350	.....	.....
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	140	140	140	.....	.....

EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	517	517	517	.....	.....
EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	100	100	100	.....	.....
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	220	220	220	.....	.....
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	150	150	150	.....	.....
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	200	200	200	.....	.....
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	350	350	350	.....	.....
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	1,794	1,794	1,794	.....	.....
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	1,090	1,090	1,090	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	659	659	659	.....	.....
JAMAICA BAY, NY	140	140	140	.....	.....
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	200	200	200	.....	.....
MORICHES INLET, NY	80	80	80	.....	.....
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	3,845	3,845	3,845	.....	.....
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	7,200	7,200	7,200	.....	.....
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	3,410	3,410	3,410	.....	.....
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY AND NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	4,400	4,400	4,400	.....	.....
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY AND NJ (PREV OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSIT	.....	.....	950	+950	+950
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,310	1,310	1,310	.....	.....
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	120	120	120	.....	.....
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	662	662	662	.....	.....
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	710	710	710	.....	.....
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	678	678	678	.....	.....
NORTH CAROLINA					
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	860	860	5,860	+5,000	+5,000
B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,849	1,849	1,849	.....	.....
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	635	635	635	.....	.....
CAROLINA BEACH INLET	.....	.....	550	+550	+550
FALLS LAKE, NC	2,097	2,097	2,097	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	35	35	35	.....	.....
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	.....	.....	950	+950	+950
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	7,855	7,855	15,855	+8,000	+8,000
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	3,700	3,700	3,700	.....	.....
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	3,575	3,575	3,575	.....	.....
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	.....	.....	1,050	+1,050	+1,050
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	.....	.....	675	+675	+675
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	226	226	226	.....	.....
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	1,540	1,540	1,540	.....	.....
W. KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	2,817	2,817	2,817	.....	.....
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	13,963	13,963	13,963	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
NORTH DAKOTA					
BOWMAN-HALEY LAKE, ND	156	156	156	.....	.....
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	13,266	13,516	14,266	+1,000	+750
HOMME LAKE, ND	266	266	266	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	85	85	85	.....	.....
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,242	1,242	1,242	.....	.....
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	459	459	459	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	117	117	117	.....	.....
SOURIS RIVER, ND	422	422	422	.....	.....
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	31	31	31	.....	.....
OHIO					
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	948	948	948	.....	.....
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,063	1,063	1,063	.....	.....
BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,544	1,544	1,544	.....	.....
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,222	1,222	1,222	.....	.....
CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM, OH	1,358	1,358	1,358	.....	.....
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,305	3,305	3,305	.....	.....
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	2,315	2,315	2,315	.....	.....
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	815	815	815	.....	.....
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	794	794	794	.....	.....
DILLON LAKE, OH	1,790	1,790	1,790	.....	.....
HURON HARBOR, OH	.....	.....	105	+105	+105
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	280	280	280	.....	.....
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	600	600	600	.....	.....
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25	25	25	.....	.....
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	718	718	718	.....	.....
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	717	717	717	.....	.....
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	6,754	6,754	6,754	.....	.....
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	125	125	125	.....	.....
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	721	721	721	.....	.....

PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	240	240	240	.....	.....
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30	30	30	.....	.....
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	890	850	890	.....	+40
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	170	170	170	.....	.....
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,682	3,650	3,682	.....	+32
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	290	290	290	.....	.....
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	403	403	403	.....	.....
WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE, OH	710	710	710	.....	.....
OKLAHOMA					
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	429	429	429	.....	.....
BIRCH LAKE, OK	475	475	475	.....	.....
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,493	1,493	1,493	.....	.....
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,723	1,723	1,723	.....	.....
COPAN LAKE, OK	1,511	1,511	1,511	.....	.....
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	5,312	5,312	5,312	.....	.....
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	5,053	5,053	5,053	.....	.....
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	733	733	733	.....	.....
GRAND LAKE, OR	.....	.....	650	+650	+650
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	166	166	166	.....	.....
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	529	529	529	.....	.....
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,451	1,451	1,451	.....	.....
HULAH LAKE, OK	626	626	750	+124	+124
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	88	88	88	.....	.....
KAW LAKE, OK	2,378	2,378	2,378	.....	.....
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	4,300	4,300	4,300	.....	.....
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,955	1,955	1,955	.....	.....
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	61	61	61	.....	.....
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	57	57	57	.....	.....
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	857	857	857	.....	.....
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,517	4,517	4,517	.....	.....
SARDIS LAKE, OK	1,192	1,192	1,192	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	508	508	508	.....	.....
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,086	1,086	1,086	.....	.....
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	2,998	2,998	2,998	.....	.....
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,528	1,528	1,528	.....	.....
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	4,815	4,815	4,815	.....	.....
WISTER LAKE, OK	460	460	460	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
OREGON					
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	595	595	595		
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	312	312	312		
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	7,792	7,792	7,792		
CHETCO RIVER, OR	348	348	348		
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE R. BLW VANCOUVER, WA AND PORTLA	16,829	16,829	17,579	+750	+750
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA	10,186	10,186	27,186	+17,000	+17,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR	254	254	254		
COOS BAY, OR	4,594	4,594	4,594		
COQUILLE RIVER, OR			348	+348	
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	780	780	780		
COUGAR LAKE, OR	766	766	766		
DEPOE BAY, OR			400	+400	+400
DETROIT LAKE, OR	729	729	729		
DORENA LAKE, OR	613	613	613		
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	555	555	555		
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	966	966	2,100	+1,134	+1,134
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,186	1,186	1,186		
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	3,807	3,807	3,807		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	167	167	167		
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	4,692	4,692	4,692		
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,272	1,272	1,272		
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	5,096	5,096	5,096		
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	7,129	7,129	7,129		
PORT ORFORD, OR			723	+723	+723
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	177	177	177		
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	394	394	394		
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	62	62	62		
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	449	449	449		
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	134	134	134		
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR (PORT OF GARIBALDI)			1,500	+1,500	+1,500

UMPQUA RIVER, OR	.....	225	679	+679	+454
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	72	72	72	.....	.....
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	80	80	80	.....	.....
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	538	538	538	.....	.....
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,006	1,006	1,006	.....	.....
PENNSYLVANIA					
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	4,393	4,393	4,393	.....	.....
ALVIN R. BUSH DAM, PA	727	727	727	.....	.....
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	251	251	251	.....	.....
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,026	1,026	1,026	.....	.....
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,662	2,662	2,662	.....	.....
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,074	1,074	1,074	.....	.....
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	2,793	2,793	2,793	.....	.....
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,033	1,033	1,033	.....	.....
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	717	717	717	.....	.....
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	799	799	799	.....	.....
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	745	745	745	.....	.....
FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM, PA	731	731	731	.....	.....
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	249	249	249	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	196	196	196	.....	.....
JOHNSTOWN, PA	1,603	1,603	1,603	.....	.....
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,147	1,447	1,147	.....	−300
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	785	785	785	.....	.....
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	946	946	946	.....	.....
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	17,138	17,138	17,138	.....	.....
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH AND WV	18,362	18,362	18,362	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	30	30	30	.....	.....
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	483	483	483	.....	.....
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	13	13	13	.....	.....
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	5,449	5,849	5,449	.....	−400
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	66	66	66	.....	.....
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	70	70	70	.....	.....
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	1,831	1,831	1,831	.....	.....
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	386	386	1,000	+614	+614
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	80	80	80	.....	.....
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	3,365	3,365	3,365	.....	.....
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,331	1,331	1,331	.....	.....
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	147	147	147	.....	.....
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	714	714	714	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	556	556	556	.....	.....
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD	2,124	2,124	2,124	.....	.....
PUERTO RICO					
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	1,800	1,800	1,800	.....	.....
RHODE ISLAND					
BULLOCKS POINT COVE, RI	.....	.....	700	+700	+700
BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR, RI	.....	.....	120	+120	+120
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	15	15	15	.....	.....
PAWTUXET COVE, RI	.....	.....	1,600	+1,600	+1,600
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	400	400	400	.....	.....
SOUTH CAROLINA					
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	467	467	3,000	+2,533	+2,533
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	11,038	11,038	11,038	.....	.....
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	2,905	2,905	2,905	.....	.....
FOLLY RIVER, SC	987	987	987	.....	.....
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	1,342	1,342	4,000	+2,658	+2,658
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	30	30	30	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	349	349	349	.....	.....
TOWN CREEK, SC	.....	.....	459	+459	+459
SOUTH DAKOTA					
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	7,577	7,577	7,577	.....	.....
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRVLE SIOUS, SD	.....	.....	2,000	+2,000	+2,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	275	275	275	.....	.....
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	192	192	192	.....	.....
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	9,635	9,635	9,635	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	17	17	17	.....	.....
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD AND MN	434	434	434	.....	.....
MISSOURI R. BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	350	350	350	.....	.....

OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD AND ND	11,421	11,421	11,421	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	52	52	52	.....	.....
TENNESSEE					
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	6,397	6,397	6,397	.....	.....
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,103	5,103	5,103	.....	.....
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	2,430	2,430	2,430	.....	.....
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	6,226	6,226	6,226	.....	.....
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	5,531	5,531	5,531	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	137	137	137	.....	.....
J. PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,738	3,738	3,738	.....	.....
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,385	6,385	6,385	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	7	7	7	.....	.....
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	18,537	18,537	18,537	.....	.....
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	23	23	23	.....	.....
TEXAS					
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	1,108	1,108	1,108	.....	.....
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI	1,051	1,051	1,051	.....	.....
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,538	1,538	1,538	.....	.....
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,875	2,875	2,875	.....	.....
BELTON LAKE, TX	3,041	3,041	3,041	.....	.....
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,097	2,097	2,097	.....	.....
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	3,775	3,775	3,775	.....	.....
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,875	2,875	2,875	.....	.....
CANYON LAKE, TX	3,667	3,667	3,667	.....	.....
CHOCOLATE BAYOU	.....	.....	2,000	+2,000	+2,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,900	3,900	3,900	.....	.....
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	5,569	5,569	5,569	.....	.....
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	5	5	5	.....	.....
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	3,075	3,075	3,075	.....	.....
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	3,610	3,610	3,610	.....	.....
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	4,800	4,800	4,800	.....	.....
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	6,975	6,975	6,975	.....	.....
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,004	2,004	2,004	.....	.....
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	3,349	3,349	3,349	.....	.....
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	29,312	29,312	29,312	.....	.....
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,665	1,665	1,665	.....	.....
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,261	3,261	11,056	+7,795	+7,795
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	557	557	557	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	2,897	2,897	2,897		
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	1,023	1,023	1,023		
LAKE KEMP, TX	422	422	422		
LAVON LAKE, TX	3,885	3,885	3,885		
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	4,290	4,290	4,290		
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	8,700	8,700	8,700		
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	2,353	2,353	2,353		
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	2,320	2,320	2,320		
O. C. FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,260	1,260	1,260		
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,266	1,266	1,266		
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	2,221	2,221	2,221		
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	50	50	50		
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	1,070	1,070	1,070		
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	13,478	13,478	13,478		
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	11,578	11,578	11,578		
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	84	84	84		
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	3,068	3,068	3,068		
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,951	1,951	1,951		
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,150	2,150	2,500	+350	+350
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	500	500	1,600	+1,100	+1,100
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B. A. STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	3,995	3,995	3,995		
WACO LAKE, TX	3,295	3,295	3,295		
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,662	1,662	1,662		
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	5,603	6,803	5,603		−1,200
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	3,416	3,416	3,416		
UTAH					
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	40	40	40		
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	631	631	631		
VERMONT					
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	801	801	801		

CONNECTICUT RIVER FLOOD CONTROL DAMS	.....	.....	500	+500	+500
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	45	45	45	.....	.....
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	706	706	706	.....	.....
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	892	892	892	.....	.....
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	786	786	786	.....	.....
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	684	684	684	.....	.....
VIRGINIA					
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	.....	.....	500	+500	+500
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA	1,670	1,670	1,670	.....	.....
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA	275	275	850	+575	+575
BENNETT'S CREEK, VA	.....	.....	352	+352	+352
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	900	900	900	.....	.....
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,084	2,084	2,084	.....	.....
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK AND NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	825	825	825	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	127	127	127	.....	.....
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,295	3,295	3,295	.....	.....
JOHN H. KERR LAKE, VA AND NC	11,513	11,513	11,513	.....	.....
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,435	1,435	1,435	.....	.....
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	11,203	11,203	14,672	+3,469	+3,469
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	346	346	346	.....	.....
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	5,391	5,391	5,391	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	793	793	793	.....	.....
RUDEE INLET, VA	635	635	1,275	+640	+640
TANGIER CHANNEL, VA	600	600	600	.....	.....
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	200	200	200	.....	.....
WASHINGTON					
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	2,419	2,419	2,419	.....	.....
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA (PORT OF ILWACO)	.....	.....	1,000	+1,000	+1,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND THE HEAD OF SAND	.....	.....	1,000	+1,000	+1,000
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,508	1,508	1,508	.....	.....
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	8,582	9,000	8,582	.....	−418
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	2,481	2,481	2,481	.....	.....
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,670	5,670	5,670	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	311	311	311	.....	.....
LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR), WA	342	342	342	.....	.....
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	4,387	4,387	6,480	+2,093	+2,093
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,165	2,165	2,165	.....	.....
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,422	2,422	2,422	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,996	1,996	1,996	.....	.....
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	1,041	1,041	1,041	.....	.....
MT. ST. HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	257	257	257	.....	.....
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	2,516	2,516	3,419	+903	+903
NEAH BAY, WA	.....	.....	1,000	+1,000	+1,000
OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	400	400	400	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	403	403	403	.....	.....
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	864	864	864	.....	.....
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	58	58	58	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	485	485	485	.....	.....
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	555	555	555	.....	.....
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	226	226	226	.....	.....
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	66	66	66	.....	.....
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	112	112	112	.....	.....
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA AND OR	3,667	3,667	3,877	+210	+210
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	158	158	158	.....	.....
WEST VIRGINIA					
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,014	1,014	1,014	.....	.....
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	3,828	3,828	3,828	.....	.....
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,517	1,517	1,517	.....	.....
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,799	1,799	1,799	.....	.....
ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	10	10	10	.....	.....
ELKINS, WV	16	16	16	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	117	117	117	.....	.....
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	13,661	13,661	13,661	.....	.....
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY AND OH	19,530	19,530	20,530	+1,000	+1,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY AND OH	2,019	2,019	2,519	+500	+500
R. D. BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,515	1,515	1,515	.....	.....
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	640	640	640	.....	.....
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,657	1,657	1,657	.....	.....
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,788	1,788	1,788	.....	.....

TYGART LAKE, WV	2,950	2,950	2,950	.....	.....
WISCONSIN					
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	.....	.....	166	+166	+166
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	647	647	647	.....	.....
FOX RIVER, WI	1,748	1,748	1,748	.....	.....
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	2,476	2,476	2,476	.....	.....
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	40	40	40	.....	.....
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	.....	.....	288	+288	+288
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	.....	.....	450	+450	+450
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	844	844	844	.....	.....
PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI	.....	.....	213	+213	+213
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	105	105	105	.....	.....
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	.....	.....	257	+257	+257
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	472	472	472	.....	.....
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	.....	420	.....	.....	−420
WYOMING					
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	11	11	11	.....	.....
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,094	1,094	1,094	.....	.....
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	86	86	86	.....	.....
MISCELLANEOUS					
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	690	690	690	.....	.....
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,475	2,475	2,475	.....	.....
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	1,391	1,391	1,391	.....	.....
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	8,000	8,000	8,000	.....	.....
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,062	1,000	1,062	.....	+62
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	6,080	5,660	6,080	.....	+420
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)	1,391	1,300	1,391	.....	+91
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	270	270	270	.....	.....
FACILITY PROTECTION	12,000	12,000	12,000	.....	.....
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS	900	900	900	.....	.....
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	608	608	608	.....	.....
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	3,708	3,708	3,708	.....	.....
LONG TERM OPTION ASSESSMENT FOR LOW USE NAVIGATION	1,500	.....	.....	−1,500	.....
MONITORING OF COMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,575	1,500	1,575	.....	+75
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	250	250	250	.....	.....
NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM	31	31	31	.....	.....
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP)	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to (+ or −)	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
NATIONAL LEWIS AND CLARK COMMEMORATION COORDINATION	319	319	319	.....	.....
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	2,540	734	734	−1,806	.....
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT (ABS–P2)	250	250	250	.....	.....
PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SEC 3)	45	45	45	.....	.....
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM (RMSP)	1,600	1,500	1,600	.....	+100
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	1,391	1,391	10,016	+8,625	+8,625
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	608	608	608	.....	.....
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	500	775	+275	+275
RESERVE FOR KEY EMERGENCY MAINTENANCE/REPAIRS	20,000	20,000	.....	−20,000	−20,000
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS)	653	653	653	.....	.....
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,271	4,200	4,271	.....	+71
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−12,766	.....	−66,232	−52,341	−65,107
Total, Operation and Maintenance	1,977,894	2,000,000	2,100,000	+122,106	+100,000

Alabama-Coosa River, AL.—The Committee has included an additional $1,500,000 for maintenance dredging.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, AL & MS.—The Committee has included for additional maintenance dredging and for aquatic plant control activities.

Cordova Harbor, AK.—The Committee has included $600,000 for maintenance dredging of the harbor.

Lowell Creek Tunnel, AK.—The Committee has included $100,000 for maintenance of the Lowell Creek Tunnel project.

Nome Harbor, AK.—The Committee has included an additional $2,496,000 for maintenance dredging of the harbor.

Alamo Lake, AZ.—The Committee has provided an additional $450,000 for ecological restoration studies at the lake.

Helena Harbor, AR.—The Committee has included $400,000 for maintenance dredging of this harbor.

McClellan-Kerr, Arkansas River Navigation System, AR and OK.—Additional funds are provided to initiate replacement of towhaulage equipment at Locks 1 and 2.

Ouachita and Black Rivers, AR and LA.—The Committee has included an additional, $1,800,000 for maintenance dredging.

Crescent City, CA.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the continued work on the dredge material management plan.

Sacrement River (Bascule Bridge), CA.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to initiate transfer of the Bascule Bridge to the City.

Cherry Creek, Chatfield, and Trinidad Lakes, CO.—The Committee has included an additional $2,000,000 for continued repairs at these three lakes. This action in no way is intended to alter the Corps of Engineers' lease and property accountability policies. It is the Committee's understanding that the State of Colorado has agreed to cost share this project on a 50–50 basis. It is also the understanding of the Committee that the Secretary is not to assume, nor share in the future of the operation and maintenance of these recreation facilities. Of the funds provided, the Corps is directed to conduct a reallocation study for Chatfield Reservoir project.

Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, DE and MD.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,475,000 for this project. Within the funds provided, $1,000,000 is included for maintenance costs of the SR–1 Bridge.

AIWW, Norfolk, VA to St. Johns River, FL, GA, SC, NC, and VA.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 for maintenance dredging.

Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee to Anclote, FL.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 for maintenance dredging.

Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, FL.—The Committee has included $4,250,000 for maintenance dredging.

Miami River, FL.—The Committee is aware of the ongoing economic analysis of the Miami River maintenance project. The Corps has reported to the local sponsors on several occasions that the study was nearing completion, only to postpone its final completion. Most recently, the Corps has directed the consultant to complete the study by August 15, in order for the Corps to utilize the results of the study in its preparation of the fiscal year 2007 budget request, and has conveyed its intention once again to the local spon-

sors. The Committee expects the Corps to complete and approve this analysis by August 15.

Apalachiacola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, GA, AL, and FL.—The Committee has included an additional $6,500,000, which includes annual dredging of the river channel, annual operations and maintenance of the George W. Andrews Lock, spot dredging of shoals, continuation of slough mouth restoration, and routine operations and maintenance of the project.

Pohiki Bay, Hawaii, HI.—The Committee has included $100,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the breakwater repair.

Lake Shelbyville, IL.—The Committee has included an additional $1,000,000 for deferred maintenance activities at recreation sites.

Mississippi River Between Missouri River and Minneapolis (MVR Portion), IL.—The Committee recommendation includes $50,407,000. Within the funds provided, $3,000,000 is for continuation of the rehab of Lock and Dam 11 and $2,500,000 is for the rehab of Lock and Dam 19.

Saylorville Lake, IA.—The Committee has provided an additional $250,000 to maintain the project's basic service level as determined by the Corps.

Michigan City Harbor, IN.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the dredged material management plan and plans and specifications for dredging the harbor.

Wilson Lake, KS.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the Corps to conduct a reallocation study.

Barren River Lake, KY.—The Committee has provided an additional $898,000 for the repair and upgrade of public use facilities.

Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black, LA.—The Committee has provided an additional $9,000,000 for maintenance dredging activities.

Barataria Bay Waterway, LA.—The Committee has provided funds for maintaining the authorized depth of the project.

Calcasieu River and Pass, LA.—The Committee has provided an additional $5,000,000 for maintenance dredging of this channel.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA.—The Committee has included an additional $3,000,000 for bank stabilization repairs, dredging entrances to oxbow lakes, routine operation and maintenance activities, annual dredging requirements, and backlog maintenance.

Baltimore Harbor and Channels (50 foot), MD.—The Committee has provided an additional $4,000,000 for maintenance dredging.

Herring Creek, Tall Timbers, MD.—With the funds provided, the Committee expects the Corps to complete construction of the revetment.

Boston Harbor, MA.—The Committee has provided $7,500,000 to initiate dredging in the Inner Harbor.

Grand Marais Harbor, MI.—The Committee has provided $1,714,000 to initiate construction of the replacement breakwater.

Clairborne County Port, MS.—The Committee has included additional funds to continue maintenance dredging of the port.

Gulfport Harbor, MS.—The Committee has included an additional $1,500,000 for ongoing maintenance projects and dredging of the bar channel.

Mouth of the Yazoo River, MS.—The Committee has included additional funds for the maintenance dredging of the entrance to Vicksburg Harbor.

Okatibbee Lake, MS.—The Committee has included additional funds for maintenance of public user facilities.

Rosedale Harbor, MS.—The Committee has included $580,000 for maintenance dredging of the harbor.

Cocheco River, NH.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 continue dredging of the Cocheco River project.

New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, NJ.—The Committee has included an additional $1,250,000 for dredging of the project.

Albuquerque Levees, NM.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 to assess damage to and make immediate repairs to levees damaged as a result of spring run-off flooding in 2005.

Cochiti Lake, NM.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the continuation of studies that were initiated in fiscal year 2004, which include the proposed operational changes and gate automation and to begin the relocation of the Al Black area.

Jemez Canyon Dam, NM.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,500,000 to modify headworks to allow management of sediment flows to meet 2003 Biological Opinion requirements.

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

Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model, NM.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 to improve data management, coordinate river operations, automate data in partnership with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, NC.—The Committee has included an additional $5,000,000 for dredging of the project.

Manteo (Shallowbag Bay), NC.—The Committee has included an additional $8,000,000 for dredging of the project.

Garrison Dam and Lake Sakakawea, ND.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for mosquito control and $900,000 for the Corps to work in cooperation with the Friends of Lake Sakakawea to ensure the recreation sites around the lake can be utilized.

Columbia & Lower Willamette River Below Vancouver, WA and Portland, OR.—The committee recommendation includes $750,000 for continued work at the Astoria Boat Basin.

Columbia River at the Mouth, OR and WA.—The Committee has provided an additional $17,000,000 to continue jetty repairs initiated with fiscal year 2005 budgeted funds, but not budgeted in fiscal year 2006.

Fern Ridge Dam, OR.—The Committee has provided $2,100,000 for this project. The Committee understands that the additional $1,134,000 will complete the emergency repairs begun in fiscal year 2005 using emergency reprogramming procedures. The Committee understands that the repairs will cost in excess of $25,000,000. The Committee directs that these costs should be considered as dam safety repairs for cost allocation purposes.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, SC.—The Committee has included an additional $2,533,000 for dredging of the project.

Georgetown Harbor, SC.—The Committee has included additional funds for maintenance dredging of the harbor.

Oahe Dam, Lake Oahe, SD & ND.—The Committee understands that the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe's water system is facing a potential water shortage due to extremely low water levels on the Missouri River. The tribe's water intake is likely to become inoperable, as the Corps of Engineers continues to draw down the water level on Lake Oahe. The Committee urges the Corps to take all necessary steps to relocate the tribe's water intake on the Missouri River to ensure continued operation of the water system and an uninterrupted water supply for the Reservation.

Chocolate Bayou, TX.—The Committee has provided additional funds for maintenance dredging of the channel.

Houston Ship Channel, TX.—The Committee has provided an additional $7,795,000 for additional dredging and dredging related activities.

Texas Water Allocation Study, TX.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the ongoing study.

Norfolk Harbor, VA.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,469,000 for maintenance dredging and to raise the containment dikes to provide the capacity needed for the Norfolk Harbor Deepening project.

Connecticut River Flood Control Dams, VT.—$500,000 has been provided for continued work on fish passage facilities at these projects.

Lake Washington Ship Channel, WA.—The Committee has included an additional $2,093,000 to maintain basic service levels at the Ballard Locks.

Mud Mountain, WA.—Out of the funds provided, the Corps is directed to use up to $903,000 to satisfy Federal fish passage obligations for the term of the cooperative agreement with Puget Sound Energy.

The Dalles Lock and Dam, WA and OR.—The Committee has provided an additional $210,000 for Lewis and Clark activities at Celilo Park.

Ohio River Locks and Dams, WV, KY and OH.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for security monitoring and $400,000 for full levels of service at the lock.

Ohio River Open Channel Work, WV, KY and OH.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for channel condition surveys.

Long Term Option Assessment for Low Use Navigation.—The Committee has not provided funding for this study.

Regional Sediment Management Demonstration Program.—The Committee has provided $10,016,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, $500,000 is for the southeast coast of Oahu, HI; $2,500,000 is for the Littoral Drift Restoration Program, Benson Beach, WA; $375,000 is for Lido Key, Sarasota, FL, and Vicinity and central and southern Brevard County to Dade County; $350,000 is for South Jetty and Clatsop Spit, OR; and $4,900,000 is for Coastal Zone Mapping and Imaging Laser to be conducted in accordance with the University of Southern Mississippi.

Removal of Sunken Vessels.—The Committee has provided $275,000 to remove the sunken vessel State of Pennsylvania from the Christina River at Wilmington, DE.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 2005	(1)
Budget estimate, 2006	$70,000,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	43,000,000

[1] Exclude emergency appropriation of $148,000,000.

The Committee has included $43,000,000 for the FCCE account. This account provides funds for preparedness activities for natural and other disasters, response, and emergency flood fighting and rescue operations, hurricane response, and emergency shore protection work. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean water where the source has been contaminated or where adequate supplies of water are needed for consumption.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2005	$143,840,000
Budget estimate, 2006	160,000,000
House allowance	160,000,000
Committee recommendation	150,000,000

An appropriation of $150,000,000 is recommended for the regulatory program of the Corps of Engineers.

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

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

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2005	$163,680,000
Budget estimate, 2006	140,000,000
House allowance	140,000,000
Committee recommendation	140,000,000

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

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

FUSRAP is not specifically defined by statute. The program was established in 1974 under the broad authority of the Atomic Energy Act and, until fiscal year 1998, funds for the cleanup of contaminated defense sites had been appropriated to the Department of Energy through existing appropriation accounts. In appropriating FUSRAP funds to the Corps of Engineers, the Committee intended to transfer only the responsibility for administration and execution of cleanup activities at eligible sites where remediation had not been completed. It did not intend to transfer ownership of

and accountability for real property interests that remain with the Department of Energy.

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

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2005	$165,664,000
Budget estimate, 2006	162,000,000
House allowance	152,021,000
Committee recommendation	165,000,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommendation is $165,000,000. The Committee understands that the cost of the required financial audit of the Corps of Engineers may exceed $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2006. Therefore, the Committee encourages the Corps to use the Revolving Fund to undertake this audit and budget appropriation for this audit in future years.

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

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

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

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

Office of Congressional Affairs.—The Committee has included statutory language for the past several years prohibiting any funds from being used to fund an Office of Congressional Affairs within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers. The Committee believes that an Office of Congressional Affairs for the Civil Works Program would hamper the efficient and effective coordination of issues with the Committee staff and Members of Congress. The Committee believes that the technical knowledge and managerial expertise needed for the Corps headquarters to effectively address Civil Works authorization, appropriation, and Headquarters policy matters resides in the Civil Works organization. Therefore, the Committee strongly recommends that the office of Congressional Affairs not be a part of the process by which information on Civil Works projects, programs, and activities is provided to Congress.

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

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

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Section 101. The bill includes language limiting reimbursements.

Section 102. The bill includes language prohibiting the divesting or transferring Civil Works functions.

Section 103. The bill includes language prohibiting any steps to dismantle the St. Georges Bridge in Delaware.

Section 104. The bill includes language concerning report notifications.

Section 105. The bill includes language concerning report notifications.

Section 106. The bill includes language making a technical correction to the Baltimore Metropolitan Watershed Feasibility Study-Gwnns Falls, MD.

Section 107. The bill includes language that provides for increasing the cost ceiling for the Marmet Lock, Kanawha River, WV project.

Section 108. The bill includes language that provides for increasing the cost ceiling for the Lower Mud River, Milton, WV project.

Section 109. The bill includes language regarding water reallocation at Lake Cumberland, KY, the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson Reservoir in California.

Section 110. The bill includes language regarding the Lower Las Vegas Wash, NV.

Section 111. The bill includes language regarding the Yazoo Basin, Upper Yazoo Projects in Mississippi.

Section 112. The bill includes language regarding the Lower Mississippi River Museum and Riverfront Interpretive Site, MS.

Section 113. The bill includes language regarding the Central New Mexico, NM.

Section 114. The bill includes language regarding the Los Angeles Harbor, CA.

Section 115. The bill includes language regarding the Missouri and Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement Project.

Section 116. The bill includes language regarding the Missouri and Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement Project.

Section 117. The bill includes language regarding the Missouri and Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement Project.

Section 118. The bill includes language regarding the Missouri River Levee System, Unit L–15 Levee, MO.

Section 119. The bill includes language regarding the Alpine, CA project.

Section 120. The bill includes language regarding regulatory permit processing.

Section 121. The bill includes language regarding the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program, NM.

Section 122. The bill includes language regarding Bluestone Dam, WV.

Section 123. The bill includes language deauthorizing a portion of a project in Washington.

Section 124. The bill includes language regarding Fern Ridge Dam, WV.

Section 125. The bill includes language regarding the Federal dredges.

Section 126. The bill includes language regarding Federal dredges.

Section 127. The bill includes language regarding a Dispersal Barrier in Vermont and New York.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2005	$47,625,000
Budget estimate, 2006	34,350,000
House allowance	34,350,000
Committee recommendation	34,350,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2006 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act totals $34,350,000. An appropriation of $31,668,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction; $946,000 for fish, wildlife, and recreation, mitigation and conservation. The Committee recommendation provides $1,736,000 for program administration and oversight.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2005	$852,605,000
Budget estimate, 2006	801,569,000
House allowance	832,000,000
Committee recommendation	899,569,000

An appropriation of $899,569,000 is recommended by the Committee for general investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation. The water and related resources account supports the development, management, and restoration of water and related natural resources in the 17 Western States. The account includes funds for operating and maintaining existing facilities to obtain the greatest overall level of benefits, to protect public safety, and to conduct studies on ways to improve the use of water and related natural resources. Work will be done in partnership and cooperation with non-Federal entities and other Federal agencies.

The Committee has divided underfinancing between the Resources Management Subaccount and the Facilities Operation and Maintenance Subaccount. The Committee directs that the underfinancing amount in each subaccount initially be applied uniformly

across all projects within the subaccounts. Upon applying the underfinanced amounts, normal reprogramming procedures should be undertaken to account for schedule slippages, accelerations or other unforeseen conditions.

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

BUILDING AND SITE SECURITY

Security Costs and Allocations.—Following the attacks on September 11, 2001, the Bureau of Reclamation strengthened security at Federal dams and similar facilities and has undertaken but not completed extensive risk assessments for over 400 units throughout the West. Many of these are multi-purpose facilities providing flood control, water storage for contract irrigators, municipal and industrial water supplies, power generation, recreation and environmental mitigation benefits. The Committee understands that beginning in fiscal year 2006, Reclamation will no longer make a distinction between pre-September 11, 2001, security costs and post-September 11, 2001, security costs. The Committee recognizes that the security posture of Reclamation will likely not approach pre-September 11, 2001, levels for many years, if ever. The Committee recognizes that project beneficiaries benefit from this enhanced security. However, the Committee remains concerned about the reimbursability of increased security costs for Reclamation projects. The Committee wants to ensure that all project beneficiaries that benefit from the enhanced security posture, pay a fair share of the costs. Therefore, Reclamation shall provide a report to the Committee, no later than, May 1, 2007, with a breakout of planned reimbursable and non-reimbursable security costs by project pro rated by project purposes. The Committee directs the Commissioner not to begin the reimbursement process until the Congress provides direct instruction to do so.

Direct Funding of Operations and Maintenance Work and the PMAs

The Committee has chosen not to include the legislative proposal to directly fund reclamation hydropower operation and maintenance activities through receipts from the power marketing administrations due to budgetary scoring implications.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES						
ARIZONA						
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	.....	7,200	.....	7,200	.....	7,200
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER BASIN	22,128	95	22,128	95	22,128	95
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	2,455	.....	3,200	.....	8,200	.....
FORT MCDOWELL SETTLEMENT ACT	400	.....	400	.....	400	.....
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	250	.....	250	.....	250	.....
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER REUSE PROJECT	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
SALT RIVER PROJECT	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	4,725	.....	4,725	.....	4,725	.....
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	795	.....	795	.....	1,354	.....
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,722	20,378	1,722	20,878	1,722	20,378
CALIFORNIA						
CACHUMA PROJECT	988	588	988	588	988	588
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	580	.....	580	.....	580	.....
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PLANT	1,350	.....	2,500	.....	2,000	.....
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	2,060	7,437	2,060	7,437	2,060	7,437
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	5,966	.....	5,966	.....	5,966	.....
DELTA DIVISION	10,441	5,752	10,441	5,752	10,441	5,752
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,907	2,297	1,907	2,297	1,907	2,297
FRIANT DIVISION	2,235	3,481	2,235	3,481	2,435	3,481
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	12,511	1,114	12,511	1,114	15,074	1,114
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT	.....	23,200	.....	23,200	.....	23,200
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	2,381	1,759	2,381	1,759	2,458	1,759
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	846	.....	846	.....	846	.....
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
SHASTA DIVISION	1,050	7,606	1,050	7,606	1,050	7,606
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	7,621	3,242	7,621	3,242	8,121	3,242

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	1,707	10,211	1,707	10,211	1,707	10,211
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	5,191	7,146	5,191	7,146	5,191	7,146
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
EL DORADO TEMPERATURE CONTROL DEVICE	.....	.....	1,000	.....	.....	.....
LAKE CACHUMA WATER AND SEWAGE TREATMENT	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	.....
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	100	.....	100	.....	3,000	.....
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	650	.....	650	.....	650	.....
LONG BEACH DESALINATION PROJECT	.....	.....	1,250	.....	1,250	.....
MISSION SPRINGS WATER REUSE, DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....
NAPA—SONOMA—MARIN AGRICULTURAL REUSE PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	1,250	.....	2,500	.....	1,250	.....
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT, PHAS	1,250	.....	2,250	.....	2,250	.....
ORLAND PROJECT	41	920	41	920	41	920
PASADENA RECLAIMED WATER PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	160	.....
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVERSION STUDY	.....	.....	1,000	.....	.....	.....
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	1,000	.....	4,800	.....	1,000	.....
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	3,500	.....	3,500	.....	3,500	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION PROJECT	.....	.....	10,000	.....	.....	.....
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	300	.....	300	.....	1,000	.....
SANTA MARGARITA RIVER CONJUNCTIVE USE PROJECT	.....	.....	500	.....	.....	.....
SOLANO PROJECT	1,502	2,863	1,502	2,863	1,502	2,863
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	550	.....	1,050	.....	550	.....
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT	596	.....	596	.....	596	.....
WATSONVILLE AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	.....	.....	2,000	.....	.....	.....
COLORADO						
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP SECTION 5 AND 8	52,000	.....	56,000	.....	60,000	.....
COLLBRAN PROJECT	166	1,277	166	1,277	166	1,277
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	438	16,151	438	16,151	438	16,151
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	20	128	20	128	20	128
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	173	8,579	173	8,579	173	8,579

GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	233	670	233	670	233	670
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY	72	2,250	72	2,250	72	2,250
MANCOS PROJECT	86	88	86	88	86	88
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	62	2,055	62	2,055	62	2,055
PINE RIVER PROJECT	114	128	114	128	114	128
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT	279	5,490	279	5,490	279	5,490
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	172	126	172	126	172	126
HAWAII						
HAWAIIAN RECLAIM AND REUSE STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
IDAHO						
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	2,480	2,520	2,480	2,520	2,480	2,520
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	17,500	.....	17,500	.....	17,500	.....
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	548	.....	548	.....	548	.....
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,169	2,639	3,169	2,639	3,169	2,639
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
MINIDOKA PROJECT, GRASSY LAKE SOD	.....	310	.....	310	.....	310
KANSAS						
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	150	.....	150	.....	150	.....
WICHITA PROJECT	261	334	261	334	261	334
MONTANA						
FORT PECK DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	.....	.....	13,000	.....	19,000	.....
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	.....	331	.....	331	.....	331
HUNTLEY PROJECT	26	125	26	125	26	125
MILK RIVER PROJECT	455	852	455	852	455	852
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	385	.....	385	.....	385	.....
NORTH CENTRAL MONTANA RURAL WATER PROJECT	.....	.....	7,500	.....	.....	.....
ST. MARY'S FACILITIES REHABILITATION	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
SUN RIVER PROJECT	.....	241	.....	241	.....	241
NEBRASKA						
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	12	71	12	71	12	71
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	128	.....	128	.....	128	.....
NEVADA						
HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY	200	.....	200	.....	1,000	.....
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	4,520	3,057	4,520	3,057	4,520	3,057

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	1,200		1,200		2,775	
NORTH LAS VEGAS WATER REUSE					1,000	
SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT					3,423	
NEW MEXICO						
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER AND RECLAMATION REUSE					1,000	
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,297	822	2,297	822	2,297	822
CHIMAYO WATER PLAN					1,000	
EASTERN NEW MEXICO WATER SUPPLY						
EASTERN NEW MEXICO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMS	70		70		70	
ESPANOLA WATER DIVERSION					1,000	
JICARILLA APACHE RESERVATION RURAL WATER SYSTEM			500			
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	9,150	9,850	9,150	9,850	15,650	9,850
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE OFF-CHANNEL SANCTUARIES					2,000	
NAVAJO GALLUP WATER SUPPLY			500		500	
NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	180		180		180	
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT		181		181		181
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	1,134	3,567	1,134	3,567	1,134	3,567
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	150		150		150	
SANTA FE—WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT						
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	230		230		230	
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	56	7	56	7	56	7
NORTH DAKOTA						
DAKOTAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	237		237		237	
DAKOTAS TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	84		84		84	
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM, GARRISON DIVERSION	22,640	4,197	22,640	4,197	26,640	4,197
OKLAHOMA						
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	17	183	17	183	17	183
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	33	518	33	518	33	518
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	17	338	17	338	17	338

NORMAN PROJECT	17	384	17	384	17	384
NORMANIOR FEASISBILITY STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
NORTH FORK OF THE RED RIVER PROJECT, (OKLAHOMA INVESTI	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	155	.....	155	.....	155	.....
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	30	1,155	30	1,155	30	1,155
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	137	389	137	389	137	389
OREGON						
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	661	446	661	446	661	446
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,000	.....
DESCHUTES PROJECT	301	147	301	147	301	147
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	544	362	544	362	544	362
KLAMATH PROJECT	21,310	690	21,310	690	21,310	690
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	450	.....	450	.....	450	.....
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	780	223	780	223	780	223
SAVAGE RAPIDS DAM REMOVAL	1,000	.....	1,000	.....	2,000	.....
TUALATIN PROJECT	475	147	475	147	475	147
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY PROJECT	.....	.....	300	.....	300	.....
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
UMATILLA PROJECT	803	3,127	803	3,127	803	3,127
SOUTH DAKOTA						
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	15,000	.....	15,000	.....	20,000	.....
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	.....	15	.....	300	4,000	15
MNI WICONI PROJECT	22,447	7,053	14,947	7,053	26,447	7,053
PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER DISTRICT	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,000	.....
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM	.....	50	.....	50	.....	50
TEXAS						
BALMORHEA PROJECT	24	.....	24	.....	24	.....
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	69	97	69	97	69	97
EL PASO WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	.....	.....	100	.....	103	.....
LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES	50	.....	2,900	.....	50	.....
NUECES RIVER	36	503	36	503	36	503
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	17	344	17	344	17	344
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	214	.....	214	.....	214	.....
TRINITY RIVER WASTEWATER STUDY	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	.....
WILLIAMSON COUNTY WATER RECYLING PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
UTAH						
HYRUM PROJECT	125	30	125	30	125	30
MOON LAKE PROJECT	13	27	13	27	13	27
NEWTON PROJECT	43	23	43	23	43	23
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	154	.....	154	.....	654	.....
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	228	35	228	35	228	35
PARK CITY FEASIBILITY STUDY	.....	.....	500	.....	500	.....
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	894	319	894	319	894	319
PROVO RIVER PROJECT, DEER CREEK DAM	.....	4,900	.....	4,900	.....	4,900
SCOFIELD PROJECT	86	27	86	27	86	27
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	177	8	177	8	177	8
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,841	357	1,841	357	1,841	357
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, PINEVIEW PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	41	80	41	80	41	80
WASHINGTON						
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	4,047	7,616	4,047	7,616	4,047	7,616
LOWER ELWHA KLALLAM WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
MAKAH INDIAN COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	.....	.....	300	.....	300	.....
STORAGE DAM FISH PASSAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY	780	.....	780	.....	780	.....
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	300	.....	550	.....	950	.....
YAKIMA PROJECT	1,524	6,398	1,524	6,398	1,524	6,398
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER STORAGE	.....	.....	1,500	.....	1,500	.....
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	8,500	.....	7,000	.....	8,500	.....
WYOMING						
KENDRICK PROJECT	50	4,010	50	4,010	50	4,010
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	79	1,817	79	1,817	79	1,817
SHOSHONE PROJECT	62	740	62	740	62	740
WYOMING INVESTIGATION PROGRAM	40	.....	40	.....	40	.....

VARIOUS						
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I	.....	10,673	.....	10,673	.....	10,673
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II	10,000	.....	10,000	.....	10,000	.....
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5	6,293	3,403	6,293	3,403	6,293	3,403
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8	4,030	.....	4,030	.....	4,030	.....
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	465	.....	465	.....	465	.....
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,500	.....	1,500	.....	1,500
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	.....	44,578	.....	44,578	.....	44,578
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	.....	100	.....	100	.....	100
SAFETY OF EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	.....	18,500	.....	18,500	.....	18,500
DEPARTMENTAL IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,900	.....
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	.....	1,360	.....	1,360	.....	1,360
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	9,734	.....	9,734	.....	9,734	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,790	.....	1,790	.....	1,790	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	965	.....	965	.....	965	.....
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	.....	5,699	.....	5,699	.....	5,699
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,575	.....	1,575	.....	1,575
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	2,006	.....	2,006	.....	2,006	.....
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	7,000	.....	7,000	.....	7,000	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	17,894	.....	17,894	.....	17,894	.....
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	.....	631	.....	631	.....	631
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	7,525	.....	7,525	.....	9,025	.....
NATURAL RESOURCES DAMAGE ASSESSMENT	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,745	.....	1,745	.....	1,745	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	165	876	165	876	165	876
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN—OTHER PROJECTS	3,537	38,553	3,537	38,553	3,537	38,553
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	1,020	212	1,020	212	1,020	212
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	634	124	634	124	634	124
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	2,368	.....	2,368	.....	2,368	.....
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT—TITLE XXVIII	582	.....	582	.....	582	.....
RECREATION & FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,570	.....	1,570	.....	1,570	.....
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	25	.....	25	.....	11,025	.....
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	9,684	.....	9,684	.....	10,684	.....
SITE SECURITY	.....	50,000	.....	40,000	.....	50,000
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION	293	.....	293	.....	293	.....
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	1,884	.....	1,884	.....	1,884	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
TITLE XVI, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	1,229				4,229	
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECHNICAL SUPPORT	80		80		80	
WATER CONSERVATION FIELD SERVICE PROGRAM	8,950		9,875		9,250	
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM						
WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM						
WATER 2025	30,000				20,000	
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT					1,500	
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	−30,172		−6,967		−30,749	−2,978
RESCISSION—PUBLIC LAW 108–447						
Total, Water and Related Resources	409,892	391,677	449,488	382,462	510,870	388,699
	801,569		832,000		899,569	

Colorado Front Work and Levee System, AZ.—The Committee has included $8,200,000 for continuation of this project. Additional funds were provided above the budget request for continued work on the regulating reservoirs and for initiation of appropriate studies to determine if additional capacity can be economically realized behind Laguna Dam if sediment is removed. The Committee understands that these projects have the potential of saving as much as 300,000 acre-feet of Colorado River System water that would otherwise be over-delivered to Mexico. Due to the potential for such water savings (essentially Nevada's entire annual share of Colorado River Water), the Committee urges Reclamation to increase budgeting for these items.

South/Central Arizona Investigations Program, AZ.—Within the funds provided, the Committee has included $300,000 for the Central Arizona Salinity Study and $250,000 for the West Salt River Study.

Central Valley Project.—

—*Delta Division.*—Within the funds provided for the Delta Division, $4,000,000 is provided for the Interagency Ecological Program.

—*Friant Division.*—$200,000 has been provided for appraisal level studies of the Madera Irrigation District Water Supply Enhancement.

—*Miscellaneous Project Programs.*—Additional funds above the budget request are provided for the Kaweah River Delta Corridor Enhancement Study ($63,000) and the Sacramento Valley Regional Integrated Water Management Plan ($2,500,000).

—*Sacramento River Division.*—Additional funds above the budget request are provided to complete the Glen Colusa Irrigation District Fish Screen Improvement Project.

—*Trinity River Division.*—The Committee has provided $500,000 above the budget request for the Fishery Restoration program. These funds are to be used in concert with the $2,000,000 provided in the Central Valley Project Restoration Program to meet Federal trust responsibilities to protect the fishery resources of the Hoopa Valley Tribe. The Commissioner is urged to continue to support a Co-Management Agreement between the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Animas-La Plata, CO.—The Committee has provided $60,000,000 for construction of this project.

Colorado-Big Thompson Project, CO.—The Committee is aware of the recently completed pipeline study and urges Reclamation to work with the stakeholders with relation to the Colorado-Big Thompson project as authorities allow.

Fort Peck, Dry Prairie Rural Water System, MT.—The Committee has provided $19,000,000 for continued construction of the project.

Lahontan Basin Project, NV.—The Committee has learned that dam safety issues have arisen concerning Tahoe Dam. As this dam provides more than 70 percent of the water supply for the area, it is imperative that safety remediation activities be undertaken as soon as possible. The Committee understands that preliminary investigations are underway and will be continued with budgeted funds in fiscal year 2006. The Committee expects Reclamation to

ask for the appropriate funding level in the fiscal year 2007 budget to address safety issues.

Southern Nevada Water Recycling Project, NV.—The Committee has provided $3,423,000 to complete the Federal share of this project.

Chimayo Water Plan, NM.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to initiate this project.

Espanola Water Diversion, NM.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to initiate this project.

Middle Rio Grande Project, New Mexico.—The conferees support the reorganization of the Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program resulting in the Army Corps of Engineers in collaboration with the Fish and Wildlife Service taking responsibility to provide the administrative support for the program and the Army Corps of Engineers taking responsibility to meet the Reasonable and Prudent Alternative of the 2003 Biological Opinion required by section 205 of Public Law 108–447 (118 Stat 2949) other than the water acquisition and management functions set out in the Reasonable and Prudent Alternative. Additionally, the Army Corps of Engineers will assume responsibility for providing a detailed spending plan for fiscal year 2006 funds to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees for approval; completion of the baseline Long-Term Plan and completion of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement before the end of fiscal year 2006. The Bureau of Reclamation retains responsibility to meet the Reasonable and Prudent Alternative regarding water acquisition and management, including acquisition of water to meet the flow requirements articulated in the 2003 Biological Opinion and development of a long-term plan to meet these flow requirements. The conferees expect the Bureau of Reclamation to facilitate a smooth transition of administrative functions for the program to the Army Corps of Engineers and the Fish and Wildlife Service within 3 months of the beginning of fiscal year 2006. Of the total $25,500,000 provided for the Middle Rio Grande Project, the conferees have provided $12,900,000 for the collaborative program. Of these funds, The Bureau of Reclamation is provided $5,000,000 for water acquisition and associated administrative support within the Bureau; the Bureau is to transfer $7,500,000 to the Army Corps of Engineers to fund populations management, habitat restoration, water management studies, fish passage and river connectivity, minnow management, water quality, science and monitoring, biological opinion monitoring, and program management to meet the 2003 Biological Opinion Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives; and to provide $400,000 to the Fish and Wildlife Service for program management support. The cost-share requirements of the program remain 75 percent Federal/25 percent non-Federal for all activities except water acquisition and program administration. Non-Federal cost share may be provided through in-kind services and participation on the administration team.

Middle Rio Grande Off-Channel Sanctuaries, New Mexico.—The Committee provides $2,000,000 for completion of construction and initial operation of the off-channel sanctuary authorized under section 6014 of Public Law 109–13.

Norman, OK.—The Committee has included $300,000 to initiate this study.

Deschutes Ecosystem Restoration Project, OR.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 to continue this project.

Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project, SD.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 to close out this project that was completed in fiscal year 2005.

El Paso, Water Reclamation and Reuse, TX.—The Committee has included $103,000 to complete the project as currently authorized.

Williamson County Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, TX.—The Committee has provided $200,000 to initiate this project.

Northern Utah Investigations Program, UT.—The Committee has included an additional $500,000 for the Rural Water Technology Alliance.

Washington Investigations Program, WA.—The Committee has provided $950,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, $600,000 is for the Odessa Sub Area study, and $50,000 is for the West Canal study.

Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title I.—The Committee is concerned about drought conditions in the west and particularly how they relate to the Colorado River System. As was discussed under the Colorado Front Work and Levee System Project, it is imperative that Reclamation, working with the stakeholders, determine how to retain additional water in the system to avoid making excess releases to Mexico.

The Yuma desalting plant was constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation to address Treaty water, quality and quantity, issues with Mexico; however, it has never been operated at more than about one-third capacity for about 6 months. Without the plant, about 100,000 acre feet of Colorado River water is bypassed to Mexico through the Welton-Mohawk Drain. Treaty obligations have been met by other means over the last 10–12 years rather than using the desalting plant. However, with the persistent drought the loss of that 100,000 acre feet of water is becoming more of an issue as Lake Mead and Lake Powell have dropped.

The Committee understands that the Yuma plant is antiquated and expensive to operate. However, it appears to the Committee that it might be the best short-term alternative to respond to the drought. Therefore, the Committee directs the Commissioner of Reclamation to provide an engineering report to the Committee no later than 30 days after the enactment of this act detailing the costs and current progress towards modernizing the Yuma plant to where it could be used as intended. Further, the Committee directs the Commissioner to include realistic operational costs in the report for the plant. The Committee would entertain discussions of alternate ideas for water sources or operation of the plant provided they do not infringe upon property rights, state or local laws.

Departmental Irrigation Program.—The Committee has provided $1,900,000 for this program. $150,000 is provided for the Uncompaghre selenium control project and $1,750,000 is for irrigation modernization activities for Elephant Butte Irrigation District.

Drought Emergency Assistance.—The Committee has provided the budget request for this program. Within the funds provided,

the Committee urges Reclamation to provide full and fair consideration for drought assistance from the State of Hawaii.

Native American Affairs Program.—Additional funds provided above the budget request are for continued work on the AAMODT settlement.

Research and Development, Science and Technology Program.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 above the request for the further refinement of the Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model in collaboration with the Army Corps of Engineers and Sandia National Laboratories.

Research and Development, Desalination Research and Development Program.—The Committee has provided $11,025,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, $4,000,000 is for desalination R&D efforts directed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Committee continues to urge the Bureau of Reclamation to place a higher priority on desalination activities in future budgets given the importance of sustainable water supplies to the West and to other regions of the country. Additionally, the Committee has provided $7,000,000 for the completion of construction of the Tularosa Basin Desalination Facility, New Mexico and initial operation. Upon completion of the facility, the Bureau is directed to select an organization to operate the facility under Bureau direction. In this selection the Bureau should give priority to local education institutions who have expertise, do not need to relocate and have on-going water research activities.

Site Security.—The Committee has provided the budget request for this item and directs that increased security costs continue to be non-reimbursible until the Committee notifies Reclamation otherwise.

Title XVI, Water Reclamation and Reuse.—The Committee has provided $4,229,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, the Committee has included $3,000,000 for the WateReuse Foundation. These funds shall be available to support the Foundation's research priorities.

Water Conservation Field Service Program.—The Committee has included $300,000 for urban water conservation projects identified through the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Innovative Conservation Program that will increase water-use efficiency. In addition, $100,000 is provided for the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate a study to identify concurrent and overlapping Government programs aimed at improving water resource efficiency. It is hoped that the study will encourage agencies to look beyond their individual areas of responsibility in an effort to bring about greater resource efficiencies to the Southern California region.

Water 2025.—The dire drought the West is currently experiencing, combined with an unprecedented number of water users and endangered species and related requirements, make water use efficiencies more critical than ever. The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for this initiative proposed by the administration. The Committee believes that water resource and efficiency issues, combined with the drought and endangered species listings, make the Rio Grande River in New Mexico the embodiment of the Water 2025 initiative. Therefore, the Committee has included $1,000,000

to provide for continued efficiency and water improvements related to the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District and $1,000,000 for work related to water efficiency and supply supplementation in the Pecos consistent with the partnership between the Carlsbad Irrigation District and the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission. A critical component of reducing tension among multiple water users is collaborative planning and joint operations. Within the funds provided, $2,000,000 is for the Desert Research Institute to address water quality and environmental issues in ways that will bring industry and regulators to mutually acceptable answers.

Wetlands Development.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 for the Yuma East Wetlands project.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2005	$54,628,000
Budget estimate, 2006	52,219,000
House allowance	52,219,000
Committee recommendation	52,219,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $52,219,000, the same as the budget request for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund.

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

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2005	.....
Budget estimate, 2006	$35,000,000
House allowance	35,000,000
Committee recommendation	37,000,000

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

The Committee has provided $37,000,000, $2,000,000 above the budget request for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program. The Committee is aware of recent declines in the Delta smelt population in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Within the funds provided, $1,000,000 is for the Interagency Ecological Program to identify the causes of and propose remedies for the smelt's population decline

and $1,000,000 is for the Westside Regional Drainage Program in the San Luis Division of the Central Valley Project.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2005	$57,688,000
Budget estimate, 2006	57,917,000
House allowance	57,917,000
Committee recommendation	57,917,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is $57,917,000. This is the same as the budget request.

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

Bureau of Reclamation Transformation for the Future.—The Committee notes that the core activities of the Bureau have largely transitioned from design and construction of dams and power plants to maintenance, repair, and renovation of these facilities. It is appropriate to ask whether Reclamation has the appropriate organizational structure, core competencies, and resource allocations to meet the current realities of the Bureau's mission. The Committee therefore directs that Reclamation contract with the National Research Council to conduct a study to advise Reclamation on the appropriate organizational, management, and resource configurations to meet its construction, maintenance, and infrastructure missions of the 21st Century. Once completed, the Bureau shall submit the findings to the Committee.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

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

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

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

Section 204. The bill includes language authorizing Water 2025 and making it permanent.

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

Section 206. The bill includes language extending the Desalination Act by 5 years, regarding the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson Reservoir in California.

Section 207. The bill includes language extendeing the completion date for the Animas-La Plata.

Section 208. The bill includes language regarding the Humbolt Project Title transfer.

Section 209. The bill includes language regarding Desert Terminus Lakes.

Section 210. The bill includes language authorizing a feasibility study for Norman, OK.

Section 211. The Committee has included a provision concerning Animas-La Plata.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Title III provides for the Department of Energy's programs relating to energy supply, environmental management, science, national security and other related programs, including the power marketing administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

REPROGRAMMINGS

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

Reprogrammings should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change program, project, or activity allocations specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require such changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee and be fully explained and justified. The Committee has not provided the Department with any internal reprogramming flexibility in fiscal year 2005, unless specifically identified in the House, Senate, or conference reports. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the Committees in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENTS

The Committee is concerned that the Department of Energy's current efforts at breaking out procurements for small business contracts do not represent a systematic approach for consideration of small business statutory goals together with other legitimate acquisition objectives.

Beginning with its roots in the Manhattan Project, the Department of Energy [DOE] has executed a broad mandate with regard to the Nation's nuclear and energy challenges. The Department maintains the primary responsibility for energy security, ensuring the safety, security and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile, cleaning up the environment from the legacy of the Cold War, and developing innovations in science and technology. A significant portion of DOE's mission (approximately 83 percent of DOE's budget)

is carried out by industrial and academic contractors operating DOE-owned plants and laboratories under large facilities management contracts where it is essential to meeting mission needs for the work to be fully integrated at a site. Although DOE has aggressively sought out new opportunities for small businesses as both prime contractors and subcontractors, there is a limit to what it can do since DOE's facility management contracts are not, for the most part, suitable for award to small businesses as prime contractors.

Nevertheless, DOE has increased the amount of DOE dollars awarded to small businesses and over $4,000,000,000 a year is awarded to small businesses under DOE prime contracts and subcontracts. However, DOE's recent innovative efforts to increase small business prime contracts have met with mixed results. For example, major small business set-a-sides by the Office of Environmental Management [EM] have continued EM's preferred, but complicated, cost-plus-incentive fee type contracts for mission reasons, but have also attempted to streamline the process for small businesses. The complexities of the Federal procurement process and the clean up mission requirements for these procurements often resulted in schedule delays which negatively impact the small business participants who may be less able to absorb such delays than larger businesses may be. NNSA's attempts to break out work from facility management contracts have been met with concerns over mission fragmentation and the ability to properly administer new cadres of newly awarded prime Federal contracts.

Language was included in section 6022 of Public Law 109–13, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror and Tsunami Relief Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–13) directing the Secretary of Energy and Administrator of the Small Business Administration to negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding on developing a better methodology of counting prime and subcontracts awarded by the Department of Energy's management and operating, management and integration and other facility management prime contractors. During this period of negotiation, the Committee expects the Department and the National Nuclear Security Administration to refrain from implementing new contracting schemes, such as the Tri-lab Initiative, until an MOU has been filed with the Congress. Consistent with section 6022 of the Emergency Supplemental, the Committee also urges the Department to increase it efforts to ensure that any efforts to break out of prime contracts are provided to local small businesses.

Contracting requirements for the Department designed to assist small businesses access the Federal procurement market has created inequitable competition amongst 8(a) firms. In the attempt to comply with the current contracting requirements, the Department has turned to Alaska Native Corporations [ANC] as a means to increase its Federal prime contracting numbers. Since October 2003, the Department has signed contracts with Alaska Native Corporations totaling more that $500,000,000 as 8(a) firms, despite the size and income of some ANCs. In New Mexico, for example, the National Nuclear Security Administration has used ANC contractors at the expense of New Mexico small businesses.

The Committee is aware of an ongoing Government Accountability Office [GAO] investigation into Federal contracting rules that are applied to Indian tribes and Native American businesses, including Alaska Native Corporations and Hawaiian Native Organizations. The Committee looks forward to the completion of the GAO report and the study conducted by the Department so that it may identify where appropriate reforms are necessary to ensure that the spirit of the Small Business Act is fulfilled.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY LABS

In February 2005, the Government Accountability Office [GAO] issued a report entitled, "Equal Employment Opportunity: Information on Personnel Actions, Employee Concerns, and Oversight at Six Department of Energy Laboratories" (GAO–05–190). This report examined six Department of Energy laboratories to determine whether differences existed for managerial and professional women and minorities compared with men and whites in salaries, merit pay increases, separation patterns, and promotion rates; what concerns these women and minorities have raised; and how the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs [OFCCP] and the Department of Energy are responding to these issues. Based on the recommendations of the GAO, the Committee directs the Department of Energy to work with Department of Labor's OFCCP to determine the causes of the disparities and take the necessary corrective steps to address the problems identified.

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT [LDRD]

The Committee is concerned with the continued lack of recognition of the value of the LDRD, Plant Directed Research and Development [PDRD] and Site Directed Research and Development [SDRD] programs to DOE, other Federal agencies, and the American taxpayer. For example, the most recent DOE report submitted to Congress on the LDRD program clearly indicates that other Federal agencies continue to receive a very favorable return on their limited investment in the LDRD program. The LDRD program continues to provide solutions to future science and defense mission needs before program problems or requirements are even realized.

Building on extensive understanding of radiation transport, LDRD efforts successfully developed a method for simulating dose response in radiation treatment of cancer. This system, dubbed Peregrine, has been licensed and approved by the FDA, and is currently in use for treating patients. The technology is a substantial improvement over previous approaches, providing more precise targeting of cancerous cells with radiation therapy, lowering the overall dose to the patient, and protecting healthy tissue from unnecessary exposure. LDRD research has resulted in systems for detecting biological and chemical warfare agents which have been deployed in recent combat zones. Specifically, Sniffer-Star has as its core technology the "chem-lab-on-a-chip" developed under the LDRD program, and has been flown over combat areas on unmanned aerial vehicles, ensuring that these areas were safe for our troops.

The LDRD program provides the Nation the flexibility needed to support various research activities that result in many additional

scientific breakthroughs and advances that would not have occurred otherwise, since DOE program funding is limited in its ability to fund these critical research efforts. Limiting the amount of funding provided to this program is counter-intuitive to the continued strength of American science and defense programs in the long run, and the Committee strongly resists any penny-wise but pound-foolish calls to arbitrarily limit the amounts provided for LDRD.

As currently structured, the LDRD program ensures that a very small fraction of the laboratories' budgets are invested in innovative research and new ideas that are relevant to the missions of DOE/NNSA and the laboratories. In fact, the current funding level for the LDRD program is relatively small compared to the overall laboratory and Departmental budgets, but the program has been able to produce significant scientific and technical results that benefit the Nation's science and defense missions, and the Committee is hard-pressed to think of another program that produces results as beneficial to the taxpayer with such a paltry amount of funds. In this regard, the Committee is concerned that the current funding ceiling for the LDRD program is not adequate to continue to achieve the objectives of the program. Therefore, we recommend the LDRD funding ceiling be raised to effectively meet the increasing challenges faced by the laboratories to maintain their critical scientific competencies and attract and retain the best and brightest scientists. The new LDRD funding ceiling shall now be set at 8 percent (up from the current 6 percent) and PDRD and SDRD shall now be set at 4 percent (up from the current 2 percent) and continue to be annually approved by the Department.

Further, the Committee would like to compliment the Department for its strong and effective management of the LDRD program. The Department has been subject to several internal and external reviews over the last 5 years which have indicated the LDRD program continues to be well-managed by the Department. In fact, the most recent GAO review specifically indicated that DOE has implemented procedures for the LDRD program to ensure compliance with existing laws. The report also states that the GAO contacted the CFO and/or General Counsel of six Federal agencies and "each agency told us that the LDRD program's inclusion as an indirect cost does not limit their ability to comply with their agency's statutory or appropriations requirements. Similarly, none of the research managers and/or contracting officers at the agencies expressed concern about the LDRD program or its funding method." The White House Federal Laboratory Review Panel (called the Packard Panel) recommended the Federal laboratories conduct discretionary research programs at the 5–10 percent level with appropriate Federal oversight. The Panel's report also states:

"If U.S. taxpayers are to get the most return from their support of R&D, government laboratories must have sufficient discretionary funding for independent research and development. Almost every laboratory has found that the most important innovation often comes from the scientists' independent ideas or actions. Thus the productivity of the U.S. R&D establishment depends on a vigorous independent R&D program."

Over the years, LDRD-funded research has resulted in many scientific breakthroughs and advances, benefiting and furthering not only DOE's mission, but the missions of all sponsors of work at the laboratories. LDRD is a cost of doing business at the laboratories, and the Department should continue to ensure its laboratories distribute LDRD as indirect costs, in accordance with cost accounting standards [CAS], to all work performed at its laboratories. The Department must maintain a funding mechanism that is: (1) stable, to ensure the laboratories continue to perform long-term, fundamental research—which is among their most distinctive contributions to the Nation; (2) flexible because of the uniqueness of each institution; (3) equitable for all customers; and (4) consistent with cost accounting standards in order to allocate expenses to cost objectives that cause, or benefit from, the expenses in accordance with CAS (a model consistent with government contracts placed with private industry). The Committee supports the current method for accumulating LDRD program dollars and believes that it is a fair and equitable approach to funding the program. Therefore, funds provided in Title III of this Act may be used to finance the total cost of work performed for other Federal sponsors, including LDRD costs, until they are reimbursed through the Department's normal billing and collection processes.

Given the evidence reiterating the well managed LDRD program and the public benefits it provides, the Committee strongly supports the LDRD program as currently structured and managed by the Department, and specifically rejects the program changes suggested by the House Committee on Appropriations in their report (House Report 109–86) accompanying the fiscal year 2006 Energy and Water Appropriations bill. The Department and its laboratories have clearly demonstrated the need for the LDRD program to continue. The Committee recognizes LDRD as a legitimate cost for keeping the laboratories vibrant, cutting edge and creative in ideas and new fields, and thereby benefits all customers using the DOE laboratories as well as the DOE and its missions. For the future of the Department and its laboratories, the Committee suggests that the Secretary of Energy should consider expanding the LDRD program to other DOE laboratories to further enhance the clear benefits of the program.

The Committee recognizes that scientific discovery does not always coincide with the annul budget cycles and promising scientific discovery occasionally fails to capture the attention of this Committee. The LDRD program will continue to provide scientists the best opportunity to pursue discoveries as they develop, regardless if it was never contemplated by the Congress or the Office of Management and Budget. The Committee strongly endorses the LDRD program, as authorized, to ensure researchers sufficient funding and flexibility to pursue useful and relevant scientific discovery.

ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION

Appropriations, 2005	$1,806,936,000
Budget estimate, 2006	1,749,446,000
House allowance	1,763,888,000
Committee recommendation	1,945,330,000

The purposes of the programs funded under Energy Supply are to develop new energy technologies and improve existing energy technologies through basic and applied research and targeted programs in technology development. This account provides funds for both operating expenses and capital equipment for the advancement of the various energy technologies.

The Energy Supply and Conservation account includes the following programs: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Nuclear Energy, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense) and Legacy Management. Energy Conservation programs previously funded by the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act are now funded by the Energy Supply and Conservation appropriation, and are combined with energy efficiency activities in the Energy Supply and Conservation activities. These funds shall remain available until expended.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation provides $1,253,819,000 for renewable energy resources, an increase of $53,405,000 from the current year level.

This program undertakes research and development of renewable energy and related technologies to meet the growing need for clean and affordable energy. Program activities range from basic research in universities and national laboratories to cost-shared applied research, development, and field validation in partnership with the private sector.

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. The Committee continues to support the efforts of the National Center on Energy Management and Building Technologies to improve energy efficiency in buildings. The Committee directs that this project shall be subject to the cost-sharing requirements of a research project rather than a demonstration project and directs the Department to continue to fund this project at the fiscal year 2005 level of $5,000,000.

Hydrogen Research.—As a key component of the President's Hydrogen Fuel Initiative, this program develops hydrogen production, storage and delivery technologies that are more energy efficient, cleaner, safer and lower in cost. The long-term aim is to develop hydrogen technologies that will allow the Nation to aggressively move forward to achieve a vision of a cleaner, more secure energy future. Current research will facilitate a decision by industry to commercialize hydrogen-powered fuel cell vehicles by 2015.

As such, the Committee recommendation includes $182,694,000 for hydrogen research, which is consistent with the request and $13,188,000 above the current year level. The Committee also directs the Department to provide the budget request for Hydrogen Storage Centers of Excellence.

The Committee recognizes the importance of DOE's "Controlled Hydrogen Fleet and Infrastructure Demonstration Validation Program" for further development of hydrogen technology to meet our

Nation's energy needs. This demonstration program is unique in that for the first time vehicles and energy infrastructure are integrated in real world settings that serve as test laboratories. The DOE requires extensive data collection and sharing that will be used to help advance this technology towards commercialization. The demonstration program requires full cost sharing. The Committee specifically provides $14,900,000 for infrastructure and $24,000,000 for vehicles for the demonstration projects as requested in the Department's fiscal year 2006 budget.

Industrial consumption of hydrogen, especially by the petrochemical and fertilizer communities is large and growing. The rate of petro-chemical hydrogen consumption necessary for gasoline-powered vehicles will accelerate as global reserves of sweet crude oil diminish. The dominant resource for hydrogen production today is natural gas whose reformation into hydrogen and carbon dioxide contributes significantly to atmospheric greenhouse gases. Moreover, natural gas reserves are insufficient to service simultaneously domestic heating and electricity requirements, industrial hydrogen consumption, and future demands by hydrogen powered vehicles and other fuel cell applications that would accompany the future "Hydrogen Economy." Thus, the Committee recommendation seeks to focus the resources of the initiative on developing the most economical means of producing hydrogen from renewable sources and nuclear power. In addition, the Committee supports the recommendations of the National Academy of Science, and requests that the Department integrate their recommendations into the program. The Committee is aware of an ethanol-to-hydrogen fueling station and vehicle demonstration project in Chicago and encourages the Department to provide appropriate technical and financial assistance.

For the UNLV Research Foundation the Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 to continue evaluation of solar-powered thermochemical production of hydrogen and $4,000,000 for on-going hydrogen fuel cell and storage research and development.

Biomass/Biofuels—Energy Systems.—The Committee recommendation includes $92,164,000 for biomass/biofuels energy systems, an increase of $20,000,000 above the request.

The Committee believes that the Regional Biomass Energy Program [RBEP] has been a successful partnership with the five distinct regions it has served. The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000 for product development for the State and Regional Partnership Activity, of which $11,000,000 shall be provided to establish the Southeastern Center at Mississippi State University to support regional biomass research and development efforts and identify the best commercial opportunities in the Southeast for the use of biofuels and biomass to reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommends $5,000,000, the amount of the budget request, for the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory to sustain the bioproducts program focused on catalysis and fungal biotechnology for replacing petroleum derived chemicals and materials.

The Committee recommendation also includes $4,000,000 for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, a successful consor-

tium of 34 universities and 33 agribusinesses and trade associations.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommends $23,299,000 for geothermal technology development, the same as the request, including continued funding (at current year levels) for GeoPowering the West. The Committee recommendation also includes $1,300,000 for the Geothermal and Renewable Energy Laboratory of Nevada; $500,000 to continue funding of operations at the GeoHeat Center at Oregon Institute of Technology; and $500,000 for the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe Energy Project.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommends $500,000 for hydropower, the same as the budget request.

Solar Energy.—The Committee recommendation for solar energy programs is $83,953,000.

The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the Southeast and Southwest photovoltaic experiment stations. The Committee recommends $1,200,000 for Sandia National Laboratories for the development of advanced cells and modules using ultra-thin back-contact multicrystalline-silicon solar cells employing micromachining. The Department should continue to fully support the public/private Million Solar Roofs initiative or another effective solar deployment program. The Committee recommendation includes $11,000,000 from within available funds for concentrating solar power, including $5,000,000 to validate the commercial viability by supporting a one megawatt demonstration at Sandia National Laboratory for dish concentrating solar power.

Wind.—The Committee recommendation includes $34,249,000 for wind energy systems. The Committee recognizes that wind energy has succeeded in penetrating the energy markets as a cost-effective renewable energy resource. Between 1990 and 2003, the United States added 6,347 MW of wind-based generating capacity. The Committee concurs with the assessment of the Government Accountability Office in its September 2004 report (GAO–04–756) that noted that the driving factor behind wind deployment is the production of tax credit.

The budget request also provides support for offshore wind research and development. Due to Federal regulatory uncertainty in permitting offshore facilities, the Committee recommends that the Department not expend any funds to support offshore wind energy research until the Federal rules and permitting requirements are implemented through legislation. In addition, the Committee recognizes that the intermittent nature of wind energy has made interconnection to the electricity grid a barrier to entry. The Committee supports Federal efforts to integrate renewable energy, but believes this activity is better suited to the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.

Vehicles Technology.—This program was previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and now is funded within the Energy Supply and Conservation account of this Act. The mission of the Vehicle Technologies Program is to develop more energy efficient and environmentally friendly highway transportation technologies that will enable America to use significantly less petroleum. The long-term aim is to develop "leapfrog" technologies that through improve-

ments in vehicle energy efficiency will provide Americans with continuing freedom of mobility and greater energy security, at lower costs and with lower impacts on the environment than current vehicles. The program focuses its research and development investments specifically on potential technology improvements that have uncertain or long-term outcomes, yet have significant public benefit. The high risks associated with these projects make it unlikely that they would be pursued by industry alone. The Committee recommends $199,943,000, an increase of $34,000,000 above the request. The Committee includes $15,000,000 above the budget request for the Oak Ridge National Lab to be divided evenly between materials development and computational modeling to develop more energy efficient and environmentally friendly highway transportation technologies. The Committee provides an additional $4,500,000 for the CAVS Center located at Mississippi State University. The Committee also recommends an additional $2,600,000 to support the VULCAN beam line. Within available funds, $2,000,000 is provided for the Transportable Emissions Testing Laboratory; $1,000,000 is provided for the lightweight composite materials for heavy duty vehicles program; and $500,000 is provided for the hydrogen natural gas vehicles cylinder safety, inspection and maintenance program. The Committee recommendation includes $3,500,000, the same as current year, for the Off-Highway Program. The Committee expects the Department to fund the Automotive Lightweight Vehicles program account at the President's request of $18,000,000. The Committee recommends $12,000,000 for support of natural gas fueled vehicles. The Committee recognizes the Department's cooperative turbocharger research and development program and its contribution to increasing fuel efficiency in diesel engines. The Committee urges the continuation of the turbocharger initiative and seeks to facilitate the integration of such technology into engine and vehicle designs.

The Committee recognizes the need to ensure that materials research funding within the vehicles technology program supports strategic advances in science and innovation and the long-term competitiveness of U.S. industry. The Committee directs DOE to expand research in the area of computational predictive engineering and testing of lightweight thermoplastic polymer composites as an enabling technology supporting the future design and manufacture of safer, more fuel efficient, and lower emissions vehicles competitive in global markets. In addition, the Committee acknowledges the important work in this area being undertaken by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and Oak Ridge National Laboratory in cooperation with the American Plastics Council.

Building Technologies.—This program was previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and now is funded within the Energy Supply and Conservation account of this Act. The Building Technologies program aims to reduce energy use in homes and commercial buildings by developing advanced lighting and appliances which, when coupled with improved building design, will yield maximum results. The Committee recommends $67,000,000, which includes $22,000,000 for lighting R&D, an increase of $5,000,000 to support through this office and the Office of Science a National

Center for Solid State Lighting Research affiliated with the Center for Integrated Nanotechnologies. The Committee recommendation also includes $20,000,000, an increase of $2,250,000 above the request, for Residential Buildings Research. The Committee notes there are a number of proposed activities within the Building Technologies program that seek to reduce electricity through demand side management. The Secretary should consider transferring these activities to the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability. At a minimum, the Committee directs the Department to provide the Committee with a brief report on how the research between the two programs will add value to both programs and not needlessly duplicate research efforts. The Committee recommendation includes a $4,000,000 increase for Thermal Energy Technologies. Within the $12,000,000 recommended, $4,000,000 is for gas engine-driven heat pump development; $2,000,000 shall be used to complete the on-going Ammonia Absorption Technology Development for HVAC&R activity; $2,500,000 shall be available for a CHP engineering prototype & field test activity of ammonia absorption technology; Desiccant research shall be continued at a level of $1,500,000; and heat and mass transfer activities shall be continued at a level of $2,000,000.

Industrial Technologies.—This program was previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and now is funded within the Energy Supply and Conservation account of this Act. The Industrial Technologies program aims to develop more efficient industrial processes in energy intensive industries through the cost-sharing of research. The Committee recommends $56,489,000.

FEDERAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

This program was previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and now is funded within the Energy Supply and Conservation account of this act. The Federal Energy Management Program advances energy efficiency and use of renewable energy in Federal buildings through financial and technical assistance and project evaluation. The Committee recommends $17,147,000 for Federal Energy Management Programs.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommendation for Facilities and Infrastructure is $16,315,000. The recommendation includes $5,800,000 for operation and maintenance of facilities and $10,515,000 for construction of Project 04–E–001, Science and Technology Facility, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, Colorado.

WEATHERIZATION AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES

The mission of the Weatherization and Intergovernmental Program is to develop and accelerate the adoption of energy efficiency, renewable energy, and oil displacement technologies and practices by a wide range of stakeholders. These include State and local governments, weatherization agencies, communities, companies, fleet managers, building code officials, technology developers, Native

American tribal governments, and international agencies. This program was previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and now is funded within the Energy Supply and Conservation account of this Act. The Committee recommends $240,000,000 for weatherization assistance program grants, an increase of $15,000,000 above the request, $4,600,000 for training and technical assistance, $41,000,000 for State energy program grants, $500,000 for State energy activities, and $26,657,000 for gateway deployment. The Committee recommends that gateway deployment funds be distributed as follows: $6,571,000 for Rebuild America; $350,000 for energy efficiency information and outreach; $4,550,000 for building codes training and assistance; $6,510,000 for Clean Cities; $5,776,000 for Energy Star; and $2,400,000 for inventions and innovations. The intergovernmental total includes $2,910,000 for the International Renewable Energy program to promote the use of renewable energy resources in international markets. The Committee directs the Department to avoid using funds appropriated to the International Renewable Energy Program to fund domestic programs and projects. From within the funds provided, the Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the Renewable Energy Production Incentive [REPI]. The Intergovernmental total includes $4,000,000 for the tribal energy program to help Native Americans develop renewable energy resources on their lands and help tribal leaders develop energy plans. Within the funds provided to the tribal energy program, the Committee includes $1,000,000 for the Council of Renewable Energy Resource Tribes [CERT] to provide technical expertise and training of Native Americans in renewable energy resource development and electric generation facilities management.

The Committee provides $600,000 above the President's request, to be made available to the Office of International Energy Market Development in the Department of Energy to carry out a program in support of the multi-agency Clean Energy Technology Exports Initiative.

Program Support.—The Committee recommendation for Program Support is $9,456,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 to continue the efforts of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory [NREL] to develop renewable energy resources uniquely suited to the Southwestern United States through its virtual site office in Nevada.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation for Program Direction is $86,524,000.

Regional Offices.—The Committee recognizes and applauds EERE's efforts to strengthen project management through its creation of the EERE Project Management Center [PMC] and notes that the National Academy for Public Administration has identified it as a best management practice in the Department of Energy. To accelerate and strengthen its development, the Committee directs that the six Regional Offices be consolidated into the PMC locations at the Golden Field Office and the National Energy Technology Laboratory. To allow for an orderly implementation, contract close-out and personnel relocations, the Committee provides that this consolidation be fully implemented by June 1, 2006. The Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy originally estab-

lished 10 regional offices in 1973 in response to the Arab Oil Embargo. The original function of the offices was to coordinate gasoline and petroleum allocations to distributors and resellers and to promote energy conservation. They were located in what used to be standard Federal Regions. In addition to the current regional offices in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Philadelphia, and Seattle, offices were located in San Francisco/Oakland, Kansas City, New York City, and Dallas. In 1996, as part of Secretary O'Leary's Strategic Realignment Initiative, regional offices in San Francisco, Dallas, Kansas City and New York City were closed and the programmatic responsibilities of those offices were distributed among the remaining regions. In order to support weatherization assistance, the Committee recommends the Department close the remaining offices and develop a more cost effective outreach plan that minimizes the impact on employees. The Committee has reserved 20 percent for necessary close-out cost and severance payments. The Committee recognizes this is a Presidential priority and is confident the distribution of the formula based grants will not be negatively impacted. The Committee will apply $15,000,000 toward weatherization grants.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes the following congressionally directed projects. The Committee has provided sufficient funding to cover the cost of these additions so as not to impact essential research.

—$1,000,000 for Missouri biodiesel demonstration project (Biomass);
—$2,000,000 for Alternative Uses for Asphalt Shingle Waste, UT (Biomass);
—$1,200,000 for Auburn Alternative Fuel Source Study of Cement Kilns, AL (Biomass);
—$1,000,000 for Canola-based Automotive Oil Research and Development, PA (Biomass);
—$1,000,000 for Center for Advanced Bio-based Binders, IA (Biomass);
—$1,000,000 for Biomass Power for Rural Development, IA (Biomass);
—$500,000 for the Development of Applied membrane Technology for Processing Ethanol from Biomass, DE (Biomass);
—$500,000 for the National Ag-Based Industrial Lubricants Center at the University of Northern Iowa (Biomass);
—$1,000,000 for the University of North Dakota Center for Biomass Utilization (Biomass);
—$1,000,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Institute (Biomass);
—$500,000 for the Washington State Ferries Biodiesel Demonstration Project (Biomass);
—$500,000 for the Oxydiesel demonstration project in California and Nevada (Biomass);
—$500,000 for the Louisiana State University Biorefinery for Ethanol, Chemicals, Animal Feed and Biomaterials (Biomass);
—$500,000 for the Vermont Biomass Energy Resource Center (Biomass);
—$500,000 for a demonstration project on alternative sources of energy at St. Joseph College in West Hartford, CT (Biomass);

—$4,000,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation for development of biofuels utilizing ionic transfer membranes (Biomass);
—$500,000 for the Lake County Full Circle Project, CA (Geothermal);
—$3,000,000 for the Montana Palladium Research Center (Hydrogen);
—$1,100,000 for the Ohio Distributed Hydrogen Project (Hydrogen);
—$3,000,000 for the hydrogen fuel cell project for the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County, NV (Hydrogen);
—$500,000 for the production of Hydrogen at the Nanotechnology Center of Excellence University of Arkansas, Little Rock (Hydrogen);
—$4,000,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation for the renewable hydrogen refueling station system, including development of high pressure electrolysis using photovoltaics (Hydrogen);
—$3,000,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation for development of photoelectric chemical production of hydrogen (Hydrogen);
—$500,000 for the Michigan Technological University Fuel Cell Research, MI (Hydrogen);
—$500,000 for the University of Southern Mississippi's School of Polymers and High Performance Materials' Improved Materials for Fuel Cell Membranes program (Hydrogen);
—$5,000,000 for the photoelectrochemical generation of hydrogen by solid nanoporous titanium dioxide project at the University of Nevada-Reno (Hydrogen);
—$1,000,000 for the California Hydrogen Infrastructure Project (Hydrogen);
—$500,000 for the Southern Nevada Alternative Fuels Demonstration Project (Hydrogen);
—$400,000 for the University of Louisville Sustainable Buildings Project, KY (Building Technologies);
—$4,000,000 for the Hackensack University Medical Center Green Building, NJ (Building Technologies);
—$500,000 Portland Center Stage Armory Theater Energy Conservation Project, OR (Building Technologies);
—$1,000,000 for the Brigham City, UT Wind Energy Project (Wind);
—$1,500,000 for Alaska Wind Energy (Wind);
—$500,000 for Renewable Energy for Rural Economic Development [RERED] Program, UT (Wind);
—$500,000 for Synchronous Wind Turbines, ID (Wind);
—$2,000,000 for Texas Tech Great Plains Wind Power Test Facility (Wind);
—$500,000 for the North Dakota Hydrogen Wind Pilot Project, ND (Wind);
—$500,000 for the Fox Ridge Renewable Energy Education Center, SD (Wind);
—$250,000 for the PowerJet Wind Turbine project, NV (Wind);
—$300,000 for Portland State University's Solar Photovoltaic Test Facility System, OR (Solar);
—$1,000,000 for Next Generation Hydraulic Actuator Technology for Solar Power, OH (Solar);

—$3,000,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation for photonics research, including evaluation of advanced fiber optics for hybrid solar lighting (Solar);
—$2,000,000 for Waste Heat Recovery Program, IN (Vehicle Technologies);
—$500,000 for the Gerlach Green Energy Project, NV (Energy Conservation);
—$500,000 for the Minnesota Center for Renewable Energy, MN (Energy Conservation);
—$500,000 for the Wireless Sensor Network for Advanced Energy Management, WI (Energy Conservation); and
—$2,000,000 for ITM/Syngas Project (PA).

OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

Appropriations, 2005	$120,185,000
Budget estimate, 2006	95,604,000
House allowance	99,849,000
Committee recommendation	178,083,000

Electric Transmission and Distribution

Consistent with the direction from Congress in fiscal year 2005, this office has merged the old Offices of Transmission and Distribution and Energy Assurance to create this entity. The office has responsibility for modernizing our national electric grid to increase reliability and security and respond to widespread interruption or failure in our energy infrastructure. Without enforcement authority, this office will find numerous challenges in trying to lead a national reform effort. However, this office must support investment in research and development initiatives such as high temperature superconductivity and next generation wire, in areas where utilities or State regulatory authorities are unlikely to support such investment. These technological developments have the potential to drastically increase line capacity and serve areas that are currently transmission constrained as a result of either an unwillingness or inability to increase transmission capacity. This office should also take the lead in working to integrate alternative technologies such as distributed generation and renewable energy sources into the grid for the Department of Energy. This office also has the responsibility for understanding and correcting vulnerabilities in our energy transmission infrastructure. Drawing on the technical expertise of our national laboratories through testing on Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition [SCADA] systems this office should identify and support the deployment of a technology based architecture that will reduce the vulnerability of our energy infrastructure at both a cyber and physical level.

The Committee provides $178,083,000 for the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, an increase of $82,479,000 over the budget request.

Research and Development.—The Committee provides $128,386,000, an increase of $56,629,000 above the budget request. This increase is a result of transferring the Distributed Generation program to the Office of Electricity Reliability and Energy Assurance.

The Committee recommends $50,500,000 for continued development of high temperature superconductivity [HTS], which promises to revolutionize electrical generation, transmission and distribution, conditioning and, ultimately, consumption. This is an increase of $5,500,000.

The Committee recommends eliminating funding for Gridwise and Gridworks and has shifted this funding to the R&D budget to support superconductivity research and transmission reliability. The Committee recommends $5,000,000 to conduct research and development at the National Energy Technology Laboratory associated with electricity transmission, distribution and energy assurance activities. Additionally, $2,500,000 shall be for the continued development of an energy information training facility at Camp Dawson, and related activities. The Committee recommendation also includes $1,000,000 for the integrated control of next generation power systems project at West Virginia University. The Committee provides $10,000,000 to support critical research at SCADA test facilities. The funds are to be equally divided between the Sandia and Idaho National Labs.

The Distributed Energy and Electricity Reliability Program.—This program was previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and is now funded within the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability [OE] account within this Act. The activities within this account complement the mission of OE and are consistent with the research and development initiatives related to advanced composite conductors and high temperature superconductive cable and wire. If the distributed generation platform is to be successfully deployed it must be integrated into the electricity transmission and distribution network, which is a primary responsibility for the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability. This program has been merged with the Electricity distribution transformation R&D program and the Committee recommends $64,666,000 to support these activities. Both programs are funded at the requested level. The Committee urges the Secretary to reorganize these activities as appropriate in the fiscal year 2007 budget request.

The Committee is aware that program managers with the Distributed Energy Program have failed to adequately support the telecommunications sector that has high electric power requirements and represents a critical element in our first response needs during emergencies. The Committee directs the Department to provide $3,000,000 for deployment testing and analysis of advanced energy storage systems for telecommunication applications in Kansas.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $15,477,000, an additional $4,000,000 for Program Direction to support the transition of staff to this new office and to properly align staff and mission responsibilities.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes the following congressional directed projects. The Committee has provided sufficient funding to cover the cost of these additions so as not to impact essential research.

—$5,000,000 for Hawaii/New Mexico Sustainable Energy Security Partnership [OE];

—$2,000,000 for the Navajo Electrification Project, NM [OE];
—$2,350,000 for Load Control System Reliability, MT [OE];
—$10,000,000 for SCADA test beds in New Mexico and Idaho [OE];
—$2,500,000 for advancing AC- and DC-power communications, OH [OE];
—$2,000,000 for Grid Computing in KY and its Impact of Research and Education Project [OE];
—$1,500,000 to University of Missouri-Rolla for electric grid modernization [OE]; and
—$1,000,000 for the Integrated Distribution Management System in Alabama [OE].

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2005	$385,568,000
Budget estimate, 2006	389,906,000
House allowance	377,701,000
Committee recommendation	449,906,000

The Committee recommendation provides $449,906,000 for nuclear energy, an increase of $60,000,000 above the request.

University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support.—The Committee recommends $24,000,000 for university reactor fuel assistance and support. The Committee recommends $4,500,000 from within available funds for the Institute of Nuclear Science and Engineering at the Idaho National Laboratory.

University nuclear engineering programs and university research reactors represent a fundamental and key capability in supporting our national policy goals in health physics, materials science and energy technology. The Committee strongly supports the University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support program's efforts to provide fellowships, scholarships, and grants to students enrolled in nuclear energy, science and engineering programs and related areas like health physics at U.S. universities, as well as efforts to provide fuel assistance and reactor upgrade funding for university-owned research reactors.

The Committee remains concerned about the ability of the Nation to respond to the growing demand for trained experts in nuclear science and technology in the face of financial and other challenges affecting engineering programs and research reactor facilities at American universities.

The Committee strongly endorses the administration's commitment to cooperate with the People's Republic of China in its expansion of nuclear power. The Committee believes that the deployment of advanced U.S. reactor technology is critical to meet the growing energy demands in China and to contribute to improved air quality.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy research and development includes a total of $251,000,000, an increase of $60,000,000 over the budget request.

Nuclear Energy Research Initiative.—The Committee strongly supports the NERI program. Consistent with the goals of the November 1997 President's Committee of Advisors on Science and

Technology [PCAST] that addresses energy research, the Committee directs the Department to maintain the existing, standalone NERI program that provides funding to peer-reviewed projects proposed by national laboratories, universities and industry on issues facing the nuclear energy industry. As provided in the PCAST report, research topics should include research into developing a proliferation resistant fuel cycle, improvements to reactor designs of new and existing designs, increased efficiency, as well as better knowledge of materials and fuel characteristics to support the Next Generation Nuclear Plant and Generation IV programs. The Committee is aware that the budget proposes to merge the NERI funding into the various research and development programs. The Committee concurs with the request and provides NERI funding in the following manner: $4,000,000 within the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative; $4,000,000 within the Generation IV program; and $2,000,000 for Nuclear Hydrogen Initiative.

Nuclear Power 2010.—The recommendation includes $76,000,000 for nuclear power 2010. The Department is directed to focus the resources on the demonstration of the regulatory licensing processes of 10 CFR Part 52 for early site permits, design certifications, and combined construction and operating licenses. This is to be cost-shared with industrial and governmental entities.

The Committee recommendation supports demonstration of key regulatory approval processes in order to encourage the deployment of new, advanced nuclear plants in the United States by the 2010 timeframe. The strong industry response to the Department's request for proposals for a Combined Operating License is a turning point in the future of nuclear energy in the country and presents the Department with a unique opportunity to facilitate the deployment of one or more new nuclear plants in a generation. Support for such a program is critical in order to diversify our electric generation fuel supply with the added benefit of not producing any greenhouse gas emissions.

Generation IV.—The recommendation includes $60,000,000 for the Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative, an increase of $15,000,000 over the request. The Committee directs $40,000,000 to be used for the Next Generation Nuclear Plant [NGNP] program. Prior to the submission of this budget the Office of Nuclear Energy had worked expeditiously on a process to select a reactor design from a competitive solicitation in order to deploy and test the design at the Idaho National Laboratory where it will serve as a test bed for electric and hydrogen cogeneration. The Department had received a strong response to the expression of interest and was preparing a request for proposal. Unfortunately, the current budget recommendation fails to adequately support the Next Generation Nuclear Plant. The Committee is concerned that the administration's strategy of collaborative international research lacks sufficient focus and doesn't support a specific schedule to facilitate the construction of a next generation reactor at the Idaho National Lab. The Generation IV budget should be used as an initiative to build and demonstrate new technologies and rebuild U.S. nuclear capabilities as opposed to the current proposal of indefinite research.

This funding shall be used to support a design competition conducted by DOE as well as fund R&D efforts linked to the NGNP program. The Committee urges the Department to complete the competition by the end of fiscal year 2006. The Committee expects the Department to submit a budget for fiscal year 2007 that will fund a pre-engineering design that is consistent with the goal of testing hydrogen production or electricity generation by 2017 at Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee encourages the Department to give priority consideration to fast spectrum technologies. Coupled with efforts of the Advanced Fuel Cycle initiative, research in this program must keep nonproliferation as a primary objective to reduce the amount of plutonium and other high level wastes that are a by-product of current technology. The Committee also recognizes that new advances in materials and fuels must be developed before these technologies can be deployed. In addition, the Department shall develop a R&D road map by which the Department identifies the current technical challenges, proposes a research and development plan to resolve existing fast spectrum challenges within the Generation IV program, and downselects to no more than two technologies by the end of fiscal year 2007. The Department shall provide a copy of the Generation IV R&D roadmap to the Committee by the end of fiscal year 2006.

The Committee remains interested in the potential use and application of small modular reactors that would be inherently safe, be relatively cost effective, contain intrinsic design features which would deter sabotage or diversion, require infrequent refuelings, and be primarily factory constructed and deliverable to remote sites. The Committee is particularly interested in design of a small modular fast reactor that can serve as both a test bed for small commercial reactors and to test fast spectrum technologies. Within available funds, $5,000,000 is provided for the development of high temperature fuel fabrication capabilities in Virginia, in support of the Generation IV program, under the direction of the Idaho National Laboratory.

Nuclear Hydrogen Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes $30,000,000, an increase of $10,000,000.

The Committee provides an additional $7,000,000 above the budget request for the Nuclear Hydrogen Initiative to accelerate essential materials research and development and component design, test and evaluation for implementing the high temperature sulfur-iodine water spitting process for hydrogen production necessary to the advanced reactor hydrogen co-generation project at Idaho National Laboratory. In addition, the Department is directed to establish a 5-year Cooperative Agreement with the UNLV Research Foundation for advanced Nuclear Hydrogen Initiative materials research and development.

Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes $85,000,000, an increase of $15,000,000 over the budget request. The initiative should continue to focus on development of fuel cycle technologies that minimize the toxicity of final waste products resulting from spent fuel while recovering energy remaining in spent fuel; minimize proliferation concerns and environmental impacts of the fuel cycle and minimize the number of reprocessing steps so as to minimize system costs. The initiative shall

assist the Secretary with development of alternative technology options.

Based on the success learned at the Savannah River Technology Center of the Uranium Extraction Technology, known as UREX in 2002, the Committee expects the Department to expand its efforts to advance research of aqueous spent fuel treatment and to begin the engineering scale demonstrations. The Committee recommends an additional $10,000,000 to accelerate the design activities associated with a proposed Engineering Scale Demonstration [ESD]. The ESD will provide the United States with the capability to conduct research and development into advanced spent fuel separations and transmutation from laboratory scale through engineering scale prior to commercial deployment. The budget request provided funds for pre-conceptual design activities only. This funding will allow completion of the conceptual design in fiscal year 2006 and enable preengineering design to commence in fiscal year 2007. In addition to studying light water reactors, the Committee expects the Department to evaluate fast reactors that are capable of destroying larger amounts of long-lived radioactive material.

To provide confidence in the technology options proposed, the project will use Department of Energy national laboratory and university expertise to perform research and development of advanced technologies for spent fuel treatment and transmutation of plutonium, higher actinides and long-lived fission products. Advanced nuclear material recycle and safeguard technologies, proliferation-resistant nuclear fuels, and transmutation systems shall be investigated. Both reactor-based and a combination of reactor and accelerator-based transmutation approaches may be included as part of the research and systems analysis.

The project shall use international and university collaborations to provide cost effective use of research funding. The Committee has provided an additional $6,000,000 to the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative for the UNLV Research Foundation and directs the Department to enter into a 5-year cooperative agreement to study deep burn-up of nuclear fuel and other fuel cycle research to eliminate the need for multiple spent nuclear fuel repositories, to eliminate weapons useable material from disposed spent fuel, and to maintain forever potential radiological releases from a repository below currently legislated limits.

The Committee is aware of the excellent recent progress in the jointly funded U.S./Russian program to develop the GT–MHR. The recent completion of the particle fuel fabrication and testing facilities in Russia along with continued progress in the area of the power conversion system indicates the continued support of the Russians for the development of this option. The Committee also notes that the GT–MHR is a leading Gen IV reactor type. Within the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative, $3,000,000 is provided for the Idaho Accelerator Center and the Department is directed to enter into a 5-year cooperative agreement with IAC. The Department is provided $7,000,000 to develop a Nuclear Energy Materials Test Station at Los Alamos Neutron Science Center to advance the technology needed to support the materials and fuel experiments required by the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative and for the exploration of Generation IV fast neutron spectrum systems. Since the

closure of the Fast Flux Test Facility, resulting in no domestic fast neutron source for conducting actinide transmutation, the Materials Test Station will advance the development of improved fuel cycles that can reduce the quantity, heat generation and toxicity of spent nuclear fuel. The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for the Center for Materials Reliability and $750,000 for nuclear transportation hazard research at the University of Nevada-Reno.

The Committee is aware of the fact that the Department is responsible for the maintenance of 62 metric tons of sodium bonded spent nuclear fuel located in Idaho. Of these amounts, the Office of Environmental Management manages 34 tons (55 percent of the total) from the Detroit Edison Fermi plant which is stored at the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center. The remaining 28 tons (45 percent) is from the Experimental Breeder Reactor-II and is managed by the Office of Nuclear Energy, AFCI program. The AFCI program spends $18,000,000 annually to maintain this stockpile, funding that could be more effectively used to explore critical materials and fuels research and development. The EBR–II reactor fuel adds little to the AFCI program, which is focused on Generation IV fuel types such as nitride fuels, and not solid metal fuels such as the EBR–II fuels. The AFCI program only needs 3 percent of the inventory for future pyroprocessing experiments. The Committee directs the Department to undertake a study to evaluate and propose a disposal solution for the entire 62 tons of sodium bonded spent fuel and to consider what minimal amount of fuel is needed for future experiments under the AFCI. The Department shall provide a report recommending the preferred disposal pathway to the Committee no later than March 1, 2006.

FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

Radiological Facilities Management.—The Committee recommends $64,800,000. The purpose of this program is to maintain the critical user facilities in a safe, environmentally compliant and cost-effective manner to support national priorities in serving our space missions or medical fields. Facilities located at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Los Alamos, Sandia, Brookhaven and Idaho National Labs all support this mission. The Committee supports the ongoing efforts at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Committee recommends the investment of $1,300,000 in new equipment for Los Alamos National Lab and $12,700,000 provided to operate the bench-scale scrap recovery line and to address the long-term storage and disposal of waste residues.

Idaho National Lab.—This program funds the site-wide landlord infrastructure activities for the Idaho National Laboratory. These activities are required to support the laboratory's technical efforts such as research on the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative, Generation IV nuclear energy systems, the Space and Defense Power Systems program, and the Navy's nuclear propulsion research and development program. The Committee recommendation for these infrastructure activities is $111,362,000. Of this total budget request $80,100,000 is funded in the Energy Supply appropriation, which includes $10,955,000 for construction activities. The Committee provides $17,762,000 in the Other Defense Activities appropriation

and $13,500,000 to be transferred from Naval Reactors program to support the ATR Gas Loop.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation includes $30,006,000 for program direction, the amount of the request. The Committee has also provided $31,103,000 from Other Defense Activities.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation includes $33,522,000 as provided in the budget request. Funding is provided to support the long-term surveillance and maintenance of non-defense sites where remediation has been substantially completed, to oversee post-retirement benefits for former DOE contractor employees, and for records management and retrieval.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

Appropriations, 2005	$27,778,000
Budget estimate, 2006	30,000,000
House allowance	26,000,000
Committee recommendation	30,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes $30,000,000 for non-defense environment, safety, and health, which includes $20,900,000 for Program Direction.

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(DEFERRAL)

The Committee recommends the deferral of $257,000,000 in clean coal technology funding until fiscal year 2007. These balances are not needed to complete active projects in this program.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2005	$571,854,000
Budget estimate, 2005	491,456,000
House allowance	502,467,000
Committee recommendation	641,646,000

The mission of the Fossil Energy R&D Program is to create public benefits by enhancing U.S. economic, environmental, and energy security. The program carries out three types of activities: (1) managing and performing energy-related research that reduces market barriers to the reliable, efficient, and environmentally sound use of fossil fuels for power generation and conversion to other fuels such as hydrogen; (2) partnering with industry and others to advance clean and efficient fossil energy technologies toward commercialization in United States and international markets; and (3) supporting the development of information and policy options that benefit the public by ensuring access to adequate supplies of affordable and clean energy.

Clean Coal Power Initiative.—By 2010, demonstration of advanced coal-based power generation technologies will be initiated that will lead to long-range economic and environmental public benefits. The Committee recommends $100,000,000 for the Clean Coal Power Initiative, an increase of $50,000,000.

FutureGen.—The FutureGen research prototype facility within the Clean Coal Power Initiative subprogram will demonstrate the technical feasibility and economic viability of the zero emission (including carbon) coal concepts. The Committee recommends $18,000,000 for FutureGen as requested.

Fuels and Power Systems.—The Committee recommends a total of $306,550,000 for fuels and power systems, an increase of $23,550,000. The recommendation includes $99,850,000 for central systems (innovations for existing plants, advanced integrated gasification combined cycle, and advanced turbines). The Committee recommends $74,200,000 for carbon sequestration, including $10,000,000 for the Center for Zero Emissions Research and Technology, and $5,000,000 above the request for the Energy and Environmental Research Center. The Committee recommendation includes $29,000,000 for fuels, $69,000,000 for fuel cells, (including $7,500,000 for High Temperature Electrochemistry), and $34,500,000 for Advanced Research. Within funds made available for Advanced Fuels Research, $700,000 is provided for development of continuous solvent extraction processes for coal derived carbon products; and $500,000 is provided within the amount for fuels to West Virginia University to study the long-term environmental and economic impacts of the development of coal liquefaction in China.

U.S./China Energy and Environmental Center.—The Committee recommends the Department continues support for the U.S./China Energy and Environmental Center. The Center provides essential services to assist U.S. industries entering the complex and expanding Chinese energy market.

Natural Gas Technologies.—The Committee recommendation includes $27,000,000, an increase of $17,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee recommends $2,000,000 to support the efforts of the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission.

Petroleum—Oil Technologies.—The Committee recommendation includes $32,000,000, an increase of $22,000,000 above the budget request.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation includes $106,941,000, an increase of $8,000,000 above the budget request for the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

Plant and Capital Equipment.—The Committee recommendation includes $23,000,000 for plant and capital equipment, an increase of $23,000,000 above the budget request. Within these funds, $20,000,000 is for the infrastructure improvement program at the National Energy Technology Laboratory and $3,000,000 is for general plant projects.

Fossil Energy Environmental Restoration.—The Committee recommendation includes $9,600,000, an increase of $1,600,000 above the budget request.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes the following congressionally directed projects, within available funds.

—$2,500,000 for the Coal to Liquids program—Phase II, MT (Coal);

—$2,000,000 for the Utah Center for Ultra-Clean Coal Utilization (Coal);

—$500,000 for the Coal-Waste Slurry Reburn Project, PA (Coal);

—$1,500,000 for the Multi-Disciplinary Coal-bed Natural Gas Research Center at the University of Wyoming (Coal);
—$3,000,000 for the National Center for Hydrogen Technology, ND (Fuels and Power);
—$5,000,000 for the High Temperature Electrochemistry Center in Montana (Fuels and Power);
—$5,000,000 for Solid Oxide Fuel Cells, PA (Fuels and Power);
—$1,500,000 for Fuel Processors for megawatt-scale solid oxide fuel cell systems for stationary power generation, OH (Fuels and Power);
—$2,000,000 for National Biofuel Energy Laboratory, MI (Fuels and Power);
—$1,000,000 for the Oil Heat Research Project (Oil and Gas);
—$7,000,000 for Arctic Energy Office, AK (Oil and Gas);
—$400,000 Risk Base Data Management System, AK (Oil and Gas);
—$1,750,000 for the Utah Center for Heavy Oil Research (Oil and Gas); and
—$1,000,000 for hydrates research at the University of Mississippi (Oil and Gas).

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

Appropriations, 2005	$17,750,000
Budget estimate, 2006	18,500,000
House allowance	18,500,000
Committee recommendation	21,500,000

The Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves no longer serve the national defense purpose envisioned in the early 1900's, and consequently the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) required the sale of the Government's interest in the Naval Petroleum Reserve 1 [NPR–1]. To comply with this requirement, the Elk Hills field in California was sold to Occidental Petroleum Corporation in 1998. Following the sale of Elk Hills and the transfer of the oil shale reserves, DOE retains two Naval Petroleum Reserve properties: the Naval Petroleum Reserve 3 in Wyoming (Teapot Dome field), a stripper well oil field that the Department is maintaining until it reaches its economic production limit; and the Buena Vista Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve 2 in California, a checkerboard pattern of Government and privately owned tracts adjacent to the Elk Hills field. The DOE continues to be responsible for routine operations and maintenance of NPR–3, management of the Rocky Mountain Oilfield Testing Center at NPR–3, lease management at NPR–2, and continuing environmental and remediation work at Elk Hills.

The Committee recommends $21,500,000, an increase of $3,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee has provided the additional funding to support the activities under the NPR/Colorado, Utah Wyoming program.

ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND

Appropriations, 2005	[1] $36,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	48,000,000
House allowance	48,000,000
Committee recommendation	48,000,000

[1] The fiscal year 2005 enacted level reflects an advanced appropriation available on October 1, 2005.

Payment to the Elk Hills school lands fund was part of the settlement associated with the sale of the Naval Petroleum Reserve Number 1. Under the settlement, payments to the fund are to be made over a period of 7 years. The payments to date ($216,000,000) were based on an estimate of the amount that would be required to pay the State of California nine percent of the net sales of proceeds.

The Committee recommends $48,000,000, the same as the budget request, and combined with the fiscal year 2005 advance appropriation of $36,000,000, will make available a total of $84,000,000 in fiscal year 2006. While this represents Payment #7 in a series of seven payments, the Committee understands that the final amount due will be based on the resolution of equity determinations, which cannot be determined until all divestment-related expenses are accounted for.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

Appropriations, 2005	$169,710,000
Budget estimate, 2006	166,000,000
House allowance	166,000,000
Committee recommendation	166,000,000

The mission of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve [SPR] is to store petroleum to reduce the adverse economic impact of a major petroleum supply interruption to the United States and to carry out obligations under the international energy program. The reserve will be filled to 700 million barrels in 2005, providing 59 days of net import protection.

The Committee recommends $166,000,000, the same as the budget request, for operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, a decrease of $3,710,000 from the fiscal year 2005 level.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

Appropriations, 2005	$4,960,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

The acquisition and storage of heating oil for the Northeast States began in August 2000 when the Department of Energy, through the Strategic Petroleum Reserve account, awarded contracts for the lease of commercial storage facilities and acquisition of heating oil. The purpose of the reserve is to assure home heating oil supplies for the Northeast States during times of very low inventories and significant threats to immediate supply of heating oil. The Northeast Heating Oil Reserve was established as a separate entity from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve on March 6, 2001. The 2 million barrel reserve is stored in commercial facilities in

New York Harbor, New Haven, Connecticut, and the Providence, Rhode Island area.

The Committee recommends no new appropriation, the same as the budget request, for the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve, a decrease of $4,960,000 from the fiscal 2005 level. All activities in fiscal year 2006 are funded from carryover balances.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2005	$83,819,000
Budget estimate, 2006	85,926,000
House allowance	86,426,000
Committee recommendation	85,926,000

The Committee recommends $85,926,000, the same as the budget request.

The Energy Information Administration is a leader in providing high-quality, policy-neutral energy information to meet the requirements of Congress, the Federal Government, industry, energy markets and the public in a manner that promotes sound policymaking and efficient markets. As the energy industry becomes more complex and interdependent, it has been EIA's responsibility to update its energy data to keep pace with changing energy industry and markets. It is critical that EIA continue to adapt to rapid changes and provide data that is relevant and helpful to industry, policymakers, the media and Federal enforcement officials.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The Non-Defense Environmental Management program includes funds to manage and clean up sites used for civilian energy research, and non-defense related activities. These past activities resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination that requires remediation, stabilization, or some other type of action.

The Non-Defense Environmental Management activities were previously funded in three separate accounts, two of which are now combined: Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion, and Non-Defense Environmental Services are now one account, Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup. The Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund for environmental management responsibilities at the three gaseous diffusion enrichment plants (Oak Ridge, Portsmouth, and Paducah) and for reimbursement of licensees conducting cleanup of uranium and thorium processing sites remains the same.

The Committee remains committed to the strategy of accelerating cleanup and closing sites. However, the categorization of funding activities by planning goals has diminished in utility over time—dates slip, and activities that do not fit the "2012" timeframe were merely moved into the "2035" timeframe as a matter of course. As such, the Committee no longer finds this display of activities useful, and has moved to a location/site-based display, to increase the transparency of where environmental cleanup dollars are being spent. The Committee requests that congressional budget submissions be submitted in this format in the future.

Reprogramming Authority.—The Committee continues to support the need for flexibility to meet changing funding requirements at

sites. In fiscal year 2006, the Department may transfer up to $2,000,000 between control points, to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increased or decreased by more than $2,000,000 once during the fiscal year. The control points for reprogramming are the Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility, West Valley Demonstration Project, Gaseous Diffusion Plants, Small Sites, and construction line items. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. The Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate must be notified within 30 days prior to the use of this reprogramming authority.

Economic Development.—None of the Non-Defense Environmental Management funds, including those provided in the Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup, and Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, are available for economic development activities.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2005	$439,601,000
Budget estimate, 2006	259,934,000
House allowance	319,934,000
Committee recommendation	353,219,000

The Committee recommendation for Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup is $353,219,000, an increase of $3,285,000 above the budget request.

The Committee provides $77,100,000 for solid waste stabilization and disposition, and nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning at the West Valley Demonstration Project, and $48,813,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of the gaseous diffusion plants. The Committee provides $46,113,000 for the decontamination and decommissioning of the Fast Flux Test Facility [FFTF].

The Committee provides $85,803,000 for depleted uranium hexafluoride conversion at Portsmouth and Paducah. The Committee provides $28,006,000, for soil and water remediation measures at the former Atlas uranium mill tailings site at Moab, Utah.

Small Sites.—The Committee provides $34,328,000 for soil and water remediation, graphite research reactor and high flux beam reactor decontamination and decommissioning at Brookhaven National Laboratory; $10,487,000 for soil and water remediation and nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning at Argonne National Laboratory; and $5,274,000 for spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition at Idaho National Laboratory.

The Committee recommendation provides $3,900,000 for soil and water remediation at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; $3,500,000 for soil and water remediation at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center; $9,000,000 for nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning for the Energy Technology Engineering Center; $490,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of the Tritium System Test Assembly Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory; and $305,000 for soil and water remediation at Inhalation Toxicology Laboratory.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriations, 2005	$415,655,000
Budget estimate, 2006	571,498,000
House allowance	571,498,000
Committee recommendation	561,498,000

The Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund supports projects to maintain, decontaminate, decommission and otherwise remediate the gaseous diffusion plants at Portsmouth, Ohio; Paducah, Kentucky; and Oak Ridge, Tennessee. In addition, the Uranium/Thorium Licensee Reimbursement program activities are funded within this appropriation.

Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning.—The Committee recommendation includes $561,498,000, a decrease of $10,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $281,329,000 for activities at Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The Committee recommends $105,000,000 at Paducah, Kentucky, an increase of $7,000,000 above the budget request. The Department shall use the additional funds to accelerate the characterization and disposition of waste offsite, including the Designated Material Storage Areas, low-level wastes, TSCA waste, and mixed low level waste. Within the funds provided the Department shall undertake a study of the potential purchase of property or options to purchase property that is located above the plume of contaminated groundwater near the facility site. The study shall evaluate the adequate protection of human health and environment from exposure to contaminated groundwater and consider whether such purchase, when taking into account the cost of remediation, long-term surveillance, and maintenance, is in the best interest of taxpayers.

The Department of Energy Inspector General published a report on March 10, 2005, which found that the Department had spent $17,000,000 for "activities that are not specifically related to accelerating the cleanup at Portsmouth". The IG found that $14,000,000 was used to move equipment in order to accommodate USEC's schedule to develop a gas centrifuge facility. The IG also found that the Department has expended $3,000,000 to move equipment to a temporary storage site to benefit USEC. The IG believes these expenditures and another $16,000,000 in possible future expenditures are in violation of the terms of the 2002 Agreement in which the Department agreed to clean up the Portsmouth site, leaving USEC to build and operate the enrichment facility at its own expense. It was the IG's determination that the Department had gone out of its way to support the commercial operations. The Committee also recognizes that the fiscal year 2003 House Energy and Water report (H. Rept. 107–681) provided clear direction that the Department was only to provide assistance on a reimbursable basis. As such, the Committee recommends a $17,000,000 reduction in funding and directs the Department to recover the funding reduction from USEC. The Committee directs the Department to provide a full accounting and justification of all future expenditures at Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant to the Department of Energy Inspector General for review to ensure compliance with the 2002 agreement between the Department and USEC in fiscal year 2006.

The Committee recommends $175,157,000 for cleanup activities at Portsmouth, Ohio, a reduction of $17,000,000 below the budget request.

The Committee does not approve of and has provided no funds for direct or indirect costs; and prohibits the Department from transferring any uranium assets for trade, sale or barter with USEC as proposed in the budget. The Department has failed to adequately specify proposed costs associated with these activities and the Committee is skeptical that this proposal is in the best interests of Federal Government and U.S. taxpayers. The Committee understands that the Government Accountability Office is undertaking a study of the terms and conditions of this arrangement and will provide a report to Congress to clarify if this activity is in the best interest of taxpayers. Until Congress has an opportunity to review the GAO report, the Congress does not provide any funds to support the barter arrangement. The Committee is also skeptical of the proposed benefits of the USEC-proposed Project Isaiah to down blend highly enriched uranium and undertake a complicated scheme of transactions to provide low enriched fuel to the market. The Committee provides no funding to the Department to undertake Project Isaiah or support this effort.

Uranium/Thorium Reimbursement.—The Committee recommendation includes no funding for this activity.

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2005	$3,599,871,000
Budget estimate, 2006	3,462,718,000
House allowance	3,666,055,000
Committee recommendation	3,702,718,000

The Committee recommendation for the Office of Science is $3,702,718,000, an increase of $240,000,000 above the request and $102,847,000 above the current year level.

The Science account funds investment in basic research critical to the success of the Department's missions in national security, energy security and economic security. Programs funded under this account perform a leadership role in advancing the frontiers of knowledge in the physical sciences and areas of biological, environmental and computational sciences. The Department provides 40 percent of the total Federal spending that supports the research of 15,000 PhDs, post doctorate and graduate students, as well as operating 10 facilities used by over 19,000 researchers each year.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Investment in the physical sciences and engineering plays a critical role in enabling U.S. technological innovation and global economic leadership. It is essential to the development and utilization of our energy resources, as well as innovations in the areas of defense, the environment, communications and information technologies, health care and much more. Over the past 50 years, half of U.S. economic growth has come from prior investment in science and technological innovation. Life expectancy has grown from 55 years in 1900 to nearly 80 years today.

The United States has been the undisputed world leader in the physical sciences for the past six decades, an investment strategy

that has led to huge gains in our national security, economic prosperity and overall quality of life for all U.S. citizens. Federal support for fundamental research in physics, chemistry, materials sciences, and other scientific disciplines crucial to U.S. industry has been a major contributor to this national success story.

But the foundations for the future of the physical sciences are eroding. The Department of Energy's Office of Science, which is the leading source of Federal investment for R&D facilities and fundamental research in the physical sciences, is at a crossroads. At a time when our international competitors are significantly scaling up their investments in the physical sciences (the European Union will soon double its overall funding for R&D), funding for the Office of Science and other U.S. agencies has been flat or even declining. This comes at a time when U.S. industry is scaling back its investments in long-term research in the physical sciences in an effort to remain competitive in the short term.

This trend is not uniform or irreversible. Significant investments in key areas of science, most of which are supported by DOE's Office of Science, will keep our Nation at the forefront of future research into the physical sciences. The future health of our national system of physical sciences R&D can be restored by focused investments in three areas: major scientific user facilities that support the physical sciences; the university scientists who conduct world class research and train our next generation of scientific talent; and DOE's national laboratories, which are the Nation's crucible for multidisciplinary work in challenging aspects of the physical sciences that cannot be performed elsewhere.

The Office of Science has done commendable work planning for the future of the physical sciences in the United States. A 20-year investment plan for the new research facilities that our Nation needs is being implemented but existing capabilities cannot be sacrificed to purchase new facilities. The Committee urges that the Office of Science research programs work closely with their university counterparts to make joint investments that ensure the vitality of physical science academic departments.

The Government must tap into the enormous capabilities of the Office of Science and regain world leadership in the physical sciences. DOE user facilities should be operating at their designed capacity, providing key discovery opportunities for thousands of new researchers every year. University research programs in nanoscience, catalysis, mathematics and physics should be expanded to ensure training of the next generation of outstanding scientists needed to solve important national problems. Multidisciplinary research at the national laboratories should be encouraged to meet national challenges in defense, energy production and the environment. Taken as a whole, these investments will ensure U.S. leadership in the physical sciences and the vitality of the U.S. economy.

The Office of Science operates many of the Nation's most advanced large-scale user facilities of importance to all areas of science. These state-of-the-art facilities are shared with the science community world-wide and contain technologies and instrumentation that are available nowhere else. These facilities serve tens of thousands of users in laboratories, universities, industry, and other

Federal agencies, and represent large Federal capital investments. Over the last several years many of these facilities have operated below optimal levels. In order to rectify this situation, the Committee has provided funding to restore operations of the SC user facilities to optimal levels by providing an additional $100,000,000 for facility operations allocated as follows: $20,000,000 in Basic Energy Sciences; $3,000,000 in High Energy Physics; $49,000,000 in Nuclear physics; and $28,000,000 in Fusion Energy Sciences.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2005	$735,699,000
Budget estimate, 2006	713,933,000
House allowance	735,933,000
Committee recommendation	716,933,000

The Committee recommendation includes $716,933,000 for high energy physics, an increase of $3,000,000, to provide operational funding to ensure full utilization of facilities.

The high energy physics program focuses on gaining insights into the fundamental constituents of matter, the fundamental forces in nature, and the transformations between matter and energy at the most elementary level. The program encompasses both experimental and theoretical particle physics research and related advanced accelerator and detector technology R&D. The primary mode of experimental research involves the study of collisions of energetic particles using large particle accelerators or colliding beam facilities.

The Committee recognizes the critical importance of the DOE/NASA Joint Dark Energy Mission [JDEM] in answering fundamental questions about the nature and substance of the universe. Consequently, the Committee encourages the Department to move JDEM forward aggressively to ensure the timely accomplishment of this important work.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2005	$404,778,000
Budget estimate, 2006	370,741,000
House allowance	408,341,000
Committee recommendation	419,741,000

The Committee recommends $419,741,000 for nuclear physics, an increase of $49,000,000 to ensure full utilization of experimental facilities.

The nuclear physics program supports and provides experimental equipment to qualified scientists and research groups conducting experiments at nuclear physics accelerator facilities. These facilities provide new insights and advance our knowledge of the nature of matter and energy and develop the scientific knowledge, technologies and trained manpower needed to underpin the Department's nuclear missions.

Rare Isotope Accelerator.—The Committee requests the Department to submit a report within 120 days after the enactment of this Act, with information critical to moving forward with the site selection of the Rare Isotope Accelerator. The report shall include, but not be limited to, (1) the status and progress of the conceptual research and development supporting the development of RIA over

the past 6 years; (2) the priority research areas the Department will complete prior to site selection for RIA; (3) the process by which the Department selects recipients for its research and development funding; (4) how the results of current and future research and development may affect the design of RIA or the path forward; (5) what technical hurdles remain before RIA site selection can resume; and (6) what funding will be required to clear those hurdles and what is the expected length of time for completion of these activities.

Finally, the Committee requests the Department clarify its plans to move forward with RIA, provide an estimate of when the draft request for proposals will be reissued, and assess whether in a constrained budget environment the Department has any concern that RIA, as it is currently envisioned, will not be built. If the Department anticipates that future budgets will not allow for RIA, the Committee requests the report provide alternatives and explain how the Nation would meet our need for the fundamental physics knowledge and training of scientists applicable to national security and homeland security that RIA would provide.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2005	$571,922,000
Budget estimate, 2006	455,688,000
House allowance	525,688,000
Committee recommendation	503,688,000

The Committee recommendation includes $503,688,000 for biological and environmental research, an increase of $48,000,000 over the budget request.

The biological and environmental research program develops the knowledge base necessary to identify, understand, and anticipate the long-term health and environmental consequences of energy use and development. The program utilizes the Department's unique scientific and technological capabilities to solve major scientific problems in the environment, medicine, and biology. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request for low dose radiation research. The Department is in the process or reorganizing the National Institute for Global Environmental Change [NIGEC] into the National Institute for Climatic Change Research [NICCR]. The Committee directs that a center be created that will work in collaboration with the other four regional centers of NICCR and will address the need for the development of methodologies and tools for the understanding and modeling of the impacts of global and regional climatic changes on riparian and coastal environmental and ecological systems that are throughout the Nation.

Genomes.—Funding for the Human Genome program is provided to understand the genes identified in the Human Genome Project and to meet growing demand for sequencing in the broader scientific community. The Genome to Life activity aimed at understanding the composition and function of biochemical networks that carry our essential processes of living organisms. Current estimates project that the energy needs of the world will double by the year 2050. Energy supply and demand are expected to exert strong economic pressure on the United States and become one of the most

important factors in the security of the country in this time frame. Biology-based solutions that contribute to increasing U.S. energy supply and decreasing its dependence on foreign sources of energy offer an exceptionally attractive alternative to petroleum-based sources. Microbes can act as catalysts to convert biomass to clean fuels and feedstock for key chemicals. To develop practical and economical biology-based systems for generation of energy and high-value chemicals, we must increase our knowledge of key biological systems, metabolic pathways, gene regulatory systems, and molecular structures and function. Understanding these key areas will provide new insights in microbial systems and permit biology-based resources to be harnessed.

The Committee is supportive of the Department's effort to move ahead with a request for proposal for the first of four GTL facilities. The Committee is concerned that under the current budget and timetable, it is unlikely the Office of Science will be able to successfully prepare timely procurements for the three remaining facilities unless changes are made to the program. The Committee recommends the Department apply the same model as was used for the competition of the five nanotechnology centers. The Department was able to complete the five regional centers for a total cost of $301,000,000. Using the nanotechnology centers as the model, the Committee directs the Office of Science to accelerate the deployment of these world class genomic facilities.

Each of the four proposed facilities already identified by the Office of Science will support research and development to understand and develop solutions related to bioenergy and biobased products. However, due to the nature of the research there is a need for all four facilities to be deployed in order to meet the separate scientific challenges of molecular characterization, analysis of microbial response, and developing a better understanding of biological systems. The Committee has provided $40,000,000 to accelerate the Genomics: GTL program. Within the funds provided $20,000,000 shall be used to support research and development to support the GTL program and $20,000,000 to conduct preliminary engineering and design for the remaining 3 facilities in the Genomes To Life program.

Molecular Medicine.—The Committee continues to support research that brings together PET imaging, systems biology and nanotechnology to develop new molecular imaging probes. These probes should provide a biological diagnosis of disease that is informative of the molecular basis of disease and specific for guiding the development of new molecular therapies.

The Committee is concerned about the consequences mitigation activities and public health impact associated with the threat of any radiological event and strongly encourages the Department to develop therapeutical radiological countermeasures to protect against exposure to the effects of ionizing radiation. The Committee is aware of the potential of inositol signaling molecules as a therapy for exposure to ionizing radiation and encourages the Department to support research of this emerging technology. The Committee recommends $7,000,000 for UCLA Institute for Molecular Medicine to protect the public health against radiation exposure.

The Committee strongly supports DOE's efforts to maintain the scientific infrastructure of the Nation's structural biology assets, and encourages the Department to work to address the needs within the broader community.

The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for the purchase of equipment at the New York Structural Biology Center.

Within available funds, the Department shall continue to fund the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $3,500,000 to the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory [EMSL] for upgrades to instrumentation at this national user facility.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes the following Congressionally directed projects, within available funds. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may attach to these projects.

—$12,000,000 for the Mind Institute in New Mexico;
—$1,000,000 for the Mississippi State University Bio-fuel Application Center;
—$1,500,000 for the University of Louisville Institute for Advanced Materials, KY;
—$400,000 for Center for River Dynamics and Restoration at Utah State University;
—$3,000,000 for Texas' Metroplex Comprehensive Imaging Center;
—$1,000,000 for Ultra Dense Memory Storage for Supercomputing in CO;
—$2,000,000 for Health Sciences Research and Education Facility, MO;
—$1,500,000 for the National Center for Regenerative Medicine, OH;
—$1,000,000 for the University of Alabama at Birmingham-Radiation Oncology Functional Imaging Program;
—$1,762,000 for the University City Science Park, Philadelphia, PA;
—$2,500,000 for Jackson State University Bioengineering Complex, MS;
—$800,000 for the Science Building Renovation Project, CO;
—$538,000 for St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital, TN;
—$500,000 for the California Hospital medical Center PET/CT Fusion imaging system;
—$1,000,000 for Mount Sinai Medical Center Imaging and Surgical Equipment, FL;
—$350,000 for Benedictine University Science Lab. & Research Equipment, IL;
—$350,000 for Swedish American Health Systems, IL;
—$350,000 for La Rabida Children's Hospital, Chicago, IL;
—$500,000 for Edward Hospital, Plainfield, IL;
—$1,000,000 for Morgan State University Center for Environmental Toxicology, MD;
—$500,000 for the University of Massachusetts at Boston Multidisciplinary Research Facility and Library;
—$500,000 for the CIBS Solar Cell Development, NE;

—$1,000,000 for the University Medical Center of Southern Nevada Radiology/Oncology Program Equipment;
—$1,000,000 for Mega Cargo Imaging Program at the Nevada Test Site;
—$500,000 for the University of Delaware Medical Research Facility;
—$500,000 for the St. Francis Hospital Linear Accelerator, DE;
—$500,000 for the ViaHealth/Rochester General Hospital Emergency Department, NY;
—$1,000,000 for University of Vermont Functional MRI Research;
—$1,000,000 for the Nevada Cancer Institute;
—$3,000,000 for the Vermont Institute of Natural Sciences;
—$500,000 for the Queen's Medical Center Telemedicine Project, HI;
—$250,000 for the Sarcoma Alliance for Research through Collaboration, MI;
—$250,000 for Rush Medical Center, IL;
—$500,000 for the North Shore Long Island Jewish Health System, NY;
—$250,000 for the Hackensack University Medical Center Ambulatory Adult Cancer Center, NJ;
—$250,000 for the College of New Jersey Genomic Analysis Facility;
—$500,000 for the Western Michigan University Expanded Energy and Natural Resources Learning Center;
—$500,000 for the Arnold Palmer Prostate Center, CA;
—$500,000 for the Louisiana Immersive Tech Enterprise program at the University of Louisiana-Lafayette;
—$500,000 for the Brown University MRI Scanner, RI;
—$350,000 for the University of Dubuque Environmental Science Center, IA;
—$500,000 for the New School University in New York City, NY;
—$500,000 for the Oregon Nanoscience and Microbiologies Institute;
—$350,000 for Mt. Sinai Hospital Cardiac Catheterization Lab, MD;
—$250,000 for the University of Massachusetts Medical School NMR Spectrophotometer;
—$250,000 for the Mojave Bird Study, NV;
—$250,000 for the Science Center at Maltby Nature Preserve in Minnesota; and
—$2,000,000 for the Existing Business Enhancement Program Building, University of Northern IA.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 2005	$1,104,632,000
Budget estimate, 2006	1,146,017,000
House allowance	1,173,149,000
Committee recommendation	1,241,017,000

The Committee recommendation provides $1,241,017,000, an increase of $95,000,000.

The basic energy sciences [BES] program funds basic research in the physical, biological and engineering sciences that support the

Department's nuclear and non-nuclear technology programs. The BES program is responsible for operating large national user research facilities, including synchrotron light and neutron sources, and a combustion research facility, as well as smaller user facilities such as materials preparation and electron microscopy centers. The BES program supports a substantial basic research budget for materials sciences, chemical sciences, energy biosciences, engineering and geosciences.

Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $7,280,000 for the Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research. The Committee provides $5,000,000 to purchase additional fuel for the High Flux Isotope Reactor.

Research

The Committee recommendation includes $1,062,944,000, the amount of the request, for materials sciences, engineering research, chemical sciences, geosciences, and energy biosciences. The Committee recommendation includes $4,500,000 for Altair Nanotech for nanotechnology, nanosensors, and nanomaterials research, development, and deployment.

Energy-Water Supply Technologies.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $25,000,000, within the chemical sciences, geosciences, and energy biosciences account, to support a research and demonstration program to study energy-related issues associated with water resources and issues associated with sustainable water supplies for energy production. Within available funds, the Committee recommends $25,000,000 for energy and water resources management including $8,000,000 for advanced concept desalination and arsenic treatment research in partnership with American Water Works Research Foundation and WERC; $12,000,000 for water supply technology development in partnership with other national laboratories to initiate demonstration projects and technology transfer activities; and $5,000,000 for water management decision support including demonstration programs in partnership with the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer, transboundary applications and support for international energy and water efficiency.

Construction

Spallation Neutron Source.—The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $41,744,000 to continue construction at Oak Ridge National Laboratory for the Spallation Neutron Source [SNS] to meet the Nation's neutron scattering needs.

Nanoscale Science Research Centers.—The Committee recommendation supports the high priority given to nanoscale research and has included the budget request for the nanoscale science research centers at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Argonne National Laboratory, Brookhaven National Laboratory, and the joint effort between Sandia National Laboratories and Los Alamos National Laboratory.

National Nanotechnology Enterprise Development Center.—The Committee directs $30,000,000 for the establishment of the National Nanotechnology Enterprise Development Center [NNEDC], to be co-located with the Center for Integrated Nanotechnologies

[CINT], a joint facility of Sandia National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Committee intends that the NNEDC will assist in the technological maturation of nanotechnologies developed at the National Nanoscience Initiative facilities. The mission of the NNEDC will be to identify nanotechnologies developed at the national laboratories and partnered universities that are promising candidates for commercialization and to assist in their transition to the marketplace. The Center will be directed by employees of Sandia National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory and will emphasize opportunities for industry partnership with the CINT.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation provides $207,055,000 for advanced scientific computing research. The Advanced Scientific Computing Research [ASCR] program supports advanced computational research—applied mathematics, computer science, and networking—to enable the analysis, simulation and prediction of complex physical phenomena. The program also supports the operation of large supercomputer user facilities.

The National Leadership Computing Facility at Oak Ridge National Laboratory will provide the scientific community with the computing capability needed to solve problems out of reach of currently available systems and lead to significant advancements in areas such as biology, fusion, and climate change. Unfortunately, the budget request for this effort would halt the next phase of machine acquisitions and provides inadequate funding to operate the system that will be installed during fiscal year 2005.

The Committee strongly supports the National Leadership Computing Facility and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory's leadership in this important area. Full operation of the National Leadership Computing Facility at ORNL is necessary to keep domestic researchers and industries competitive with their global counterparts. The Committee will work to ensure that sufficient funding is provided to meet the next phase of machine acquisitions and encourages the Department to focus its efforts on enhancing and expanding activities at the National Leadership Computing Facility.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommends $40,105,000, to support infrastructure activities at the five national labs under the direction of the Office of Science.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

Fusion Energy.—The Committee provides $290,550,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee has provided $28,000,000 in additional funding to ensure the full operations on the DIII–D, Alcator C-Mod, and NSTX fusion research facilities. The current budget reduces operations from 48 weeks to just 17 weeks, which the Committee believes is an irresponsible use of the taxpayer investment in these facilities. The Committee has reduced funding for the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor [ITER] by $28,000,000, equal to the amount domestic research has been

increased. The Committee is disappointed that a decision has not been made in selecting a site for the location of this international burning plasma user facility. Without a final decision on a location or allocation, the Committee is skeptical the Department will be able to expend the full budget request for this project in fiscal year 2006. If a site is selected, the Committee will work with the Department to provide an allocation that is consistent with the expected needs for this project. Within available funds, the Committee includes $1,000,000 for non-defense research activities at the Atlas Pulse Power facility.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation provides $74,317,000 for safeguards and security, the same level as the request.

The safeguards and security line identifies the funding necessary for the physical protection, protective forces, physical security, protective systems, information security, cyber security, personnel security, materials control and accountability and program management activities for national laboratories and facilities of the Office of Science.

SCIENCE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation provides $7,192,000 for science workforce development.

The science workforce development program provides limited funding to train young scientists, engineers, and technicians to meet the demand for a well trained scientific and technical workforce, including the teachers that educate the workforce.

The Committee encourages the Department of Energy to provide funds and technical expertise for high school students to participate in the 2005 For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology [FIRST] Robotics competition. FIRST has proven to be a valuable program to introduce and mentor students in math and science.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation provides $207,725,000 for science program direction.

Within available funds, the Committee provides $5,000,000 for the Office of Science to conduct project engineering and design in support of replacement facilities at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in order to support accelerated cleanup of Hanford site. The Committee has provided a total of $18,000,000 for preliminary engineering and design in this account and in Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriations, 2005	$343,232,000
Budget estimate, 2006	300,000,000
House allowance	310,000,000
Committee recommendation	300,000,000

The Committee provides $300,000,000 from fees collected by the Secretary and deposited into the fund established by Public Law

97–425 as amended. In addition to the defense contribution of $277,000,000, funding for Yucca Mountain will be provided at the fiscal year 2004 level of $577,000,000.

The Department plans to submit its nuclear waste repository license application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission during fiscal year 2006. In view of the authority granted to the State of Nevada and the affected units of local government to participate in licensing activities under this Act, the Congress wants to ensure that conflicts of interest are avoided between the Department as license applicant and the affected governments as potential parties to the license proceeding. The Department's practice of reviewing and approving annual work plans for affected government oversight programs is inconsistent with its role as a license applicant because the affected governments are potential parties to the proceeding. In place of an approval function, the Department shall advise and consult with affected governments for the sole purpose of assisting them to comply with the requirements of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (Public Law 97–425). The affected governments are required, under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act [NWPA], to provide certification to the Department that all funds have been expended for activities authorized by the NWPA and this Appropriations Act. The prior approval of the Department is not required by these acts. Such certification and any audits carried out by the Department or others are sufficient to ensure that affected governments are using funds for the purpose intended. Audits shall be carried out at regular intervals by auditors from the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, or by independent auditors, using uniform criteria and procedures. Funds appropriated under this Act may be used for review of repository activities authorized in Section 116(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, for review of any proposal to develop a Monitored Retrievable Storage facility or an Interim Storage facility, and for monitoring lessons learned from related facilities for the storage and disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. Such review activities may include potential economic, social, public health and safety, and environmental impacts of the transportation, storage and disposal of nuclear wastes.

The Committee has provided $3,500,000 for the State of Nevada and $8,500,000 for the affected units of local government in accordance with the statutory restrictions contained in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The Committee directs that $500,000 be provided to Nye County, Nevada, to conduct on-site activities pursuant to Section 117(d) of that Act. These funds shall be separate and apart from oversight funding under Section 116(c) of the Act, and shall be made available to Nye County by direct payment subject to the same restrictions as apply to oversight payments for affected units of local government. Nye County is still permitted to seek funding under the Section 116(c) program, but the Committee expects the county to seek a lesser percentage of that program's annual funding.

The administration has requested that the funds provided to the AULG's be provided for a period of 21 months. The Committee rejects this approach and directs the Department to provide this funding in the traditional annual (i.e., 12 month) manner. The

Committee expects to provide fiscal year 2007 funding in the fiscal year 2007 Appropriations bill.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 2005	$238,503,000
Budget estimate, 2006	279,976,000
House allowance	252,909,000
Committee recommendation	280,976,000

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2005	$121,024,000
Budget estimate, 2006	123,000,000
House allowance	123,000,000
Committee recommendation	123,000,000

The Committee recommends $280,976,000 for departmental administration, a net appropriation of $157,976,000.

The Departmental Administration account funds policy development and analysis activities, institutional and public liaison functions, and other program support requirements necessary to ensure effective operation and management. The account also covers salaries and expenses for the Office of the Secretary; Board of Contract Appeals; Chief Information Officer; Congressional and intergovernmental affairs; Economic impact and diversity; General Counsel; Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation; Policy and International Affairs; and Public Affairs. The Committee recommends an increase of $1,000,000 for Public Affairs.

INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2005	$41,176,000
Budget estimate, 2006	43,000,000
House allowance	43,000,000
Committee recommendation	43,000,000

The Committee has provided $43,000,000 for the Office of the Inspector General, the same as the budget request.

The Office of the Inspector General provides agency-wide audit, inspection, and investigative functions to identify and correct management and administrative deficiencies which create conditions for existing or potential instances of fraud, waste, and mismanagement.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy are provided for in two categories—the National Nuclear Security Administration and Environmental and Other Defense Activities. Appropriation accounts under the National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA] are Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and the Office of the Administrator. Environmental and Other Defense Activities include appropriation accounts for Defense Site Acceleration Completion, Defense Environmental Services, Other Defense Activities, and Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA], a separately organized and semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy, came into existence on March 1, 2000. The missions of the NNSA are: (1) to enhance United States national security through the military application of nuclear energy; (2) to maintain and enhance the safety, reliability, and performance of the United States nuclear weapons stockpile, including the ability to design, produce, and test, in order to meet national security requirements; (3) to provide the United States Navy with safe, militarily effective nuclear propulsion plants and to ensure the safe and reliable operation of those plants; (4) to promote international nuclear safety and nonproliferation; (5) to reduce global danger from weapons of mass destruction; and (6) to support United States leadership in science and technology. The programs and activities of the NNSA are funded through the following appropriation accounts: Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and Office of the Administrator.

The committee is pleased that the administration has submitted the revised nuclear weapons stockpile plan as required by the fiscal year 2004 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act (Public Law 108–137). The plan outlines how the Nation will achieve the 1,700–2,200 operationally deployed strategic warheads first outlined by the President in 2001 and subsequently codified in the Moscow Treaty. Once the reductions are achieved, the U.S. active nuclear weapons stockpile will be the smallest since the Eisenhower Administration. It clearly shows that the Administration undertook a careful analysis of the size and composition of the nuclear weapons stockpile that will be needed in the years ahead to ensure U.S. national security. To mitigate the risks of a smaller stockpile requires the United States must make continued progress in restoring a modern nuclear weapons infrastructure that can rapidly respond to geopolitical changes that may challenge U.S. national security or address potential problems in the Nation's nuclear deterrent.

NNSA Complex Review.—Initiated under former Secretary Abraham, a task force was commissioned to study potential reforms to the nuclear weapons complex. This is the ninth such study commissioned since 1988. Previous studies have proposed a multitude of wide-ranging proposals, of which many were justifiably ignored. The challenge for the latest study panel will be to develop a modest package of reforms that identify cost savings and improvement to the complex without undermining the safety and security of our nuclear deterrent. It is the hope of this Committee that the study group will support the ongoing reforms to modernize the stockpile, through the Reliable Replacement Warhead program. This initiative, which was first proposed in the fiscal year 2005 Consolidated Appropriations Conference Report (H. Rept. 108–447) by the Energy and Water subcommittee, is a means to assure continued certification of the existing stockpile and to make it more affordable to manufacture, maintain and secure weapons. Such a plan will challenge weapons designers, manufacturing experts, computer scientists and experimentalists at our national labs to modernize the

stockpile and will require sufficient funding in Science and Engineering Campaigns. The RRW program is not a new weapon, and this fact should be clear to the study panel members.

The Committee recognizes the temptation for panel members to recommend comprehensive changes to shake up the complex and set it on a new direction. However, the Committee disagrees with the purported proposal to consolidate all of the nuclear material and the entire weapons manufacturing capability, including the construction of a Modern Pit Facility, at a single location. There are very strong opinions in Congress regarding the siting of a new pit facility or changing the military capability of the existing weapons. As such, the Committee believes it is unlikely that Congress would support such comprehensive reforms as currently proposed by the NNSA Complex study panel.

It would be premature for this study to recommend significant changes to the complex until it is clear to both the Department of Defense and the Department of the Energy agree on what the stockpile will look like in the future and has the concurrence of the Congress before policy makers are likely to support the deployment of a brand new weapon into the stockpile, even if the military requirements remain the same. Those who support broad complex-wide reforms to the complex must be realistic in their expectations in reinventing the complex. Such a task will take time to ensure that the necessary improvement adequately supports science based stockpile stewardship.

To protect the interests of the Committee and to ensure that this report and it proposed recommendations are carefully considered, no funds shall be used to implement any of the panel's recommendations in fiscal year 2006. This delay will provide Congress the opportunity to fully review the impact of the proposed recommendations. Since this report was not contemplated in President's fiscal year 2006 request, Congress will consider the implementation of any reforms as part the President's fiscal year 2007 budget request.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2005	$6,331,590,000
Budget estimate, 2006	6,630,133,000
House allowance	6,181,121,000
Committee recommendation	6,554,354,00

The Weapons Activities account provides for the maintenance and refurbishment of nuclear weapons in order to sustain confidence in their safety, reliability, and performance; the expansion of scientific, engineering, and manufacturing capabilities to enable certification of the enduring nuclear weapons stockpile; and the manufacture of nuclear weapon components under a comprehensive test moratorium. The Weapons Activities account also provides for maintaining the capability to return to the design and production of new weapons and to underground nuclear testing if so directed by the President and Congress. The major elements of the program include the following: directed stockpile work, campaigns, readiness in technical base and facilities, facilities and infrastructure, secure transportation asset, and safeguards and security.

Weapons Activities Reprogramming Authority.—The Committee provides limited reprogramming authority within the Weapons Activities account without submission of a reprogramming to be approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. The reprogramming categories will be as follows: directed stockpile work, science campaigns, engineering campaigns, inertial confinement fusion, advanced simulation and computing, pit manufacturing and certification, readiness campaigns, and operating expenses for readiness in technical base and facilities. In addition, funding of not more than $5,000,000 may be transferred between each of these categories and each construction project subject to the following limitations: only one transfer may be made to or from any program or project; the transfer must be necessary to address a risk to health, safety or the environment or to assure the most efficient use of weapons activities funds at a site; and funds may not be used for an item for which Congress has specifically denied funds or for a new program or project that has not been authorized by Congress. Congressional notification within 15 days of the use of this reprogramming authority is required. Transfers during the fiscal year which would result in increases or decreases in excess of $5,000,000 or which would be subject to the limitations outlined above require prior notification and approval from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

The Committee recommendation includes $1,458,786,000 for directed stockpile work.

Directed Stockpile Work [DSW] includes all activities that directly support weapons in the nuclear stockpile, including maintenance, research, development, engineering, certification and dismantlement and disposal activities.

The Committee supports a degree of flexibility in executing this budget by providing limited reprogramming authority within Directed Stockpile Work [DSW]. The control levels for the DSW program are:

(1) Life Extension Programs;
(2) Stockpile Systems;
(3) Retired Warhead Stockpile Systems; and
(4) Stockpile Services.

Life Extension Program.—Within Life Extension Programs, the Committee fully funds LEP activities at $348,318,000 including the administration's request for the B61 at $50,810,000 to refurbish the canned subassembly and replacement of associated seals, supports, cables and connectors. The Committee provides full funding of $162,268,000 for the W76 to provide among other activities funding to support the design of the refurbished warheads to meet the military characteristics. The Committee provides for the W80 at $135,240,000 in order to accelerate process prove-in activities, ground qualification tests for hardware that supports future flight tests, hydrodynamic tests, the system thermal mechanical tests and the full system engineering tests.

Stockpile System.—Within Stockpile Systems, the Committee fully endorses $311,804,000 for Stockpile Systems including the W80 at $26,315,000 in order to conduct vital surveillance lab tests,

Canned Subassembly [CSA] surveillance and significantly decrease the current surveillance backlog of work. Other critical activities include support of the annual assessment process, providing support for all agency safety studies, accelerating completion of Significant Finding Investigations [SFIs], conducting key integrated experiments per the baseline plan; maintain steady production of the 1K reservoir, timely production of telemetry units and other Joint Test Assembly [JTA] hardware for support of flight tests. Also, these improvements and acceleration of activities will support the Seamless Safety for the 21st Century [SS–21] initiative. Within the Stockpile Systems program the Committee supports the budget request and provides $66,050,000 for the B61; $8,967,000 for the W62; $63,538,000 for the W76; $32,632,000 for W78; $26,315,000 for the W80; $26,391,000 for B83; $4,402,000 for the W84; $50,678,000 for the W87; and $32,831,000 for the W88.

Stockpile Services.—The Committee fully endorses the President's request at $798,664,000 for Stockpile Services with the areas of: Production Support; Research and Development Support; Research and Development Certification and Safety; Management, Technology, and Production; and, the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. The Stockpile Services Program provides essential funding for production activities that supports all of the weapons systems. Any reduction to this program would undermine the U.S. infrastructure and the critical R&D and production support, including quality control, certification, and training.

The Committee recommends $267,246,000 for Production Support in order to facilitate, expedite and improve activities in the areas of Engineering Support; Manufacturing Support; Quality Supervision and Control; Tool, Gage and Test Equipment support; Purchasing and Material Support; and, Information Systems Support that were previously allocated to weapon types.

The Committee recommends $71,753,000 for R&D Support in order to continue to conduct timely and essential activities directly supporting research, development, design, and maintenance functions where the work is performed by the same functional organization, the work supports two or more weapon types, and the work is essentially the same for each weapon-type and association of project costs to a weapon type would be arbitrary and are not directly identified or allocated to specific weapon types. The Committee directs the NNSA to fund the Nevada Test Site at $40,000,000, $5,000,000 above the request, to maintain the Subcritical Experiment Program, including the Phoenix Explosive Pulse Power program.

The Committee recommends $243,727,000 for R&D Certification and Safety in order to promote core competencies and capabilities not directly attributable to a single warhead type. Critical activities include modeling and assessment; safety, surety, and quality; warhead effects and system analysis studies, and model-based engineering and manufacturing; preparing and performing hydrodynamic tests; providing engineering and infrastructure support; multi-system surveillance; material science support and legacy archiving. The Committee recommends that an additional $21,000,000 be provided for Research and Development Certification and Safety to integrate new technologies into the stockpile

consistent with the RRW program. The Committee provides an additional $10,000,000 to Los Alamos National Laboratory to conduct hydrodynamic testing in support of the Stockpile Stewardship program.

The Committee recommends $171,587,000 for Management, Technology, and Production in order to continue key management and workload activities, not associated with a particular weapon type, which includes updating the Stockpile Dismantlement Database for the Nuclear Weapons Complex; Gas Transfer System [GTS] Redevelopment Reclamation for the First Production Unit [FPU]; core surveillance diagnostics; timely close-out of Significant Finding Investigations [SFIs]; conducting component engineering activities, reservoir forging development and special stockpile studies. The Committee provides $4,000,000 above the request to fund independent assessments of the safety of the stockpile and secure information exchange within the weapons complex.

Reliable Replacement Warhead.—In response to a Los Alamos National Lab proposal to improve the sustainability of our national nuclear deterrent, Congress adopted the Reliable Replacement Warhead [RRW] Program in the fiscal year 2005 Consolidated Appropriations Act (Public Law 108–447). NNSA is undertaking the RRW Program to understand if warhead design constraints imposed on Cold War systems (e.g. high yield to weight ratios that have typically driven "tight" performance margins in nuclear design) are relaxed, could replacement components for existing stockpile weapons be more easily manufactured with more readily available and more environmentally benign materials, and whose safety and reliability could be assured with high confidence, without nuclear testing. This effort does not call into question the safety or reliability of the current stockpile but acknowledges the long-term sustainability of the legacy stockpile will be difficult. Implementation of RRW should also result in reduced life-cycle costs for supporting the stockpile. The Committee recognizes that RRW is early in its development and will not significantly alter the near-term plans for stockpile support such as LEPs, but NNSA is encouraged to move aggressively to incorporate benefits from RRW into the stockpile as soon as possible.

The Committee recommends $25,351,000 for RRW to accelerate the planning, development and design for a comprehensive RRW strategy that improves the reliability, longevity and certifiability of existing weapons and their components.

Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator.—The Committee recommends $4,000,000 to support the funding of the Air Force led study. The NNSA–DOD teams will conduct B83 impact studies and analyze test data. Sandia National Laboratory is the site of the RNEP tests and the Laboratory possesses a unique set of capabilities to conduct the test on a qualified test track where they are able to design and produce necessary instrumentation. Sandia is also able to maintain a Secret/Restricted Data Protected Environment in which to conduct the test and disassemble test materials that include hazardous material such as depleted uranium and insensitive high explosives. There are no other facilities aside from Sandia and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory where the test data can be readily used to validate computer models that require terra-scale

computers to model the data. If this test were moved to another site, it would cost at least 100 percent more than the existing budget request in order to replicate the test facility, prepare the test in a Secret/Restricted Data environment and handle the appropriate material. Any alternative site would need to conduct the appropriate environmental impact statement to ensure full compliance with environmental statutes. The Committee urges the Department to quickly complete the testing and opposes the Department moving this test to any other facility, as it would be a waste of taxpayer resources. The Committee reminds the administration that none of the funds provided may be used for activities at the engineering development phases, phase 3 or 6.3 or beyond, in support of the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator.

The Committee recommends $15,000,000 for the warhead dismantlement program within stockpile services. The Committee urges the NNSA to explore alternatives to more aggressively work off the dismantlement backlog, but acknowledges that effectively utilizing NNSA site/plant space and throughput capacities is challenging in order to balance the priority commitment to support the Life Extension Programs.

CAMPAIGNS

Campaigns focus on scientific, technical and engineering efforts to develop and maintain critical capabilities and tools needed to support stockpile refurbishment and continued assessment and certification of the stockpile for the long term in the absence of underground nuclear testing. The major elements of the campaigns are: science campaigns, engineering campaigns, inertial confinement fusion and high yield, advanced simulation and computing, pit manufacturing and certification, and readiness campaigns.

Within available funds, the Department is directed to work with the UNLV Research Foundation and a consortium of universities to continue design, preparation and experimentation on the Atlas Machine.

Science Campaigns.—The Committee recommendation includes $307,925,000 for the Science campaign, an increase of $46,000,000 above fiscal year 2005 levels. The Science Campaign is the principal mechanism for supporting the science required to maintain the technical viability of the national nuclear weapons laboratories to enable them to respond to emerging national security needs. As such the campaign maintains the scientific infrastructure of the three weapons laboratories.

The Department is directed to renew for 5 years the existing cooperative agreements with the University of Nevada Las Vegas and the University of Nevada Reno. The Department is also directed to provide funding of $3,000,000 to each institution per year.

Primary Assessment Technologies.—The Committee recommends $55,179,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request, to improve the understanding of boost physics, one of the most complex challenges facing weapons designers. To understand the performance of materials subjected to extreme pressures that occur during a nuclear event, the laboratories have developed the capabilities to replicate the extreme physical environment in order to support the stockpile stewardship activities. The Committee ex-

pects the laboratories to support these activities with experiments using radiography and hydrotests. This data will be used to reduce the uncertainties in performance codes. Within the increased level of funding $5,000,000 is provided to Los Alamos to initiate preliminary design activities and demonstrate the capability of proton radiography of the LANSCE facilities in supporting stockpile stewardship activities.

The Committee directs NNSA to fund the Nevada Test Site at $15,000,000, an increase of $5,000,000 to maintain NTS dynamic experiments, diagnostics, and data analysis, including past UGT analysis, at the level necessary to sustain the critical personnel skills and institutional viability to meet national program goals.

Test Readiness.—The Committee recommends $25,000,000, the same as the budget request and a decrease of $1,784,000 below fiscal year 2005 funding levels.

Dynamic Materials Properties.—The Committee recommends $90,894,000, an increase of $10,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee provides an additional $5,000,000 above the budget request of $20,000,000 to fund the Dynamic Materials Properties at the Nevada Test Site [NTS], and directs NNSA to make full use of plutonium experiments at the Joint Actinide Shock Physics Experimental Research facility [JASPER] and experiments on dynamic materials properties at the Atlas facility. The Committee opposes the budget request since it is unable to adequately support necessary experiments to validate thermodynamic properties and better understand material properties. Without additional funding, the Atlas Machine at the Nevada Test Site would be put on standby. The Committee directs the Department to use the increased funds to support experiments using the Z machine at Sandia National Lab, gas guns at Los Alamos, dynamic materials property tests using Atlas and plutonium experiments at the Joint Actinide Shock Physics Experimental facility [JASPER] located at the Nevada Test Site. The Committee directs the Department to support additional funding to Lawrence Livermore National Lab for experiments on equation-of-state measurements at JASPER needed for primary certification. The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for LCS laser upgrades to the Idaho Accelerator Center.

Advanced Radiography.—The Committee recommends $59,520,000, an increase of $10,000,000 above the budget request. The goal of the Advanced Radiography program is to develop multi-axis, multi-time radiographic hydrotest capability and to develop techniques for focused physical studies. The top priority for NNSA has been the refurbishment and reinstallation of the 2nd axis on DARHT. This is a joint effort among LANL, LLNL and Lawrence Berkley National Lab. The Committee recommends $10,000,000 to support improvements in radiography improvements to better diagnostic support on future subcritical experiments ad to ensure timely completion of the DARHT 2nd axis.

Secondary Assessment Technologies.—The Committee recommends $77,332,000, an increase of $16,000,000. This program plays a critical role in developing the Advanced Scientific Computing effort to validate experimental data in modeling the yield performance of our nuclear systems and the impact of aging of ma-

terials. This program supports hydrodynamic and high-energy-density experiments.

As a result of NNSA's decision to focus on construction of the National Ignition Facility [NIF] rather than focus on stockpile research there will be an increased reliance on the Z facility at Sandia and the Omega laser at the University of Rochester to support critical R&D efforts. As such, the Committee directs the NNSA to support additional experiments on Z machine and Omega laser using the increase in funding. Failure to provide adequate funding would prevent the labs from meeting the necessary campaign milestones.

Engineering Campaigns

The Committee recommends $272,756,000 for the Engineering Campaign, an increase of $14,013,000 over fiscal year 2005 levels. This campaign provides validation of engineering science, modeling and simulation tools necessary to support design, qualification and the certification of the stockpile. This campaign also supports at an increased level the development of surety technologies that are critical to ensuring the safe storage and transportation of these weapons.

Enhanced Surety.—The Committee recommends $45,845,000, an increase of $16,000,000 above the request, to provide validation technology for inclusion in the stockpile refurbishment program to assure that modern nuclear safety standards are fully met and a new level of use-denial performance is achieved. The Committee recommends $16,000,000 in additional funding to be provided to research, develop and design architectures to integrate required safety, security, reliability and use control functions. Work performed under this campaign supports all of the current and future stockpile activities that will utilize MESA developed micro technologies. This funding increase will allow restoration of activities for developing surety architectures that will provide increased security during storage, transportation and mission-related activities. This funding should be used to supplement the increased investment in the RRW initiative to ensure that enhanced safeguards are included in future modifications to the stockpile.

Weapons Systems.—The Committee recommends $20,040,000, 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 $25,386,000, an increase of $16,000,000 above the budget 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. The Committee provides $16,000,000 to support work at the MESA facility to design work for the W76–1 and other reentry systems to meet the requirement for radiation hardening. Sandia National Laboratory retains the only expertise in the Nation to develop equipment and electronics capable of withstanding intense radiation environments.

Enhanced Surveillance.—The Committee recommendation includes $111,207,000 for the Enhanced Surveillance Campaign, $15,000,000 above the request. The increase is provided to begin enhanced surveillance work to take advantage of the accelerated MESA completion and newly-developed ASC simulation codes, as well as to encourage the development and deployment of advanced surveillance technologies and techniques into RRW and the sustainable stockpile. Modern stockpile evaluation based upon the enhanced surveillance program activities is intended to provide an accurate, more timely and more cost-effective means for assuring performance of existing stockpile systems, upcoming LEPs, and RRW. Funding increases will enable the development and implementation of these new techniques, and improving their readiness for RRW and the sustainable stockpile.

The Enhanced Surveillance program provides component and material lifetime assessments and develops predictive capabilities for early identification and assessment of stockpile aging concerns. This program supports the University Research Program in Robotics at $4,465,000.

Project 01–D–108 Microsystem and Engineering Science Applications [MESA], SNL, Albuquerque, New Mexico.—The Committee recommendation includes $65,564,000 to maintain the construction schedule consistent with projected stockpile needs. The budget also provides $4,714,000 in operating funds to support other project costs that are related to the MESA line item construction project but are not capitalized.

Inertial Confinement Fusion and High Yield

The Committee recommends $314,023,000, a reduction of $4,482,000 from the budget request for the Inertial Confinement Fusion and High Yield Campaign. This allocation restores $61,000,000 in funding to the Support of Stockpile and Inertial Fusion Technology program that was cut from the budget request.

National Ignition Facility [NIF].—The Committee is disappointed in the long-term funding outlook for Weapons Activities contained in the fiscal year 2006 FYNSP. Compared to the budget request in fiscal year 2005, Weapons Activities funding is reduced by $3,000,000,000 over the next 5 years. This decline is likely to have significant programmatic impacts and drastically curtail NNSA's scientific capabilities. It is difficult to conceive of a single program not being severely impacted, including NIF, as a result of the declining budget. The Committee is cognizant that the modest funding reduction of $25,000,000 in fiscal year 2005 to the NIF program forced NNSA managers to rebaseline the entire project. As a result of the rebaselining effort, the NNSA has made the decision to support the NIF construction effort at the expense of the Inertial Confinement Fusion and High Yield Campaigns, putting in jeopardy critical high energy stewardship research at Los Alamos, Sandia, and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories. The fiscal year 2006 budget cuts experimental programs that are essential in obtaining scientific data for ASC codes. The budget proposes the elimination of the Inertial Fusion Technology program that supported research on the Z machine and High Average Power Laser

program. Currently, NIF is able to operate four beamlines, making NIF the most powerful laser in the world.

The NNSA has not completed the rebaselining of the NIF program, and the Committee directs that no funds be expended on project 96–D–111 in order to focus on supporting a comprehensive stewardship program.

Ignition.—The Committee recommends $68,800,000 to support experiments at Inertial Confinement facilities to demonstrate the principles of thermonuclear fusion. Sufficient funding is provided to support computer simulation, target fabrication, and target design calculation.

Support for Other Stockpile Programs.—In order to avoid drastic cuts to the ICF program, the Committee recommends restoring funding to $41,000,000 to perform experiments on the Z-machine to validate computer models as well as experiments on OMEGA at the University of Rochester, NY. This is an increase of $31,128,000 above the budget request.

NIF Diagnostics, Cryogenics and Experimental Support.—The Committee provides $30,000,000. It is clear from recent advances in target research that targets may hold the key to significant increases in efficiency. Targets with cryogenic fuel, composite ablators, foams, double shells and advanced hohlraum designs can compensate for limitation for both indirect and direct target concepts. The Committee directs the Department to provide $10,000,000 from within available funds to accelerate development of targets to support experiments on NIF, OMEGA and Z-machine.

Pulsed Power Inertial Confinement Fusion.—The Committee's recommendation provides $10,900,000, a $910,000 increase over the budget request for pulsed power ICF to assess Z pinches as drivers for ignition and high yield fusion.

University Grants/Other ICF Support.—The Committee provides $7,700,000 for research assistance in high energy density science, a level consistent with fiscal year 2005.

The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to Nevada Terawatt Facility. Within the funds provided, $3,000,000 is for research into strongly magnetized highly density energy matter and $2,000,000 is for construction of the high energy, short-pulse laser system.

Facility Operations and Target Production.—The Committee provides $54,623,000 as requested to support operations on OMEGA and Z-machine. Funds will support target production, engineering support, and maintenance.

Inertial Fusion Technology.—The Committee is disappointed that the budget completely eliminated funding with this account. As such the Committee has restored the funding to $41,000,000 and provides $6,000,000 to prepare Z-machine to support extended operations.

NIF Demonstration.—The Committee recommends $50,000,000 to support the NIF Demonstration program. The committee directs the NNSA to use this funding to support Stockpile Stewardship responsibilities necessary for closeout costs or other impacts as a result of the halt in construction and installation.

High Energy Petawatt Laser Development.—The Committee strongly supports the OMEGA petawatt laser and provides

$10,000,000 an increase of $7,000,000 above the request. The funding supports the development and testing of two short pulsed laser beams to support the existing capabilities at OMEGA in Rochester, New York. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $7,000,000 for university grants and other support. Of this amount, $3,000,000 is provided for continued development of petawatt laser at the University of Texas at Austin; $2,000,000 is provided to the University of Nevada, Reno to continue its collaboration with Sandia National Laboratories on highly diagnosed studies of exploding wire arrays and implosion dynamics. The Committee provides $2,000,000 to Sandia National Laboratories for Z-Petawatt Consortium experiments using the Sandia Z-Beamlet and Z-Petawatt lasers.

Construction—Project 96–D–111.—The Committee directs that no funds shall be expended for this project.

The Committee directs the NNSA to continue working with the Office of Science and the NSF on interagency coordination and support of high energy density physics and high intensity laser science. The Committee recommends that the Department form a High Energy Density Physics Advisory Committee, drawn from the scientific and technical community, to assist in this effort. The Committee further directs the Department to provide to the Committee a plan for funding and managing non-defense high energy density physics research and facilities development by March 1, 2006.

Advanced Simulation and Computing

The Committee recommends $735,830,000, an increase of $75,000,000 above the President's budget request, to support stockpile refurbishments, annual assessment and certification. The Committee acknowledges the important role of the ASC Program in Stockpile Stewardship as affirmed by the JASONs' study directed by Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003, Public Law 108–7. The Committee shares the concerns raised by the JASONs about ensuring both adequate capacity and capability to meet the growing computational demands of the weapons designers and engineers at the laboratories. The Committee urges NNSA to further improve code confidence through more rigorous analysis. The Committee recognizes that without the Advanced Computing program the labs will be unable to certify the life extension program designs in the required timeframes. Codes based in experimental data are critical to validating the calculated changes to a physics package that will be included in the life extension program. As the labs enter a new phase in the life extension program through the RRW program, improved computer modeling will be critical to designing and deploying more reliable and interchangeable parts.

The Committee is aware of the enormous management and technical challenge the NNSA has faced in establishing the ASC program over the past 10 years. The Committee is supportive of NNSA's proposed transition to a product-focused initiative that will integrate the experimental data and enhance the predictability to answer challenging questions researchers have yet to solve. In fiscal year 2006, the ASC program is expected to deliver an advanced physics and engineering simulation capability to support the W76

and the W80 life extension certifications. The Committee supports the ASC challenge to complete the modern baseline that reflects the comprehensive physics baseline of our enduring stockpile with ASC codes by fiscal year 2009. In order for the NNSA to meet these milestones and complete its transition to a product based program that serves, the Committee directs the Secretary to withhold funding of earmarks that do not directly support the stockpile stewardship mission within the ASC program until the Secretary certifies in writing to Congress on an annual basis that the ASC program remains on track to meet the annual milestones, as well as goals laid out in the NNSA 5-year plan.

The Committee recognizes that there is a need for much faster computer systems to perform the most complicated weapons systems analyses. The Committee recommends an increase of $75,000,000 to acquire a 150 teraflop computing system at Los Alamos to decrease the time required for the large weapons related calculations and to increase the productivity of the scientists. Currently, Los Alamos is working on a life extension program for the W76. The Committee has been informed that one calculation to support the LEP has been running for 19 months on a 20 teraflop machine. This is an unacceptable timeframe. The purchase of the new 150 TF machine will reduce the runtime from 19 months to just 3 months for the same calculation. In 2003 the Committee charged JASON and the National Academies to report on the requirements drivers and computer architectural directions chosen by the Advanced Simulation and Computing program. The studies recognized that Stockpile Stewardship simulation demands oversubscribe current resources and that a diversity of supercomputer architectures is needed to meet the demanding obligations of Stewardship. Demands of the Life Extension Programs in particular and Stockpile Stewardship in general do not allow the reallocation of leading systems to single problems for any extended period of time. The Blue Gene/L system at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and its focus on critical nuclear weapons science, only fulfills part of the mission needs. While this system effectively targets weapons aging issues, by design it is not suited to advance the complex full-weapons-systems simulation. The Committee agrees with study recommendations and recognizes the need to support the most demanding requirements.

From within amounts provided, the Committee recommends that no less than $269,800,000 is provided to Los Alamos National Laboratory; $243,700,000 for Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; and $162,500,000 for Sandia National Laboratory to support the Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign. In addition, the Committee provides $55,000,000 for the capacity computing requirements to support the W76–1 LEP.

Pit Manufacturing and Certification

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $248,760,000 for the pit manufacturing and certification campaign, the same as the budget request. This amount includes $182,821,000 to support the manufacturing and certification of a W88 pit consistent with the project baseline. The Committee directs the NNSA to revise as appropriate the pit production and certification plan and submit

the report to the relevant congressional committees by March 31, 2005, and annually thereafter.

Modern Pit Facility.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $7,686,000, the same as the budget request.

Readiness Campaigns

Stockpile Readiness Campaign.—The Committee recommends $218,755,000 for the stockpile readiness campaign, the amount of the request. This program, initiated in fiscal year 2001, enables the Y–12 National Security Complex to replace or restore production capability and to modernize aging facilities. At present, all of the critical manufacturing capabilities required for weapons refurbishments at Y–12 do not exist.

High Explosives and Weapons Operations.—The Committee recommends $17,097,000 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 $28,630,000, 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.

Tritium Readiness.—The Committee recommendation includes $87,588,000 for the tritium readiness campaign, the same as the request. This includes funding for the construction of the Tritium extraction facility at the requested level of $24,894,000.

Advanced Design and Production Technologies.—The Committee recommends $54,040,000.

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 recruiting the future workforce in technical areas that are critical to the continuing stewardship enterprise. The Committee remains supportive of this activity and directs the administration to honor existing cooperative agreements as this new office implements its responsibilities. The Committee is aware of the successful partnerships between the NNSA and the University of Nevada-Las Vegas and the University of Nevada-Reno that have been fostered through a series of cooperative agreements. The Department is encouraged to renew these agreements.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

The Committee recommendation includes $1,696,336,000 an increase of $64,950,000 from the budget request.

The readiness in technical base and facilities [RTBF] program provides the underlying physical infrastructure and operational readiness for the directed stockpile work and campaign programs. RTBF activities include ensuring that facilities are operational, safe, secure, and in compliance with regulatory requirements, and

that a defined level of readiness is sustained at facilities funded by the Office of Defense Programs.

Operations of Facilities.—The Committee recommends $1,200,483,000, an increase of $39,700,000, to maintain readiness for all RTBF facilities. The Committee provides an additional $15,000,000 above the budget request to support operation and recapitalization of facilities at the Nevada Test Site [NTS], specifically the Device Assembly Facility preparations for expanded missions, the Joint Actinide Shock Physics Experimental Research facility, Big Explosive Experimental Facility [BEEF], U1a Complex, and other projects. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $11,000,000 within the funds provided for modification of the Z-Beamlet laser at the Z Pinch at Sandia National Laboratories. The Committee provides $12,000,000 from within available funds to support MESA Operations. The Committee provides an additional $20,000,000 for facility upgrades at the Kansas City Plant, to be distributed as follows: $5,000,000 is provided to replace machinery essential to support the Life Extension Programs; $7,000,000 to address deferred maintenance to machinery; and $5,700,000 to support infrastructure improvement.

The Committee recommendation includes $2,500,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation to support the ongoing programs of the Institute for Security Studies. The Committee provides an additional $3,000,000 above the budget request for the Advanced Monitoring Systems Initiative at the NTS to continue micro-sensing technology deployment and prototype deployment of remote monitoring systems for the underground test area.

The Committee recommendation provides an additional $15,000,000 to improve and upgrade existing roads at the Nevada Test Site and an additional $4,000,000 to install two new water storage tanks in Area 6 of the NTS. The Committee provides $1,000,000 to purchase and install a Geographic Information Center at the NTS. Additionally, the Committee recommendation provides $4,000,000 to install a 17-mile fiber optic link between the Nevada Test Site and Indians Springs Air Force Base; and $4,500,000 to upgrade the Emergency Operations Center within the Nevada Support Facility to meet national program goals.

The recommendation also includes, within funds provided, $3,000,000 for the Consortium for Terrorism and Fire Science at UNR.

Program Readiness.—The Committee recommends $105,738,000, the same as the budget request, to enhance readiness and maintain materials processing and component manufacturing readiness.

Special Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes $19,869,000 for special projects. Within the available funds, $250,000 for the continuing operations and security at the Atomic Testing History Institute; $2,000,000 to the UNLV Research Foundation to continue support of the radioanalytical services laboratory. The Committee provides $3,500,000 to the not-for-profit Technology Ventures Corporations to continue the successful technology transfer and commercialization efforts at the National Laboratories and the Nevada Test Site. The Committee provides $2,500,000 for the National Museum of Nuclear Science and History.

The Committee recommends $1,250,000 for the Arrowhead Center at New Mexico State University. The Committee provides $2,000,000 for Rapid Prototyping activities at the Special Technology Laboratory in Santa Barbara, CA to accelerate development of sensor and live plume tracking capabilities at the Nevada Test Site. The Committee recommendation also includes $2,000,000 for a public-private partnership to continue the test and evaluation of water filtration technology to protect the public against nuclear, biological, and chemical threats. The Committee recommends $1,000,000 to continue the ongoing administration infrastructure support grant for the UNLV Research Foundation.

Material Recycle and Recovery.—The Committee recommends $72,730,000, the amount of the budget request.

Construction Projects.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $255,047,000, for construction projects under Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities.

The Committee continues to be concerned about the fire station support at the Nevada Test Site and is pleased by the decision to use a design-build acquisition strategy for the fire stations and encourages completion at the earliest possible time within the funding that has been provided. $65,000,000 is provided to the 4–D–125 the CMR Replacement facility. In 1999, NNSA approved a strategy to managing risk at CMR that recognized the facility could not continue its mission at acceptable level of risk to the workforce without operational restrictions. The CMRR project will allow the NNSA to consolidate the critical stewardship mission support functions including analytical chemistry, materials characterization, and actinide R&D located in the existing facility. The Committee recognizes and fully supports the NNSA's efforts to construct the CMR Replacement facility near the TA–55 plutonium facility to ensure Los Alamos will be able to fully support its ongoing plutonium mission.

Project 05–D–140, Project Engineering and Design [PED]—RTBF, Various Locations.—The Committee recommends an additional $2,000,000 for the Test Capabilities Revitalization project at Sandia National Laboratory.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation includes $261,809,000, a reduction of $21,700,000 below the request.

The facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program is a multi-year but limited term effort to restore the physical infrastructure of the weapons complex and eliminate the maintenance backlog. The program provides funds to accomplish deferred maintenance and utilities replacement while improving facility management practices to preclude further deterioration.

SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $212,100,000.

The secure transportation asset program provides for the safe, secure movement of nuclear weapons, special nuclear material, and weapon components between military locations and nuclear complex facilities within the United States.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS INCIDENT RESPONSE

Formerly funded in the Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities account, the program funding for emergency management and radiological emergency response activities ensures a central point of contact and an integrated response to radiological emergencies. The Committee recommends $118,796,000, the amount of the request.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation includes $740,478,000, the same as the request.

The safeguards and security line identifies the funding necessary for all safeguard and security requirements (except for personnel security investigations) at NNSA landlord sites, specifically the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, Kansas City Plant, Pantex Plant, Y–12 Plant, and the Savannah River Site Tritium Facilities. The Committee directs NNSA to fund the Nevada Site Office security budget at the fiscal year 2006 request of $62,000,000 and provide an additional $20,000,000 to fully staff the security force at the Device Assembly Facility, including the full implementation of the protective force Special Response Team program. The Committee provides $20,000,000 to complete the expansion of the red network at Los Alamos in order to reduce the necessity for CREM. The Committee provides within available funds $12,000,000 to reinvigorate security research development, test and evaluation. Without the assistance of innovative technological solutions, most sites are forced to rely on protective forces. Technology can be a force multiplier, but without investment in advanced security technology research and development new technologies will not be realized. The Committee provides $1,900,000 to deploy and demonstrate an enterprise PKI for secure authentication and communication at Sandia National Laboratory.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriations, 2005	$1,409,033,000
Budget estimate, 2006	1,637,239,000
House allowance	1,500,959,000
Committee recommendation	1,729,066,000

The Committee recommendation includes $1,729,066,000 for defense nuclear nonproliferation, an increase of $91,827,000.

The Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account funds programs and activities to (1) prevent the spread of materials, technology, and expertise relating to weapons of mass destruction; (2) detect the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction worldwide; (3) provide for international nuclear safety, and (4) eliminate inventories of surplus fissile materials usable for nuclear weapons. These highly important initiatives address the danger that hostile nations or terrorist groups may acquire weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material, dual-use production technology or weapons of mass destruction expertise. The major elements of the program include the following: nonproliferation and verification research and

development, nonproliferation and international security, and nonproliferation programs with Russia.

The Committee recognizes the importance of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT] in preventing states of concern and terrorists from acquiring or developing nuclear weapons. Developments with North Korea and Iran as well as the A.Q. Khan nuclear black market underscore the need to strengthen the NPT. The Committee is concerned that efforts to strengthen the NPT have been weakened by the allegation that U.S. nuclear weapons policy is not consistent with its commitment under Article VI of the NPT to work toward general and complete disarmament. The nuclear posture and nonproliferation policies of the United States are consistent with its obligations under Article VI. The United States nuclear stockpile is the smallest in many decades, and it is not developing new generations of nuclear weapons. The Committee urges the Department of Energy to focus on the primary challenge of strengthening the NPT by closing the loopholes that enable countries to develop weapons programs under the guise of peaceful nuclear energy programs. The Committee also urges the Department to use any and all incentives available to accelerate conversion of research reactors fueled with highly-enriched uranium [HEU] to low enriched uranium to eliminate the use of HEU in the civilian sector.

NONPROLIFERATION VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation includes $297,218,000, an increase of $30,000,000.

The nonproliferation and verification research and development program conducts applied research, development, testing, and evaluation leading to prototype demonstrations and detection systems that are critical to the United States response to current and projected threats posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and diversion of special nuclear material. The program works directly with agencies responsible for monitoring proliferation and combating terrorism.

The Committee recommendation includes $2,500,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation support of nonproliferation activities at Institute for Security Studies.

The Committee supports the nuclear and radiological national security program. The NNSA is directed to provide for the sustained development of advanced technologies needed to counter nuclear terrorism threats and should focus on improving capabilities through research and development in threat assessment and prediction, basic nuclear understanding, sensors and detection systems, consequence mitigation, forensics and attribution and render-safe technologies.

The Committee recommends $10,000,000 to support a research and development program in the NNSA, through the national laboratories and drawing on the expertise of the Science programs, to provide a foundation and long term R&D capability in chemical and biological detection.

Project 06–D–180, National Nuclear Security Administration Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program, Project Engineering and

Design [PED], National Security Laboratory, PPNL, Washington.—The Committee recommendation includes $13,000,000.

The Committee recommends $2,000,000 to begin the conceptual design effort to design a facility to accommodate the security category of III/IV radiological mission, materials and activities currently housed at TA–18.

NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The Committee recommendation includes $90,173,000, an increase of $9,827,000 from the request to adequately fund Global Threat Reduction Initiative. The Committee supports the administration's efforts to remove and secure high-risk nuclear and radiological materials and equipment around the world that pose a threat to the United States and its allies by: consolidating, accelerating, and expanding the Department's nuclear materials removal efforts; enhancing the security of vulnerable radiological materials worldwide; and identifying nuclear and radiological materials and equipment not being addressed by current nonproliferation activities.

The nonproliferation and international security program supports activities to: control the export of items and technology useful for weapons of mass destruction [WMD]; implement international safeguards in conjunction with the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA]; monitor and implement treaties and agreements; develop and implement policy in support of international security efforts aimed at securing high-risk nuclear material; develop and implement transparency measures to assure international nonproliferation and arms control commitments; and explore and implement innovative approaches to improve regional security. The Committee directs the Department to provide $5,000,000 in grants to institutions of higher learning and non-profit entities for research related to nuclear nonproliferation and chemical and biological weapons detection. Each individual grant provided shall not exceed $500,000.

The recommendation includes $10,000,000 to reinvigorate initiatives focused on removing nuclear materials from vulnerable sites around the world. These activities are essential to prevent terrorist groups or states hostile to the United States from acquiring destructive nuclear capabilities.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS PROTECTION AND COOPERATION

The Committee recommendation includes $343,435,000, the same as the request. This program will continue to improve the security for nuclear material and weapons in Russia by installing basic rapid upgrades and through comprehensive security improvements.

The Committee continues to believe that these activities are critical elements of the United States nonproliferation efforts.

Regarding the second line of defense activities, the Committee urges the NNSA to continue its efforts in the use of integrated monitoring methodology for special nuclear monitoring detection at airports, ports, and border crossing in the former Soviet Union and newly independent States. The Committee provides $97,929,000 for Second Line of Defense Activities, including $73,929,000 for the Megaports program.

GLOBAL INITIATIVE FOR PROLIFERATION PREVENTION

The Committee recommendation includes $50,890,000 to support the Global Initiative for Proliferation Prevention [GIPP]. In fiscal year 2005, this account was formerly named the Russian Transition Initiatives [RTI] and supported the funding for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention and the Nuclear Cities Initiative [NCI]. Although the names have changed the purpose remains the same. The Department recognizes that scientists in other countries are seeking to, or are already working on developing the capability for nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. Consistent with the successful mission of the former RTI programs, the Department should look to engage scientists outside the former Soviet Union in useful scientific discovery and cooperation. The Department should continue to support the original activities within Russia, but seek to expand its cooperation with other countries that pose the highest risk of developing weapons of mass destruction.

HEU Transparency Implementation.—The Committee recommendation includes $20,483,000 to support continued work with Russia to provide confidence to the United States that the Russian highly enriched uranium [HEU] being converted is from its military stockpile, consistent with the 1993 United States-Russia HEU Purchase Agreement.

Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $152,000,000 for this program to assist the Russian Federation in ceasing its production of weapons-grade plutonium production by providing replacement power production capacity.

The Committee recommends $20,000,000 to support conversion of the Zheleznogorsk plutonium reactor.

In 2004, Congress authorized the Department to use international funds for the EWGPP program without further appropriation and without fiscal year limitation. Additionally, the Department is authorized and encouraged to develop and implement cost-sharing options with the Russian Federation, when practicable.

Fissile Materials Disposition.—The Committee recommendation includes $653,065,000. This program conducts activities in both the United States and Russia to dispose of fissile materials that would pose a threat to the United States if acquired by hostile nations or terrorist groups.

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 understands the important role the U.S. plutonium disposition program plays in the Department's domestic efforts to consolidate and dispose of inventories of surplus weapons-grade plutonium. The consolidation and the safe disposals of this material from across the complex will significantly lower safety and

security costs, and facilitate the closure of former nuclear weapons sites across the NNSA complex. Any effort to eliminate funding for this project will likely foreclose a disposal pathway for plutonium stored at Savannah River causing the Department to pay the State of South Carolina up to $100,000,000 per year in fines starting in 2011. Without a viable disposal solution, the cleanup of the Hanford Site and arrangements for decreasing inventories of plutonium at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and the Pantex Plant will cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars annually for storage and related Design Basis Threat activities.

CONSTRUCTION

Project 99–D–141 Pit Disassembly & Conversion Facility.—The Committee recommends $24,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 99–D–143 Mixed Oxide [MOX] Fuel Fabrication Facility.—The Committee recommends $338,565,000, the same as the request.

GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

The Global Threat Reduction Initiative mission is to identify, secure, remove high-risk, vulnerable nuclear and radiological materials and equipment around the world that pose a potential threat to the United States and the International community. The Committee encourages the Department to increase its efforts to accelerate the return of highly enriched uranium [HEU] from research and test reactors worldwide. The Committee provides $108,975,000, an increase of $11,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee has provided this funding increase to the Radiological Threat Reduction program to establish a pilot program that would utilize commercial or non-governmental resources for recovery, storage and monitoring of greater than class C domestic radiological sealed sources.

The Committee provides an addition $7,000,000 to support the conversion of highly enriched uranium core to a low enriched uranium core for as many as four university research reactors located in the United States. The reactors targeted for conversion are Purdue University, Oregon State, University of Wisconsin and Washington State.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2005	$801,437,000
Budget estimate, 2006	786,000,000
House allowance	799,500,000
Committee recommendation	799,500,000

The Committee recommendation includes $799,500,000, an increase of $13,500,000 above the budget request. The increase is to be transferred to the office of Nuclear Energy to support the Idaho National Laboratory's Advanced Test Reactor.

The Naval Reactors account funds the design, development, and testing necessary to provide the Navy with safe, militarily effective nuclear propulsion plants in keeping with the Nation's nuclear-powered fleet defense requirements. Naval Reactors will continue

to develop nuclear reactor plant components and systems for the Navy's new attack submarine and next-generation aircraft carriers, and continue to maintain the highest standards of environmental stewardship by responsibly inactivating shut down prototype reactor plants.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 2005	$353,350,000
Budget estimate, 2006	343,869,000
House allowance	366,869,000
Committee recommendation	343,869,000

The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $343,869,000.

The Office of the Administrator account provides corporate planning and oversight for programs funded by the Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Naval Reactors appropriations including the National Nuclear Security Administration field offices. This account provides the Federal salaries and other expenses of the Administrator's direct staff, headquarters employees, and employees at the field service center and site offices. Program Direction for Naval Reactors remains within that program's account, and program direction for the Secure Transportation Asset remains in Weapons Activities.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.—The Committee provides $70,000,000 for the Federal Employees in Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation to allow for greater flexibility for that office for hiring and supporting the Federal staff. Both the budget request and the Committee recognize the increasing role this office and staff play in global nonproliferation efforts. As such it is critical that this office is provided sufficient funding and support to fulfill it national security mission.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT TRANSITION TO NNSA

On March 24, 2004, the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA] announced that NNSA would assume responsibilities for both newly generated and legacy wastes, and environmental remediation at NNSA sites beginning in fiscal year 2006. In his announcement, the Administrator stated that NNSA management of newly generated waste would reside with the generator, in this case principally the Office of Defense Programs [NA–10]. Having been assigned authority for the long-term stewardship of the Nation's nuclear weapons program by the NNSA Act, the Committee was concerned that in accepting responsibility for managing legacy waste and environmental remediation, the NNSA may be forced to divert funds from or dilute its focus on weapons activities. As such, the Committee does not support the transfer of cleanup responsibility to the NNSA and expects the Office of Environmental Management make environmental remediation its sole responsibility. The Committee has adopted a new budget structure that more accurately tracks environmental cleanup expenditures by site and project.

The mission of the Office of Environmental Management is the cleanup and risk reduction of the environmental impact as a result of the nuclear weapons program. For over 50 years, the Department and its predecessor agencies supported nuclear weapons production and energy research that has created million of gallons of waste and thousands of tons of contaminated soil, material and nuclear fuel. All of this legacy material must be addressed in an effective way.

Since 2001 the program has succeeded in making significant progress by reducing the life-cycle cost on a comparable scope basis by $50,000,000,000 and reducing the time frame by 35 years. The Committee is supportive of these efforts and encourages the Department to continue keep the remaining sites on track.

Reprogramming.—The Committee continues to support the need for flexibility to meet the changing funding requirements at the sites. In fiscal year 2006, the Department may transfer up to $5,000,000 between control points, as noted in the table below, to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increase or decreased by more than $5,000,000 once during the fiscal year. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new program or programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. The Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate must be notified within 30 days of the use of this reprogramming authority.

CONTROL LEVELS FOR REPROGRAMMING

Savannah River site, 2012 accelerations
Savannah River site, 2035 accelerations
Savannah River Tank Farm
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
Idaho National Laboratory
Oak Ridge Reservation
Hanford site, 2012 accelerated completions
Hanford site, 2035 accelerated completions
Office of River Protection, waste treatment & immobilization
Office of River Protection, tank farm activities
Closure sites
Program direction
Program support
UE D&D fund contribution
Technology development
All construction line items
NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites
Safeguards and Security.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2005	$6,808,319,000
Budget estimate, 2006	6,015,044,000
House allowance	6,468,366,000
Committee recommendation	6,366,441,000

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Cleanup totals $6,366,441,000, an increase of $351,397,000 above budget request of $6,015,044,000. The Committee does not support the proposed transfer of environmental cleanup responsibilities from the Office of Environmental Management to the National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA]. By restoring these core cleanup responsibilities to the Office of Environmental Management the Defense Environmental Cleanup budget is increased by $222,887,000. The Committee recommends that the Department provide any carry over balances for WERC a consortium for environmental education and technology development, be provided to

support an educational foundation with that organization. Within the amounts provided, the Department is directed to fund hazardous waste worker training at $10,000,000.

Closure Sites.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,008,589,000, the same as the budget request. Cleanup of this category of sites is expected to be complete in fiscal year 2006. The recommendation provides $579,950,000 for Rocky Flats, Colorado; $327,609,000 for Fernald, Ohio; $16,000,000 for Ashtabula, Ohio; $75,530,000 for Miamisburg, Ohio; and $9,500,000 for West Jefferson site, Columbus, Ohio.

Savannah River Site.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,247,082,000, an increase of $18,000,000 to address solid waste stabilization and soil and water remediation for cleanup at the Savannah River Site. The Committee supports the request of $10,000,000 for the melt and dilute technology for excess weapons-grade plutonium. The Committee believes this project is appropriately managed by the Office of Environmental Management.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant [WIPP].—The Committee recommendation provides $230,629,000 for the Waste Isolation Pilot Project. The Committee recommends $6,000,000 to purchase TRUPACT–III shipping containers which will allow the Department to accommodate large shipments to WIPP and reduce worker exposure by not requiring materials to be repackaged. The recommendation includes an additional $3,500,000 which shall be made available to the Carlsbad community for educational support, infrastructure improvements, and related initiatives to address the impacts of accelerated operations.

The Committee understands that the Carlsbad Field Office has established a joint task force with the City of Carlsbad to evaluate the needs, functions, and requirements of a record center in Carlsbad. In order to provide more timely information in a useable format to citizens, researchers, stakeholders, and regulators, the Committee provides an additional $5,000,000 and directs the Department to consolidate at Carlsbad all record archives relevant to the operations of WIPP and the TRU waste in the repository under a new contract.

The Committee directs the Department to utilize up to $2,000,000 from within funds available to the Office of Environmental Management to support the important work of the Center for Excellence in Hazardous Materials.

The Committee provides $1,500,000 from within available funds for Neutrino research.

Waste Analysis Requirements for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant [WIPP].—The Committee recognizes that the WIPP facility is central to the cleanup of the nuclear weapons complex and that waste should be emplaced as quickly and safely as possible—for reasons of reducing clean-up costs, public safety, and with the growing threat of radiological terrorism and for national security. Current law and regulation regarding the sampling and analysis of waste destined for WIPP produces substantial health and safety risks to workers with little if any corresponding public benefit.

Idaho National Laboratory.—The Committee recommendation provides $544,725,000, an increase of $13,000,000 above the request. The Committee has modified the request to accelerate the

construction of the Sodium Bearing Waste Treatment Project at Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee recommends an additional $39,270,000 to begin construction of Project 06–D–401, Sodium Bearing Waste Treatment Project. The Committee has offset this increase by reducing PBS ID–0014B, operating expenses by $26,700,000 and $13,000,000 in additional budget authority.

Oak Ridge Reservation.—The Committee recommendation provides $221,854,000, an increase of $25,302,000 above the budget request. The Committee recommends reallocating funds to restore funding to the original closure contract baseline for the Melton Valley. The Department has recommended offsets be taken from Safeguards and Security PBS OR–0040 without any impact to the program.

Hanford Site.—The Committee recommendation provides $749,717,000, the same as the budget request for the Hanford Site.

The Committee recommendation provides $5,861,000 to operate the waste disposal facility, $1,813,000 for spent fuel stabilization and storage, and $15,411,000 for Richland community and regulatory support, the same as the budget request. Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $6,500,000 for the Volpentest Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response [HAMMER] training and education center. The Department is expected to continue making PILT payments at last year's level to counties that have the Hanford reservation within their boundaries. The Committee recognizes that the Department has been taking steps to increase the involvement of, and cooperation with, its co-trustees on natural resource damages issues. The Committee encourages the Department to continue those efforts, including funding for the other natural resource trustees to provide technical assistance in cleanup matters.

Office of River Protection.—The Committee recommendation provides $962,699,000, an increase of $34,393,000 above the budget request. Within the available funds, the Committee recommends $328,840,000 an increase of $34,393,000 to address tank waste stabilization and disposition.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation provides $230,931,000.

Program Support.—The Committee recommendation provides $32,846,000 for program support, the same as the budget request.

Federal Contribution to Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.—The Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–486) created the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund to pay for the cost of cleanup of the gaseous diffusion facilities located in Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Paducah, Kentucky; and Portsmouth, Ohio. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $451,000,000 for the Federal contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund as authorized in Public Law 102–486.

Technology Development and Deployment.—The Committee recommendation provides $56,389,000, an increase of $35,000,000 over the budget request. This program focuses on high priority technical needs at near-term closure sites and projects. In addition, the technology program will focus on identifying technical vulnerabilities

and alternative solutions in support of the Department's accelerated cleanup strategies.

Within available funds, the Committee provides $6,000,000 for the Western Environmental Technology Office; $5,000,000 for the UNR School of Medicine Core Facilities equipment; $4,500,000 for the Great Basin Science Sample and Records Library; $2,000,000 for the Desert Research Institute's CAVE project; $1,000,000 to the UNLV Research Foundation to continue earthquake hazard and seismic risk research; and $1,500,000 is provided for work on the subsurface science research institute by Idaho National Laboratory and the Inland Northwest Research Alliance institutions; $5,000,000 is provided for the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory.

The Department is directed to renew its cooperative agreements with the University of Nevada-Las Vegas and the University of Nevada-Reno. The Committee is concerned that the Department has ignored direction in prior Conference Reports regarding these cooperative agreements. The Department is specifically directed to reinstitute the NRAMP cooperative agreement at a level consistent with the original agreement.

Within available funds, $3,000,000 is provided to continue the development of an electrochemical system utilizing ceramic ionic transport membranes for the recycle and disposal of radioactive sodium ion waste.

The Department shall continue its support of the Tribal Colleges Initiative grant, involving Crownpoint Institute of Technology, Diné College, Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute, to develop high-quality environmental programs at tribal colleges. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the continued support of the international agreement and collaboration with AEA Technology to address alternative cost effective technologies for cleaning up legacy waste.

Within available funds, $3,000,000 is provided for the Desert Research Institute's Environmental Monitoring Program; $2,000,000 for the Nye County Groundwater Evaluation Program; $2,000,000 for emergency and non-emergency communications systems upgrades in Nye County, Nevada, for areas closest to the Nevada Test Site and Yucca Mountain; and $1,500,000 for the City of Caliente, Nevada.

NNSA Sites and Nevada Off-sites.—The Committee recommendation provides $352,757,000, an increase of $207,702,000 over the budget request. The increase reflects the return of cleanup activities to the Environmental Management program that otherwise would have transferred to the NNSA. The Committee recommends $5,300,000 for Stabilization of Los Alamos Airport Landfill.

Safeguards and Security.—The Committee recommendation provides $287,223,000, the same as the budget request.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2005	$687,149,000
Budget estimate, 2006	635,998,000
House allowance	702,498,000
Committee recommendation	661,998,000

The Other Defense Activities account provides funding for the following Departmental offices and functions: security; intelligence; counterintelligence; independent oversight and performance assurance; defense-related environment, safety and health support; worker and community transition, legacy management; and hearings and appeals.

OFFICE OF SECURITY AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Committee recommendation includes $321,095,000, $20,000,000 above the budget request.

The security program consists of the following elements: nuclear safeguards and security, security investigations, and program direction. These programs provide policy for the protection of the Department's nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, classified information, and facilities. They ensure a Department-wide capability to continue essential functions across a wide range of potential emergencies, allowing DOE to uphold its national security responsibilities and provide security clearances for Federal and contractor personnel.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $83,029,000 in the budget request. The Committee provides $7,000,000 to undertake the Chernobyl Research and Service Project.

The defense-related environment, safety and health program is a corporate resource that provides Departmental leadership and management to protect the workers, public, and environment in the areas of oversight, health studies, radiation effects research, employee compensation support, and program direction.

The Committee supports the Radiation Effects Research Foundation at the requested level to carry out the scientific work, which the United States has funded since 1947, to study the health effects associated with the atomic blast over Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the DOE Worker Records Digitization project in Nevada.

Former Worker Medical Screening.—The Committee directs the Secretary to allocate $16,500,000 for the former worker medical screening programs, $4,000,000 above the budget request. From within available funds the Committee directs $465,000 to extend medical screening and outreach to current and former workers at the three gaseous diffusion plants [GDP] in Portsmouth, Ohio, Paducah, Kentucky and Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The Committee directs the Secretary to allocate $1,000,000 to carry out medical screening and outreach to former workers at the Mound facility in Miamisburg, Ohio; and $1,000,000 for medical screening and outreach for former workers at the Fernald facility in Harrison, Ohio, who were employed after 1985. The Committee directs the Secretary to commence a program of early lung cancer detection using helical low dose CT technology for all workers who are at elevated risk of lung cancer at the Y–12 and X–10 facilities in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, consistent with the eligibility protocols established for the three GDPs. Given that the cancer screening program carried out at the three GDPs since 2000 has identified the majority of

lung cancers at early stages where surgical intervention is likely to be successful, and which has led to an increase in survival rates; and given the increased rates of lung cancer identified in health studies at Y–12, it is appropriate to extend lung screening to at-risk workers at the Oak Ridge Y–12 and X–10 facilities. The Committee supports DOE's plan to continue and extend its regional medical screening projects in fiscal year 2006. To offset the increases, the Committee allocates $2,700,000 in fiscal year 2006, for activities under the DOE–HHS Memorandum of Agreement, and directs the Department to prioritize funds for the work of the National Center for Environmental Health at Los Alamos National Labs, and to fully support the research work of the Health Energy Related Branch of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation includes $45,076,000, the same as the budget request.

DEFENSE-RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $87,575,000 for National Security Programs Administrative support. This fund pays for departmental services that are provided in support of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

FUNDING FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES IN IDAHO

The Committee recommendation includes $123,873,000 to fund the defense-related activities at the Idaho National Laboratory [INL] and associated Idaho cleanup sites. This amount includes $17,762,000 for INL infrastructure, the same as the budget request, $75,008,000 for Idaho site-wide safeguards and security, the same as the budget request; and $31,103,000 for program direction to support headquarters and Idaho Field Office personnel.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

The Committee recommendation includes $4,353,000 for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, the same as the budget request.

The Office of Hearings and Appeals conducts all of the Department's adjudicative processes and provides various administrative remedies as may be required.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2005	$229,152,000
Budget estimate, 2006	351,447,000
House allowance	351,447,000
Committee recommendation	277,000,000

The Committee recommends $277,000,000 for defense nuclear waste disposal.

This account provides the Federal Government's fiscal year 2006 contribution to the nuclear waste repository program to support nuclear waste repository activities attributed to atomic energy defense activities.

The Committee understands that the Department formally approved in 1995 the right of the Affected Units of Local Government to retain interest earned on unexpended balances in their oversight accounts. The Committee affirms that this policy reflects the intent of Congress and should be maintained by the Department.

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.

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 States in the Columbia River basin. BPA markets hydroelectric power from 21 multipurpose water resource projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and 10 projects of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, plus some energy from non-Federal generating projects in the region. These generating resources and BPA's transmission system are operated as an integrated power system with operating and financial results combined and reported as the Federal Columbia River Power System [FCRPS]. BPA is the largest power wholesaler in the Northwest and provides about 45 percent of the region's electric energy supply and about three-fourths of the region's electric power transmission capacity.

BPA finances its operations on the basis of the self-financing authority provided by Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974 (Transmission Act) (Public Law 93–454) and the borrowing authority provided by the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (Pacific Northwest Power Act) (Public Law 96–501) for energy conservation, renewable energy resources and capital fish facilities. Authority to borrow is available to the BPA on a permanent, indefinite basis.

The Committee is concerned about the increasing cost of salmon recovery efforts in the Columbia River Basin, and about the potential adverse impact of those increased costs on customers of the Bonneville Power Administration. The Committee also is concerned about the quality and efficiency of some of the fish data collection efforts and analyses being performed. As a result, during fiscal

year 2006, the Bonneville Power Administration may make no new obligations from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund in support of the Fish Passage Center. The Committee understands that there are universities in the Pacific Northwest that already collect fish data for the region and are well-positioned to take on the responsibilities now being performed by the Fish Passage Center, and that the universities can carry out those responsibilities at a savings to the region's ratepayers that fund these programs.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2005	$5,158,000
Budget estimate, 2006	
House allowance	5,600,000
Committee recommendation	5,600,000

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

The Committee recommendation includes $32,713,000 for purchase power and wheeling activities.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2005	$29,117,000
Budget estimate, 2006	3,166,000
House allowance	30,166,000
Committee recommendation	30,166,000

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 recommendation includes $3,000,000 for purchase power and wheeling activities.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2005	$171,715,000
Budget estimate, 2006	53,957,000
House allowance	226,992,000
Committee recommendation	240,757,000

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 more than 260 substations.

Utah Mitigation and Conservation Fund.—This fund is dedicated primarily for environmental mitigation expenditures covering fish and wildlife, and recreation resources impacted by the Central Utah Project and the Colorado River Storage Project in the State of Utah. For fiscal year 2004, the President's Budget proposes to transfer the authorities and future contributions for the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account from the Secretary of Energy, Western Area Power Administration, to the Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation.

The Committee recommendation includes $279,500,000 for purchase power and wheeling activities, and provides $53,957,000 for construction and rehabilitation as requested.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

The Committee recommendation is $2,692,000, the same as the budget request.

Creation of the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund was directed by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994–95 (Public Law 103–236). 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 understands that WAPA has included $6,700,000 in its request to be transferred to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Fund. The Committee expects WAPA to continue budgeting for and transferring these funds to the fund as required by section 214 of Public Law 108–137.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2005	$210,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	220,400,000
House allowance	220,400,000
Committee recommendation	220,400,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2005	$210,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	220,400,000
House allowance	220,400,000
Committee recommendation	220,400,000

The Committee recommendation includes $220,400,000, 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.

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	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION							
ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY							
Hydrogen Technology:							
Hydrogen technology	94,562	99,094	99,094	99,094	+4,532		
Fuel cell technologies	74,944	83,600	83,600	83,600	+8,656		
Subtotal, hydrogen technology	169,506	182,694	182,694	182,694	+13,188		
Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D	89,063	72,164	86,164	92,164	+3,101	+20,000	+6,000
Solar energy	85,841	83,953	83,953	83,953	−1,888		
Wind energy systems	41,267	44,249	44,249	34,249	−7,018	−10,000	−10,000
Geothermal technology	25,594	23,299	23,299	23,299	−2,295		
Hydropower	4,960	500	500	500	−4,460		
Vehicle technologies	166,905	165,943	167,943	199,943	+33,038	+34,000	+32,000
Building technologies	67,138	57,966	64,966	67,000	−138	+9,034	+2,034
Industrial technologies	75,349	56,489	58,891	56,489	−18,860		−2,402
Distributed energy and electricity reliability	60,626	56,629	56,629		−60,626	−56,629	−56,629
Federal Energy Management Program:							
Departmental energy management program	1,951	2,019	2,019	2,019	+68		
Federal energy management program	18,144	17,147	17,147	17,147	−997		
Subtotal, Federal Energy Management Program	20,095	19,166	19,166	19,166	−929		
Facilities and infrastructure:							
National Renewable Energy Laboratory	4,762	5,800	5,800	5,800	+1,038		
Construction: 02–E–001 Science and technology facility, NREL	6,627	10,515	10,515	10,515	+3,888		
Total, Facilities and infrastructure	11,389	16,315	16,315	16,315	+4,926		
Weatherization and Intergovernmental program:							
Weatherization assistance	224,738	225,400	235,400	240,400	+15,662	+15,000	+5,000
Training and technical assistance	3,422	4,600	4,600	4,600	+1,178		
State energy program grants	44,176	41,000	41,000	41,000	−3,176		

State energy activities	2,320	500	500	500	−1,820	.....	.....
Gateway deployment	34,973	26,657	26,657	26,657	−8,316	.....	.....
International renewable energy program	6,449	2,910	3,910	2,910	−3,539	.....	−1,000
Tribal energy activities	5,457	4,000	4,000	4,000	−1,457	.....	.....
Renewable energy production incentive	4,960	5,000	5,000	5,000	+40	.....	.....
Subtotal, Weatherization and Intergovernmental program	326,495	310,067	321,067	325,067	−1,428	+15,000	+4,000
Congressionally directed priorities	.....	.....	.....	57,000	+57,000	+57,000	+57,000
Program Direction	93,129	101,524	101,524	86,524	−6,605	−15,000	−15,000
Program Support	16,837	9,456	9,456	9,456	−7,381	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	−5,318	.....	.....	.....	+5,318	.....	.....
TOTAL, ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	1,248,876	1,200,414	1,236,816	1,253,819	+4,943	+53,405	+17,003
ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION							
Research and development	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
High temperature superconductivity R&D	54,560	45,000	45,000	50,500	−4,060	+5,500	+5,500
Transmission reliability R&D	15,594	9,220	13,220	14,220	−1,374	+5,000	+1,000
Electricity distribution transformation R&D	5,415	4,037	4,037	60,666	+55,251	+56,629	+56,629
Energy storage R&D	3,968	3,000	3,000	3,000	−968	.....	.....
Gridwise	6,448	5,500	6,745	.....	−6,448	−5,500	−6,745
Gridworks	5,456	5,000	5,000	.....	−5,456	−5,000	−5,000
Total, Research and development	91,441	71,757	77,002	128,386	+36,945	+56,629	+51,384
Electricity restructuring	19,840	12,400	12,400	12,400	−7,440	.....	.....
Congressionally directed priorities	.....	.....	.....	21,850	+21,850	+21,850	+21,850
Program direction	8,135	11,447	10,447	15,447	+7,312	+4,000	+5,000
Construction: 04–E–001 Project engineering and design (PED), Energy Reliability and Efficiency Laboratory	769	.....	.....	.....	−769	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION	120,185	95,604	99,849	178,083	+57,898	+82,479	+78,234
NUCLEAR ENERGY							
University reactor infrastructure and education assist	23,808	24,000	24,000	24,000	+192	.....	.....
Research and development:							
Nuclear energy plant optimization	2,480	.....	.....	.....	−2,480	.....	.....
Nuclear energy research initiative	2,480	.....	.....	.....	−2,480	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Nuclear power 2010	49,600	56,000	46,000	76,000	+26,400	+20,000	+30,000
Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative	39,680	45,000	45,000	60,000	+20,320	+15,000	+15,000
Nuclear hydrogen initiative	8,928	20,000	20,000	30,000	+21,072	+10,000	+10,000
Advanced fuel cycle initiative	67,456	70,000	75,500	85,000	+17,544	+15,000	+9,500
Total, Research and development	170,624	191,000	186,500	251,000	+80,376	+60,000	+64,500
Infrastructure:							
Radiological facilities management:							
Space and defense infrastructure	33,530	31,200	39,700	31,200	−2,330	.....	−8,500
Medical isotopes infrastructure	21,024	14,395	14,395	14,395	−6,629	.....	.....
Construction: 05–E–203 Facility modifications for U–233 di disposition, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN	13,507	18,705	.....	18,705	+5,198	.....	+18,705
Subtotal, Medical isotopes infrastructure	34,531	33,100	14,395	33,100	−1,431	.....	+18,705
Enrichment facility and uranium management	496	500	500	500	+4	.....	.....
Subtotal, Radiological facilities management	68,557	64,800	54,595	64,800	−3,757	.....	+10,205
Idaho facilities management:							
INL Operations and infrastructure	120,555	86,907	102,907	86,907	−33,648	.....	−16,000
ANL—West operations	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
INL infrastructure	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Construction:							
06–E–200 Project engineering and design (PED), INL, ID	.....	7,870	7,870	7,870	+7,870	.....	.....
06–E–201 Gas test loop in the ATR, INL, ID	.....	3,085	3,085	3,085	+3,085	.....	.....
99–E–200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Lab, ID	1,511	.....	.....	.....	−1,511	.....	.....
95–E–201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements (INEL)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	1,511	10,955	10,955	10,955	+9,444	.....	.....

Subtotal, Idaho facilities management	122,066	97,862	113,862	97,862	−24,204	.....	−16,000
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	58,103	75,008	75,008	75,008	+16,905	.....	.....
Total, Infrastructure	248,726	237,670	243,465	237,670	−11,056	.....	−5,795
Spent nuclear fuel management	6,681	.....	.....	.....	−6,681	.....	.....
Program direction	60,076	61,109	61,109	61,109	+1,033	.....	.....
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy	509,915	513,779	515,074	573,779	+63,864	+60,000	+58,705
Funding from other defense activities	−114,347	−123,873	−123,873	−123,873	−9,526	.....	.....
Funding from Naval Reactors	−10,000	.....	−13,500	.....	+10,000	.....	+13,500
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	385,568	389,906	377,701	449,906	+64,338	+60,000	+72,205
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH							
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)	7,936	9,100	5,100	9,100	+1,164	.....	+4,000
Program direction	19,842	20,900	20,900	20,900	+1,058	.....	.....
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	27,778	30,000	26,000	30,000	+2,222	.....	+4,000
OFFICE OF LEGACY MANAGEMENT							
Legacy management	30,881	33,522	23,522	33,522	+2,641	.....	+10,000
Subtotal, Energy supply and conservation	1,813,288	1,749,446	1,763,888	1,945,330	+132,042	+195,884	+181,442
Use of prior year balances	−6,352	.....	.....	.....	+6,352	.....	.....
Less security charge from reimbursable work	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Miscellaneous appropriations (Public Law 108–199)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION	1,806,936	1,749,446	1,763,888	1,945,330	+138,394	+195,884	+181,442
CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY							
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2005	−257,000	257,000	257,000	257,000	+514,000	.....	.....
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2007	.....	.....	−257,000	−257,000	−257,000	−257,000	.....
Rescission	.....	−257,000	.....	.....	.....	+257,000	.....
Total, Clean Coal Technology	−257,000	.....	.....	.....	+257,000	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT							
Clean coal power initiative	49,305	50,000	50,000	100,000	+50,695	+50,000	+50,000
FutureGen	17,750	18,000	18,000	18,000	+250	.....	.....
Advance appropriation, fiscal year 2007	.....	257,000	.....	.....	.....	−257,000	.....
Fuels and Power Systems:							
Innovations for existing plants	19,081	23,850	23,850	25,400	+6,319	+1,550	+1,550
Advanced integrated gasification combined cycle	45,805	56,450	56,450	56,450	+10,645	.....	.....
Advanced turbines	15,383	18,000	18,000	18,000	+2,617	.....	.....
Carbon sequestration	45,361	67,200	50,000	74,200	+28,839	+7,000	+24,200
Fuels	32,147	22,000	22,000	29,000	−3,147	+7,000	+7,000
Fuel cells	77,386	65,000	65,000	69,000	−8,386	+4,000	+4,000
Advanced research	42,699	30,500	30,500	34,500	−8,199	+4,000	+4,000
Combustion systems	5,227	.....	.....	.....	−5,227	.....	.....
U.S./China Energy and Environmental Center	986	.....	.....	.....	−986	.....	.....
Subtotal, Fuels and power systems	284,075	283,000	265,800	306,550	+22,475	+23,550	+40,750
Subtotal, Coal	351,130	608,000	333,800	424,550	+73,420	−183,450	+90,750
Natural Gas Technologies	44,839	10,000	33,000	27,000	−17,839	+17,000	−6,000
Petroleum—Oil Technologies	33,921	10,000	29,000	32,000	−1,921	+22,000	+3,000
Program direction	104,528	98,941	105,152	106,941	+2,413	+8,000	+1,789
Plant and Capital Equipment	6,902	.....	.....	23,000	+16,098	+23,000	+23,000
Fossil energy environmental restoration	9,467	8,060	8,060	9,600	+133	+1,540	+1,540
Import/export authorization	1,774	1,799	1,799	1,799	+25	.....	.....
Advanced metallurgical research	9,861	8,000	8,000	8,000	−1,861	.....	.....
National Academy of Sciences program review	493	.....	.....	.....	−493	.....	.....
Special recruitment programs	656	656	656	656	.....	.....	.....
Cooperative research and development	8,283	3,000	3,000	3,000	−5,283	.....	.....
Congressionally directed priorities	.....	.....	.....	25,100	+25,100	+25,100	+25,100
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....	−20,000	−20,000	−20,000	−20,000	.....
Subtotal, FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	571,854	491,456	502,467	641,646	+69,792	+150,190	+139,179

Advance appropriations	.....	257,000	.....	.....	.....	−257,000	.....
TOTAL, FOSSIL ENERGY R&D INCLUDING ADVANCES	571,854	748,456	502,467	641,646	+69,792	−106,810	+139,179
NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES	17,750	18,500	18,500	21,500	+3,750	+3,000	+3,000
ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUNDS	72,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	+12,000	.....	.....
STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE	169,710	166,000	166,000	166,000	−3,710	.....	.....
NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE	4,930	.....	.....	.....	−4,930	.....	.....
ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION	83,819	85,926	86,426	85,926	+2,107	.....	−500
NON–DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP							
West Valley Demonstration Project	73,628	77,100	77,100	77,100	+3,472	.....	.....
Gaseous Diffusion Plants	143,962	45,528	45,528	48,813	−95,149	+3,285	+3,285
Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion, 02–U–101	99,200	85,803	70,803	85,803	−13,397	.....	+15,000
Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility (WA)	45,715	46,113	41,113	46,113	+398	.....	+5,000
Small Sites:							
Argonne National Lab	785	10,487	10,487	10,487	+9,702	.....	.....
Brookhaven National Lab	42,316	34,328	34,328	34,328	−7,988	.....	.....
Idaho National Lab	.....	5,274	5,274	5,274	+5,274	.....	.....
Consolidated Business Center:							
California Site support	98	100	100	100	+2	.....	.....
Inhalation Toxicology Lab	487	305	305	305	−182	.....	.....
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab	4,038	3,900	3,900	3,900	−138	.....	.....
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center	2,480	3,500	3,500	3,500	+1,020	.....	.....
Energy Technology Engineering Center	18,238	9,000	9,000	9,000	−9,238	.....	.....
Los Alamos National Lab	447	490	490	490	+43	.....	.....
Lab for Energy-Related Health Research	496	.....	.....	.....	−496	.....	.....
Moab	7,711	28,006	18,006	28,006	+20,295	.....	+10,000
Subtotal, small sites	77,096	95,390	85,390	95,390	+18,294	.....	+10,000
TOTAL, NON–DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	439,601	349,934	319,934	353,219	−86,382	+3,285	+33,285
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND							
Decontamination and decommissioning	415,655	571,498	571,498	561,498	+145,843	−10,000	−10,000
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	79,360	20,000	20,000	.....	−79,360	−20,000	−20,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT D&D FUND	495,015	591,498	591,498	561,498	+66,483	−30,000	−30,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
SCIENCE							
High energy physics:							
Proton accelerator-based physics	401,120	387,093	398,093	390,093	−11,027	+3,000	−8,000
Electron accelerator-based physics	143,929	132,822	132,822	132,822	−11,107	.....	.....
Non-accelerator physics	46,934	38,589	38,589	38,589	−8,345	.....	.....
Theoretical physics	48,995	49,103	49,103	49,103	+108	.....	.....
Advanced technology R&D	94,721	106,326	117,326	106,326	+11,605	.....	−11,000
Subtotal	735,699	713,933	735,933	716,933	−18,766	+3,000	−19,000
Construction: 98–G–304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	745	.....	.....	.....	−745	.....	.....
Total, High energy physics	736,444	713,933	735,933	716,933	−19,511	+3,000	−19,000
Nuclear physics	404,778	368,741	406,341	417,741	+12,963	+49,000	+11,400
Construction: 06–SC–02 Project engineering and design (PED), Electron beam ion source, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY	.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	+2,000	.....	.....
Total, Nuclear physics	404,778	370,741	408,341	419,741	+14,963	+49,000	+11,400
Biological and environmental research	571,992	455,688	525,688	503,688	−68,304	+48,000	−22,000
Construction: 05–SC–004 Project engineering and design (PED), Facility for the Production and Characterization of Proteins and Molecular Tags	9,920	.....	.....	.....	−9,920	.....	.....
Basic energy sciences:							
Research:							
Materials sciences and engineering research	635,132	746,143	772,025	816,143	+181,011	+70,000	+44,118
Chemical sciences, geosciences and energy biosciences	239,475	221,801	223,051	246,801	+7,326	+25,000	+23,750
Subtotal, Research	874,607	967,944	995,076	1,062,944	+188,337	+95,000	+67,868
Construction:							
05–R–320 LINAC coherent light source (LCLS)	29,760	83,000	83,000	83,000	+53,240	.....	.....
05–R–321 Center for Functional Nanomaterials (BNL)	18,317	36,553	36,553	36,553	+18,236	.....	.....

04–R–313 The molecular foundry (LBNL)	31,828	9,606	9,606	9,606	−22,222	.....	.....
03–SC–002 Project engineering & design (PED) SLAC	19,914	2,544	2,544	2,544	−17,370	.....	.....
03–R–312 Center for Nanophase Materials Sciences, ORNL	17,669	.....	.....	.....	−17,669	.....	.....
03–R–313 Center for Integrated Nanotechnology	30,650	4,626	4,626	4,626	−26,024	.....	.....
02–SC–002 Project engineering and design (VL)	1,996	.....	.....	.....	−1,996	.....	.....
99–E–334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	79,891	41,744	41,744	41,744	−38,147	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	230,025	178,073	178,073	178,073	−51,952	.....	.....
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,104,632	1,146,017	1,173,149	1,241,017	+136,385	+95,000	+67,868
Advanced scientific computing research	232,468	207,055	246,055	207,055	−25,413	.....	−39,000
Science laboratories infrastructure:							
Laboratories facilities support:							
Infrastructure support	1,752	1,520	1,520	1,520	−232	.....	.....
General plant projects	.....	3,000	3,000	3,000	+3,000	.....	.....
Construction:							
04–SC–001 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	4,960	3,000	3,000	3,000	−1,960	.....	.....
03–SC–001 Science laboratories infrastructure	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
MEL–001 Multiprogram Energy Laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	19,236	12,869	14,869	12,869	−6,367	.....	−2,000
Subtotal, Construction	24,196	15,869	17,869	15,869	−8,327	.....	−2,000
Subtotal, Laboratories facilities support	25,948	20,389	22,389	20,389	−5,559	.....	−2,000
Oak Ridge landlord	5,039	5,079	5,079	5,079	+40	.....	.....
Excess facilities disposal	6,051	14,637	14,637	14,637	+8,586	.....	.....
Safety-related corrective actions	4,960	.....	.....	.....	−4,960	.....	.....
Total, Science laboratories infrastructure	41,998	40,105	42,105	40,105	−1,893	.....	−2,000
Fusion energy sciences program	273,903	290,550	296,155	290,550	+16,647	.....	−5,605
Safeguards and security	72,773	74,317	74,317	74,317	+1,544	.....	.....
Workforce development for teachers and scientists	7,599	7,192	7,192	7,192	−407	.....	.....
Science program direction:							
Field offices	88,809	92,593	92,593	92,593	+3,784	.....	.....
Headquarters	65,222	70,132	70,132	70,132	+4,910	.....	.....
Technical information management program	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Energy research analyses	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Congressionally directed priorities	.....	.....	.....	45,000	+45,000	+45,000	+45,000
Total, Science program direction	154,031	162,725	162,725	207,725	+53,694	+45,000	+45,000
Subtotal, Science	3,610,538	3,468,323	3,671,660	3,708,323	+97,785	+240,000	+36,663
Use of prior year balances	−5,062	.....	.....	.....	+5,062	.....	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−5,605	−5,605	−5,605	−5,605	.....	.....	.....
Miscellaneous appropriations (Public Law 108–199)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,599,871	3,462,718	3,666,055	3,702,718	+102,847	+240,000	+36,663
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL							
Repository program	263,872	218,536	228,536	218,536	−45,336	.....	−10,000
Program direction	79,360	81,464	81,464	81,464	+2,104	.....	.....
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	343,232	300,000	310,000	300,000	−43,232	.....	−10,000
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION							
Administrative operations:							
Salaries and expenses:							
Office of the Secretary	4,644	5,399	4,843	5,399	+755	.....	+556
Board of Contract Appeals	648	648	680	648	.....	.....	−32
Chief Information Officer	37,967	51,122	39,865	51,122	+13,155	.....	+11,257
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,826	5,089	5,067	5,089	+263	.....	+22
Economic impact and diversity	5,099	5,352	5,352	5,352	+253	.....	.....
General Counsel	21,774	24,217	22,780	24,217	+2,443	.....	+1,437
Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation	106,850	111,806	110,300	111,806	+4,956	.....	+1,506
Policy and international affairs	14,993	18,844	15,743	18,844	+3,851	.....	+3,101
Public affairs	2,459	4,504	2,566	5,504	+3,045	+1,000	+2,938
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	199,260	226,981	207,196	227,981	+28,721	+1,000	+20,785

Program support:							
Minority economic impact	823	830	823	830	+7		+7
Policy analysis and system studies	392	395	392	395	+3		+3
Environmental policy studies	562	567	562	567	+5		+5
Cybersecurity and secure communications	24,733	32,000	24,733	32,000	+7,267		+7,267
Corporate management information program	31,881	23,055	23,055	23,055	−8,826		
Subtotal, Program support	58,391	56,847	49,565	56,847	−1,544		+7,282
Competitive sourcing initiative (A–76)	2,480	3,000	3,000	3,000	+520		
Total, Administrative operations	260,131	286,828	259,761	287,828	+27,697	+1,000	+28,067
Cost of work for others	71,048	80,723	80,723	80,723	+9,675		
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	331,179	367,551	340,484	368,551	+37,372	+1,000	+28,067
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments							
Funding from other defense activities	−91,700	−87,575	−87,575	−87,575	+4,125		
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	239,479	279,976	252,909	280,976	+41,497	+1,000	+28,067
Miscellaneous revenues	−122,000	−123,000	−123,000	−123,000	−1,000		
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	117,479	156,976	129,909	157,976	+40,497	+1,000	+28,067
Office of Inspector General	41,176	43,000	43,000	43,000	+1,824		
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES							
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION							
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES							
Directed stockpile work:							
Stockpile research and development							
Stockpile maintenance							
Stockpile evaluation							
Dismantlement/disposal							
Production support							
Field engineering, training and manuals							
Life extension program				348,318	+348,318	+348,318	+348,318

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
B61	116,984	50,810	50,810		−116,984	−50,810	−50,810
W76	234,536	162,268	162,268		−234,536	−162,268	−162,268
W80	145,239	135,240	100,240		−145,239	−135,240	−100,240
Subtotal, Life extension program	496,759	348,318	313,318	348,318	−148,441		+35,000
Stockpile systems:				311,804	+311,804	+311,804	+311,804
B61	90,526	66,050	66,050		−90,526	−66,050	−66,050
W62	18,254	8,967	8,967		−18,254	−8,967	−8,967
W76	136,427	63,538	63,538		−136,427	−63,538	−63,538
W78	43,958	32,632	32,632		−43,958	−32,632	−32,632
W80	39,191	26,315	16,315		−39,191	−26,315	−16,315
B83	44,635	26,391	26,391		−44,635	−26,391	−26,391
W84	6,070	4,402	4,402		−6,070	−4,402	−4,402
W87	79,245	50,678	50,678		−79,245	−50,678	−50,678
W88	48,700	32,831	32,831		−48,700	−32,831	−32,831
Subtotal, Stockpile systems	507,006	311,804	301,804	311,804	−195,202		+10,000
Stockpile services:							
Production support		267,246	200,246	267,246	+267,246		+67,000
Research and development		66,753	50,753	71,753	+71,753	+5,000	+21,000
Research and development certification and safety	146,802	211,727	150,727	243,727	+96,925	+32,000	+93,000
Management, technology, and production	112,196	166,587	131,589	171,587	+59,391	+5,000	+39,998
Reliable replacement warhead	8,928	9,351	25,000	25,351	+16,423	+16,000	+351
Robust nuclear earth penetrator		4,000		4,000	+4,000		+4,000
Warheads Dismantlement	74,400	35,245	110,245	15,000	−59,400	−20,245	−95,245
Subtotal, Stockpile services	342,326	760,909	668,560	798,664	+456,338	+37,755	+130,104
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,346,091	1,421,031	1,283,682	1,458,786	+112,695	+37,755	+175,104
Campaigns:							
Science campaigns:							
Primary assessment technologies	73,381	45,179	35,179	55,179	−18,202	+10,000	+20,000

Test readiness	.....	25,000	15,000	25,000	+25,000	.....	+10,000
Dynamic materials properties	85,829	80,894	70,894	90,894	+5,065	+10,000	+20,000
Advanced radiography	54,928	49,520	40,500	59,520	+4,592	+10,000	+19,020
Secondary assessment technologies	63,088	61,332	55,332	77,332	+14,244	+16,000	+22,000
Subtotal, Science campaigns	277,226	261,925	216,905	307,925	+30,699	+46,000	+91,020
Engineering campaign:							
Enhanced surety	32,856	29,845	22,000	45,845	+12,989	+16,000	+23,845
Weapons system engineering assessment technology	27,052	24,040	15,040	20,040	−7,012	−4,000	+5,000
Nuclear survivability	9,384	9,386	9,386	25,386	+16,002	+16,000	+16,000
Enhanced surveillance	99,080	96,207	76,000	111,207	+12,127	+15,000	+35,207
Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), other project costs	4,563	4,714	4,714	4,714	+151	.....	.....
Construction: 01–D–108 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM	85,808	65,564	65,564	65,564	−20,244	.....	.....
Subtotal, MESA	90,371	70,278	70,278	70,278	−20,093	.....	.....
Subtotal, Engineering campaign	258,743	229,756	192,704	272,756	+14,013	+43,000	+80,052
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Ignition	68,882	75,615	75,615	68,800	−82	−6,815	−6,815
Support of stockpile program	38,675	9,872	9,872	41,000	+2,325	+31,128	+31,128
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experiment support	48,631	43,008	43,008	30,000	−18,631	−13,008	−13,008
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	10,991	10,111	10,111	10,900	−91	+789	+789
University grants/other support	7,714	9,946	9,946	7,700	−14	−2,246	−2,246
Facility operations and target production	62,552	54,623	69,623	54,623	−7,929	.....	−15,000
Inertial fusion technology	33,728	.....	40,000	41,000	+7,272	+41,000	+1,000
NIF demonstration program	94,934	112,330	112,330	50,000	−44,934	−62,330	−62,330
High-energy petawatt laser development	41,639	3,000	29,000	10,000	−31,639	+7,000	−19,000
Subtotal	407,746	318,505	399,505	314,023	−93,723	−4,482	−85,482
Construction: 96–D–111 National ignition facility, LLNL	128,960	141,913	141,913	.....	−128,960	−141,913	−141,913
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	536,706	460,418	541,418	314,023	−222,683	−146,395	−227,395
Advanced simulation and computing	694,928	660,830	500,830	735,830	+40,902	+75,000	+235,000
Construction:							
01–D–101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
00–D–103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	3,202				−3,202		
Subtotal, Construction	3,202				−3,202		
Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing	698,130	660,830	500,830	735,830	+37,700	+75,000	+235,000
Pit manufacturing and certification:							
W88 pit manufacturing	130,949	120,926	120,926	120,926	−10,023		
W88 pit certification	60,472	61,895	61,895	61,895	+1,423		
Pit manufacturing capability	13,392	23,071	23,071	23,071	+9,679		
Modern pit facility	6,944	7,686		7,686	+742		+7,686
Pit campaign support activities at NTS	51,788	35,182	35,182	35,182	−16,606		
Subtotal, Pit manufacturing and certification	263,545	248,760	241,074	248,760	−14,785		+7,686
Readiness campaign:							
Stockpile readiness	45,446	31,400	31,400	31,400	−14,046		
High explosives readiness/assembly campaign	33,946	17,097	17,097	17,097	−16,849		
Non-nuclear readiness	32,693	28,630	28,630	28,630	−4,063		
Advanced design and production technologies	79,150	54,040	54,040	54,040	−25,110		
Tritium readiness	58,379	62,694	62,694	62,694	+4,315		
Construction: 98–D–125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	20,832	24,894	24,894	24,894	+4,062		
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	79,211	87,588	87,588	87,588	+8,377		
Subtotal, Readiness campaign	270,446	218,755	218,755	218,755	−51,691		
Total, Campaigns	2,304,796	2,080,444	1,911,686	2,098,049	−206,747	+17,605	+186,363
Readiness in technical base and facilities:							
Operations of facilities	1,112,585	1,160,783	1,204,786	1,200,483	+87,898	+39,700	−4,303
Program readiness	105,354	105,738	105,738	105,738	+384		
Special projects	41,168	6,619		19,869	−21,299	+13,250	+19,869
Material recycle and recovery	86,269	72,730	72,730	72,730	−13,539		

Containers	17,767	17,247	17,247	17,247	−520	.....	.....
Storage	18,830	25,222	25,322	25,222	+6,392	.....	−100
Nuclear weapons incident response	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,381,973	1,388,339	1,425,823	1,441,289	+59,316	+52,950	+15,466
Construction:							
06–D–140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	.....	14,113	14,113	14,113	+14,113	.....	.....
06–D–402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV	.....	8,284	8,284	8,284	+8,284	.....	.....
06–D–403 Tritium facility modernization Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA	.....	2,600	2,600	2,600	+2,600	.....	.....
06–D–404 Building remediation, restoration, and upgrade, Nevada Test Site, NV	.....	16,000	16,000	16,000	+16,000	.....	.....
05–D–140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	16,467	5,000	5,000	7,000	−9,467	+2,000	+2,000
05–D–401 Building 12–64 production bays upgrades, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	24,899	11,000	11,000	11,000	−13,899	.....	.....
05–D–402 Berylium capability (BEC) project, Y–12 National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN	3,598	7,700	7,700	7,700	+4,102	.....	.....
04–D–101 Test capabilities revitalization, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
04–D–102 Exterior communications infrastructure modernization, Sandia National Laboratories	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
04–D–103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	1,488	2,000	2,000	2,000	+512	.....	.....
04–D–104 National security sciences building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
04–D–125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	39,680	55,000	.....	65,000	+25,320	+10,000	+65,000
04–D–126 Building 12–44 production cells upgrade, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	2,579	.....	.....	.....	−2,579	.....	.....
04–D–127 Cleaning and loading modifications, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
04–D–128 TA–18 mission relocation project, Los Alamos Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	.....	13,000	13,000	13,000	+13,000	.....	.....
03–D–102, National Security Sciences building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	37,049	.....	.....	.....	−37,049	.....	.....
03–D–103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	15,153	29,000	15,000	29,000	+13,847	.....	+14,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
03–D–121 Gas transfer capacity expansion, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
03–D–122 Purification facility, Y–12 plant,	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
3–D–123 Special nuclear materials requalification, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	4,565	.....	.....	.....	−4,565	.....	.....
02–D–103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	5,208	.....	.....	.....	−5,208	.....	.....
02–D–105 Engineering technology complex upgrade, LLNL, CA	5,357	.....	.....	.....	−5,357	.....	.....
02–D–107 Electrical power systems safety communications and bus upgrades, NV	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
01–D–103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	5,952	9,000	9,000	9,000	+3,048	.....	.....
01–D–124 HEU materials facility, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	113,088	70,350	81,350	70,350	−42,738	.....	−11,000
01–D–126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
99–D–104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction—Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
99–D–127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
96–D–102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	275,083	243,047	185,047	255,047	−20,036	+12,000	+70,000
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,657,056	1,631,386	1,610,870	1,696,336	+39,280	+64,950	+85,466
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	289,239	233,484	200,484	211,784	−77,455	−21,700	+11,300
Construction:							
06–D–160 Project engioneering and design (PED), various locations	.....	5,811	5,811	5,811	+5,811	.....	.....
06–D–601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	.....	4,000	4,000	4,000	+4,000	.....	.....
06–D–602 Gas main and distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	.....	3,700	3,700	3,700	+3,700	.....	.....

06–D–603 Steam plant life extension project (SLEP), Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN	.....	729	729	729	+729	.....	.....
05–D–160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program project engineering design (PED), various locations	8,630	10,644	10,644	10,644	+2,014	.....	.....
05–D–601 Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y–12, National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN	4,365	9,741	9,741	9,741	+5,376	.....	.....
05–D–602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	9,920	8,500	8,500	8,500	−1,420	.....	.....
05–D–603 New master substation (NMSU), SNL	595	6,900	6,900	6,900	+6,305	.....	.....
04–D–203 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), project engineering design (PED), various locations	973	.....	.....	.....	−973	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	24,483	50,025	50,025	50,025	+25,542	.....	.....
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	313,722	283,509	250,509	261,809	−51,913	−21,700	+11,300
Secure transportation asset:							
Operations and equipment	142,722	143,766	143,766	143,766	+1,044	.....	.....
Program direction	56,968	68,334	68,334	68,334	+11,366	.....	.....
Subtotal, Secure transportation asset	199,690	212,100	212,100	212,100	+12,410	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Secure transportation asset	199,690	212,100	212,100	212,100	+12,410	.....	.....
Nuclear weapons incident response	98,415	118,796	118,796	118,796	+20,381	.....	.....
Environmental projects and operations:							
Environmental projects and operations program	.....	156,504	.....	.....	.....	−156,504	.....
Program direction	.....	17,885	.....	.....	.....	−17,885	.....
Subtotal, Environmental projects and operations	.....	174,389	.....	.....	.....	−174,389	.....
Safeguards and security	714,913	699,478	784,478	699,478	−15,435	.....	−85,000
Construction:							
05–D–170 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	16,864	41,000	41,000	41,000	+24,136	.....	.....
05–D–701 Security perimeter project, Los Alamos, National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	19,840	.....	.....	.....	−19,840	.....	.....
99–D–132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Total, Safeguards and security	751,617	740,478	825,478	740,478	−11,139		−85,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities	6,671,387	6,662,133	6,213,121	6,586,354	−85,033	−75,779	+373,233
Use of prior year balances	−14,039				+14,039		
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−29,760	−32,000	−32,000	−32,000	−2,240		
Undistributed miscellaneous adjustment	4,002				−4,002		
Excluding transfer of DOD ppropriations	−300,000				+300,000		
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	6,331,590	6,630,133	6,181,121	6,554,354	+222,764	−75,779	+373,233
Transfer from Department of Defense appropriations	(300,000)				(−300,000)		
Total, Weapons Activities (program level)	(6,631,590)	(6,630,133)	(6,181,121)	(6,554,354)	(−77,236)	(−75,779)	(+373,233)
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION							
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	223,944	267,218	322,218	297,218	+73,274	+30,000	−25,000
Construction: 06–D–180 Project engineering and design (PED), National Security Laboratory, PNNL		5,000	13,000	13,000	+13,000	+8,000	
Subtotal, Nonproliferation & verification R & D	223,944	272,218	335,218	310,218	+86,274	+38,000	−25,000
Nonproliferation and international security	152,768	80,173	75,836	90,000	−62,768	+9,827	+14,164
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	319,424	343,435	428,435	343,435	+24,011		−85,000
Accelerated highly enriched uranium (HEU)							
Global initiatives for proliferation prevention	40,672	37,890	30,312	50,890	+10,218	+13,000	+20,578
HEU transparency implementation	20,782	20,483	20,483	20,483	−299		
International nuclear safety							
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	39,776	132,000	197,000	152,000	+112,224	+20,000	−45,000
Fissile materials disposition:							
U.S. surplus materials disposition	158,422	226,500	168,700	226,500	+68,078		+57,800
Russian surplus materials disposition	63,488	64,000	64,000	64,000	+512		

Construction:							
01–D–407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
99–D–141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	32,042	24,000	24,000	24,000	−8,042	.....	.....
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	365,056	338,565	35,000	338,565	−26,491	.....	+303,565
Subtotal, Construction	397,098	362,565	59,000	362,565	−34,533	.....	+303,565
Melt and dilute immobilization project	.....	.....	10,000	.....	.....	.....	−10,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	619,008	653,065	301,700	653,065	+34,057	.....	+351,365
Offsite source recovery project	7,539	.....	.....	.....	−7,539	.....	.....
Global threat reduction initiative	.....	97,975	111,975	108,975	+108,975	+11,000	−3,000
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,423,913	1,637,239	1,500,959	1,729,066	+305,153	+91,827	+228,107
Use of prior year balances	−14,880	.....	.....	.....	+14,880	.....	.....
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–13)	84,000	.....	.....	.....	−84,000	.....	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,493,033	1,637,239	1,500,959	1,729,066	+236,033	+91,827	+228,107
NAVAL REACTORS							
Naval reactors development	755,121	738,800	738,800	738,800	−16,321	.....	.....
Construction:							
06–D–901 Central office building II	.....	7,000	7,000	7,000	+7,000	.....	.....
Transfer to Nuclear Energy	9,920	.....	13,500	13,500	+3,580	+13,500	.....
05–N–900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY	6,151	9,900	9,900	9,900	+3,749	.....	.....
03–D–201 Cleanroom technology facility, Bettis atomic power lab, West Mifflin, PA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
90–N–102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	981	.....	.....	.....	−981	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	17,052	16,900	30,400	30,400	+13,348	+13,500	.....
Total, Naval reactors development	772,173	755,700	769,200	769,200	−2,973	+13,500	.....
Program direction	29,264	30,300	30,300	30,300	+1,036	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Subtotal, Naval Reactors	801,437	786,000	799,500	799,500	−1,937	+13,500	.....
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	801,437	786,000	799,500	799,500	−1,937	+13,500	.....
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR							
Office of the Administrator	353,350	350,765	373,765	350,765	−2,585	.....	−23,000
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	.....	−6,896	−6,896	−6,896	−6,896	.....	.....
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	353,350	343,869	366,869	343,869	−9,481	.....	−23,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	8,979,410	9,397,241	8,848,449	9,426,789	+447,379	+29,548	+578,340
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP							
Closure Sites:							
Ashtabula	15,752	16,000	16,000	16,000	+248	.....	.....
Columbus	19,690	9,500	9,500	9,500	−10,190	.....	.....
Fernald	317,725	327,609	327,609	327,609	+9,884	.....	.....
Miamisburg	110,905	75,530	105,530	75,530	−35,375	.....	−30,000
Rocky Flats	641,700	579,950	579,950	579,950	−61,750	.....	.....
Total, closure sites	1,105,772	1,008,589	1,038,589	1,008,589	−97,183	.....	−30,000
Savannah River site:							
04–D–423 Container surveillance capability in 235F	20,475	.....	.....	.....	−20,475	.....	.....
04–D–414 Container surveillance capability in 235F PED	2,976	.....	.....	.....	−2,976	.....	.....
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition 2012	355,111	250,303	250,303	250,303	−104,808	.....	.....
Subtotal, 2012 accelerated completions	378,562	250,303	250,303	250,303	−128,259	.....	.....
SNF stabilization, disposition/storage	11,240	13,889	13,889	13,889	+2,649	.....	.....

SR community and regulatory support	11,592	13,046	13,046	13,046	+1,454	.....	.....
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	43,218	75,105	65,105	75,105	+31,887	.....	+10,000
Spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition	22,767	11,273	11,273	11,273	−11,494	.....	.....
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	88,313	112,993	112,993	112,993	+24,680	.....	.....
Soil and water remediation	100,896	103,665	103,665	112,665	+11,769	+9,000	+9,000
Nuclear facility D&D	68,198	66,516	66,516	75,516	+7,318	+9,000	+9,000
Subtotal, 2035 accelerated completions	346,224	396,487	386,487	414,487	+68,263	+18,000	+28,000
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabil. & disposition	381,858	500,975	500,975	500,975	+119,117	.....	.....
HLW legislative proposal	112,039	.....	.....	.....	−112,039	.....	.....
03–D–414, Salt waste processing facility PED SR	23,469	4,342	4,342	4,342	−19,127	.....	.....
04–D–408, Glass waste storage building #2	43,476	6,975	6,975	6,975	−36,501	.....	.....
05–D–405, Salt waste processing facility	25,792	70,000	70,000	70,000	+44,208	.....	.....
Subtotal, Tank farm activities	586,634	582,292	582,292	582,292	−4,342	.....	.....
Total, Savannah River site	1,311,420	1,229,082	1,219,082	1,247,082	−64,338	+18,000	+28,000
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant:							
Operate WIPP	146,430	111,948	111,948	117,948	−28,482	+6,000	+6,000
Central Characterization Project	26,242	38,502	38,502	38,502	+12,260	.....	.....
Transportation	29,248	37,631	37,631	37,631	+8,383	.....	.....
Community and regulatory support	23,452	24,548	24,548	36,548	+13,096	+12,000	+12,000
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	225,372	212,629	212,629	230,629	+5,257	+18,000	+18,000
Idaho National Laboratory:							
SNF stabilization and disposition/storage	32,419	12,666	12,666	12,666	−19,753	.....	.....
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	1,889	1,555	1,555	1,555	−334	.....	.....
SNF stabilization and disposition—2012	10,224	19,158	19,158	19,158	+8,934	.....	.....
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	109,472	140,015	140,015	140,015	+30,543	.....	.....
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	127,635	124,965	124,965	98,695	−28,940	−26,270	−26,270
06–D–401, Sodium bearing waste treatment project, ID	.....	15,000	15,000	54,270	+54,270	+39,270	+39,270
04–D–414, Sodium bearing waste treatment facility, PED ID	.....	9,200	9,200	9,200	+9,200	.....	.....
04–D–402, Cathodic Protection System Expansion PED ID	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Soil and water remediation—2012	124,994	161,489	161,489	161,489	+36,495	.....	.....
Nuclear facility D&D	5,425	5,026	5,026	5,026	−399	.....	.....
Non-nuclear facility D&D	26,993	39,105	39,105	39,105	+12,112	.....	.....
Soil and water remediation—2035	1,984	.....	.....	.....	−1,984	.....	.....
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,088	3,546	3,546	3,546	+458	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
HLW legislative proposal	96,522				−96,522		
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	540,645	531,725	531,725	544,725	+4,080	+13,000	+13,000
Oak Ridge Reservation:							
Solid waste stabilization and completion—2006	39,775			4,630	−35,145	+4,630	+4,630
Soil and water remediation—Melton Valley	71,099	15,146	15,146	35,818	−35,281	+20,672	+20,672
Solid waste stabilization and disposition—2012	46,744	68,360	68,360	68,360	+21,616		
Soil and water remediation—offsites	12,753	16,483	16,483	16,483	+3,730		
Nuclear facility D&D, E. Tenn. Technology Park	6,540	6,034	12,534	6,034	−506		−6,500
Nuclear facility D&D Y–12	27,323	40,558	40,558	40,558	+13,235		
Nuclear facility D&D ORNL	19,626	16,034	25,634	16,034	−3,592		−9,600
Solid waste stabilization & disp.—science current gen	18,220	18,267	18,267	18,267	+47		
Solid waste stabilization & disp—NNSA current gen	19,619				−19,619		
OR contract/post closure liabilites/admin	14,583				−14,583		
OR reservation community & regulatory support	3,592	5,670	5,670	5,670	+2,078		
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	279,874	186,552	202,652	211,854	−68,020	+25,302	+9,202
Hanford Site:							
Nuclear material stabilization & disposition PFP	179,097	190,772	206,565	190,772	+11,675		−15,793
SNF stabilization and disposition	122,885	58,479	58,479	58,479	−64,406		
Nuclear facility D&D, river corridor closure project	212,033	168,501	188,501	168,501	−43,532		−20,000
HAMMER facility			7,500				−7,500
B-reactor museum			1,000				−1,000
Subtotal, 2012 accelerated completions	514,015	417,752	462,045	417,752	−96,263		−44,293
Solid waste stabilization & disposition 200 Area	219,139	165,113	173,113	165,113	−54,026		−8,000
Soil & water remediation—groundwater/vadose zone	50,231	72,955	86,955	72,955	+22,724		−14,000
Nuclear facility D&D—remainder of Hanford	118,182	70,812	75,812	70,812	−47,370		−5,000
Operate waste disposal facility	6,103	5,861	5,861	5,861	−242		
SNF stabilization and disposition/storage	991	1,813	1,813	1,813	+822		
Richland community and regulatory support	13,124	15,411	15,411	15,411	+2,287		

Subtotal, 2035 accelerated completions	407,770	331,965	358,965	331,965	−75,805	.....	−27,000
Total, Hanford Site	921,785	749,717	821,010	749,717	−172,068	.....	−71,293
Office of River Protection:							
01–D–416 Waste treatment & immobilization plant	684,480	625,893	690,000	625,893	−58,587	.....	−64,107
Tank Farm activities:							
Rad liquid tank waste stabil. and disposition	332,878	294,447	361,447	328,840	−4,038	+34,393	−32,607
HLW rad liquid tank waste stabil & disp leg prop	31,793	.....	.....	.....	−31,793	.....	.....
03–D–403 Immobilized HLW interim storage facility	.....	7,495	.....	7,495	+7,495	.....	+7,495
River protection community and regulatory support	.....	471	471	471	+471	.....	.....
Subtotal, Tank Farm activities	364,671	302,413	361,918	336,806	−27,865	+34,393	−25,112
Total, Office of River Protection	1,049,151	928,306	1,051,918	962,699	−86,452	+34,393	−89,219
Program direction	270,016	230,931	248,816	230,931	−39,085	.....	−17,885
Program support	32,707	32,846	32,846	32,846	+139	.....	.....
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	459,296	451,000	451,000	451,000	−8,296	.....	.....
Technology development	59,726	21,389	21,389	56,389	−3,337	+35,000	+35,000
NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites:							
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	57,948	.....	54,578	54,578	−3,370	+54,578	.....
NNSA Service Center	9,002	.....	8,304	8,304	−698	+8,304	.....
Nevada	90,095	.....	85,024	85,024	−5,071	+85,024	.....
Kansas City Plant	3,478	.....	4,526	4,526	+1,048	+4,526	.....
California site support	746	.....	550	550	−196	+550	.....
Pantex	24,016	.....	19,654	19,654	−4,362	+19,654	.....
Pinellas (Post Closure Benefits)	.....	.....	.....	9,769	+9,769	+9,769	+9,769
Sandia National Laboratories	20,084	.....	9,769	21,997	+1,913	+21,997	+12,228
Y–12 newly generated waste	.....	.....	21,997	.....	.....	.....	−21,997
Nevada off-sites	.....	2,846	2,846	2,846	+2,846	.....	.....
Los Alamos National Laboratory	116,752	142,209	142,209	145,509	+28,757	+3,300	+3,300
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	322,121	145,055	349,457	352,757	+30,636	+207,702	+3,300
Safeguards and Security:							
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,072	4,223	4,223	4,223	+151	.....	.....
Oak Ridge Reservation	21,850	28,855	28,855	28,855	+7,005	.....	.....
Fernald	1,157	1,391	1,391	1,391	+234	.....	.....
Miamisburg	524	.....	.....	.....	−524	.....	.....
West Valley	2,648	1,800	1,800	1,800	−848	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Paducah	7,760	11,014	11,014	11,014	+3,254		
Portsmouth	16,009	17,842	17,842	17,842	+1,833		
Richland/Hanford Site	56,276	82,155	82,155	82,155	+25,879		
Rocky Flats	16,455	3,200	3,200	3,200	−13,255		
Savannah River Site	136,191	136,743	136,743	136,743	+552		
Total, Safeguards and Security	262,942	287,223	287,223	287,223	+24,281		
Use of prior year balances	−32,508				+32,508		
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP	6,808,319	6,015,044	6,468,336	6,366,441	−441,878	+351,397	−101,895
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES							
Other national security programs:							
Energy security and assurance:							
Energy security							
Program direction							
Subtotal, Energy security and assurance							
Office of Security:							
Nuclear safeguards and security	193,794				−193,794		
Security investigations	44,561				−44,561		
Program direction	57,763				−57,763		
Subtotal, Office of Security	296,118				−296,118		
Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance:							
Nuclear safeguards and security		176,878	233,378	196,878	+196,878	+20,000	−36,500
Security investigations		48,725	48,725	48,725	+48,725		
Program direction		75,492	75,492	75,492	+75,492		
Subtotal, Office of Security and Safety Performance		301,095	357,595	321,095	+321,095	+20,000	−36,500
Intelligence							

Counterintelligence	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Independent oversight and performance assurance	24,472	.....	.....	.....	−24,472	.....	.....
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	108,352	56,483	56,483	62,483	−45,869	+6,000	+6,000
Program direction—EH	20,251	20,546	20,546	20,546	+295	.....	.....
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	128,603	77,029	77,029	83,029	−45,574	+6,000	+6,000
Worker and community transition	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Program direction—WT	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Office of Legacy Management:							
Legacy management	33,425	31,421	41,421	31,421	−2,004	.....	−10,000
Program direction	13,095	13,655	13,655	13,655	+560	.....	.....
Subtotal, Office of Legacy Management	46,520	45,076	55,076	45,076	−1,444	.....	−10,000
Nuclear energy:							
Infrastructure:							
Idaho facilities management	.....	17,762	17,762	17,762	+17,762	.....	.....
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	.....	75,008	75,008	75,008	+75,008	.....	.....
Subtotal, Infrastructure	.....	92,770	92,770	92,770	+92,770	.....	.....
Program direction	.....	31,103	31,103	31,103	+31,103	.....	.....
Subtotal, Nuclear energy	.....	123,873	123,873	123,873	+123,873	.....	.....
Defense related administrative support	91,700	87,575	87,575	87,575	−4,125	.....	.....
Defense activities at INEEL	113,456	.....	.....	.....	−113,456	.....	.....
Office of Hearings and Appeals	4,283	4,353	4,353	4,353	+70	.....	.....
Subtotal, Other Defense Activities	705,152	639,001	705,501	665,001	−40,151	+26,000	−40,500
Use of prior year balances	−15,000	.....	.....	.....	+15,000	.....	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−3,003	−3,003	−3,003	−3,003	.....	.....	.....
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	687,149	635,998	702,498	661,998	−25,151	+26,000	−40,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL							
Defense nuclear waste disposal	229,152	351,447	351,447	277,000	+47,848	−74,447	−74,447
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	16,704,030	16,399,730	16,370,730	16,732,228	+28,198	+332,498	+361,498
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS							
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION							
Operation and maintenance:							
Purchase power and wheeling	34,000	32,713	32,713	32,713	−1,287	.....	.....
Program direction	5,158	5,600	5,600	5,600	+442	.....	.....
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	39,158	38,313	38,313	38,313	−845	.....	.....
Offsetting collections	−34,000	−38,313	−32,713	−32,713	+1,287	+5,600	.....
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	5,158	.....	5,600	5,600	+442	+5,600	.....
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION							
Operation and maintenance:							
Operating expenses	4,639	7,042	7,042	7,042	+2,403	.....	.....
Purchase power and wheeling	2,900	1,235	1,235	3,000	+100	+1,765	+1,765
Program direction	19,169	19,958	19,958	19,958	+789	.....	.....
Construction	5,309	3,166	3,166	3,166	−2,143	.....	.....
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	32,017	31,401	31,401	33,166	+1,149	+1,765	+1,765
Offsetting collections	−2,900	−28,235	−1,235	−3,000	−100	+25,235	−1,765
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	29,117	3,166	30,166	30,166	+1,049	+27,000	.....

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION							
Operation and maintenance:							
Construction and rehabilitation	20,029	53,957	40,192	53,957	+33,928	.....	+13,765
Operation and maintenance	39,510	47,295	47,295	47,295	+7,785	.....	.....
Purchase power and wheeling	227,600	148,500	148,500	279,000	+51,400	+130,500	+130,500
Program direction	115,844	143,667	143,667	143,667	+27,823	.....	.....
Utah mitigation and conservation	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	402,983	393,419	379,654	523,919	+120,936	+130,500	+144,265
Offsetting collections	−227,600	−335,300	−148,500	−279,000	−51,400	+56,300	−130,500
Offsetting collections (Public Law 98–381)	−3,668	−4,162	−4,162	−4,162	−494	.....	.....
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	171,715	53,957	226,992	240,757	+69,042	+186,800	+13,765
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND							
Operation and maintenance	2,804	2,692	2,692	2,692	−112	.....	.....
Offsetting collections	.....	−2,692	.....	.....	.....	+2,692	.....
TOTAL, FALCON AND AMISTAD O&M FUND	2,804	.....	2,692	2,692	−112	+2,692	.....
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	208,794	57,123	265,450	279,215	+70,421	+222,092	+13,765
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION							
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	210,000	220,400	220,400	220,400	+10,400	.....	.....
FERC revenues	−210,000	−220,400	−220,400	−220,400	−10,400	.....	.....
Economic Regulation—Office of Hearings and Appeals	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	24,419,197	24,213,307	24,317,857	25,074,256	+655,059	+860,949	+756,399
(Total amount appropriated)	(24,263,197)	(23,920,307)	(24,281,857)	(25,038,256)	(+775,059)	(+1,117,949)	(+756,399)
(Advance appropriations from previous years)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	.....	.....	.....
(Advance appropriations, fiscal year 2007)	(36,000)	(257,000)	.....	.....	(−36,000)	(−257,000)	.....
(Emergency appropriations)	(84,000)	.....	.....	.....	(−84,000)	.....	.....

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:

Section 301. Language is included under section 301 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, 2004 (Public Law 108–137).

Section 302. Language is included under section 302 which prohibits the use of funds for severance payments under the worker and community transition program. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2004.

Section 303. Language is included under section 303 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, 2004.

Section 304. Language is included 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, 2004.

Section 305. Language is included that prohibits the use of funds by the Bonneville Power Administration to enter into energy efficiency contracts outside its service area.

Section 306. This section requires the Secretary to compete the management and operating contracts of certain Department of Energy or National Nuclear Security Administration laboratories.

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

Section 308. The Committee provides a provision allowing the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to authorize certain nuclear weapons production plants, including the Nevada Test Site, to use not more than 4 percent of available fund for research, development and demonstration activities. This provision has been carried in previous Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts.

Section 309. Language is included specifically authorizing intelligence activities pending enactment of the fiscal year 2004 Intelligence Authorization Act (Public Law 108–381).

Section 310. Language is included that requires that waste characterization at WIPP be limited to determining that the waste is not ignitable, corrosive, or reactive. This confirmation will be performed using radiography or visual examination of a representative subpopulation of the waste.

Section 311. This section is included to require that all the national security milestones in the Advanced Simulation Computing

program are achieved before congressionally directed priorities are funded.

Section 312. Language is included under section 312 clarifying the cost-share requirements for a hydrogen fuel project.

Section 313. This provision allows the Secretary to authorize up to 8 percent of laboratory funds be used for laboratory directed research and development.

Section 314. Language is included to ensure the funds provided to the Department are available for payment of Laboratory Directed Research and Development, Plant Directed Research and Development and Site Directed Research and Development activities.

Section 315. Language is included to ensure the funds provided to the Department are available for direct and indirect cost of research performed on behalf of other Federal agencies.

Section 316. Language is included to limit funds from being spent on unbudgeted NNSA complex reforms.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2005	$65,472,000
Budget estimate, 2006	65,472,000
House allowance	38,500,000
Committee recommendation	65,482,000

The Committee recommendation for the Appalachian Regional Commission totals $65,482,000.

The Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is composed of the Governors of the 13 Appalachian States and a Federal cochairman who is appointed by the President.

Consistent with the administration's budget request, the Committee recommendation does not include funding for ARC highways. Funding for ARC development highways is provided through the Highway Trust Fund in fiscal years 1999 through 2004 consistent with provision contained in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (Public Law 102–240).

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

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2005	$20,106,000
Budget estimate, 2006	22,032,000
House allowance	22,032,000
Committee recommendation	22,032,000

An appropriation of $22,032,000, the amount of the request, is recommended for fiscal year 2006.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board was created by the Fiscal Year 1989 National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 100–180). The Board, composed of five members appointed by the President, provides advice and recommendations to the Secretary of

Energy regarding public health and safety issues at the Department's defense nuclear facilities. The Board is also responsible for investigating any event or practice at a defense nuclear facility which has or may adversely affect public health and safety. The Board is responsible for reviewing and evaluating the content and implementation of the standards relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of defense nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2005	$6,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	6,000,000
House allowance	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	12,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $12,000,000 for the Delta Regional Authority, an increase of $6,000,000 above the request.

The Delta Regional Authority [DRA], authorized by Public Law 106–554, was established to assist an eight-state, 236-county region of demonstrated distress in obtaining transportation and basic public infrastructure, skills training, and opportunities for economic development essential to strong local economies.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2005	$66,464,000
Budget estimate, 2006	2,562,000
House allowance	2,562,000
Committee recommendation	67,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes $67,000,000 for the Denali Commission.

The Denali Commission is a regional economic development agency established in 1998 for the intended purpose of delivering basic utilities, including affordable power, and other essential infrastructure to the nation's most geographically isolated communities. The Committee is encouraged by the progress of the Denali Commission in assisting distressed communities throughout Alaska, and urges continued work among local and State agencies, nonprofit organizations and other participants in meeting the most pressing infrastructure needs.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2005	$657,475,000
Budget estimate, 2006	693,376,000
House allowance	714,376,000
Committee recommendation	734,376,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2005	$530,079,000
Budget estimate, 2006	559,643,000
House allowance	580,643,000
Committee recommendation	598,643,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2005	$128,142,000
Budget estimate, 2006	134,564,000
House allowance	134,564,000
Committee recommendation	136,564,000

Fee Recovery.—The Committee recommendation includes bill language providing for a 1 year extension of the authority to continue the fee recovery percentage used in fiscal year 2005. This language requires the NRC to recover 90 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation derived from the Nuclear Waste fund and the amount necessary to implement Section 3116 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), by assessing license and annual fees.

New Reactor Licensing.—The Committee recommends $20,000,000 to support the preparatory activities and pre-application consultations for expected combined license applications beginning fiscal year 2008. The investment over 2 years includes accelerating efforts update NRC's regulatory infrastructure, training and preparing new technical staff and putting into place the infrastructure for additional NRC staff. The Committee urges the NRC to utilize these resources in a manner to ensure the effective and timely consideration of new combined license applications. The Committee expects three to five applications to be submitted in the next 2 years.

Security and Personnel.—The Committee recommends an additional $21,000,000 to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to be used to conduct site-specific assessments of spent fuel pools at each of the nuclear reactor sites consistent with the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences study. The Committee expects the NRC to provide written updates as to its findings and any changes to the current regulations as a result of the assessments. The Committee directs the NRC to allocate $4,000,000 to supporting the establishment of Department of Homeland Security's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office and to use $5,600,000 to meet the salary and benefits requirements consistent with the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447).

The Committee recommendation for the NRC is $734,376,000. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $598,643,000 resulting in a net appropriation of $136,564,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2005	$7,458,000
Budget estimate, 2006	8,316,000
House allowance	8,316,000
Committee recommendation	8,316,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2005	$6,712,000
Budget estimate, 2006	7,485,000
House allowance	7,485,000
Committee recommendation	7,485,000

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,485,000 for fiscal year 2006.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2005	$3,152,000
Budget estimate, 2006	3,608,000
House allowance	3,608,000
Committee recommendation	3,608,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,608,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–203) 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.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2004	.....
Budget estimate, 2005	$9,000,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

The Office of the Inspector General, for fiscal year 2006, proposes to appropriate funds for TVA's IG out of TVA's revenues beginning in 2006. The Committee has not included the administration's proposal to establish a congressionally-funded Office of the Inspector General to over the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Committee believes the current relationship between the Inspector General and the TVA Board is working well and sees no reason to change that relationship.

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:

Section 501. The provision prohibits the transfer of unexpended balances of appropriations to another Federal department, agency or instrumentality of the U.S. Government.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The Committee recommends funding for the following programs or activities which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2006:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action program; Middle Rio Grande ESA Collaborative Program; Bank Stabilization on Upper Yazoo Project, MS; Lower Mississippi River Museum Interpretative Site, MS; Missouri and Middle Mississippi Enhancement Project; Lake Champlain Canal Dispersal Barrier Study, Vermont and New York;

Bureau of Reclamation: Water 2025, Norman, OK Feasibility Study; Water Desalination Act of 1996; Rio Grande Collaborative Water Operations Team;

Department of Energy: Energy Conservation and Supply Activities: Hydrogen Technology, Solar Energy, Wind Energy, Hydropower, Geothermal Technology Biomass and Biorefinery R&D, Intergovernmental Activities, Department Energy Management Programs, Program Direction, Facilities and Infrastructure, Weatherization;

Office of Nuclear Energy;

Office of Fossil Energy: Fossil Energy R&D, Clean Coal, Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Research;

Office of Environment, Safety and Health;

Non-Defense Environmental Management;

Federal Lab Consortium;

Office of Science;

Department of Administration; Office of Inspector General; Office of Economic Impact and Diversity;

National Nuclear Security Administration: Weapons Activities; Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation; Naval Reactors; Office of the Administrator;

Defense Environmental Management, Defense Site Acceleration Completion;

Other Defense Activities;

Defense Nuclear Waste Fund;

Office of Security and Performance Assurance;

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;

Power Marketing Administrations: Southeastern, Southwestern, Western Area; and

Energy Information Administration.

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on June 16, 2005, the Committee ordered reported, en bloc, H.R. 2419, an Act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and H.R. 2360, an Act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, both subject to further amendment and subject to the budget allocations, by a recorded vote of 28–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Cochran	
Mr. Stevens	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Burns	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Craig	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. DeWine	
Mr. Brownback	
Mr. Allard	
Mr. Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Johnson	
Ms. Landrieu	

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.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1992, PUBLIC LAW 102–580

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 101. * * *

* * * * * * *

SEC. 103. VISITOR CENTERS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER MUSEUM AND RIVERFRONT INTERPRETIVE SITE—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish and operate in accordance with this subsection an interpretive facility (including a museum and interpretive site) in Vicksburg, Mississippi, which shall be known as the "Lower Mississippi River Museum and Riverfront Interpretive Site".

(2) LOCATION OF MUSEUM.—The museum shall be located on [property currently held by the Resolution Trust Corporation in the vicinity of the Mississippi River Bridge] *riverfront property* in Vicksburg, Mississippi. Title to the property shall be transferred to the Secretary at no cost.

* * * * * * *

(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—[There is]

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated [$2,000,000 to carry out this subsection, including acquiring and restoring under paragraph (2) the property held by the Resolution Trust Corporation and planning, designing, and constructing the museum and riverfront interpretive site under this subsection.] *$15,000,000 to plan, design, and construct generally in accordance with the conceptual plan to be prepared by the Corps of Engineers.*

(B) FUNDING.—The planning, design, and construction of the Lower Mississippi River Museum and Riverfront Interpretive Site shall be carried out using funds appropriated as part of the Mississippi River Levees feature of the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project, authorized by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534, chapter 569).

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1996, PUBLIC LAW 104–303

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) PROJECTS WITH CHIEF'S REPORTS.—Except as provided in this subsection, the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports designated in this subsection:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(31) MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WEST VIRGINIA.—The project for navigation, Marmet Lock, Kanawha River, West Virginia: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 24, 1994, at a total cost of **[**$229,581,000**]** *$358,000,000*. The costs of construction of the project are to be paid ½ from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999, PUBLIC LAW 106–53

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. * * *

* * * * * * *

SEC. 514. MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

* * * * * * *

(e) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAW.—In carrying out the plan and the activities described in subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall comply with any applicable Federal law, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(f) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), for any project undertaken under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a Regional or National nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.

(g) COST LIMITATION.—Not more than $5,000,000 in Federal funds may be allotted under this section for a project at any single locality.

[(f)**]** *(h)* COST SHARING.—

(1) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 35 percent *which may be in cash,*

by the provision of lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations or disposal areas, by in-kind services to implement the project, or by any combination of the foregoing. Land needed for a project under this authority may remain in private ownership subject to easements satisfactory to the Secretary necessary to assure achievement of the project purposes.

(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of any 1 activity described in subsection (b) shall not exceed $5,000,000.

(3) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The operation and maintenance of the project shall be a non-Federal responsibility.

(g) *(i)* AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to pay the Federal share of the cost of carrying out this section $30,000,000 **[**for the period of fiscal years 2000 and 2001**]** *per year, and such authority shall extend until Federal fiscal year 2015*.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 593. CENTRAL NEW MEXICO.

(a) DEFINITION OF CENTRAL NEW MEXICO.—In this section, * * *

* * * * * * *

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section **[**$25,000,000**]** *$50,000,000* for the period beginning with fiscal year 2000, to remain available until expended.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000, PUBLIC LAW 106–541

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. * * *

* * * * * * *

SEC. 214. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In fiscal years 2001 through **[**2005**]** *2006*, the Secretary, after public notice, may accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities to expedite the evaluation of permits under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. * * *

* * * * * * *

SEC. 529. LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.

(a) * * *

(b) PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated [$10,000,000] *$20,000,000* to carry out this section.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 547. BLUESTONE, WEST VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control, Bluestone Lake, Ohio River basin, West Virginia, authorized by section 4 of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1217), is modified to authorize construction of hydroelectric generating facilities at the project by the Tri-Cities Power Authority of West Virginia under the terms and conditions of the agreement referred to in subsection (b).

(b) AGREEMENT.—

(1) AGREEMENT TERMS.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Southeastern Power Administration, shall enter into a binding agreement with the Tri-Cities Power Authority that contains mutually acceptable terms and conditions and under which the Tri-Cities Power Authority agrees to each of the following:

(A) To design and construct the generating facilities referred to in subsection (a) within [4 years] *5 years* after the date of such agreement.

(B) To reimburse the Secretary for—

(i) the cost of approving such design and inspecting such construction;

(ii) the cost of providing any assistance authorized under subsection (c)(2); and

(iii) the redistributed costs associated with the original construction of the dam and dam safety [if all parties agree with the method of the development of the chargeable amounts associated with hydropower at the facility] *assurance project*.

(C) To release and indemnify the United States from any claims, causes of action, or liabilities that may arise from such design [and construction], *construction, and operation and maintenance* of the facilities referred to in subsection (a), including any liability that may arise out of the removal of the facility if directed by the Secretary.

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The agreement shall also specify each of the following:

(A) The procedures and requirements for approval and acceptance of design, construction, and operation and maintenance of the facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(B) The rights, responsibilities, and liabilities of each party to the agreement.

(C) The amount of the payments under subsection (f) and the procedures under which such payments are to be made.

(3) OPERATION AND OWNERSHIP.—The Tri-Cities Power Authority shall be the owner and operator of the hydropower facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—[No] *Unless otherwise provided, no* Federal funds may be expended for the *planning,* design, construction, and operation and maintenance of the facilities referred to in subsection (a) [prior to the date on which such facilities are accepted by the Secretary under subsection (d)].

(2) REIMBURSEMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if requested by the Tri-Cities Power Authority, the Secretary may provide, on a reimbursable basis, assistance in connection with the [design] *planning, design,* and construction of the generating facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(d) COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.—

[(1) TRANSFER OF FACILITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon completion of the construction of the facilities referred to in subsection (a) and final approval of such facilities by the Secretary, the Tri-Cities Power Authority shall transfer without consideration title to such facilities to the United States, and the Secretary shall—

[(A) accept the transfer of title to such facilities on behalf of the United States; and

[(B) operate and maintain the facilities.

[(2) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary may accept title to the facilities pursuant to paragraph (1) only after certifying that the quality of the construction meets all standards established for similar facilities constructed by the Secretary.]

(1) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall review the design and construction activities for all features of the hydroelectric project that pertain to and affect stability of the dam and control the release of water from Bluestone Dam to ensure that the quality of construction of those features meets all standards established for similar facilities constructed by the Secretary.

[(3)] *(2)* AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES.—The operation and maintenance of the facilities shall be conducted in a manner that is consistent with other authorized project purposes of the Bluestone Lake facility[.], *except that hydroelectric power is no longer a project purpose of the facility so long as Tri-Cities Power Authority continues to exercise its responsibilities as the builder, owner, and operator of the hydropower facilities at Bluestone Dam. Water flow releases and flood control from the hydropower facilities shall be determined and directed by the Corps of Engineers.*

(3) COORDINATION.—Construction of the hydroelectric generating facilities shall be coordinated with the dam safety assurance project currently in the design and construction phases.

(e) EXCESS POWER.—Pursuant to any agreement under subsection (b), the Southeastern Power Administration shall market the excess power produced by the facilities referred to in subsection

(a) [in accordance with section 5 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s; 58 Stat. 890)].

(f) PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Southeastern Power Administration, may pay, in accordance with the terms of the agreement entered into under subsection (b), out of the revenues from the sale of power produced by the generating [facility of the interconnected systems of reservoirs operated by the Secretary] *facilities under construction under such agreements* and marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration—

(1) to the Tri-Cities Power Authority all reasonable costs incurred by the Tri-Cities Power Authority in the [design] *planning, design* and construction of the facilities referred to in subsection (a), including the capital investment in such facilities and a reasonable rate of return on such capital investment; and

(2) to the [Secretary] *Tri-Cities Power Authority*, in accordance with the terms of the agreement entered into under subsection (b) out of the revenues from the sale of power produced by the generating [facility of the interconnected systems of reservoirs operated by the Secretary] *facilities under construction under such agreements* and marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration, all reasonable costs incurred by the [Secretary] *Tri-Cities Power Authority* in the operation and maintenance of [facilities referred to in subsection (a)] *such facilities*.

(g) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF ENERGY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Southeastern Power Administration, is authorized—

[(1) to construct such transmission facilities as necessary to market the power produced at the facilities referred to in subsection (a) with funds contributed by the Tri-Cities Power Authority; and]

(1) to arrange for the transmission of power to the market or to construct such transmission facilities as necessary to market the power produced at the facilities referred to in subsection (a) with funds contributed by the Tri-Cities Power Authority; and

(2) to repay those funds, including interest and any administrative expenses, directly from the revenues from the sale of power produced by [such facilities of the interconnected systems of reservoirs operated by the Secretary] *the generating facility* and marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration.

(h) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section affects any requirement under Federal or State environmental law relating to the licensing or operation of the facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(i) TRI-CITIES POWER AUTHORITY DEFINED.—In this section, the "Tri-Cities Power Authority" refers to the entity established by the City of Hinton, West Virginia, the City of White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, and the City of Philippi, West Virginia, pursuant to a document entitled "Second Amended and Restated Intergovern-

mental Agreement" approved by the Attorney General of West Virginia on February 14, 2002.

* * * * * * *

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001, PUBLIC LAW 106–554

* * * * * * *

DIVISION B

TITLE I

SEC. 101. * * *

* * * * * * *

SEC. 108. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE. (a) TECHNICAL, PLANNING, AND DESIGN ASSISTANCE.—Section 219(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(19) MARANA, ARIZONA.—Wastewater treatment and distribution infrastructure, Marana, Arizona.

* * * * * * *

(d) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CRITICAL RESOURCE PROJECTS.—Section 219(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(45) WASHINGTON, D.C., AND MARYLAND.—$15,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(1), modified to include measures to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the Anacostia River watershed.

* * * * * * *

"(70) WASHINGTON, GREENE, WESTMORELAND, AND FAYETTE COUNTIES, PENNSYLVANIA.—$8,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Washington, Greene, Westmoreland, and Fayette Counties, Pennsylvania.".

* * * * * * *

(72) ALPINE, CALIFORNIA.—$10,000,000 is authorized for a water transmission main, Alpine, CA.

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—COLORADO UTE SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000

SEC. 301. * * *

SEC. 303. MISCELLANEOUS.

The Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–585; 102 Stat. 2973) is amended by adding at the end the following:

* * * * * * *

"SEC. 17. COLORADO UTE SETTLEMENT FUND.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is hereby established within the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the 'Colorado Ute Settlement Fund'.

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Colorado Ute Settlement Fund such funds as are necessary to complete the construction of the facilities described in sections 6(a)(1)(A) and 15(b) [within 7 years of the date of enactment of this section. Such funds are authorized to be appropriated for each of the first 5 fiscal years beginning with the first full fiscal year following the date of enactment of this section] *for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2012*.

* * * * * * *

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004, PUBLIC LAW 108–137

* * * * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

SEC. 123. GWYNNS FALLS WATERSHED, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND. The Secretary of the Army shall implement the project for ecosystem restoration, Gwynns Falls, Maryland, [in accordance with the Baltimore Metropolitan Water Resources-Gwynns Falls Watershed Feasibility Report prepared by the Corps of Engineers and the City of Baltimore, Maryland.] *in accordance with the "Baltimore Metropolitan Water Resources-Gwynns Falls Watershed Study" report prepared by the Corps of Engineers and the City of Baltimore, Maryland, dated September 2002.*

* * * * * * *

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005, PUBLIC LAW 108–447

* * * * * * *

DIVISION C—ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

* * * * * * *

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. * * *

* * * * * * *

SEC. 207. ANIMAS-LA PLATA NON-INDIAN SPONSOR OBLIGATIONS. In accordance with the nontribal repayment obligation specified in Subsection 6(a)(3)(B) of the Colorado Ute Indian Rights Settlement Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–585), as amended by the Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000 (Public Law 106–554), the reimbursable cost upon which the cost allocation shall be based shall not exceed $43,000,000, plus interest during construction for those parties not utilizing the up front payment option, of the first $500,000,000 (January 2003 price level) of the total project costs. Consequently, the Secretary may forgive the obligation of the non-Indian sponsors relative to the $163,000,000 increase*, and any effects of inflation thereon,* in estimated total project costs that occurred in 2003.

* * * * * * *

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND TSUNAMI RELIEF, 2005, PUBLIC LAW 109–13

* * * * * * *

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

SEC. 6001. * * *

* * * * * * *

DESALINATION ACT EXTENSION

SEC. 6015. Section 8 of Public Law 104–298 (The Water Desalination Act of 1996) (110 Stat. 3624) as amended by section 210 of Public Law 108–7 (117 Stat. 146) is amended by—

(1) in paragraph (a) by striking "2004" and inserting in lieu thereof "**[**2005**]**" *2010*; and

(2) in paragraph (b) by striking "2004" and inserting in lieu thereof "**[**2005**]**" *2010*.

* * * * * * *

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93–344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation [1]	Amount of bill	Committee allocation [1]	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the Budget Resolution for 2006: Subcommittee on Energy and Water:				
Discretionary	31,245	31,245	31,155	[1] 31,118
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2006	.....	.....	.....	[2] 20,026
2007	.....	.....	.....	9,167
2008	.....	.....	.....	1,832
2009	.....	.....	.....	106
2010 and future years	.....	.....	.....	81
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2006	NA	450	NA	186

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers—Civil							
General investigations	143,344	95,000	100,000	180,000	+36,656	+85,000	+80,000
Hurricane Disasters Assistance (emergency)	400				−400		
Construction	1,781,720	1,637,000	1,900,000	2,086,664	+304,944	+449,664	+186,664
Hurricane Disasters Assistance (emergency)	62,600				−62,600		
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	321,904	270,000	290,000	433,336	+111,432	+163,336	+143,336
Hurricane Disasters Assistance (emergency)	6,000				−6,000		
Operation and maintenance	1,943,428	1,979,000	2,000,000	2,100,000	+156,572	+121,000	+100,000
Offsetting collection		−181,000				+181,000	
Hurricane Disasters Assistance (emergency)	145,400				−145,400		
Storm damage—(Public Law 108–324—Sec. 401) (emergency)	10,000				−10,000		
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	2,098,828	1,798,000	2,000,000	2,100,000	+1,172	+302,000	+100,000
Regulatory program	143,840	160,000	160,000	150,000	+6,160	−10,000	−10,000
FUSRAP	163,680	140,000	140,000	140,000	−23,680		
Flood control and coastal emergencies		70,000		43,000	+43,000	−27,000	+43,000
Hurricane Disasters Assistance (emergency)	148,000				−148,000		
General expenses	165,664	162,000	152,021	165,000	−664	+3,000	+12,979
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	3,968		4,000		−3,968		−4,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	5,039,948	4,332,000	4,746,021	5,298,000	+258,052	+966,000	+551,979

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Central Utah Project Completion Account							
Central Utah project construction	30,560	31,668	31,668	31,668	+1,108		
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	15,345	946	946	946	−14,399		
Subtotal	45,905	32,614	32,614	32,614	−13,291		
Program oversight and administration	1,720	1,736	1,736	1,736	+16		
Total, Central Utah project completion account	47,625	34,350	34,350	34,350	−13,275		
Bureau of Reclamation							
Water and related resources	852,605	801,569	832,000	899,569	+46,964	+98,000	+67,569
Offsetting collection		−30,000				+30,000	
Subtotal, water and related resources	852,605	771,569	832,000	899,569	+46,964	+128,000	+67,569
Central Valley project restoration fund	54,628	52,219	52,219	52,219	−2,409		
California Bay-Delta restoration		35,000	35,000	37,000	+37,000	+2,000	+2,000
Policy and administration	57,688	57,917	57,917	57,917	+229		
Drought conditions Nevada (Public Law 108–324) (emergency)	5,000				−5,000		
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	969,921	916,705	977,136	1,046,705	+76,784	+130,000	+69,569
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	1,017,546	951,055	1,011,486	1,081,055	+63,509	+130,000	+69,569
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy supply and conservation	1,806,936	1,749,446	1,763,888	1,945,330	+138,394	+195,884	+181,442

Clean coal technology:							
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2005	−257,000	257,000	257,000	257,000	+514,000	.....	.....
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2007	.....	.....	−257,000	−257,000	−257,000	−257,000	.....
Rescission	.....	−257,000	.....	.....	.....	+257,000	.....
Total, Clean coal technology	−257,000	.....	.....	.....	+257,000	.....	.....
Fossil Energy Research and Development	571,854	491,456	502,467	641,646	+69,792	+150,190	+139,179
Advance appropriations, fiscal year 2007	.....	257,000	.....	.....	.....	−257,000	.....
Total, Fossil Energy Research and Development	571,854	748,456	502,467	641,646	+69,792	−106,810	+139,179
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	17,750	18,500	18,500	21,500	+3,750	+3,000	+3,000
Elk Hills school lands fund	72,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	+12,000	.....	.....
Strategic petroleum reserve	169,710	166,000	166,000	166,000	−3,710	.....	.....
Northeast home heating oil reserve	4,930	.....	.....	.....	−4,930	.....	.....
Energy Information Administration	83,819	85,926	86,426	85,926	+2,107	.....	−500
Non-defense site environmental clean up	439,601	349,934	319,934	353,219	−86,382	+3,285	+33,285
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	495,015	591,498	591,498	561,498	+66,483	−30,000	−30,000
Science	3,599,871	3,462,718	3,666,055	3,702,718	+102,847	+240,000	+36,663
Nuclear Waste Disposal	343,232	300,000	310,000	300,000	−43,232	.....	−10,000
Departmental administration	238,503	279,976	252,909	280,976	+42,473	+1,000	+28,067
Miscellaneous revenues	−121,024	−123,000	−123,000	−123,000	−1,976	.....	.....
Net appropriation	117,479	156,976	129,909	157,976	+40,497	+1,000	+28,067
Office of the Inspector General	41,176	43,000	43,000	43,000	+1,824	.....	.....
Atomic Energy Defense Activities							
National Nuclear Security Administration:							
Weapons activities	6,331,590	6,630,133	6,181,121	6,554,024	+222,434	−76,109	+372,903
Transfer from Department of Defense approps	(300,000)	.....	.....	.....	(−300,000)	.....	.....
Total, Weapons activities (program level)	(6,631,590)	(6,630,133)	(6,181,121)	(6,554,024)	(−77,566)	(−76,109)	(+372,903)
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,409,033	1,637,239	1,500,959	1,729,066	+320,033	+91,827	+228,107
Emergency appropriations (H.R. 1268)	84,000	.....	.....	.....	−84,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,493,033	1,637,239	1,500,959	1,729,066	+236,033	+91,827	+228,107
Naval reactors	801,437	786,000	799,500	799,500	−1,937	+13,500	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Office of the Administrator	353,350	343,869	366,869	343,869	−9,481		−23,000
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	8,979,410	9,397,241	8,848,449	9,426,459	+447,049	+29,218	+578,010
Defense site environmental cleanup	6,808,319	6,015,044	6,468,336	6,366,771	−441,548	+351,727	−101,565
Other defense activities	687,149	635,998	702,498	665,001	−22,148	+29,003	−37,497
Defense nuclear waste disposal	229,152	351,447	351,447	277,000	+47,848	−74,447	−74,447
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	16,704,030	16,399,730	16,370,730	16,735,231	+31,201	+335,501	+364,501
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	5,158	38,313	38,313	38,313	+33,155		
Offsetting collection		−38,313	−32,713	−32,713	−32,713	+5,600	
Subtotal, O&M, Southeastern Power Administration	5,158		5,600	5,600	+442	+5,600	
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	29,117	31,401	31,401	33,166	+4,049	+1,765	+1,765
Offsetting collection		−28,235	−1,235	−3,000	−3,000	+25,235	−1,765
Subtotal, O&M, Southwestern Power Administration	29,117	3,166	30,166	30,166	+1,049	+27,000	
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	171,715	393,419	379,654	523,919	+352,204	+130,500	+144,265
Offsetting collection		−335,300	−148,500	−279,000	−279,000	+56,300	−130,500
Offsetting collection (Public Law 98–381)		−4,162	−4,162	−4,162	−4,162		
Subtotal, O&M, Western Area Power Administration	171,715	53,957	226,992	240,757	+69,042	+186,800	+13,765
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,804	2,692	2,692	2,692	−112		
Offsetting collection		−2,692				+2,692	

Subtotal, Falcon and Amistad O&M fund	2,804	.....	2,692	2,692	−112	+2,692	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	208,794	57,123	265,450	279,215	+70,421	+222,092	+13,765
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	210,000	220,400	220,400	220,400	+10,400	.....	.....
Revenues applied	−210,000	−220,400	−220,400	−220,400	−10,400	.....	.....
Total, title III, Department of Energy	24,419,197	24,213,307	24,317,857	25,077,259	+658,062	+863,952	+759,402
Appropriations	(24,263,197)	(23,920,307)	(24,281,857)	(25,041,259)	(+778,062)	(+1,120,952)	(+759,402)
Advance appropriations from previous years	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	.....	.....	.....
Advance appropriations, fiscal year 2007	(36,000)	(257,000)	.....	.....	(−36,000)	(−257,000)	.....
Emergency appropriations	(84,000)	.....	.....	.....	(−84,000)	.....	.....
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission	65,472	65,472	38,500	65,482	+10	+10	+26,982
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	20,106	22,032	22,032	22,032	+1,926	.....	.....
Delta Regional Authority	6,000	6,000	6,000	12,000	+6,000	+6,000	+6,000
Denali Commission	66,464	2,562	2,562	67,000	+536	+64,438	+64,438
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:.							
Salaries and expenses	657,475	693,376	714,376	734,376	+76,901	+41,000	+20,000
Revenues	−530,079	−559,643	−580,643	−598,643	−68,564	−39,000	−18,000
Subtotal	127,396	133,733	133,733	135,733	+8,337	+2,000	+2,000
Office of Inspector General	7,458	8,316	8,316	8,316	+858	.....	.....
Revenues	−6,712	−7,485	−7,485	−7,485	−773	.....	.....
Subtotal	746	831	831	831	+85	.....	.....
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	128,142	134,564	134,564	136,564	+8,422	+2,000	+2,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,152	3,608	3,608	3,608	+456	.....	.....
Tennessee Valley Authority: Office of Inspector General	.....	9,000	.....	.....	.....	−9,000	.....
Offset	.....	−9,000	.....	.....	.....	+9,000	.....
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	289,336	234,238	207,266	306,686	+17,350	+72,448	+99,420
Grand total	30,766,027	29,730,600	30,282,630	31,763,000	+996,973	+2,032,400	+1,480,370

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2005 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Appropriations	(30,489,627)	(29,437,600)	(30,246,630)	(31,727,000)	(+1,237,373)	(+2,289,400)	(+1,480,370)
Emergency appropriations	(461,400)	.....	.....	.....	(−461,400)	.....	.....
Advance appropriations from previous years	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	.....	.....	.....
Advance appropriations, fiscal years 2006 and 2007	(36,000)	(257,000)	.....	.....	(−36,000)	(−257,000)	.....

○