Calendar No. 504

109TH CONGRESS *2d Session* | SENATE | REPORT 109–274

ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2007

JUNE 29, 2006.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 5427]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 5427) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with an amendment, and an amendment to the title, and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2007

Total of bill as reported to the Senate	$31,238,000,000
Amount of 2006 appropriations	[1] 37,299,714,000
Amount of 2007 budget estimate	29,980,227,000
Amount of House allowance	30,526,000,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2006 appropriations	−6,061,714,000
2007 budget estimate	+1,257,773,000
House allowance	+712,000,000

[1] Includes Emergency Appropriations of $6,600,473,000.

28–409 PDF

CONTENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2007 beginning October 1, 2006, and ending September 30, 2007, 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 2007 budget estimates for the bill total $31,238,000,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $31,238,000,000. This is $1,257,773,000 above the budget estimates and $6,061,714,000 under 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 2007 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 2007 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 29, 2006, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

—Coastal storm damage reduction

—Disaster preparedness and response

—Environmental protection and restoration

—Flood damage reduction

—Hydropower

—Navigable waters

—Recreational opportunities

—Regulatory oversight
—Water supply

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

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

FISCAL YEAR 2007 BUDGET OVERVIEW

The fiscal year 2007 budget request for the Corps of Engineers is composed of $4,733,000,000 in new budgetary authority.

The Committee recommends a total of $5,139,430,000 for the Corps of Engineers, a decrease of $189,740,000 from fiscal year 2006 enacted levels (adjusted for emergency spending of $6,600,473,000). The Committee recommendation is $406,430,000 above the request. The Committee recommendation provides for a robust planning program as well as providing increases to the construction and operation and maintenance accounts. Unfortunately, even with this increase the Committee recommendation falls short of what is actually needed to provide efficient levels of funding for all on-going work.

The budget request was again prepared using performance based budgeting. The budget for the construction account allocates funds based on the following seven performance-based guidelines, redirecting funds to high-performing projects and limiting new construction starts. In summary, the guidelines dictate that:

—All ongoing, specifically authorized construction projects, including projects funded in the Mississippi River and Tributaries account, are assigned based upon their primary purpose to one of the main mission areas of the Corps (flood and storm damage reduction; commercial navigation; aquatic ecosystem restoration [AER]) or to hydropower. Projects, except AER projects, are ranked by their remaining benefits divided by their remaining costs [RBRC], calculated at a 7 percent discount rate. AER projects will be ranked by the extent to which they cost effectively contribute to the restoration of a nationally or regionally significant aquatic ecosystem that has become degraded as a result of a civil works project, or to a restoration effort for which the Corps is otherwise uniquely well-suited (e.g., because the solution requires complex alterations to the hydrology and hydraulics of a river system).

—Each project with an RBRC of 3.0 or greater and each AER project that cost-effectively contributes to the restoration of a nationally or regionally significant aquatic ecosystem that has

become degraded as a result of a civil works project, or to a restoration effort for which the Corps is uniquely well-suited, that can be completed in the budget year, received, the balance of funding needed to complete construction and related administrative activities.

—The projects with the highest RBRCs or the most cost effective AER projects received not less than 80 percent of the maximum level of funding that the Corps can spend efficiently in each fiscal year.

—All ongoing flood and storm damage reduction, commercial navigation, and hydropower construction projects that have RBRCs below 3.0, except those projects that are funded in the budget to address significant risk to human safety, and all ongoing AER projects that do not cost-effectively contribute to the restoration of a nationally or regionally significant aquatic ecosystem that has become degraded as a result of a civil works project, and do not address a problem for which the Corps is otherwise uniquely well-suited, and are less than 50 percent complete will be considered for deferral. Where a project considered for deferral was previously budgeted, the budget includes funding to cover the cost of terminating or completing each ongoing contract, whichever is less. Any savings from project suspensions will be used to accelerate the projects with the highest returns.

—New construction projects and resumptions to ongoing construction projects on which the Corps has not performed any physical work under a construction contract during the past 3 consecutive fiscal years, must be ranked in the top 20 percent of the ongoing construction projects in its mission area to be considered.

—Flood and storm damage reduction projects that are funded in the budget to address significant risk to human safety, which will receive at least the funding needed to pay contractor earnings and related costs. All other ongoing construction projects will receive not more than the amount needed to meet earnings permitted under ongoing multi-year contracts and related costs. Dam safety assurance, seepage control, and static instability correction projects received the maximum level of construction funding that the Corps can spend efficiently. Construction projects received the amount needed to ensure that they comply with treaties and with biological opinions pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, and meet authorized mitigation requirements.

—10 percent of the funding available for construction may be allocated to ongoing construction projects regardless of the guidelines above but not to start up or resume any project.

The Budget proposes that the administration and the Congress apply these guidelines to the Corps construction account and to the construction activities in the Mississippi River and Tributaries account.

The Committee has watched with interest over the last 3 years as the Corps has moved to this "performance based budget" model. Unfortunately, the Committee does not see improvement in the budgeting of the Nation's Civil Works infrastructure program. In

fact, the Committee believes quite the opposite is true. Rather than an integrated program, the budget for the Civil Works program seems to be degenerating toward a yearly collection of interchangeable projects dependent only on the budgetary whims and criteria in use in that particular year. The budget ignores infrastructure maintenance requirements that are costing this country business, investment, jobs, income, and tax receipts. The current method of performance based budgeting utilized in this budget preparation leads the Nation to turn away infrastructure investments that return two and even three times their cost.

From the Committee's perspective, the Corps' budget seems to be developed exactly in the opposite manner that it should be. It appears that overall spending targets are set by the administration, their priority projects are then inserted within these targets and the remaining funds are available for the remaining needs that meet the criteria for lower priority projects. The problem with budgeting in this manner is evident in the construction account for fiscal year 2007. Ten priority projects consume more than 40 percent of the requested dollars in this account. That means that some 75 projects have to split the remaining construction dollars.

In fiscal year 2005, more than 130 projects were budgeted by the administration for construction; this year there are only about 85. However, Congress funded more than 300 projects in fiscal year 2006 and has averaged about 315 annually since fiscal year 2000. Budgetary criteria established for the fiscal year 2007 budget required that eight projects that were budgeted in fiscal year 2006 could not be budgeted in fiscal year 2007. These projects were scheduled for termination or suspension. These termination/suspension projects are in addition to the more than 30 projects that were budgeted in fiscal year 2005, that were recommended for termination or suspension in the fiscal year 2006 budget based on that year's budget criteria. In other words projects aren't being completed by these budget proposals, they are being terminated or suspended. It has been up to Congress to provide funding for these projects.

The logic behind this budgeting rational appears to be that concentrating scarce resources on finishing a few higher performing projects will allow the Nation to reap the benefits of these projects sooner. The trouble with this is that these are long term projects that take many years to complete. At the rate the budget is headed, we will only be funding these projects in another couple of years with little else in the pipeline. The Committee questions this rationale when compared to the value of the benefits that are deferred by suspending or terminating these other projects in order to concentrate resources on such a few projects. In some cases these deferred benefits may never be realized due to these terminations. Local sponsors who share in these projects' cost may lose their ability to share these costs or may lose public support for finishing these projects. Once these priority projects are completed, one has to wonder whether there will be any projects or sponsors interested in resuming construction in an infrastructure program that suspends projects based on changeable annual criteria.

In the past, Corps budgets were developed from the bottom up, District to Division to Headquarters to ASA to OMB. District com-

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

Another benefit of this type of budgeting was that it allowed the Corps to undertake workforce planning to distribute their work across the Nation. When one chooses to put 40–50 percent of the budget in 10–12 projects, there is no way the workload can be balanced across the remainder of the Nation with what is left. Unlike other Federal agencies that have a salaries and expense component to their budget, the Corps does not, at least not at the District office level. Virtually all costs at District offices (rent, utilities, labor, materials, etc) are charged to projects and studies. When dealing with such large differences in workload from fiscal year to fiscal year it is clear that the administration gave no thought to how this budget would impact the Corps' organizational structure or ability to maintain a technically competent workforce. Congress has repeatedly demonstrated that it desires to keep the structure of the Corps of Engineers as it is currently configured. Yet if the budget were enacted, there would be no way to maintain this workforce, due to how budgetary criteria skewed the projects to certain areas of the country.

Funding only the "highest potential return" projects to the detriment of many other projects that provide a future vision or address far-reaching problems while not yet showing any BCR data, is "penny wise and pound foolish." These projects add value and importance and have a place in the problem solving needs of the overall Nation's water infrastructure. While this budget 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. The RBRC ratios provide a "snapshot" view of a project. It tells one nothing of the overall value of one project to another. Projects in rural areas with fewer beneficiaries will never compete effectively. Does that mean that homes, property and lives in these less urbanized areas are worth less? It would certainly appear so from the budget criteria.

The Congress will likely consider the passage of a water resources development bill this year. In this bill the benefit to cost ratio necessary for a project to be authorized for construction is 1.0 to 1. The criteria mentioned above requires remaining benefits to remaining costs to be 3.0 to 1 for budgeting with very specific exceptions. This performance based budgeting criteria furthers the divide between what is required for authorization and what is required to be budgeted. These criteria use to be one and the same. Most of the projects in the water resources development bill will likely not meet this criteria, increasing the backlog of authorized but unconstructed projects. These new projects, along with the de-

ferrals in the budget and the major rehabilitations needed for aging infrastructure, are affecting and will continue to affect the national economy. Existing water resources infrastructure is wearing out. The Nation needs to recapitalize if we are to remain competitive in a global marketplace.

Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Initiatives

The administration has proposed several changes to how the civil works program is appropriated for fiscal year 2007. These include the regionalization of operations and maintenance funding and migrating four categories of projects from the Construction, General Account to the Operations and Maintenance Account. The Committee has rejected all of these initiatives.

Regionalized operations and maintenance funding segregates funding for projects into 21 watershed regions around the country as opposed to displaying operations and maintenance costs by project as has been the tradition. As projects, not regions, are authorized and funded by Congress, the Committee must reject this proposal. Operation and Maintenance budgets are developed on a project by project basis. For large river basins such as the Ohio or the Missouri, budgeting for the individual projects, as authorized, involve multiple Districts and Divisions. As the proposals in the budget are not developed as a systemized budget, aggregating them in the fashion proposed does not lead to the "true costs" of operating the system, it just adds up the various parts. The Committee does not believe that this proposal advances the budgeting for operations and maintenance. Rather it hides the serious underfunding that is contained in the budget.

The Committee believes that an integrated watershed approach, much like the current Mississippi River and Tributaries Project [MR&T] would be a better model than the aggregated watershed approach proposed in the budget. The MR&T system-wide approach was developed after the devastating 1927 Mississippi River flood. The project not only integrates all of the operations and maintenance of the various completed components, it also integrates studies of new water resource problems and needs and ongoing and new construction activities into a single project. Budgeting for the various components is seamlessly integrated from the six District offices and overseen by a single Division office. The multitude of project components are comprehensively planned, constructed, and maintained for flood damage reduction, navigation and environmental protection/restoration throughout the entire mainline Mississippi River Valley.

The Committee is puzzled by the initiatives to move Endangered Species Act [ESA] compliance activities from Construction, General to Operations and Maintenance. The stated reason was budget transparency, or to more appropriately show the true costs of operating these projects. The Committee has two issues with this logic. Budget transparency fades when the costs are rolled into the regionalized budgets. However, even if they were budgeted on a project by project basis, the casual observer would have no notion of how much of the operational costs of these projects is related to ESA compliance. Second, these are only being considered as operational costs because mitigation for these projects was not under-

taken when they were constructed as is now required by subsequent laws. Were these projects constructed today, formulation of the projects would have required avoidance and minimization measures for the endangered species. By retaining the ESA compliance measures as a separate line item in the construction category, it is much more transparent as to how much is being spent for these activities.

The budget has proposed moving major rehabilitation for locks and dams from the Construction, General account to the Operations and Maintenance account. Corresponding to this is a legislative proposal to allow the proceeds from the Inland Waterway Trust Fund to be utilized in the Operations and Maintenance account. Current law only allows these funds to be utilized in the Construction, General account. The Congress moved major rehabilitation from the Construction, General account to the Operation and Maintenance account in fiscal year 1985. Subsequently as the backlog increased, it was returned to the Construction, General account in the fiscal year 1993 budget. The stipulations involved in moving it back to the Construction account included that these rehabilitations could involve more than a simple rehabbing of the project. Operational improvements were considered as a part of the rehab. As such, the rehab projects were considered new investment opportunities for the country the same as other new projects and had to compete as new starts in the Construction, General program. To help fund these rehabs, legislation allowed half the costs of the rehab to be borne by the Inland Waterway Trust Fund with the other half to come from the General Treasury. The Committee does not believe moving these projects back to the Operations and Maintenance account will solve the backlog of major rehabs. This only skirts the new start issue. As the inventory of maintenance projects ages, more rehabs will be required to maintain the current level of service. Only providing additional funding can solve that problem.

The Committee is disappointed that the administration has included another "new" beach policy. This is only a slight tweak to last year's proposed policy that was rejected by the Congress. The Committee rejects the new policy as well. The Committee notes that beaches are the leading tourist destination in the United States. Typically beach projects are justified on storm damages prevented alone, and the recreation benefits only enhance the benefit to cost ratio. The maximum Federal Government contribution to Federal shore protection projects is 65 percent of the total project cost but the Government receives all the benefits in reducing Federal disaster assistance payments. By paying for Federal shore protection projects now, we can avoid many of the catastrophic losses and disaster assistance payments associated with hurricanes and coastal storms. Simply stated, the Nation can pay now to avoid losses or pay more later to recover from severe impacts. It truly makes sense to be proactive and not reactive in this environment.

It is instructive to compare the Federal investment in beach infrastructure (beach nourishment) versus Federal tax revenues from tourists. The annual Federal investment in beach nourishment is approximately $100,000,000 a year. Travel and tourism in the United States produce $223,900,000,000 in tax revenues and growth in this sector exceeds 5 percent annually. About 53 percent

or $119,000,000,000 of these tax revenues go to the Federal Government. Assuming that half of these tourists are beach tourists (beaches are the leading U.S. tourist destination by more than a 2–1 margin), beach tourists produce Federal taxes of about $60,000,000,000 a year. Therefore, for every dollar in annual Federal expenditures for beach nourishment, the Federal Government is receiving tax revenues of approximately $600 from beach tourists.

The Committee notes the costs that have been required to recover from the 2005 hurricane season. Had many of these flood damage reduction projects been completed, damages would have likely been much less severe. The drain on the economy for rebuilding as well as the impact to our citizen's lives has been unprecedented in modern times. The Committee also notes the unscheduled outages on our Nation's inland waterway system due to failures of critical equipment. These failures at locks and dams have caused serious business disruptions, loss of income and loss of tax revenues. Unplanned outages are increasing and unit availability of hydropower plants is decreasing requiring replacement of this renewable power source with electricity from non-renewable sources. Had more funding been provided for maintenance of these aging facilities, most of these outages would have been avoided.

The Committee has also noted the reduced service at our Nation's multipurpose projects, antiquated recreation facilities, and shuttered recreation facilities. While the Committee agrees that there are more pressing needs than recreation at Federal projects, the Federal Government did provide these facilities and they provide substantial positive regional and national economic as well as non-economic benefits. Upkeep of these facilities should not be ignored. Additional user fees—which seems to be the preferred budget mechanism to address this issue—will never provide sufficient income to rehabilitate all of these facilities.

The Committee believes that this is no way to run a robust national infrastructure program. Last year the Committee recommended that the Corps include additional criteria into the project prioritization process. It commends the administration for having incorporated additional criteria into the fiscal year 2007 budget. However, the mix of projects is substantially unchanged. The Committee does not believe that this prioritization method can be salvaged into a useable system and believes the Corps needs to scrap its strict adherence to the high RBRCR "business line" budget model. The Committee has seen no evidence that it has improved the budget process.

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

Budget Justifications

The Committee is concerned about the manner that budget justifications were prepared for the fiscal year 2007 budget. In the past, the Corps provided justification sheets for each project and presented them in budget order by Division across the country. For fiscal year 2007, a single book of justification sheets was provided by business lines. The Committee finds this manner of displaying the budget virtually useless in being able to find meaningful information on individual projects and studies. While the Committee believes that budget justifications could be improved by providing more relevant budget information, particularly for operations and maintenance projects, the method used for display in fiscal year 2007 was a giant step backwards. Further, the Committee notes that budget justifications were not delivered to the Committee until nearly a month after the President's budget was released. This is totally unacceptable, especially in light of the fact that every other agency that the Committee oversees managed to present their budget justifications on the day that the President's budget was released. For fiscal year 2008, the Committee instructs that the budget justifications should be prepared in the format used for fiscal year 2004, that is, prior to the business line budget model. Further the Committee directs that budget justifications shall be delivered to the Committee no later than the day the President's budget is released.

Interagency Performance Evaluation Task Force Report on Hurricane Katrina

The Chief of Engineers of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers created an Interagency Performance Evaluation Task Force [IPET] to perform an evaluation of the New Orleans and Southeast Louisiana hurricane protection system during Hurricane Katrina. This team consists of more than 150 government, academic, and private sector scientists and engineers who dedicated themselves solely to this task for the last 8 months. The draft final report is posted on the worldwide web at https://ipet.wes.army.mil. Volume VIII, Risk and Reliability is currently under independent technical review and should be posted in August 2006. The final report should be posted in September 2006. The American Society of Civil Engineers is performing an external peer review of the findings and their draft report will be available in July 2006. This report is not intended as a final expression of the findings or conclusions of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, nor has it been adopted by the Corps as such. Rather, this is a preliminary report summarizing data and interim results compiled to date. As a preliminary report, this document and the information contained therein are subject to revisions and changes as additional information is obtained.

IPET also is conducting a risk and reliability assessment of the entire system to aid in understanding the levels of protection that will exist for the future. This methodology will support the Louisiana Comprehensive Protection and Restoration Study due for submittal to congress in December 2007.

There was no evidence of government or contractor negligence or malfeasance. The team determined that the system generally was built as designed, and design approaches were consistent with local

engineering practice. However, several factors significantly impacted the system's performance. Sections of the system were built below specified design elevations due to errors made in the vertical datum that left decision makers without an accurate understanding of the level of protection. The original design developed through use of the Standard Project Hurricane in 1965 and used in the late 1980s was not representative of the hurricane hazard at the time of the design. The hurricane protection was designed and developed in a piecemeal fashion, resulting in inconsistent levels of protection.

Much has been made by the media of the strength of Hurricane Katrina. The Saffer-Simpson Hurricane rating scale is presented below. It should be noted that more than one variable defines hurricane strength.

Type	Category	Pressure		Winds		Storm Surge Feet
		Millibars	Inches	Knots	MPH	
Tropical Depression	TD			over 34	over 39	
Tropical Storm	TS			34–63	39–73	
Hurricane	1	Over 980	over 28.94	64–82	74–95	4–5
Hurricane	2	965–980	28.5 28.93	83–95	96–110	6–8
Hurricane	3	945–965	27.91–28.49	96–112	111–130	9–12
Hurricane	4	920–945	27.17–27.90	113–134	131–155	13–18
Hurricane	5	less than 920	less than 27.17	over 134	over 155	over 18

Hurricane Katrina was one of the strongest storms to impact the coast of the United States during the last 100 years. At landfall, sustained winds were 127 mph (a strong Category 3 hurricane, and the minimum central pressure was the third lowest on record (920 mb). Only a couple of hours before landfall at Buras, Louisiana, a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Buoy located about 50 miles east of the mouth of the Mississippi River reported wave heights of over 55 feet in the Gulf. At landfall, hurricane wind gusts were being experienced more than 125 miles from the center of the storm.

Though wind damage was significant, the legacy of Hurricane Katrina will be the horrific storm surge which accompanied the storm, appearing to have exceeded 25 feet in some locations in Mississippi where it utterly obliterated entire communities. Even though weakening before landfall, several factors contributed to the extreme storm surge: (a) the massive size of the storm, (b) the strength of the system (Category 5) just prior to landfall, (c) the 920 mb central pressure at landfall, and (d) the shallow offshore waters. The storm generated water levels that for much of the system significantly exceeded the design criteria, particularly in the St. Bernard and Plaquemines Parishes.

Of the 50 major breaches experienced by the hurricane protection system, all but four were due to overtopping and erosion. Those four breaches, all in the outfall canals and one in the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, and all involving I-walls, occurred before water levels reached the top of the floodwalls. All were caused by foundation failures induced by the formation of a gap along the canal side of the floodwall. The combination of factors that led to this failure mode was not anticipated to occur at these locations by the levee and floodwall designers. The most serious direct impact was the

high number of deaths. While a large number of people were able to evacuate, the groups least likely to be able to so on their own, the poor, elderly, and disabled, were hardest hit. Direct property losses were over $20,000,000,000; approximately 78 percent are attributed to residential losses.

The findings indicate projects need resilience, an ability to withstand forces and conditions beyond those intended or estimated in design without catastrophic failure. This includes recognizing risk always exists and flood reduction projects need appropriate emergency preparedness and response. The planning and design of flood damage reduction projects should be based on a system-wide performance to manage a piecemeal development of a project. A risk-based planning and design approach would provide a more viable capability to inform decisions on complex infrastructure where it is described in consistent terms to include uncertainty. Lastly, continued investment in effort and resources is needed to update design criteria and planning capabilities to keep pace with fast changing technology.

The Committee recognizes that this disaster recovery is an unprecedented undertaking, and the Committee commends the Corps for the astonishing amount of progress made since the hurricanes struck the area. However, the Committee has noted that sponsors and stakeholders in southeast Louisiana are very concerned about the seeming lack of a cogent, comprehensive, consistent plan for the execution of work funded in the region and the lack of consistent communications and coordination with their elected leaders in the area. The Committee has noted the fact that different information comes from different places within the Corps, doesn't seem coordinated, and seems to change almost daily—providing a confusing environment for resolving these difficult issues. The Committee directs the Corps to restructure its disaster recovery missions to report to the Chief so that consistent information is provided to State and Federal agencies, the public and the Congress.

The Committee has been briefed on the interim Louisiana Coastal Restoration and Protection Plan and looks forward to the final recommendations for the next steps in improving coastal storm defenses.

Based on the briefing, the Committee emphasizes that the Chief has been directed to conduct an analysis and design, not a traditional study, developing and presenting a full range of protection measures exclusive of normal policy considerations. The Committee expects information based on the Corps' expertise in a timely manner and unfiltered by policy goals of the administration. Furthermore, the Committee emphasizes that the Chief may submit reports on component areas of the larger protection program for authorization as soon as practicable and urges the Chief to utilize this discretion.

Continuing Contracts and Reprogramming

Traditionally, the Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Program has been a truly integrated nationwide water infrastructure program. As such, flexibility was required to manage the program. Congress has given the Chief of Engineers great latitude in man-

agement of this program in order to expend annual appropriations as efficiently and effectively as possible.

Water resources projects, because of the nature of the work involved, are funded on an incremental annual basis. As far back as 1922, Congress recognized the need for flexibility in management and execution and provided the Corps with legislation that allowed the use of continuing contracts for specifically authorized projects. Congress recognized that by providing this flexibility it was relinquishing some measure of control over future appropriations; however, Congress believed that that was an acceptable trade-off for the efficient use of limited funds.

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 late 1990s, the administration proposed that all Corps construction projects be fully funded, rather than be incrementally funded as had been the norm. Congress rejected this proposal in section 101 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 1999, Public Law 105–245.

Further, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, Public Law 106–53 contained a provision (section 206) relating to continuing contracts. Among other things, this legislation required the Corps to award a continuing contract for virtually all water resources projects. This position was confirmed by the Corps of Engineers Chief Legal Counsel in 2005.

An often misunderstood and closely related issue to continuing contracts is reprogramming of project funds. Reprogramming is a legitimate management technique that maximizes utilization of constrained resources. Reprogramming is generally defined as reallocation of funding from one program, project, or activity to another within an appropriation, to promote efficient, effective use of available funding, for optimum progress under changing conditions.

The history of reprogramming goes back to at least the 1950s when the Comptroller General ruled that the Department of the Army has almost unlimited legal authority to transfer appropriated funds between projects. In the ensuing 50 years after the Comptroller General's decision, policy concerning reprogramming was incrementally developed.

The Congress allowed reprogrammings for many reasons. Congress has traditionally viewed water resource projects as investments in our national economy. As such, once a project was started by the Congress, the Congress intended for the project to be completed. Congress recognized that the Corps, being much closer to the actual work of project implementation, was better situated to determine the proper funding levels for projects in a given work year, and that this may involve moving funds around in order to maintain the most efficient use of funding.

A corollary to this efficient use of funds was that the Corps was to ensure that funds which had been reprogrammed away from a project were made available when they were needed by that project. It was not considered appropriate to request donated funds as part of a budget request or as a capability statement as these

funds had already been appropriated once. Movement of these funds was supposed to be transparent and seamless in order to execute a program as efficiently as possible.

This system worked for many years. However, in the late 1990s through the early 2000s, a combination of events occurred that stretched the system to its breaking point. Congress noticed in the mid to late 1990s that project execution by the Corps had slipped dramatically. It was not uncommon to see execution rates of 60–65 percent for construction projects during that period. The Appropriations Committee expressed concern about lagging execution to the Corps and the large carryover balances in the Civil Works Program. Upon hearing Congress' concerns about project execution, the Corps set about to determine how to fix this problem.

The congressional authorizers reacting to administration proposals for fully funding projects enacted legislation modifying the Corps' traditional selective use of continuing contracts by ensuring that virtually all contracts had to be continuing contracts. In an effort to address Congress' concern about project execution, the Corps response was to aim for full execution of annual appropriations. The required use of continuing contracts for virtually all work made this significantly easier. The Corps geared up to fully execute their annual program and spend down their carryover balances.

Other events were also taking place during this same period that did not attract the notice of the Corps or the Congress as much as perhaps it should have. Annual budgets were becoming tighter. The desire for new projects intensified due to back-to-back Water Resources Development Acts. To accommodate these twin issues, savings and slippage rates for all Corps accounts were increased.

Savings and slippage [S&S] is a budgetary term that recognizes that nothing ever goes completely as planned. As Corps budgets are initiated some 22 months before they are presented to Congress a myriad of changes occur between this initial budget submission and when funds are actually appropriated. Projects speed up and slow down for a number of reasons. Hazardous wastes or a cultural resources site is discovered in the project right-of-way; a local sponsor may not have his cost share in-place; additional alternatives may need to be examined in a study; studies or even projects are terminated. All of these things lead to uncertainties which impact Corps budgets.

When viewed in the historical context of annual Corps spending rates, reasonable percentages of S&S made sense as a way to accommodate all projects needs, even if funding was insufficient, especially when combined with large carryovers of funds from year to year. Around 2001–2002 Corps program execution had substantially improved such that they were executing nearly 100 percent of their annual program and had spent down their carryover balances. However, annual budgets were constrained, the pressure to add projects continued and S&S rates continued to climb.

The cumulative effect adding additional projects and raising S&S rates resulted in considerably more active projects than the annual appropriation could fund at optimal levels. This contributed to the inability to fulfill reprogramming commitments as the Corps spent down carryover. Around 2003, the effects of these events combined to force the Corps to adopt a "just-in-time" reprogramming policy.

The problem was funding had gotten so tight, the Corps began to have trouble meeting their reprogramming commitments. Just in time started meaning, hopefully, within the same year funds were needed.

Members of Congress whose projects had donated surplus funding were understandably upset when these funds could not be returned to these projects when they were needed. This situation continued through 2004. In 2005, Congress recognized that reprogramming issues were a problem that had to be addressed. Two things were done in fiscal year 2005 to address these problems. One was to lower the S&S rates to more historic levels and Congress undertook a comprehensive review and revision on reprogramming. However, the Corps did not put any reins on their efforts to execute 100 percent of their annual program. Funding shortages continued. This resulted in the reforms enacted in the fiscal year 2006 Energy and Water Act.

This act significantly altered the focus and management of the Corps Civil Works program. Major changes to both continuing contract authority and reprogramming guidance were enacted. Virtually all reprogramming guidance up until then had been in the report that accompanied the bill, rather than in the bill text, giving the Corps flexibility when it was needed.

Two other pieces of legislation in the act severely restricted the Corps' ability to award continuing contracts. This continuing contract legislation forces the Corps to construct projects within arbitrary funding limits. This creates inefficiencies that waste resources. Corps' contracts will have to be broken up into uneconomical pieces. Multiple contracts will be required instead of a single contrct, thus increasing costs. Contractors' costs will increase as multiple mobilizations and demobilizations occur where one may have sufficed in the past. This will show up in higher bids. Probably the most devastating impact to the Corps is that starting and stopping funding streams makes the Corps an unreliable partner. If the Corps is seen as unreliable, contractor costs will increase based on risk and uncertainty, increasing project costs. Instead of inefficiently starting and stopping project funding each year depending on different criteria, we need to go back to the traditional congressional philosophy of finishing what we start.

Another major change is that the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army was given a much greater role in daily execution of the program than had ever been. Execution decisions that were traditionally exercised by the Chief of Engineers in previous years now must be coordinated through another bureaucracy. The Chief has to seek permission to utilize continuing contracts or for reprogramming actions that require congressional notification. All of these decisions are filtered through OMB for "administration policy compliance" reviews. This is both time consuming and costly.

The Committee believes changes are necessary in both the continuing contracts and reprogramming guidance from fiscal year 2006 if the Corps is going to be able to continue to deliver the projects and services that the country and the Congress expects of them. The reprogramming guidance that was enacted in fiscal year 2006 is much too restrictive. Under the current law, the Committee has had to approve reprogramming actions for as little as $12,000.

In a $5,000,000,000 program this is unreasonable. Further, in order for a reprogramming to get to the Committee for approval, it must be approved at the Corps District level, Division level, Headquarters level, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army level and the Office of Management and Budget level. Further, the affected congressional Members of both the donating and the receiving project can object to the reprogramming starting the process anew. It is no wonder that reprogramming actions have come to a virtual standstill this fiscal year resulting in project delays, contract terminations, large carryover balances and general uncertainties throughout the Civil Works program.

Reprogramming

Reprogramming of civil works project funds has a long history in the Corps as noted above. A unique system of definitions and terminology for moving project funds was promulgated. For years, this guidance worked well. However, in the last few years, these definitions and terminology have become problematic. The Committee recognizes that this is largely due to the Corps attempt to comply with congressional desires to expend funding, in the fiscal year appropriated, as efficiently and effectively as possible in an era when funding was constrained, but the desire to fund more projects was not.

Reprogramming guidance was substantially altered in Public Law 109–103 to address the issues of definitions and terminology. The Committee believes this directive went too far and has virtually made the reprogramming of funds impossible. As evidence of this, the Committee notes that the administration has proposed funding projects in the Operations and Maintenance account in watershed regions as opposed to the traditional method of budgeting by individual projects. While there may be legitimate reasons for budgeting in this manner, the only one offered to the Committee by administration officials was that this method would circumvent the reprogramming directive currently in law. When the administration develops an entirely new budget strategy to circumvent legislative direction, the Committee believes that the legislative direction needs modification.

The Committee is concerned that the issues currently associated with civil works reprogramming were initiated by prior Committee comments concerning the level of carryover in the budget from one year to the next. At the time that was noted, carryover amounts were in the range of $800,000,000 annually. The Corps was successful in lowering that carryover to about $300,000,000 by fiscal year 2005. With the changes made in fiscal year 2006, the civil works carryover balance is estimated to be nearly $1,500,000,000. While the Committee believes that a certain level of carryover is unavoidable and desirable, nearly one-fifth of the annual program is not acceptable. Changes must be made by Congress and the Corps to efficiently and effectively utilize annual appropriations and reduce the carryover balance to more reasonable levels. With the exceptionally large carryover balances, the Committee has continued to include small percentages of savings and slippage on all accounts to maximize resources.

The Committee expects the Chief of Engineers to execute the Civil Works program generally in accordance with congressional direction. This includes moving individual projects forward in accordance with the funds annually appropriated. However, the Committee realizes that many factors outside the Corps' control may dictate the progress of any given project or study. Therefore, the Committee believes that it is imperative to give the Chief of Engineers ample flexibility to manage the program and to utilize excess funds as they become available on a particular project in order to move the entire program forward, effectively advancing projects to completion and accruing the benefits and services for which they were authorized, as soon as practicable. However, the Committee notes that granting this flexibility also requires responsibility to insure that appropriated funds are available for projects for which they were appropriated, when needed.

The Committee further notes that current reprogramming recommendations have come to be elevated to the highest levels of the Corps, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) and OMB. The Committee believes that reprogrammings are operational decisions which should be delegated. The Committee believes that the Chief should delegate recommendation of reprogramming decisions to as low of a level as possible in order to expedite reprogramming actions in order to efficiently and effectively utilize scarce funds. The Civil Works Program Integration Division's mission is to develop the Civil Works Budget and to support the Division and Districts, in resolution of project issues pending in Headquarters as well as to monitor and assess program execution. Further, they provide procedures and guidance for program and project management functions. The Committee believes that the chief of this office would be ideally suited for this delegated authority.

Reprogramming Guidance

The Committee expects the Chief of Engineers 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 efficiently. New legislative language is provided for reprogramming actions in fiscal year 2007. The Committee expects the Chief to maximize the use of the annual funding provided by the Congress. The Committee understands that this may create "paybacks" in future years and cautions that the reprogramming actions recommended should be necessary to advance projects or studies and that the funds from donating projects are truly surplus for the needs in the current year and the budget year as there will be no way to budget for return of these funds until the following budget year.

The Committee is convinced that separate and unique reprogramming guidance is necessary for the various appropriations accounts of the Corps due to the very differing activities funded by these accounts. The Committee recognizes that General Investigations, Construction, General and Operations and Maintenance are managed very differently within the Corps. The General Investigations account is generally the poorest fiscal performing account due to the myriad of unknowns in the planning process. These range

from forecasting local sponsor abilities to provide their mandatory share of funding in a timely manner and on schedule, to unknowns discovered during implementation of the planning process. The projects funded in the Operations and Maintenance account are generally the easiest to forecast as these are planned expenditures for typically known issues or routine services. Where this becomes a problem in Operations and Maintenance is when unanticipated and unfunded failures occur, which must be dealt with on an emergency basis. For these reasons the Committee has provided different thresholds for approval of reprogrammings.

A reprogramming is defined as either the change in purpose, or the movement of funds into or out of a program, project or activity funded by one of the civil works appropriation accounts of the Army Corps of Engineers. A reprogramming action may not be used to initiate a program, project or activity. Multiple reprogrammings into or out of projects is discouraged; however, the Committee recognizes that there may be cases, particularly in the Construction, General and Operations and Maintenance accounts where multiple transactions may be appropriate. Each of these transactions shall count toward the reprogramming thresholds. They shall not be viewed individually nor should the Corps use multiple transactions from multiple projects in order to stay below the established threshold reporting requirements. The Corps shall provide a quarterly report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees reporting all reprogramming actions in the previous quarter. Approval of both House and Senate Appropriations Committees is required in advance for reprogramming actions that exceed the thresholds described below.

General Investigations.—Reprogramming a cumulative total of 50 percent or $1,000,000, whichever is less, is permitted for each study, program or activity in this account. However, in no case should a reprogramming action under this account for less than $25,000 be submitted to the Committees for approval. 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.

Construction, General.—Reprogramming a cumulative total of 50 percent or $3,000,000, whichever is less, is permitted for each study, program or activity in this account. However, in no case should a reprogramming action under this account for less than $50,000 be submitted to the Committees for approval. The Committee does not object to reprogramming of up to $300,000 to any continuing project or program that did not receive an appropriation in the current year.

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 of these emergency actions as soon thereafter as practicable. For all other situations, reprogramming a cumulative total of 50 percent or $5,000,000, whichever is less, is permitted for each study, program or activity in this account. However, in no case should a reprogramming action under this account for less than $75,000 be submitted to the Committees for approval. The Committee does not object to reprogramming of up to

$500,000 to any continuing project or program that did not receive an appropriation in the current year.

Mississippi River and Tributaries.—The Corps should follow the same reprogramming guidelines for the General Investigations, Construction, General 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 base of the receiving project.

Construction Contracting

The Committee believes that the Corps needs flexibility in the types of contracting methods used for construction of water resource projects. Currently, three main types of contracts are used. Lump sum contracts, fully funded continuing contracts and partially funded continuing contracts. Between August 17, 1999 and November 15, 2006, the Corps relied almost entirely on partially funded continuing contracts, as required by law. Public Law 109–103 challenged this reliance on partially funded continuing contracts and changed the requirement to use continuing contracts and made it optional. Another provision of Public Law 109–103 made the use of partially funded continuing contracts difficult. The unfortunate result has become an almost total reliance on fully funded contracts. The Committee believes that a balance of contracting mechanisms is necessary in order to prosecute the Corps' work. The Committee expects the Corps to avail themselves of the ability to use partially funded continuing contracts where this is the best use of funding and use other contracting vehicles where appropriate.

The Committee is aware that there are numerous other types of contracting mechanisms that are in use by the Federal Government, but may not be available to the Corps due to statutory limitations. The Committee directs the Chief of Engineers to submit a report, by September 30, 2006, to the Senate Appropriations Committee with his views on current contracting mechanisms available to him and his recommendations as to other contracting mechanisms that would be beneficial in executing the Corps' mission.

The House Report (109–275) that accompanies Public Law 109–103 gives the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works approval for use of continuing contracts. This puts the Assistant Secretary's office squarely in the day-to-day operations of the Corps. The Committee does not believe that this office has the staff or expertise to make these types of operational decisions nor does the Committee think that it is appropriate. District Commanders are the appropriate officials to determine contracting mechanisms as they are closest to the work being performed. Elevating these decisions to Division offices or higher only promotes delays and inefficiencies.

Executive Direction and Management

The Committee continues to believe that the Chief of Engineers should be responsible for the overall management and execution of the Civil Works Program of the Corps of Engineers. Day to day operational management and execution of the program are inher-

ent functions of his subordinates, but he is ultimately responsible. The Committee is encouraged that the Chief has managed to reassert some measure of control over the program. The Committee hopes that the Chief will continue along this path.

Five Year Comprehensive Budget Planning

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

Study and Project Reviews

The Committee notes that review times have markedly improved for Corps of Engineers documents at the Headquarters, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) and the Office of Management and Budget since statutory time frames and notifications were imposed on these reviews. This is shown in the table below.

Project	Date to OMB	Date review completed	Date to Congress
J.T. Myers/Greenup L&Ds KY, OH, IN	23 Aug 01	3 May 05	4 Jan 06
Stillaguamish River, WA	18 Apr 02	28 Nov 05	16 Dec 05
Duwamish-Green Rivers, WA	9 May 02	21 Nov 05	16 Dec 05
Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, CA	17 Aug 04	1 Nov 05	16 Nov 05
Turkey Creek, KS & MO	28 Oct 04	14 Oct 05	12 Dec 05
Hamilton Airfield, Bel Marin, CA	4 Feb 05	20 Apr 05	3 May 05
Silver Strand, CA	17 Feb 05	22 Apr 05	6 May 05
Southwest Valley, NM	18 Apr 05	14 Jun 05	1 Jul 05
Centralia, WA	2 May 05	15 Jun 05	1 Jul 05
Jacksonville Harbor, FL	26 May 05	22 Jul 05	3 Aug 05
Indian River Lagoon, FL	22 Jun 05	17 Oct 05	1 Feb 06
Denver Co. Reach, South Platte R, CO	5 Jul 05	2 Sep 05	13 Oct 05
Louisiana Coastal Area, LA	1 Sep 05	1 Nov 05	18 Nov 05
Dare County Beaches, NC	1 Nov 05	6 Jan 06	27 Jan 06
Chickamauga L&D, TN	16 Jun 04	11 Jan 06	24 Jan 06
Miami Harbor, FL	23 Feb 06	24 Apr 06	5 May 06
Rilito River, Pima County, AZ	1 Mar 06	1 May 06	16 May 06

However, the Committee is not pleased that this improved review time only applies to new documents that have been forwarded for review. Many documents have been languishing for 3 to 4 years. This is unacceptable to the Committee and should be to OMB as well. The following table shows the name of the document, when it was forwarded to OMB and the current status.

Project	Date to OMB	Status
Delaware Coastline, Port Mahon, DE	7 Jun 99 & 8 Jan 02	Pending
Rio de Flag, AZ	18 Sep 03	Pending
Breckinridge, MN	10 Jul 04	Pending
Park River at Grafton, ND	27 May 04	Pending
Jackson Hole, Snake River, WY	4 Mar 02	Active Review
Dallas Floodway Extension, TX	18 Aug 04	Pending
Whitewater River Basin, CA	9 May 02	Pending
Ohio River Restoration, OH	4 Mar 02	Returned to ASA(CW)
Port Sutton, FL	27 Sep 03	Pending
Port Monmouth, NJ	19 May 03	Pending
Deep Creek Bridge, VA	27 Aug 03	Active Review
Matagorda Bay Re-Route, TX	8 Sep 03	Pending
Morganza to the Gulf, LA	8 May 04	Pending
Smith Island, MD	22 Oct 02	Pending
Peoria Riverfront Development, IL	28 Feb 04	Pending
Tanque Verde, AZ	2 Jun 04	Pending
Riverside Oxbow, TX	30 Jul 04 & 26 May 05	Pending
Corpus Christi Ship Channel, TX	16 Sep 04	Pending
GIWW, High Island to Brazo, T	8 Oct 04	Pending
American River Watershed, Long-Term Study, CA	8 Oct 04	Pending
Swope Park Industrial Area, MO	28 Oct 04	Pending
South River, Raritan River Basin, NJ	5 Nov 04	Pending
False Pass, AK	3 Dec 04	Pending
Puget Sound, WA	2 May 05	Returned to ASA(CW) [1]
Missouri and Middle Mississippi River	30 Aug 05	Returned to ASA(CW) [1]
Upper Mississippi River Navigation Study	2 Feb 06	Withdrawn [2]
Rilito River, Pima County, AZ	1 Mar 06	Approved
East Baton Rouge, LA	16 Mar 06	Pending
St. Clair River/Lake St. Clair, MI	22 Mar 06	Pending

[1] Programmatic Document (no Chief's Report).
[2] Chief's Rpt withdrawn pending economic revaluation.

The Committee directs the Chief of Engineers to work with the ASA[CW] and OMB to develop a plan to complete these policy compliance reviews as expeditiously as possible and forward the recommendations of these reports to Congress. This plan should be presented to the appropriate House and Senate authorizing and Appropriations Committees no later than September 30, 2006. The Committee directs that reviews of all of these documents should be completed no later than December 31, 2007.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2006	[1] $162,360,000
Budget estimate, 2007	94,000,000
House allowance	128,000,000
Committee recommendation	168,517,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $40,600,000.

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

The planning program is the entry point for Federal involvement in solutions to the Nation's water resource problems and needs. Unfortunately, the General Investigations [GI] account is eviscerated in the budget request. Two studies, Louisiana Coastal Area and the National Flood Project Inventory, consume 48 percent of the administration's GI request. This budget seems to be saying

that the Nation should concentrate scarce resources on completing construction of projects underway as rapidly as possible. The Committee believes this argument is remarkably shortsighted. It assumes that the country will stop growing and that new investment opportunities will not be present.

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

Planning is a very specialized discipline within the Corps. The Committee recognizes that the Corps has been hemorrhaging talent in this area for years and has been unable to hire replacements due to budget constraints. Once this planning capability is lost, the Corps will be unable to rebuild it rapidly, if ever. This will greatly impact their relevance to water resource development.

The Committee notes that much of the public discourse over Corps of Engineers projects has revolved around the formulation of water resource projects. One possible reason is the loss of the professional talent in this specialized era. Another possible reason is that the the policies that the Corps uses for determining investment decisions were developed more than 20 years ago. The Corps is one of the few Federal agencies that can project returns on investment to the national economy from the projects and programs that they undertake. However, the Committee recognizes that the world economy has changed dramatically in the intervening years since this guidance was developed.

The administration's economic theory of estimating "national economic development benefits" and not counting the effects of regional benefits assumes that if an investment decision is not made in a particular State or region, the industry will simply move to another, more efficient location and or mode of transportation, elsewhere in the United States. Current polices do not take into account the amount of private investment that follows these Federal investments. Water compelled rates for alternate modes of transportation are ignored in benefit to cost calculations.

The current theory in the administration's policies holds that the country will eventually get the benefits, just somewhere else within the country. The preponderance of evidence over the last 5–7 years leads the Committee to believe that this economic theory has changed. When American businesses become inefficient now, the investment, the industry and the jobs move overseas—away from the United States.

Unfortunately the opportunities for investments are being ignored by the administration and, to some extent, by the Congress. The Committee believes that water resources investments provide positive returns to the economy and that they should be given the same consideration as funding for any other homeland or national security investment within the national budget. The Committee be-

lieves that the administration should substantially overhaul guidance for development of water resources projects to maximize the investment decisions available to the administration to improve the Nation's competitiveness.

The Committee has provided for a robust and balanced planning program for fiscal year 2007. The Committee has included a limited number of new study starts as well as provided completion funds for a number of studies. The Committee has used the traditional view within the Corps planning program that only considers new starts as those that have never received GI funds before. To provide additional transparency in the budget process, the Committee has segregated the budget into three columns in the following table.

The first column represents the reconnaissance phase of the planning process. These cursory studies determine if there is a Federal interest in a water resource problem or need and if there is a cost sharing sponsor willing to move forward with the study. The next column represents the feasibility phase of the study. These detailed studies determine the selected alternative to be recommended to the Congress for construction. The third column represents the Preconstruction engineering and design phase. These detailed designs are prepared while the project recommended to Congress is authorized for construction.

The Committee believes that by segregating the table in this manner that more attention will be focused on the various study phases, and a more balanced planning program will be developed. As the last two columns are generally cost shared, they demonstrate the commitment by cost sharing sponsors to be a part of the Federal planning process. By the same token, it also shows the level of commitment of the Federal Government to these cost sharing sponsors. The Committee directs that the fiscal year 2008 planning budget be presented to the Committee in this fashion.

The budget request, the House allowance 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		RECON	FEAS	PED
ALASKA						
ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK					1,000	
ATAKA HARBOR, AK				200		
BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE DEEPENING, AK					400	
DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK					100	400
HAINES HARBOR, AK						350
HOMER HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK					500	
KENAI RIVER BLUFF EROSION, AK					400	
KLAWOK HARBOR, AK				90	210	
KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK					350	
LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK					600	
MCGRATH, AK					200	
MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK					200	
YAKUTAT HARBOR, AK	300		300		300	
WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK					1,000	
ARIZONA						
PIMA COUNTY (TRES RIOS DEL NORTE), AZ			250			
RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ		300				300
RIO SALADO OESTE, SALT RIVER, AZ			250		250	
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION, AZ		200	200			200
ARKANSAS						
HOT SPRINGS CREEK, AR	200		200		200	
LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESOURCE ASSESMENT, AR, IL, KY IA, MS, MO, & TN				250		
MAY BRANCH, FORTS SMITH, AR						250
PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR			400			200
RED RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, SW ARKANSAS, AR						400
WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO					200	
WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR						125

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance	Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning		RECON	FEAS	PED
CALIFORNIA						
ARROYO SECO WATERSHED			200		400	
BALLONA CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA					450	
BIG BEAR LAKE, SANTA ANNA RIVER, CA			850			
BOLINAS LAGOON, CA					597	
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA	300		300		300	
CARPINTERIA SHORELINE STUDY, CA					200	
CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CA			175		175	
CITY OF NORWALK, CA			200			
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA			550			
COAST OF CA, SOUTH COAST REGION (LA COUNTY), CA			200			
CORNFIELDS, CA			500			
CORTE MADERA CREEK WATERSHED, CA			200			
COYOTE CREEK, CA				100		
DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CA			600			
ESTUDILLO CANAL, CA	600		600		600	
GRAYSONS AND MURDERS CREEK, CA			200		200	
HAMILTON CITY, CA						600
HUMBOLT BAY LONG TERM SHOAL MGMT, CA					250	
IMPERIAL BEACH, SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, CA						167
LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA			200			
LLAGAS CREEK, CA			250			250
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA			200		300	
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CORNFIELDS, CA					500	
LOS ANGELES RIVER RESTORATION, CA			200			
LOS ANGELES RIVER WATERCOURSE IMPROVEMENT, HEADWORKS CA					562	
MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA					608	
MATILIJA DAM, CA		400	500			1,000
MIDDLE CREEK, CA						500
MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA						275
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA		300	300			300
OCEAN BEACH, SAN FRANCISCO, CA			500		300	

PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA			750			750
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SAMP, CA					250	
RUSSIAN RIVER RESTORATION, CA			200			
SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN, DELTA ISLANDS & LEEVES, CA					2,000	
SAN BERNARDINO LAKES AND STREAMS, CA			1,000			
SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA			300		329	
SAN DIEGO SAMP, CA					250	
SAN FRANSIQUITO CREEK, CA			225		225	
SAN JACINTO RIVER RESTORATION, CA			1,000			
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS, CA			200			
SANTA ANA RIVER & TRIBURARIES, BIG BEAR LAKE, CA					200	
SANTA ROSA CREEK, CA			300		300	
SEVEN OAKS & PRADO DAMS WATER CONS., CA			1,500			
SOLANA-ENCINITAS SHORELINE, CA						500
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO SHORELINE, CA					1,000	
SUN VALLEY WATERSHED, CA			200		200	
SUTTER COUNTY, CA	339		400		339	
TAHOE BASIN, CA & NV						1,000
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	319		319		319	
WESTMINISTER, EAST GARDEN GROVE, CA					300	
WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, ORESTIMBA CREEK, CA					400	
WILSON AND OAK GLEN CREEKS, CA			800			
COLORADO						
CACHE LA POUDRE, CO	304				304	
CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK & BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO					400	
FOUNTAIN CREEK & TRIBUTARIES, CO					449	
SOUTH BOULDER CREEK, CO				100		
DELAWARE						
BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL IN THE DELAWARE ESTUARY, DE				125		
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, DE, NJ, NY, PA					175	
FLORIDA						
BREVARD COUNTY, FL			315			
EGMONT KEY, FL			350			
FLAGLER BEACH, FL					250	
LAKE WORTH INLET FEASIBILITY STUDY					250	
MILE POINT, FL			200			
ST JOHNS COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, FL			200			

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance	Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning		RECON	FEAS	PED
WALTON COUNTY, FL						553
GEORGIA						
AUGUSTA, GA			55			
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	200				200	
OATES CREEK, AUGUSTA, GA			750			
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA			1,750			500
GUAM						
HAGATNA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, GUAM	100		100		100	
HAWAII						
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	300		300		300	
BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI					39	
KAHUKU, HI					203	
KAHULUI WEST HARBOR EXPANSION, HI				100		
KAWAIHAE HARBOR, HI					311	
LAUPAHOEHOE HARBOR, HI						300
MOANALUA STREAM FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, HI				100		
NAWILIWILI HARBOR MODIFICATION, KAUAI, HI					125	
WAIALUA-KAIAKA WATERSHED RESTORATION STUDY, HI				200		
WAILUPE STREAM, OAHU, HI						350
IDAHO						
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID				44	286	
ILLINOIS						
DES PLAINES RIVER (PHASE II), IL			500		1,000	
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	400		400		750	
KEITH CREEK, IL			300			
PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL						250
SOUTHEAST ILLINOIS SHORELINE, IL			200			

SOUTH FORK, SOUTH BRANCH, CHICAGO RIVER, IL					750	
UPPER MISS & ILLINOIS NAV IMPORVEMENT, IL, IA, MN, MO, WI						20,000
UPPER MISSISSIPPI COMP PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN, WI			500		784	
INDIANA						
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	300		750		300	
IOWA						
CEDAR RAPIDS, IA (CEDAR RAPIDS TIME CHECK AREA)					150	
CHARITON RIVER COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, IA				100		
DAVENPORT , IA						173
DES MOINES & RACCOON RIVERS, IA						300
KANSAS						
BRUSH CREEK BASIN , KS & MO					150	
MARION RESERVOIR WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, KS					150	
TOPEKA, KS		100	200		100	
UPPER ARKANSAS RIVER, KS				100		
UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS					225	
WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS	80		200		80	
KENTUCKY						
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY			200			
NORTHERN KENTUCKY, KY			300			
WILLIAMSTOWN, KY			500			
LOUISIANA						
AMITE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA					500	
AMITE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, BAYOU MANCHAC, LA					350	
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER & BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK, LA					650	
BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA		1,500	1,500			1,500
BOSSIER PARISH, LA					200	
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA			400		400	
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	247		500		125	
CALCASIEU RIVER PASS SHIP CHANNEL ENLARGEMENT, LA			500		350	
CROSS LAKE, LA			300		150	
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYST REST, LA (SCIENCE & TEC	5,000		5,000			
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	20,000		20,000		15,000	
PORT OF IBERIA, LA						500
SOUTHWEST COASTAL LOUSIANA HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA					250	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance	Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning		RECON	FEAS	PED
ST. CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA					200	
WEST PEARL NAVIGATION, LA & MS				100		
WEST SHORE LAKE PONCHARTRAIN, LA						200
MAINE						
PENOBSCOT RIVER RESTORATION, ME				100		
SEARSPORT HARBOR, ME					125	
MARYLAND						
ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD AND DC			400		200	
BALTIMORE METRO WTR RES—PATAPSCO & BACK RIVERS, MD					600	
CHES BAY SHORELINE—SEMI BUDG, MODEL					350	
CHESAPEAKE BAY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD				150		
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, MARYLAND COASTAL MANAGEMENT, MD					500	
CHESAPEAKE BAY WERLANDS, MD (BLACKWATER REFUGE)				100	325	
EASTERN SHORE, MID CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND, MD						300
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE RELLOCATION, MD & WV				80	100	
MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER GREATER SENECA/MUDDY BRANCH, MD					300	
MIDDLE POTOMAC WATERSHED STUDY, MD				50		
MASSACHUSETTS						
BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA	300		300		300	
MICHIGAN						
DETROIT RIVER GREENWAY, MI			250		500	
DETROIT RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI				50	50	
GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	300		2,034		300	
GREAT LAKE REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS (RAP) & SEDIMENT REMEDIATION, MI, NY, OH, PA, IN, EL, WI, & MN					300	
MINNESOTA						
BLUE EARTH RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MN, SD, IA, ND					60	
MARSH LAKE DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MINNESOTA (MINNESOTA RIVER BASIN, MN & SD)					125	

ROSEAU RIVER, MN						326
WILD RICE RIVER, RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN	300				150	
MISSOURI						
JORDAN CREEK, SPRINGFIELD, MO			600			
HIGH SCHOOL BRANCH—NEOSHO, MO			175			
KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS	500		750		500	250
LITTLE BLUE RIVER BASIN, JACKSON COUNTY, MO				100		
MISSOURI RIVER DEGRADATION, MILE 340 TO 400, MO & KS				300		
MISSOURI LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460–471, MO & KS					27	350
SPRINGFIELD, MO	250		250		310	
ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO		243	350			519
ST LOUIS MISSISSIPPI RIVERFRONT, MO & IL			200			
SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO						158
WEARS CREEK, JEFFERSON CITY, MO	150					
MONTANA						
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	200		250		1,000	
NEBRASKA						
LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	130		175		175	
NEVADA						
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING, NV & CA					725	
TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV						1,500
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
CONNECTICUT RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH, CT, MA & VT					200	
MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA	200				250	
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR & PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH			200			
NEW JERSEY						
HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, HUDSON-RATITAN, NJ	200		500			
HIGHLANDS, RARITAN BAY & SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ			200			
HUDSON RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWS, NJ					500	
HUDSON RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ					1,000	
LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, HUDSON-RARITAN EST., NJ			1,000			
LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ			250			100
NEW JERSEY, INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY ENV. RESTORATION, NJ					67	
NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLE	200		200		304	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance	Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning		RECON	FEAS	PED
NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALT NOURISHMENT, NJ			400		200	
PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ						250
PECKMAN RIVER BASIN, NJ					325	
RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ					125	
RARITAN BAY & SAND HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ						125
RARITAN BAY & SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ					100	
RARITAN BAY & SANDY HOOK BAY, KEYPORT, NJ					100	
RARITAN BAY & SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ						125
SHREWSBURY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, NJ					100	
STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ					150	
NEW MEXICO						
EAST MESA, LAS CRUCES, NM					413	
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE & TRIBUTARIES, NM					500	
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE BOSQUE, NM	200		300		300	
NAVAJO NATION, FLOOD PLAIN DELINEATION, NM, AZ & UT					500	
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX					250	
SANTA FE, NM					250	
SOUTHWEST VALLEY, ALBUQUERQUE, NM			225			180
NEW YORK						
BRONX RIVER BASIN			400			
CRESCENT BEACH, SOUTH SIDE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY			200			
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	100		200		250	
FLUSHING BAY & CREEK, NY						125
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, GOWANUS CANAL, NY					250	
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	400		600		400	
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK & PLUM BEACH, NY					250	
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY					175	
MONTAUK POINT, NY						250
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY			750			
OSWEGO RIVER BASIN, NY					100	

SAW MILL RIVER BASIN, WESTCHESTER COUNTY, NY			200			200
NORTH CAROLINA						
BOUGE BANKS, NC					48	
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	150				150	
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	150		150		150	
SURF CITY & NORTH TOPSAIL, NC			100		200	
OHIO						
CUYAHOGA RIVER BULKHEAD STUDY, OH					421	
MAHONING RIVER, OH, ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING PROJECT						500
OHIO RIVERFRONT, CINCINNATI, OH						1,000
WESTERN LAKE ERIE, OH			300			
WHEELING CREEK, OH WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION					400	
WOLF CREEK WATERSHED, OH				200		
OKALHOMA						
GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER BASIN, OK, KS, MO & AR					100	
GRAND LAKE COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, OK					250	
OOLOGAH LAKE WATERSHED, OK & KS					250	
SE OKLAHOMA STUDY, OK					150	
SPAVINAW CREEK WATERSHED, OK & AR					100	
WASHITA RIVER BASIN, OK					50	
WISTER LAKE WATERSHED, OK					119	
OREGON						
AMAZON CREEK, OR					250	
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	100		200		100	
WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA					650	
WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR					250	
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR					436	
PENNSYLVANIA						
CHRISTINA RIVER WATERSHED, PA, DE, & MD					250	
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, PA					175	
DELAWARE RIVER DEEPENING DREDGED MATERIAL UTILIZATION, PA, DE, NJ				250		
SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN, WISSAHICKON CREEK BASIN, PA					100	
UPPER OHIO NAVIGATION STUDY, PA			1,300		2,500	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance	Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning		RECON	FEAS	PED
RHODE ISLAND						
RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION STUDY, RI					250	
SOUTH CAROLINA						
EDISTO ISLAND, SC	100		200		100	
PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC						109
SOUTH DAKOTA						
WATERTOWN & VICINITY, SD						450
CANYON LAKE DAM, RAPID CITY, SD				100		
JAMES RIVER, SD					602	
TENNESSEE						
MILL CREEK WATERSHED, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	150		150		150	
NASHVILLE RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, DAVISON COUNTY, TN				600		
TENNESSEE-CUMBERLAND RIVERS SYSTEM STUDY, TN				200		
TEXAS						
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX	500		500		500	
BUFFALO BAYOU, TX			200			
BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBS, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX			200			
CEDAR BAYOU, TX						647
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX						114
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	500		500		500	
GIWW, VICINITY OF PORT ISABEL, TX					500	
GREENS BAYOU, TX						200
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	300		650			
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	300		400		500	
LOWER COLORADO RIVER, WHARTON & ONION CREEKS, TX						1,000
LOWER SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASIC (TRI-COUNTY), TX			300			
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX					400	

MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX			325			
NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX			200			
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	250		250		400	
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX			300			300
RESACAS AT BROWNSVILLE, TX			250			
RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	50		50		50	
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	400		400		400	
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	270		300		600	
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX					125	
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX		900				900
UPPER TRINITY RIVER, TX			1,600			
UTAH						
PARK CITY WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH					500	
VIRGINIA						
AIWW BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA						289
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE EROSION, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	39		39		39	
CLINCH RIVER WATERSHED, WISE, LEE, SCOTT, DICKENSON					275	
DISMAL SWAMP AND DISMAL SWAMP CANAL, VA	62		62		152	
ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENV RESTORATION, VA (PHASE II)					175	
ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA						193
FOUR MILE RUN, VA			800			
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SEC 216)	300		300			
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	349		349		403	
MIDDLE POTOMAC, CAMERON/HOLMES RUN, VA			400			
NORFOLK HARBOR & CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA					175	2,000
PHILPOT LAKE, VA			225			
POWELL RIVER WATHERSHED, VA					300	
VICINITY OF WILLOUGHBY SPIT, VA						403
WASHINGTON						
CENTRALIA, WA						150
ELLIOT BAY SEAWALL, WA			225		500	
GRAYS HARBOR AT CHEHALIS RIVER, WA			325			
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA					400	
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	400		500		1,500	
SKAGIT RIVER, WA			200		300	
SKOKOMISH RIVER, WA			325			

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance	Committee recommendation		
	Investigations	Planning		RECON	FEAS	PED
WEST VIRGINIA						
CHERRY RIVER BASIN, WV				150		
LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV					88	300
PARKERSBURG/VIENNA RIVERFRONT PARK, WV			325			
UPPER GUYANDOTTE RIVER BASIN, WV				150		
WISCONSIN						
ST CROIX RIVER RELOCATION OF ENDANGERED MUSSELS, WI			325		325	
ST CROIX RIVER, WI & MN			250			
WYOMING						
BEAR RIVER FEASIBILITY STUDY, WY				100		
MISCELLANEOUS						
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	1,400		1,400		4,900	
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	50		50		50	
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	220		220		220	
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	5,625		6,200		11,741	
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	250		250		250	
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	200		200		200	
NATIONAL INVENTORY OF FLOOD/STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION PRO	20,000					
NATIONAL SHORELINE STUDY	375		375		375	
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	3,673		3,673		4,273	
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	4,550		4,550		6,300	
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	225		225		225	
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	150		150		150	
REPROGRAMMING INVESTMENT FUND			15,000			
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	15,200		17,734		35,000	
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	50		50		50	
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	600		600		600	
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	350		350		350	

TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	350		350		350	
USE OF PRIOR YEAR BALANCES					−961	
SAVINGS & SLIPPAGE					−20,210	
Total	90,057	3,943	128,000	4,289	118,732	45,506
GRAND TOTAL	94,000		128,000	168,517		

Atka Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee recommended $200,000 to initiate this reconnaissance study.

DeLong Mountain Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee provided $100,000 to complete feasibility studies and $400,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design.

Kenai River Bluff Erosion, Alaska.—The Committee recommended $400,000 to continue technical studies of the erosion problems.

Lower Mississippi River Resource Assessment, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.—The Committee recommends $250,000 to initiate an expanded reconnaissance study. The study will include three assessments: (1) a list which identifies data gaps in information needed for river-related management; (2) an assessment of natural resource habitat needs; and (3) a needs assessment for river-related recreation access.

May Branch, Fort Smith, Arkansas.—$250,000 is provided to execute a design agreement and initiate preconstruction engineering and design.

Red River Navigation, Southwest Arkansas, Arkansas and Louisiana.—The Committee recommends $400,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design.

Coyote Creek Watershed, California.—The Committee included $100,000 to initiate reconnaissance studies.

Los Angeles River Watercourse Improvement, Headworks, California.—$562,000 is provided to complete the feasibility studies.

Malibu Creek Watershed, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $608,000 to complete the feasibility study.

Morro Bay Estuary, California.—$275,000 is provided to complete the feasibility study.

San Clemente Shoreline, California.—The Committee included $329,000 to complete the feasibility study.

Fountain Creek and Tributaries, Colorado.—The Committee provided $449,000 to complete the feasibility study.

Boulder Creek, Greeley, Colorado.—The Committee included $100,000 to initiate this reconnaissance study. The Committee notes that studies were initiated under the Continuing Authorities Program, but that the scope of the study was considered to large for the program.

Beneficial Use of Dredged Material in Delaware Estuary, Delaware.—$125,000 is provided to initiate the reconnaissance study. The study will be coordinated closely with ongoing efforts that are being undertaken by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in using dredged material to alleviate acid mine drainage concerns.

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

Walton County, Florida.—$553,000 is provided to complete the preconstruction, engineering and design phase. This study is a test bed for the Institute of Water Resources Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction model.

Waialua-Kaiaka Watershed Restoration Study, Oahu, Hawaii.—The Committee provided $200,000 to initiate the reconnaissance

study to investigate the comprehensive scope and extensive water resource problems in the watershed.

Boise River, Idaho.—The Committee provided a total of $330,000 for study efforts on this project. $44,000 is to complete the reconnaissance phase with the remainder to be used to initiate a cost shared feasibility study.

Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway Navigation System, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.—The Committee recommendation includes $20,000,000 for continuation of preconstruction engineering and design studies. The Committee recognizes the need to modernize this more than 60-year-old navigation system and has provided continued funding for both structural design and environmental restoration work.

Cedar Rapids, Iowa.—The Committee provided $150,000 to initiate a cost-shared feasibility study. Reconnaissance level studies were completed under the Continuing Authorities Program, however, the scope of the proposed project exceeds the limits of the Continuing Authorities Program.

Marion Reservoir Watershed Ecosystem Restoration, Kansas.—This feasibility study is an interim under the Grand (Neosho) River Basin. The Committee provided $150,000 for this study.

Louisiana Coastal Area Ecosystem Restoration, Louisiana.—The Committee provides $15,000,000 for these important studies. The Committee has elected not to fund a separate Science and Technology line item under this study and directs the Corps not to include this line item in the fiscal year 2008 budget. This line item appears to be an attempt to fund other Federal agencies to undertake science activities that are not being funded within those agencies. If the administration believes this is worthwhile science, then they should budget for this work under the appropriate agency. The Committee recommendation is $10,000,000 less than the request as it is the Committee's understanding that approximately that amount will be carried over into fiscal year 2007 due to delays in the study. Any funds from the fiscal year 2006 appropriation that remain unexpended in the Science and Technology line should be utilized on advancing the study not science activities.

West Pearl Navigation, Louisiana and Mississippi.—$100,000 is provided to initiate reconnaissance studies to deauthorize this antiquated navigation project. The project has been in caretaker status for more than 10 years.

Eastern Shore-Chesapeake Bay Marshlands, Maryland (Blackwater Wildlife Refuge).—The Committee recommendation includes $425,000 for this study that was initiated under the Continuing Authorities Program in fiscal year 2006. $100,000 is to complete the reconnaissance phase with the remainder to initiate the feasibility phase.

Ecorse Creek, Michigan.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for the preconstruction engineering and design phase to initiate the general reevaluation report.

Great Lakes Navigational System, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.—The funds provided 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 sec-

retary, 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 2007, 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.

Roseau, Minnesota.—$326,000 is included to complete preconstruction engineering and design.

Kansas Citys, Missouri and Kansas.—The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 for this effort. $250,000 is included for completion of the feasibility phase and $500,000 is for initiation of preconstruction engineering and design.

Missouri River Degradation, Mile 340 to 400, Missouri and Kansas.—The Committee included $300,000 to initiate an expanded Reconnaissance Study. The Missouri River in this reach has experienced significant degradation or downcutting of the river bed. There is a strong indication that this degradation could impact navigation, flood control and other infrastructure in the area.

Yellowstone River Corridor, Montana.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to complete topographic mapping for the study.

New Jersey Shore Protection, Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee included $104,000 over the budget request to complete the preconstruction engineering and design phase of this study.

Mahoning River, Ohio.—$500,000 is included to complete the preconstruction engineering and design phase.

Walla Walla River Basin, Oregon and Washington.—$650,000 is provided to prepare and release the draft feasibility report/environmental impact statement for public review.

Cedar Bayou, Texas.—$647,000 are provided to complete preconstruction engineering and design.

Matagorda Ship Channel, Texas.—$400,000 is provided to continue the major rehabilitation study of the safety and reliability of the jettied entrance to the channel.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Bridge Replacement at Deep Creek, Chesapeake, Virginia.—The Committee recommendation includes $289,000 to complete the preconstruction engineering and design phase.

Dismal Swamp and Dismal Swamp Canal, Chesapeake, Virginia.—$152,000 is provided to complete the final feasibility study for Phase I and to develop the draft feasibility study for Phase II.

Vicinity of Willoughby Spit, Norfolk, Virginia.—The Committee recommendation includes $403,000 to complete the preconstruction engineering and design phase.

Bear River, Wyoming.—$100,000 is provided for reconnaissance studies for flood control and environmental restoration in the Bear River Basin above Bear Lake.

National Inventory of Flood/Storm Damage Reduction Projects.—No funds have been provided for this effort as $30,000,000 was provided via supplemental appropriations to initiate this effort in De-

cember 2005. The Committee is supportive of this effort; however, the Committee believes that the scope of this study effort is poorly defined. The Committee notes that this study effort consumes a large portion of the General Investigations budget over the next 5 years, yet it is unclear what the outputs of the study will be. The Committee recommends that the administration better define the scope of the study and the intended outputs before additional funds are provided. The Committee believes that providing additional resources to Flood Plain Management Services and Planning Assistance to States might achieve the same goals at a lower cost.

Other Coordination Programs.—Within the funds provided, $600,000 is provided for Lake Tahoe coordination activities.

Planning Assistance to States.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,300,000 for this nationwide program. Within the funds provided, $500,000 is for Kansas River Basin Watershed and Streamways, Kansas; $110,000 is for Ground Water Study, Greene County, Missouri; $150,000 is for Repaupo Watershed Flooding, New Jersey; $200,000 is for the Delaware Estuary Salinity Modeling Study, New Jersey and Delaware; $59,000 to complete the Mangum Lake, Oklahoma, Phase V; $253,000 to complete the Arkansas River Corridor Master Plan, Oklahoma; $75,000 to complete the Bartlesville Water Supply Study, Oklahoma; $23,000 to complete the Port of Siuslaw, Oregon-Dredged Material Placement Study; $200,000 is for the Memphis Riverfront Development, Tennessee, N Phase 3; and $60,000 is for the Flood Control and Storm Water Management, Chesapeake, Virginia.

Coastal Field Data Collection.—The Committee has provided $4,900,000 for this nationwide program. Within the funds provided $1,000,000 for the Coastal Data Information Program; $1,000,000 for the Southern California Beach Processes Study; $750,000 is for the Surge and Wave Island Modeling Studies, Hawaii; and $750,000 is for the Pacific Island Land Ocean Typhoon Experiment Program.

Flood Plain Management Services Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $11,741,000. Within the funds provided $200,000 for White Clay Creek, Delaware; $500,000 is for Albany, Georgia; $1,000,000 is for Hurricane Evacuation Studies, Hawaii; $205,000 is for Kaaawa, Hawaii; $50,000 is for Waikapu, Hawaii; $50,000 is for Wailuku, Hawaii; $300,000 is for Will County, Illinois; $161,000 is for East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana; $1,000,000 is for Livingston Parish, Louisiana; and $1,900,000 is for Papillion Creek Watershed, Nebraska.

Research and Development.—The Committee has included $35,000,000 for the Corps nationwide research and development programs. The Committee believes that this is an important area of the Corps' program that should be supported and has provided $19,800,000 above the budget request. Within the funds provided $1,000,000 is provided for submerged aquatic vegetation research in the Chesapeake Bay; $1,500,000 is provided for the Center for Computer Assisted Dispute Resolution [CADRE] within the Institute for Water Resources to undertake research, development, training and application activities consistent with the mission stated by the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Subcommittee on Water Availability and Quality for collaborative tools and processes

for U.S. water solutions in partnership with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Energy and its research laboratories, and other Federal and non-Federal parties to develop solutions to water availability and quality problems through public participation and collaboration processes, decision-support computer technologies, and techniques for integrating these within various water contexts using tools that include portable, physical and social simulation modules, software to link existing water management software, as well as interfaces for both collaborative model development and displaying modeling results and tradeoffs; $1,000,000 is provided for the Southwest Flood Damage Development and Demonstration program to be conducted in close coordination and cooperation with the New Mexico District Office, the University of New Mexico and Sandia National Laboratories; $2,000,000 is provided for innovative technology demonstrations for urban flooding and channel restoration in 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; and $1,500,000 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.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2006	[1] $2,348,280,000
Budget estimate, 2007	1,555,000,000
House allowance	1,947,171,000
Committee recommendation	2,042,429,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $650,817,000

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 Committee has previously stated its rejection of the administration's proposal to move projects from this account to the Operations and Maintenance account. Due to constrained funding, the Committee reduced the requested amounts for some administration projects. This should not be perceived as a lack of support for any of these projects, rather it is an attempt by the Committee to balance out the program across the Nation and fund most of the more than 500 projects or studies that were funded by Congress in the fiscal year 2006 Energy and Water Appropriations Act but were not addressed by the administration proposal.

Even with a more than $400,000,000 increase to the Corps' accounts, the Committee is unable to address all of the needs. By the Committee's estimate, only about 55–60 percent of the needed funding is available for this account. Construction schedules will slip due to this constrained funding. This will result in deferred

benefits to the national economy. The Committee does not believe that we can prioritize our way out of this problem. Adequate resources have been denied for too long. Only providing adequate resources for these national investments will resolve this situation.

The Committee has included a limited number of new construction starts as well as provided completion funding for a number of projects. As in the General Investigations account, the Committee has embraced the traditional view of new starts. New starts are generally defined as those projects that have not received Construction, General funding in the past. The Committee has included all of the administration's proposed new construction starts, including the major rehabilitation projects that were proposed for funding in the Operations and Maintenance account.

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, the House allowance 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	2,069	2,600	2,069
TUSCALOOSA, AL			5,000
WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (REPLACEMENT)	5,000	5,000	5,000
ALASKA			
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK			9,000
ALASKA COASTAL EROSION, AK			5,000
CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	5,000		5,000
FALSE PASS HARBOR. AK			500
HAINES HARBOR, AK			1,000
NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK			3,000
SAND POINT HARBOR, AK	3,500	3,500	5,500
SITKA BREAKWATER, AK			6,300
ST. PAUL HARBOR, AK			3,000
UNALASKA HARBOR, AK			10,000
ARIZONA			
NOGALES, AZ		1,000	3,000
RIO DEL FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ		1,500	3,000
RIO SALADA, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ		8,400	
TRES RIOS, AZ		2,000	
TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, PIMA COUNTY, AZ		2,000	4,000
ARKANSAS			
MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	14,000	14,000	13,000
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR & OK		300	
RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LA, AR, OK, & TN			2,500
RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA			4,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
CALIFORNIA			
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA	.....	.....	17,400
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MINI RAISE), CA	.....	.....	23,400
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATION), CA	.....	.....	6,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	46,800	49,800	.....
CALFED LEVEE STABILITY PROGRAM, CA	.....	.....	6,000
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	.....	1,000	.....
CITY OF CORONADO TRANSBAY PROJECT, CA	.....	.....	500
CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	.....	200	200
FARMINGTON GROUNDWATER, CA	.....	300	.....
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	5,000	6,700	3,000
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	11,700	11,700	10,000
HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT, CA	.....	800	4,000
HEACOCK & CACTUS CHANNELS	.....	900	.....
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	5,564	5,564	5,564
LOS ANGELES HARBOR DEEPENING, CA	.....	2,000	1,000
MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	.....	.....	475
MURRIETA CREEK, CA	.....	2,000	2,000
NAPA RIVER, CA	9,000	11,000	11,000
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	43,500	43,500	36,000
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	.....	3,200	.....
PLACER COUNTY SUB-REGIONAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT, CA	.....	2,000	.....
PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA	5,700	.....	5,000
SACRAMENTO AREA, CA	.....	7,000	.....
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	10,960	15,000	10,960
SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL	.....	.....	500
SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	.....	.....	700
SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	.....	500	.....
SAN LUIS REY, CA	.....	.....	1,000
SAN RAMON VALLEY RECYCLED WATER, CA	.....	.....	3,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	54,080	56,080	46,000
SANTA MARIA RIVER LEVEE, CA	.....	.....	300
SOUTH PERRIS PROJECT, CA	.....	2,000	.....
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	7,313	9,700	7,313
STOCKTON METRO FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSE, CA	.....	1,500	.....
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	25,000	25,000	25,000
SURFSIDE-SUNSET-NEWPORT BEACH, CA [1]	.....	1,200	1,200
UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	.....	.....	1,000
UPPER NEWPORT, CA	.....	5,000	5,000
YUBA BASIN, CA	.....	1,500	1,500
DELAWARE			
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES [1]	.....	60	60
DELAWARE COAST, BETHANY BEACH TO SOUTH BETHATNY BEACH	.....	.....	3,000
DELAWARE COAST, CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE	.....	.....	120
DELAWARE COAST, CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, REHOBETH BEACH/DEWEY BEACH, DE	.....	.....	100
DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	.....	.....	360
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY	320	.....	320
FLORIDA			
BREVARD COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION PROJECT, FL (GRR)	.....	.....	315
BREVARD COUNTY, FL (CANAVERAL HARBOR) [1]	.....	10,000	8,000
BROWARD COUNTY, FL	.....	750	750
CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	6,000	6,000	6,000
CENTRAL & SOUTH FLORIDA	.....	.....	55,000
DADE COUNDY, FL	.....	.....	1,500
EVERGLADES & SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	.....	.....	8,289
FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY, FL	.....	1,300	3,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL			1,500
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	39,884	39,884	39,884
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL		200	500
KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL			40,000
LAKE WORTH SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL [1]		2,000	2,000
LEE COUNTY, FL			1,500
MIAMI HARBOR, FL			500
NASSAU COUNTY, FL		6,500	6,000
PINELLAS COUNTY, FL [1]		1,000	
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL			1,000
PORT EVERGLADES, FL		250	250
SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	164,000	164,000	
ST JOHNS COUNTY, FL [1]		200	200
ST LUCIE INLET, FL		1,000	1,000
TAMPA HARBOR, BIG BEND, FL	8,500	8,500	7,500
TAMPA HARBOR, SUTTON CHANNEL, FL			1,000
GEORGIA			
ATLANTA, GA (EI)			1,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA		19,700	15,000
OATES CREEK, AUGUSTA, GA (DEF CORR)		750	750
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	4,600		4,600
TYBEE ISLAND, GA		2,000	2,000
HAWAII			
HAWAII WATER MANAGEMENT, HI			1,500
IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)			300
KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI			14,500
IDAHO			
RURAL IDAHO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE		3,000	4,800
ILLINOIS			
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	6,800	6,800	6,800
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	10,000	10,000	10,000
COOK COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE		750	
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	6,000	7,000	6,000
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	2,960		2,960
LOCK NO 27, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (REHAB) [1]		3,400	2,500
LOCK & DAM 24, IL & MO (REHAB) [1]		3,900	3,000
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	45,000	45,000	36,000
NUTWOOD DRAINAGE & LEVEE DISTRICT, IL			300
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	110,000	110,000	90,000
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO &	26,800	20,000	16,000
WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE & LEVEE DISTRICT, IL		250	
INDIANA			
CADY MARSH DITCH, LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN		4,000	
CALUMET REGION ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE		3,500	
INDIANA HARBOR (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY), IN			15,000
INDIANA SHORELINE, IN		1,000	
INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	2,787		2,787
INDIANAPOLIS ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE		500	
JOHN T MEYERS LOCK & DAM, IN & KY		2,000	
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	14,000	15,500	12,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	6,000	6,000	6,000
IOWA			
DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER & GREENBELT, IA		6,000	3,000
LOCK & DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (REHAB) [1]		20,300	18,320
LOCK & DAM 19, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (REHAB) [1]		5,444	5,444

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MISSOURI R FISH & WILDLIFE MITIGATION IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND, SD ..	.....	.....	54,000
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	2,500	.....	2,500
PERRY CREEK, IA	1,500	1,500	1,500
KANSAS			
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	4,000	4,000	5,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS (DAM SAFETY)	38,000	38,000	38,000
KENTUCKY			
GREENUP LOCKS & DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & OH	.....	200	.....
KENTUCKY LOCK & DAM, KY	.....	10,000	20,000
MARKLAND LOCKS & DAM, KY & IN (REHAB) [1]	.....	8,000	6,000
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	70,000	70,000	57,000
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	600	600	600
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	3,948	3,948	3,948
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	1,991	1,991	1,991
SOUTHERN & EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY	.....	1,000	.....
WOLF CREEK, KY (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	31,000	31,000	31,000
LOUISIANA			
ASCENSION PARISH, LA (EI)	.....	.....	375
COMITE RIVER, LA	.....	15,000	8,000
EAST BATON ROUGE, LA (FC)	.....	5,000	1,000
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA (EI)	.....	.....	750
IBERIA PARISH, LA (EI)	.....	.....	375
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	.....	18,000	18,000
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	1,500	2,000	15,000
LIVINGSTON PARISH, LA (EI)	.....	.....	500
OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA	.....	.....	1,960
MARYLAND			
ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBURARIES, MD & DC	.....	.....	308
ASSATEAGUE, MD [1]	.....	2,000	2,000
ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	.....	.....	200
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	.....	2,000	2,000
BALTIMORE METRO-GWYNNS FALLS, MD	.....	.....	1,500
CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM, MD, VA & PA	.....	.....	1,000
CUMBERLAND, MD	.....	.....	500
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY, ST. MARY'S COUNTY, MD	.....	.....	300
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	.....	.....	13,100
MASSACHUSETTS			
MUDDY RIVER, BOSTON & BROOKLINE, MA	.....	1,000	1,000
MICHIGAN			
GENESSEE COUNTY, MI	.....	500	500
GEORGE W. KUHN DRAIN RETENTION FACILITY, MI	.....	.....	300
GREAT LAKE FISHERY & ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	.....	.....	500
NEGAUNEE, MI	.....	.....	375
SAULT STE. MARIE, MI	.....	2,200	1,500
MINNESOTA			
BRECKENRIDGE, MN	.....	3,000	1,500
MILLE LACS, MN	.....	3,000	.....
NORTHEAST, MN	.....	1,000	.....
MISSISSIPPI			
DESOTO COUNTY, MS	.....	2,000	7,000
JACKSON COUNTY WATER SUPPLY PROJECTS, MS	.....	.....	5,500
MISSISSIPPI, MS (EI)	.....	.....	25,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MISSOURI			
BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	2,000	2,000	2,000
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	9,750	9,750	9,000
BOIS BRULE, MO	.....	1,060	1,560
CAPE GIRARDEAU, MO	.....	3,200	.....
CHESTERFIELD, MO	.....	150	1,400
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	28,000	28,000	25,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	7,560	8,560	7,560
MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVER ENHANCEMENT, MO	.....	.....	1,000
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO (L–142)	.....	.....	100
STE. GENEVIEVE, MO	.....	.....	375
MONTANA			
FT. PECK DAM & LAKE, MT	.....	.....	800
RURAL MONTANA, MT (EI)	.....	.....	4,200
NEBRASKA			
ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	7,500	7,500	7,500
SAND CREEK WATERSHED, NE	.....	.....	1,000
WESTERN SARPY & CLEAR CREEK, NE	.....	.....	1,000
NEVADA			
RURAL NEVADA, NV	.....	400	25,000
TAHOE BASIN RESTORATION, NV & CA (EI)	.....	.....	3,500
TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	12,400	12,400	22,000
NEW JERSEY			
BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR, NJ	2,500	6,000	2,500
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ [1]	.....	360	360
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN HCANNEL, NJ, PA, & DE	.....	.....	2,500
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET & PECK BEACH, NJ	.....	.....	2,000
HUDSON-RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	.....	.....	615
JOSEPH G. MINISH PASSAIC RIVER WATERFRONT PARK, NJ	.....	.....	2,500
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ [1]	.....	130	130
MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	.....	100	.....
MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	600	600	600
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE, NJ	.....	4,000	1,800
RAMAPO & MAHAWAH RIVERS, NEW JERSEY & SUFFERN, NY	.....	.....	500
RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	.....	455	445
RARITAN BAY & SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	.....	.....	250
RARITAN BAY & SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ (PORT MONMOUTH)	.....	.....	1,000
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREENBROOK, NJ	.....	5,000	5,000
SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	.....	.....	3,000
TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	5,816	5,816	5,000
NEW MEXICO			
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	2,400	2,400	2,400
ALAMOGORDO, NM	4,200	4,200	4,200
CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM (EI)	.....	.....	5,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELEN	.....	.....	500
NEW MEXICO, NM (EI)	.....	.....	5,000
RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	600	600	800
SW VALLEY, ALBUQUERQUE, NM	.....	.....	100
NEW YORK			
ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	2,400	2,400	2,400
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY [1]	.....	5,000	5,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	2,500	2,500	2,500
JONES INLET TO EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	.....	500	.....
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	90,000	90,000	70,000
NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY	.....	.....	750

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	.....	2,000	500
ORCHARD BEACH, BRONX, NY	.....	250	.....
NORTH CAROLINA			
BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	.....	.....	600
CAROLINA BEACH & KURE BEACH, NC	.....	.....	1,000
DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	.....	.....	2,000
WEST ONSLOW BEACH & RIVER INLET, NC	.....	.....	600
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	.....	.....	10,000
WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC	.....	.....	300
NORTH DAKOTA			
BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND AQUISITION, ND	.....	.....	1,893
DEVILS LAKE WATER SUPPLY	.....	.....	4,972
GRAND FORKS, ND—EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	12,018	12,018	12,018
MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION	.....	.....	300
SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	1,740	.....	1,740
OHIO			
HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	.....	.....	1,355
LOWER GIRARD DAM, OH	.....	785	.....
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	5,650	5,650	5,650
MILL CREEK, OH	800	800	800
OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	.....	18,300	.....
OKLAHOMA			
CANTON LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	6,000	6,000	6,000
OREGON			
COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR & WA	15,000	15,000	15,000
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	6,300	6,300	6,300
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	1,440	1,440	1,440
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	2,200	2,200	2,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	.....	.....	2,470
PENNSYLVANIA			
EMSWORTH L&D, OHIO RIVER, PA (STATIC INSTABILITY CORRE	17,000	17,000	15,000
JOHNSTOWN, PA	.....	800	.....
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	62,772	62,772	51,000
NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA, PA	.....	2,000	.....
PRESQUE ISLE, PA	.....	200	620
SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	2,300	.....	2,300
SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA, PA	.....	9,000	.....
SOUTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA INFRASTRUCTURE, PA	.....	1,190	.....
THREE RIVERS WET WEATHER DEMO PROGRAM, PA	.....	.....	1,000
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	5,600	5,600	5,600
PUERTO RICO			
ARECIBO RIVER, PR	8,900	8,900	7,500
PORTUGUES & BUCANA RIVERS, PR	.....	.....	5,000
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	25,000	25,000	18,000
RHODE ISLAND			
FOX POINT HURRICANE BARRIER, RI	.....	.....	1,055
SOUTH CAROLINA			
FOLLY BEACH, SC [1]	.....	25	80
LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC	.....	7,000	.....
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	.....	.....	2,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	.....	.....	5,000
TENNESSEE			
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	27,000	27,000	27,000
TEXAS			
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	20,000	23,000	17,000
CENTRAL CITY, FORT WORTH, UPPER TRINITY RIVER, TX	.....	6,000	500
CLEAR CREEK, TX	.....	.....	1,000
DALLAS FLOODWAY, TX	.....	5,000	13,000
HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	43,076	43,076	37,000
JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	500	500	500
NORTH PADRE ISLAND, TX	.....	500	.....
RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, OK, TX, AR & LA	.....	.....	1,500
SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL, TX	.....	2,350	10,000
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	22,400	22,400	17,850
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX	.....	.....	2,500
UTAH			
RURAL UTAH, UT (EI)	.....	.....	10,000
VERMONT			
BURLINGTON HARBOR, VT	.....	.....	500
LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED, VT	.....	.....	3,000
VERMONT DAMS REMEDIATION, VT	.....	.....	200
VIRGINIA			
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	.....	.....	425
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (REPLACEMENT)	11,000	11,000	10,000
LAKE MERRIWEATHER, GOSHEN DAM & SPILLWAY, VA	.....	.....	1,000
LYNCHBURG (CSO), VA	.....	.....	400
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	.....	3,400	1,700
RICHMOND COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, VA	.....	.....	400
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	8,300	8,300	8,300
SANDBRIDGE, VA	.....	.....	2,000
VIRGINIA BEACH HURRICANE PROTECTION, VA	.....	11,700	6,000
WASHINGTON			
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM GAS ABATEMENT, VA	.....	.....	8,000
COLUMBIA RIVER FISHING MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	.....	.....	83,000
DUWAMISH & GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	.....	.....	2,000
HOWARD HANSON DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, VA	.....	.....	16,658
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	850	850	850
MT. ST. HELENS, WA	.....	500	500
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	5,470	5,470	5,470
PUGET SOUND ADJACENT WATER, WA	.....	500	1,500
SHOALWATER BAY, WA	.....	.....	1,500
WEST VIRGINIA			
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	15,200	15,200	15,200
GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	.....	.....	2,500
ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV	.....	.....	150
LEVISA & TUG FORKS, UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, VA, KY	.....	20,000	12,800
LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	.....	.....	750
MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	50,800	50,800	50,800
ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	1,800	1,800	1,800
SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA, WV	.....	1,000	.....
WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV & PA	.....	750	.....
WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	4,300	4,300	4,300
WISCONSIN			
NORTHERN WISCONSIN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE, WI	.....	8,000	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ST. CROIX FALLS ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, WI		500	
MISCELLANEOUS			
ABANDONED MINE RESTORATION			746
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	15,100	25,000	25,000
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	3,000	4,000	5,000
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL—SEC 204/207/933 [1]		5,000	4,250
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	11,000	11,000	11,000
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITY PROGRAM			18,250
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION	1,330	15,000	12,000
EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION	21,000	21,000	21,000
ESTUARY RESTORATION PROGRAM (PUBLIC LAW 106–457)	5,000		5,000
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	16,075	29,933	45,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE	40	40	40
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE	170	170	170
NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECTS (SEC. 111) [1]		2,500	1,250
NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	845	8,000	8,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	15,000	25,000	25,000
REPROGRAMMING INVESTMENT FUND		40,000	
SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT AND DEMO PROGRAM			5,000
SHORE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	550	2,000	5,000
SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECTS (SEC 208)		500	500
SUSPENSION FUND	41,372		
TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM			1,000
USE OF PRIOR YEAR BALANCES			−6,472
REDUCTION FIR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS & SLIPPAGE			−81,468
Total, Construction	1,555,000	1,947,171	2,042,429

[1] Project contained in O&M budget request.

Tuscaloosa, Alabama.—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for the relocation project at Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Akutan Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to initiate construction of this project.

Alaska Coastal Erosion, Alaska.—The Committee recommendation provides $5,000,000 for Alaska Coastal Erosion. The following communities are eligible recipients of these funds: Kivalina, Newtok, Shishmaref, Koyukuk, Point Hope, and Unalakleet. Section 117 of Public Law 108–447 will apply to this project.

Unalaska, Alaska.—The Committee provides $10,000,000 to initiate construction.

Tucson Drainage Area, Arizona.—The Committee provides $4,000,000 for construction of this project.

Red River Below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas.—The Committee provides $2,500,000 to continue levee rehabilitation work in Arkansas and Louisiana.

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas and Louisiana.—The Committee provides $4,000,000 for bank stabilization along the Red River below Index, Arkansas.

American River Watershed, California.—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.

American River Watershed (Folsom Dam Miniraise), California.—The Committee provides $23,400,000. Within the funds provided, $15,000,000 is for construction of the bridge.

CALFED Levee Stability Program, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 to initiate this program. Within the funds provided, the Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps to coordinate and complete within 6 months a review of Delta levees emergency preparedness and response planning with appropriate Federal and State agencies. The review will address preparation and response to protect (1) life and property within the Delta and (2) statewide interests reliant on water and other resources of the Delta, including measures to prevent salt water contamination of fresh water supplies consistent with the Delta Levee Stability Program High Priority, Priority Group A projects.

Mid Valley Area Levee Reconstruction, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $475,000 for a limited reevaluation report as well as other necessary studies in advance of reconstruction.

Oakland Harbor, California.—The Committee recommends $36,000,000 to continue construction of this project. The reduction made to this project should not be viewed as any diminution of support for this project, rather an attempt to balance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

Santa Ana River, California.—The Committee provides $46,000,000 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.

Upper Guadalupe River, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Bethany Beach to South Bethany Beach, Delaware.—$3,000,000 is provided for construction of this shore protection project.

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

Washington, DC and Vicinity, District of Columbia.—The Committee provides $320,000 to initiate construction as proposed in the budget request.

Brevard County Shore Protection Project, Florida.—The Committee recommendation includes $315,000 for continuation of the General Reevaluation Report.

Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem Restoration, Florida.—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. The reduction made to the various component projects under this heading should not be viewed as any diminution of support for this project, rather an attempt to balance out the Corps of

Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

The Committee has 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 that it is appropriate 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 has included legislative language that limits the Corps of Engineers share of this project to the amount previously appropriated.

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

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

Florida Keys Water Quality Improvements, Florida.—The Committee recommendation includes $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 southern Florida's nearshore waters.

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

Tampa Harbor, Florida.—$7,500,000 is provided for the Big Bend Channel and $1,000,000 is for the Sutton Channel.

Atlanta, Georgia.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to continue this project.

Brunswick Harbor, Georgia.—The Committee includes $15,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Oates Creek, Richmond County, Georgia.—The Committee includes $750,000 to continue construction of this project.

Tybee Island, Georgia.—The Committee recommendation provides $2,000,000 for the next scheduled renourishment.

Rural Idaho Environmental Infrastructure, Idaho.—The Committee provides $4,800,000 for this project. Within the funds provided the Corps should give consideration to projects at Emmett, Burley, Deary, Rupert, Donnelly, Eastern Idaho Regional Water Authority, and Smelterville. Other communities that meet the program criteria should be considered as funding allows.

Des Plaines River, Illinois.—The Committee includes $6,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois.—The Committee includes $36,000,000 for continued 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.

Olmsted Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Illinois and Kentucky.—The Committee provides $90,000,000 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.

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

Missouri Fish and Wildlife Recovery, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota and South Dakota.—The Committee provides $54,000,000 for this project. Legislative language is included in the bill that accompanies this report to make modifications to the Intake Dam in order to provide additional habitat for the pallid sturgeon.

Turkey Creek, Kansas and Missouri.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, Kentucky.—The Committee recommendation includes $20,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

McAlpine Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Kentucky and Indiana.—The Committee has provided $57,000,000 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, Louisiana.—The Committee has included $18,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

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

Ouachita River Levees, Louisiana.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,960,000 to complete the project.

Chesapeake Bay Environmental Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 for continuation of this project. Within the funds provided, $118,000 is included to continue the environmental studies concerning non-native oysters.

Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery, Maryland and Virginia.—The Committee includes $2,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Fort Peck Dam and Lake, Montana.—The Committee recommendation includes $800,000 for continuation of Fort Peck cabin sales.

Rural Montana, Montana.—The Committee provides $4,200,000 for this project. Within the funds provided the Corps should give consideration to the following projects: Crow Tribe Water and Wastewater System, Cabinet Heights Wastewater Collection Systems, Helena-Missouri River Water Treatment Plant, Ranch Water District, Bigfork, Froid Water System Improvement, Town of Medicine Lake, County Water District of Billings Heights, Power Water System improvements, Seely Lake Sewer, Greater Woods Bay Wastewater System. Other communities that meet the program criteria should be considered as funding allows.

Sand Creek, Nebraska.—The Committee includes $1,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Rural Nevada, Nevada.—The Committee recommendation provides $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, Truckee Meadows Water Authority, McGill-Ruth Consolidated Sewer and Water District, Carlin, Moapa, Eldorado Valley, Ely and Carson City. Other communities that meet the program criteria should be considered as funding allows.

Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, Nevada.—The Committee recommendation includes $22,000,000 to continue construction of this flood control project. Within the funds provided $9,600,000 is provided for work performed in accordance with section 211 of Public Law 104–303.

Ramapo River at Oakland, New Jersey.—$445,000 is included for this project.

Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-basin, New Jersey.—The Committee includes $5,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee provides $3,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

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

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

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

Buford Trenton Irrigation District, North Dakota.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,893,000 to complete construction of this project.

Locks and Dams 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River, Pennsylvania.—The Committee recommendation includes $51,000,000 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 balance out the Corps of Engineers nationwide program among the various missions of the Corps.

Presque Isle, Pennsylvania.—The Committee provides $620,000 to continue this project.

Big Sioux River, South Dakota.—The Committee includes $2,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, South Dakota.—The Committee notes that title IV of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, Public Law 106–53 as amended, authorizes funding to pay administrative expenses, implementation of terrestrial wildlife plans, activities associated with land transferred or to be transferred, and annual expenses for operating recreational areas. The Committee includes $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, Tennessee.—The Committee provides $27,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Central City, Fort Worth, Upper Trinity River Basin, Texas.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the Central City, Fort Worth, Texas, project. Within the funds provided, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to investigate the technical merits of combining the project with the project for environmental restoration, Riverside Oxbow, Fort Worth, Texas, described in the Report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 29, 2003. In conducting this investigation, the Corps of Engineers shall not conduct a feasibility level review, but shall investigate the technical advantages, environmental acceptability, the opportunities to achieve synergy between the two projects and the views of the local interests related to combining the projects. The Chief of Engineers shall furnish a report containing his findings on this matter within 90 days of enactment of this act. While conducting this review, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to continue to pursue design and construction activities on the authorized Central City project in an expeditious manner, maintaining all established project schedules.

Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas.—The Committee provides $37,000,000 for continued construction of this project.

Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas.—The Committee Expects the Report of the Chief of Engineers for the Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas project for navigation and other allied purposes to be expedited and completed by December 2006.

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

Rural, Utah. Utah.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Burlington Harbor, Vermont.—The Committee includes $500,000 to initiate removal of oil bollards in the harbor.

Columbia River Fish Recovery, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—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 in the budget.

Mud Mountain, Washington.—Within the funds provided, the Corps is directed to use up to $1,070,000 to complete final design activities associated with the fish passage facilities.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Cumberland River, West Virginia, Kentucky and Virginia.—The Committee provides $12,800,000 for the continuation of the project. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommendation includes $5,300,000 for the Buchanan County, Dickenson County, and Grundy, Virginia elements. Further, the recommendation includes $7,500,000 for Kermit, Lower Mingo County, McDowell County, Upper Mingo and Wayne County, West Virginia.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, the Committee has provided $600,000 for a cost-shared program for Lake Gaston, North Carolina and $400,000 for a cost-shared program for Lake Champlain, Vermont.

Dredged Material Disposal Facilities Program.—The Committee has retained this program in the Construction, General account rather than the Operations and Maintenance account as proposed by the budget. $250,000 is provided above the budget request for the Wilmington Harbor, Delaware, Dredged Material Management Plan.

Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the program. Within the funds provided, $3,000,000 is for Morehead City Harbor, North Carolina.

Shore Line Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program.—The Committee provides $5,000,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, $3,000,000 is for the Miami Beach Alternative Sand Test Beach and Breakwater Project in Florida and $2,000,000 is for the Sacred Falls Demonstration project in Hawaii.

Tribal Partnership Program.—The Committee includes $350,000 for Nevada for cultural resource restoration on historic Washoe lands; $350,000 for New Mexico to further the tribal assistance efforts by the Corps in New Mexico and $300,000 for work with the Shoshone Bannick Tribes of Fort Hall, Idaho.

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

As was discussed in the fiscal year 2006 Senate Report, when Congress authorized the initial Continuing Authorities in the 1940s and 1950s, they were envisioned to provide a small pool of money available to the Corps of Engineers to solve very small localized problems without being encumbered by the longer study and project authorization process. As more programs were added to the Continuing Authorities Program [CAP] they became increasingly popular with congressional Members and the public. More and

more congressionally directed projects began to appear in the annual appropriations bills. At first these congressionally directed projects were added to the base program. As more and more of these congressionally directed projects came into the program it became difficult for these congressionally directed projects to be added to the base, and as such, the base program began to shrink. Congressionally directed projects now dominate all sections of the CAP Program. Congressionally directed projects have proliferated to such an extent that several of the sections are over-subscribed.

The Committee tried to address the oversubscribed nature of some of the CAP sections by instituting a moratorium on new cost sharing agreements in fiscal year 2006. Unfortunately, this moratorium did not have the desired effect and the Committee cannot recommend continuing it for fiscal year 2007. The Committee now believes that this was a heavy-handed approach to solving a problem that needed a more flexible solution.

Prioritization of these projects by the Corps is still essential. 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 Agreements. The next priority should be for projects with executed design agreements. Third priority would be for those with executed feasibility agreements. The fourth priority would be for those projects progressing from design to construction. The fifth priority would be for projects moving from feasibility to design and the last priority should be new starts. Priority should be given to those projects that have demonstrated capability to move forward. This would include having non-Federal financing in place and ready to be utilized. The Committee has provided limited new starts in each of the sections.

After fiscal year 2007, the Committee will no longer provide any congressional earmarks for the section 14, Emergency Bank Stabilization authority. By definition these are projects that are estimated to fail within 9–12 months. As an "emergency situation" the Chief of Engineers should have the responsibility for determining how these funds are expended in the most efficient and effective manner. Budget justifications for this section should display the anticipated projects and associated costs to be undertaken in the budget year as well as the anticipated resources necessary to address emergencies that arise in the budget year.

For fiscal year 2007, the Committee will not provide dollar amounts for the projects that are named in the report. The Committee directs that the Chief should have 100 percent reprogramming flexibility within the various sections of the CAP program in order to address the backlog. This reprogramming guidance has been addressed in section 101 of the bill accompanying this report. The Chief should provide a quarterly report to the Committee displaying by CAP section the project status and the allocations received by the projects/studies in the previous quarter.

The Committee is concerned that if the Corps adhered strictly to the priorities above, that all funding would be exhausted for construction. Therefore, in order to provide a mix of studies, design and construction within each CAP section the Committee directs

that funding be generally divided in the following manner for each of the CAP sections. These percentages should be considered upper limits in each section, not absolutes.

CAP Section	Available Funding	Percent Available for Construction
Section 103	$5,000,000	75
Section 107	8,000,000	75
Section 1135	25,000,000	70
Section 14	12,000,000	80
Sections 204, 207, 933	4,250,000	75
Section 205	45,000,000	65
Section 206	25,000,000	70

Even though the Committee is providing a listing of projects that are of interest, the Corps should develop the program based on all of the projects in each section whether named or not. Priorities should be based on the factors outlined above and should not consider prior year earmarks or a listing in this report. The Committee understands that funding in some sections may be insufficient to fund all current obligations as well as the new projects added by the Committee. The Corps is directed not to initiate any new continuing authorities projects. Only projects that have been named in prior appropriation bills or received prior year funds or are listed in this bill should be considered for funding.

A listing of CAP projects follows:

Section 14, Emergency Bank Stabilization

Kwethluk, Alaska
27th St. Bridge, Colorado
Powers Boulevard, Colorado
Coal Creek, Monroe County, Iowa
Iowa River, Sac and Fox Tribe, Iowa
Ouachita River, City of Monroe, Louisiana
Tucker Road, East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana
Quoddy Narrows, South Lubec Road, Lubec, Maine
Patuxent River, Patuxent Beach Road, Maryland
Tallahatchie River, Site 3, Tallahatchie County, Mississippi
Partridge Brook, Westmoreland, New Hampshire
Elizabeth River, Valleyview Road, Hillside, New Jersey
Mt. Pleasant Ave., Malapardis Brook, Township of Hanover, New Jersey
South Branch Rahway River, Woodbridge, New Jersey
Fort Abercrombie, North Dakota
Tuscarawas County Road 1, Ohio
St. Johns Landfill, Oregon
City of Sunbury, Pennsylvania—Sunbury Riverfront Project
New Castle, Pennsylvania (Neshannock Creek)
Patrick Street to Magic Island, Charleston, West Virginia
Kenosha Harbor Retaining Wall, Kenosha, Wisconsin
Kinnickinnic River Storm Sewer, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin

Section 103 Shoreline Protection

Unalakleet, Alaska
Bay Farm Island Dike, California
Goleta Beach, California

Conquest Preserve, Maryland
Franklin Point Park, Maryland
Mayo Beach Park, Maryland
Pleasure Island, Baltimore County, Maryland
Philadelphia Shipyard Sea Wall, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Section 107 Small Navigation Projects

Kahoolawe Small Boat Harbor, Hawaii
North Kohala Navigation Improvements, Hawaii
Port Fourchon Extension, Louisiana
Bass Harbor, Tremont, Maine
Bucks Harbor Navigation Improvement, Machiasport, Maine
Corea Harbor Navigation Improvement, Gouldsboro, Maine
Nanticoke Harbor Jetty/Nanticoke, Maryland
Woods Hole Great Harbor, Falmouth, Massachusetts
Northwestern Michigan College, Traverse City, Michigan
Coos Bay Turning Basin, Oregon
Charlestown Breachway and Ninigret Pond, Rhode Island
Northwest Tennessee Regional Harbor, Tennessee
Tangier Island Jetty, Accomack County, Virginia

Section 111 Mitigation of Shore Damages Attributable to Navigation Projects

Saco River and Camp Ellis Beach, Saco, Maine
Mobile Pass, Alabama

Section 204, 207, 933 Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material

Blackhawk Bottoms, Pool 19, Burlington, Iowa
Atchafalaya River, Shell Island Pass, Louisiana
Calcasieu River Mile 5 to 14, Cameron Parish, Louisiana
Maumee Bay Habitat Restoration, Ohio
Restoration of the Cat Islands Chain, Green Bay, Wisconsin
Morehead City Harbor, North Carolina

Section 205 Small Flood Control Projects

Fort Yukon, Alaska
Skagway, Alaska
Cosgrove Creek, California
Heacock and Cactus Channels, California
New Hogan Reservoir Re-operation, California
Oak Creek, Florence, Colorado
Ben Hill County, Georgia
Kuliouou Stream, Hawaii
Palai Stream, Hawaii
Waiahole-Waikane Valley, Hawaii
Waiakea Stream, Hawaii
Wailele Stream, Hawaii
White River, Anderson, Indiana
Denison, Iowa
Indian and Dry Run Creeks, Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Mad Creek, Muscatine, Iowa
Red Oak Creek, Iowa
Winnebago River, Mason City, Iowa
Crown Point (Jean Lafitte), Jefferson Parish, Louisiana

Fisher School Basin, Jean Lafitte, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana
Goose Bayou Basin, Jean Lafitte, Louisiana
Lockport to Larose, Louisiana
Pailet Basin, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana
Rosethorn Basin (Jean Lafitte), Louisiana
Snagging and Clearing, Bayou Sere, Louisiana
Town of Carenco, Lafayette Parish, Louisiana
Elkton, Cecil County, Maryland
North River, Peabody, Massachusetts
Montevideo, Minnesota
McKinney Bayou, Tunica County, Mississippi
Blacksnake Creek, St. Joseph, Missouri
Charleston, Missouri
Little River Diversion, Dutchtown, Missouri
Livingston, Montana
Platte River, Fremont, Nebraska
Platte River, Schuyler, Nebraska
Hatch, New Mexico
Battle Mountain, Nevada
Mill Brook, Highland Park, New Jersey
Poplar Brook, Monmouth County, New Jersey
Upper Passaic River and Tributaries, Long Hill Township, New Jersey
Gila River, Grant, Hidalgo County, New Mexico
Fargo-Ridgewood Addition, North Dakota
Lower Lycoming Creek, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania
Montoursville Borough, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania
Chattanooga Creek Watershed Study, Tennessee
First Creek, Knoxville, Tennessee
Sandy Creek, Tennessee
West Virginia Statewide Flood Warning System
Williamstown, West Virginia
Root River, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin

Section 206 Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration

Eklutna, Alaska
Northway, Alaska
Brownsville Branch, Arkansas
Upper York Creek Dam Removal and Restoration, California
Arkansas River Fisheries Habitat Restoration, Colorado
North Fork Gunnison River Ecosystem Restoration, Colorado
Tamarisk Eradication, Colorado
Mill River, Stamford, Connecticut
Rose Bay, Florida
Chattahoochee Fall Line Ecosystem Restoration Program, Georgia
Mokuhinia/Mokuula Ecsystem Restoration, Hawaii
Indian Creek, Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Caldwell, Idaho
Paradise Creek Ecosystem Restoration, Idaho
Emiquon Preserve, Fulton County, Illinois
Squaw Creek Aquatic Restoration, Lake County, Illinois
Duck Creek, Davenport, Iowa
Iowa River, Clear Creek, Iowa City, Iowa
Storm Lake, Iowa

Ventura Marsh at Clear Lake, Iowa
Whitebreast Creek, Iowa
City of Mandeville, Ecosystem Restoration, Louisiana
False River Ecosystem Restoration, Louisiana
University Lakes, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Anacostia River and Tribs, Maryland and the District of Columbia, Northwest Branch
Deep Run/Tiber Hudson, Maryland
Paint Branch Fish Passage, Maryland
Parsons Creek, Dorchester County, Maryland
St. Martin's River, Worcester County, Maryland
Milford Pond Restoration, Milford, Massachusetts
Marion Mill Pond, Marion, Michigan
Missouri Stream Restoration Pilot Project, Missouri
Carson River, Nevada
Grovers Mill Pond, New Jersey
Blue Hole Lake, Santa Rosa, New Mexico
Bottomless Lakes State Park, Roswell, New Mexico
Janes-Wallace Memorial Dam, Santa Rosa, New Mexico
Lower Hempstead Harbor, Village of Sea Cliff, Town of North Hempstead, Nassau County, New York
Manhasset Bay, New York
Soundview Park, New York
Fall Run, Wheeling Creek, Belmont, Ohio
Mineral Bayou Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Durant, Oklahoma
Arrowhead Creek, Oregon
Camp Creek, Oregon
City of York-Codorus Creek, Pennsylvania
Nanticoke Creek Ecosystem Restoration Project, Pennsylvania
North Park Lake Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Pennsylvania
Sheraden Park and Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania
Brush Neck Cove, Warwick, Rhode Island
Narrow River, Narragansett, Rhode Island
Ninigret and Cross Mills Ponds, Charlestown, Rhode Island
Ten Mile River, East Providence, Rhode Island
Winnapaug Pond, Westerly, Rhode Island
Jonesborough Watershed, Tennessee
Upper Jordan River Ecosystem Restoration, Utah
West Branch of the Little River, Stowe, Lamoille County, Vermont
Carpenter Creek, Washington
Squak Valley Park Restoration Project, Washington
Menomonee River Watershed, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin
Tichigan Lake, Waterford, Wisconsin

Section 208 Clearing and Snagging

Upper Bayou Boeuf, Snagging and Clearing, Louisiana
Great Piece Meadows and Pompton River Clearing and Snagging, Passaic, Essex and Morris Counties, New Jersey

Section 1135

Ditch 28, Arkansas

Millwood Lake, Grassey Lake, Arkansas
Tujunga Wash, California
Delaware Bay, Delaware and New Jersey Oyster Restoration
Delaware City, Delaware
Kaunakakai Stream Environmental Restoration, Hawaii
Kawainui Marsh, Hawaii
Rathbun Lake Habitat Restoration, Iowa
Rathbun Lake Shoreline Restoration, Iowa
Bayou Desiard, Monroe, Louisiana
Bayou Macon, E&W Carroll and Franklin Parishes
Frazier/Whitehorse Oxbow Lake Weir, Louisiana
Lake St. Joseph, Tensas Parish, Louisiana
Hart-Miller Island, Maryland
Broad Meadows Marsh, Quincy, Massachusetts
Blue Valley Wetlands, Jackson County, Missouri
Duck Creek, Stoddard County, Missouri
James River, Needmore Branch, Hidden Valley, Greene County, Missouri
Lower Truckee River, McCarron Ranch, Nevada
Lincoln Park West, Jersey City, New Jersey
Rahway River Environmental Restoration, Union County, New Jersey
Ecosystem Revitalization at Route 66, New Mexico
Las Cruces Dam—Environmental Restoration, Doña Ana County, New Mexico
Riparian Wetland Restoration, Pueblo of Santa Ana Reservation, New Mexico
Socorro County Bosque Restoration, New Mexico
Erie County, Smokes Creek, New York
Gerritsen Creek, New York
Spring Creek, New York
Whitney Point Lake, Broome County, New York
Fairmount Dam Fishladder, Pennsylvania
Boyd's Marsh (Town Pond), Portsmouth, Rhode Island
Lake Champlain Canal Barrier, Vermont
Lake Champlain Sea Lamprey Barriers, Vermont
Village of Oyster, Northampton County, Virginia
Union Slough, Washington
Wells Lock and Dam, West Virginia
Lake Poygan, Wisconsin

The Committee has included a rescission of $56,046,000 in unobligated funds from the Construction account of the fiscal year 2006 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act (Public Law 109–103).

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

Appropriations, 2006	[1] $396,000,000
Budget estimate, 2007	278,000,000
House allowance	290,607,000
Committee recommendation	450,530,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriation of $153,750,000.

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

The budget request, the House allowance, 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
INVESTIGATIONS			
ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA	200	200	200
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM LAND STUDY, LA	100	100	100
DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA			500
SPRING BAYOU, LA			500
BAYOU METO, AR		1,550	1,550
SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR			500
COLDWATER RIVER BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	300	300	495
QUIVER RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, MS			100
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	400	400	400
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, STORM WATER MGMT STUDY, TN & MS			152
MILLINGTON & VICINITY, TN		27	
MORGANZA TO THE GULF		2,800	4,000
CONSTRUCTION			
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	43,092	43,092	47,000
GRAND PRAIRIE, AR			14,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	40,756	43,756	69,000
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO		4,230	6,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	4,840	4,840	4,840
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	27,600	27,600	27,600
MISSISSIPPI & LOUSIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, MS & LA			500
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	3,212	3,212	3,212
ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	2,500	4,000	10,000
SUSPENSION FUND	8,000		
NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS			500
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN			500
WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN		500	1,500
YAZOO BACKWATER, LESS ROCKY BAYOU, MS			700
YAZOO BASIN, BACKWATER PUMPING PLANT, MS			15,000
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS			7,250
YAZOO BASIN, DELTA HEADWATERS, MS		5,000	25,000
YAZOO BASIN, MAINSTEM, MS			25
YAZOO BASIN, REFORMULATION UNIT, MS			3,200
YAZOO BASIN, UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS			22,500
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
REGION 8 LOWER MISSISSIPPI	145,616	147,616	
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN			60,280
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR			400
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR			273
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR			560
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR			310
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN			8,400
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO			9,000
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA			2,600
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR			1,200
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL			165
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY			84
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA			3,059

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA			18,655
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA			715
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA			56
BONNET CARRE, LA			4,596
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA			588
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA			66
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA			241
OLD RIVER, LA			11,110
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA			4,000
GREENVILLE HARBOUR, MS			437
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS			475
YAZOO BASIN, ARKABULTA LAKE, MS			9,251
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS			2,209
YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS			12,532
YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS			1,020
YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS			10,949
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS			1,929
YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS			12,425
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS			830
YAZOO BASIN, WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS			430
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS			734
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS			770
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS			387
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO			195
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO			4,768
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN			70
MEMPHIS HARBOUR, MICKELLAR LAKE, TN			1,013
WOLF RIVER HARBOUR, TN			540
MAPPING	1,384	1,384	1,384
SAVINGS & SLIPPAGE			−5,000
TOTAL	278,000	290,607	450,530

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, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate this study as recommended in the budget request.

Morganza to the Gulf, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 to continue Preconstruction Engineering and Design for this study.

Quiver River, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate this study.

Memphis Metro, Storm Water Management Study, Tennessee and Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $152,000 to initiate this study.

Construction

Grand Prairie, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $14,000,000 for continued construction of the project.

Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisisna, Mississippi, Missouri and Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $69,000,000 to continue construction of this project. Utilizing continuing contracts, where appropriate, additional funds are provided for construction on St. John's-New Madrid Levee Closure/Box Culvert, Missouri; complete Willow Point-Youngs Point, Louisiana Items 445-R and 450-R; land acquisition New Madrid Levee/Box Culvert; construction on Carrollton M–104–10L; Lower Venice, 2nd Lift; Tallulah-Magna Vista Item 474-L; Council Bend Relief Wells; Reid-Bedford-King Items 424-R and 428-R; Cairo Grade Raise; West Memphis Relief Wells; Vidalia-Morville Item 361-R; Gammon Relief Wells; continue miscellaneous relocations and construction of the LMRMRIS.

Yazoo Basin, Backwater Pumping Plant, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $15,000,000 to fully fund pump and motor contracts and initiate purchase of conservation easements.

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

Yazoo Basin, Upper Yazoo Project, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $22,500,000 to complete channel Item 6A; fully fund channel Item 6B; relocate utility lines; continue design of channel Item 7; initiate one bridge relocation; purchase project and mitigation lands; and reforestation.

Maintenance

Mississippi River Levees, Arkasnas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and Tennessee.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 to resurface levees; deliver levee gravel to the Laconia Circle Special Levee District and Laconia District of Desha County.

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, 2006	[1] $1,969,110,000
Budget estimate, 2007	2,258,000,000
House allowance	2,195,471,000
Committee recommendation	2,030,000,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriation of $330,717,000.

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.

The Committee is very concerned with the downward trend in the Operation and Maintenance budget. The fiscal year 2007 budget proposal appears to show a significant increase in funding, but

this is due to the migration of projects from the Construction, General account to the Operations and Maintenance account. When these items are removed from the O&M account, the total remaining is a decrease from the fiscal year 2006 enacted amount. This is the wrong trend for O&M.

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

The Port of Lavaca-Point Comfort, Texas is an illustrative example of what concerns the Committee about this budget proposal. O&M funding has been insufficient to complete the study to repair the channel and jetty. A catastrophic jetty failure is a distinct possibility.

Further, O&M funding has been insufficient for maintaining the channel at the authorized depth, nor has Federal maintenance of the turning basin been undertaken as authorized. GI funding has been insufficient to fund a deepening study. In desperation the port has indicated that they will likely finance the deepening study as well as the channel deepening and seek Federal reimbursement.

The port supports 5,300 direct jobs, 4,590 induced jobs and 6,690 indirect jobs. It provides $273,000,000 in direct wages and salaries, $1,000,000,000 of direct, induced and indirect income. It pays $99,000,000 State and local taxes and $178,000,000 Federal taxes.

The port commissioned a study that shows that failure to maintain the 39 foot channel costs $9,000,000/year. Equally importantly, the business managers at the port industries tell the port and the Corps that their companies are moving investments overseas because their Texas plants are failing to compete on the margin with their companies' rival plants overseas. The Port is unable to attract new investment, in part, because the investors consider channel availability, at authorized depth, to be a primary issue.

The Alcoa Aluminum plant is at the port. They turn bauxite into aluminum ingots. Two years ago, when the channel was 18 to 24 inches above the authorized depth, they told the Corps that it was costing them $150,000/inch to light load each ship or about $7,000,000 per shipload. The aluminum ingots they produce go primarily to car body plants in Waco, Texas and Detroit, Michigan.

The plant managers and others from the Texas Alcoa operation met with the Corps earlier this year and their plant manager told Corps officials that Alcoa has nine plants around the world and that this was the only plant remaining in the United States. The U.S. plant is their least cost effective and transportation of raw materials is part of the reason. They usually keep about a 20–30 day supply of bauxite on hand at any one time.

The plant manager is concerned that if they have to shut down due to jetty failure, for example, they will not be allowed to restart the plant. It takes about 40 days to completely recover/restart from

a shut down. The manager is very concerned that the operation would move to one of their more cost effective overseas plants.

There are hundreds of similar problems around the country. The Committee believes that maintenance of our aging infrastructure is imperative if the Nation is to remain competitive in the global marketplace. Even with the increase in funding provided by the Committee, O&M funding is barely keeping up with inflation.

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.

The Committee is concerned that lead and asbestos abatement measures have been deferred aboard the *McFarland* due to guidance in prior Energy and Water Appropriation Acts and uncertainties about its future based on the Corps' report recommending its retirement. The Committee is understandably skeptical of the findings of this report, particularly in light of the GAO study mentioned above. As the *McFarland* is likely to be in continued use for the foreseeable future, the Committee believes that addressing these health and safety concerns are critical and have provided legislative direction that the Revolving Fund be utilized to expeditiously fund lead and asbestos abatment.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA			
ALABAMA—COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL			180
ALABAMA—COOSA RIVER, AL			1,860
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL			21,093
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL			5,510
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL			55
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM			5,781

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MOBILE HARBOR, AL			19,600
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL			100
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL			6,122
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL			94
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL			2,000
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS			28,500
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA			7,791
ALASKA			
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK			15,300
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK			1,875
CORDOVA HARBOR, AK			500
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK			781
HOMER HARBOR, AK			303
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK			47
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, BAR POINT, AK			625
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK			251
NOME HARBOR, AK			3,613
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK			474
ARIZONA			
ALAMO LAKE, AZ			1,600
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ			92
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ			1,211
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ			37
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ			214
ARKANSAS			
BEAVER LAKE, AR			5,385
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR			8,442
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR			1,412
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR			6,292
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR			6,576
DEGRAY LAKE, AR			8,819
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR			1,222
DIERKS LAKE, AR			1,194
GILLHAM LAKE, AR			1,127
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR			5,952
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR			430
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR			216
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR			35,849
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR			3,419
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR			4,538
NIMROD LAKE, AR			1,796
NORFORK LAKE, AR			4,539
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR			590
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA			11,910
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR			4,468
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR			2
WHITE RIVER, AR			1,000
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR			176
CALIFORNIA			
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA			2,156
BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA			2,287
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA			5,086
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA			3,314
CRESENT CITY HARBOR, CA			500
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA			5,895
FARMINGTON DAM, CA			350
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA			2,427

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA			4,916
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA			1,534
ISABELLA LAKE, CA			4,050
JACK D. MALTESTER CHANNEL, CA (SAN LEANDRO)			500
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA			4,071
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBOR, CA			4,000
LOWER PETALUMA RIVER, CA			500
MARINA DEL REY, CA			1,460
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA			331
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA			204
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA			1,300
NAPA RIVER, CA			1,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA			2,226
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA			1,843
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA			8,543
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA			700
PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA			1,000
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA			3,760
PINOLE SHOAL MANAGEMENT STUDY, CA			500
PORT HUENEME, CA			500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA			2,069
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA			1,000
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA			7,377
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA			3,124
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA			1,418
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA			93
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA			1,124
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)			2,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA			2,447
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA			3,070
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA			2,498
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA			3,526
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA			1,200
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA			1,593
SUCCESS LAKE, CA			2,308
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA			2,833
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA			2,349
VENTURA HARBOR, CA			2,700
YUBA RIVER, CA			83
COLORADO			
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO			339
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO			1,764
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO			2,653
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO			112
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO			2,206
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO			627
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO			1,456
COMMONWEATLTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLAND			
ROTA HARBOR, CNMI			1,105
CONNECTICUT			
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT			469
BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CT			250
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT			612
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT			359
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT			1,502
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT			64
LONG ISLAND SOUND, CT & NY			1,742
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT			807

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
NORTH COVE HARBOR, CT			2,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT			414
NORWALK FEDERAL NAVIGATION PROJECT, CT			3,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT			1,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT			450
THOMASTON DAM, CT			705
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT			646
DELAWARE			
HARBOR OF REFUGE BREAKWATER, SUSSEX COUNTY, DE			600
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D			12,008
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBETH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D			30
MISPILLION RIVER, DE			30
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE			30
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE			83
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE			3,900
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC			19
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL)			857
POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC			100
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC			25
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC			20
FLORIDA			
AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST. JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC			2,100
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL			4,600
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL			14,241
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL			1,600
FORT MYERS BEACH, FL			150
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL			300
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE TO ANCLOTE, FL			1,500
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL			4,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL			4,700
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA			7,896
MIAMI RIVER, FL			7,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL			2,014
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL			2,400
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL			815
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL			1,025
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL			3,325
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL			30
TAMPA HARBOR, FL			4,150
GEORGIA			
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA			6,818
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &			1,455
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA			254
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA			2,451
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA			7,473
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA			6,958
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC			11,190
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA			53
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC			10,720
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA			15
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC			7,163
SAVANNAH HARBOR, ADVANCED MAINTENANCE WIDENER, GA			500
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA			11,322
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA			124
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL			9,642

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
HAWAII			
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI			245
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI			205
POHIKI BAY, HAWAII, HI			220
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI			440
IDAHO			
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID			1,653
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID			3,069
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID			80
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID			1,822
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID			443
ILLINOIS			
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN			4,219
CARLYLE LAKE, IL			4,564
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL			1,904
CHICAGO RIVER, IL			398
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL			263
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN			27,453
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN			1,893
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL			718
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL			1,819
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL			607
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL			5,291
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)			40,790
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)			22,501
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL			50
REND LAKE, IL			4,787
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL			120
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL			704
INDIANA			
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN			694
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN			883
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN			741
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN			920
INDIANA HARBOR, IN			545
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN			272
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN			1,432
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN			868
MONROE LAKE, IN			801
PATOKA LAKE, IN			814
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN			89
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN			1,179
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN			113
IOWA			
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA			3,304
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA			205
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA			152
MISSOURI RIVER—RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO			5,580
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE			1,860
RATHBUN LAKE, IA			2,204
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA			3,902
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA			4,473
KANSAS			
CLINTON LAKE, KS			1,917
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS			1,164
EL DORADO LAKE, KS			585

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ELK CITY LAKE, KS			688
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS			1,128
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS			749
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS			123
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS			1,256
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS			1,484
MARION LAKE, KS			1,322
MELVERN LAKE, KS			2,155
MILFORD LAKE, KS			2,166
PEARSON-SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS			1,118
PERRY LAKE, KS			2,160
POMONA LAKE, KS			1,905
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS			64
TORONTO LAKE, KS			535
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS			2,052
WILSON LAKE, KS			1,512
KENTUCKY			
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN			7,790
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY			1,842
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY			1,352
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY			1,288
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY			1,607
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY			883
DEWEY LAKE, KY			1,224
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY			12
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY			1,580
GRAYSON LAKE, KY			1,122
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY			2,028
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY			1,651
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY			191
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY			4
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY			1,659
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY			699
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY			62
NOLIN LAKE, KY			1,886
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH			39,243
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH			4,040
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY			828
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY			2
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY			2,479
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY			1,002
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY			7,008
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY			823
LOUISIANA			
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L			16,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA			1,104
BAYOU LACOMBE			900
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA			1,697
BAYOU PIERRE, LA			32
BAYOU SEGNETTE, LA			1,750
BAYOU TECHE, LA			110
CADDO LAKE, LA			190
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA			16,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA			1,505
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA			19,443
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA			1,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA			869
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA			13,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA			491

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA			86
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA			2,150
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA			2,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO			54,074
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA			60
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA			2,000
TANGIPAHOA RIVER, LA			650
TCHEFUNCTE RIVER & BOUGE FALIA, LA			450
WALLACE LAKE, LA			200
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA			500
MAINE			
BUCKS HARBOR, MACHIASPORT, ME			330
DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME			1,100
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME			11
NARRAGAUGAS RIVER, MILBRIDGE, ME			700
PORTLAND HARBOR, ME			135
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME			866
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME			17
MARYLAND			
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD			15,482
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)			330
CHESTER RIVER, MD			110
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV			500
GOOSE CREEK, MD			80
HERRING BAY & ROCKHOLD CREEK, MD			550
HONGA RIVER & TAR BAY, MD			110
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD			32
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV			1,992
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD			100
PARISH CREEK, MD			60
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD			467
RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD			110
ROCKALL HARBOR, MD			600
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD			100
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD			110
WICOMICO RIVER, MD			800
MASSACHUSETTS			
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA			641
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA			740
BOSTON HARBOR, MA			7,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA			580
CAPE COD CANAL, MA			8,348
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA			314
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA			260
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA			452
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA			571
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA			114
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA			606
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA			568
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER			299
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA			1,100
SALEM HARBOR, MA			2,856
TULLY LAKE, MA			720
WEST HILL DAM, MA			729
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA			578
WEYMOUTH-FORE RIVER, MA			1,728
MICHIGAN			
ALPENA HARBOR, MI			429

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI			80
CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI			300
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI			87
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI			137
CLINTON RIVER, MI			660
DETROIT RIVER, MI			5,331
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI			455
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI			1,500
GRAYS REEF PASSAGE, MI			112
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI			549
INLAND ROUTE, MI			950
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI			144
LELAND HARBOR, MI			110
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI			186
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI			177
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI			47
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI			214
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI			78
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI			551
PENTWATER, MI			84
PETOSKEY HARBOR, MI			1,000
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI			225
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR			292
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI			178
ROUGE RIVER, MI			20
SAGINAW RIVER, MI			3,642
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI			500
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI			1,471
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI			450
ST MARYS RIVER, MI			19,267
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI			2,594
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI			100
MINNESOTA			
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD			239
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI			4,890
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN			132
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN			594
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN			188
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)			59,296
ORWELL LAKE, MN			339
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN			67
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN			147
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN			2,928
ST. PAUL, HARRIET ISLANDS, LOWER HARBOR, MN			200
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN			314
TWO HARBORS, MN			198
MISSISSIPPI			
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS			62
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS			210
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS			3,683
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS			61
MOUTH OF THE YAZOO RIVER, MS			110
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS			1,885
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS			5,500
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA			283
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS			77
ROSEDALLE HARBOR, MS			600
YAZOO RIVER, MS			140

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MISSOURI			
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO			350
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO			5,916
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO			2,660
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO			8,173
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO			768
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO			795
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO			860
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO			26,013
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO			660
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MILE 889, MO			200
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO			2,080
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO			2
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO			327
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO			1,137
STOCKTON LAKE, MO			3,775
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO			6,589
UNION LAKE, MO			6
MONTANA			
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT			4,076
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT			19
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT			1,642
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT			89
NEBRASKA			
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD			5,803
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE			3,133
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE			102
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO			350
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE			583
PAPIO CREEK, NE			1
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE			734
NEVADA			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV			47
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA			1,820
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV			173
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
BLACKWATER DAM, NH			659
COCHECO RIVER, NH			2,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH			573
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH			734
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH			1,488
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH			12
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH			685
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH			231
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH			659
NEW JERSEY			
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ			75
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ			350
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ			15
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE			17,909
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ			250
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ			85
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ			335
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ			75
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ			5,000
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ			460

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ			1,318
RARITAN RIVER, NJ			200
SALEM RIVER, NJ			70
SANDY HOOK AT LEONARDO, NJ			300
SHARK RIVER, NJ			80
SHREWSBURY RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ			500
NEW MEXICO			
ABIQUIU DAM, NM			3,211
ALBUQUERQUE LEVEES, NM			500
COCHITI LAKE, NM			6,422
CONCHAS LAKE, NM			3,887
GALISTEO DAM, NM			1,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM			221
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM			2,733
RIO GRANDE BOSQUE REHABILITATION, NM			4,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM			1,329
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM			1,471
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM			531
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL			1,895
NEW YORK			
ALMOND LAKE, NY			473
ARKPORT DAM, NY			280
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY			1,147
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY			332
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY			19
EAST RIVER, NY			70
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY			2,800
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY			592
EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY			250
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY			200
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY			200
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY			350
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY			5,410
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)			1,745
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)			1,120
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY			507
JAMAICA BAY, NY			200
JONES INLET, NY			100
LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY			15
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY			100
MORICHES INLET, NY			100
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY			3,320
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY			6,735
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY AND NJ (PREV OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSI			700
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY			3,475
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)			4,800
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY			844
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY			1,418
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY			957
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY			100
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY			618
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY			460
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY			722
NORTH CAROLINA			
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC			3,370
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC			1,935
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC			558
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC			550

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
FALLS LAKE, NC			1,856
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC			79
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC			950
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC			10,000
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC			500
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC			5,200
NEW RIVER INLET, NC			820
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC			675
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC			675
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC			200
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC			3,170
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC			11,000
NORTH DAKOTA			
BOWMAN—HALEY LAKE, ND			168
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND			14,245
HOMME LAKE, ND			184
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND			87
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND			1,281
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND			499
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND			118
SOURIS RIVER, ND			402
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND			32
OHIO			
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH			1,243
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH			676
BERLIN LAKE, OH			1,714
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH			1,376
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH			853
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH			2,694
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH			1,033
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH			1,006
DELAWARE LAKE, OH			1,000
DILLON LAKE, OH			763
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH			1,941
HURON HARBOR, OH			690
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH			256
LORAIN HARBOR, OH			1,283
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH			714
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH			832
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH			7,986
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH			169
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH			976
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH			225
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH			397
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH			180
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH			4,010
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH			567
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH			560
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH			923
OKLAHOMA			
ARCADIA LAKE, OK			443
BIRCH LAKE, OK			736
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK			1,716
CANTON LAKE, OK			2,360
COPAN LAKE, OK			974
EUFAULA LAKE, OK			5,055
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK			5,404
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK			743

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK			411
HEYBURN LAKE, OK			567
HUGO LAKE, OK			1,412
HULAH LAKE, OK			506
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK			123
KAW LAKE, OK			3,012
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK			3,867
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK			3,149
OPTIMA LAKE, OK			127
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK			64
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK			942
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK			5,059
SARDIS LAKE, OK			975
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK			972
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK			1,700
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK			4,039
WAURIKA LAKE, OK			1,445
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK			4,164
WISTER LAKE, OK			610
OREGON			
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR			736
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR			287
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA			8,829
CHETCO RIVER, OR			451
COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA ..			17,800
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA			20,189
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O ...			415
COOS BAY, OR			4,189
COQUILLE RIVER, OR			275
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR			876
COUGAR LAKE, OR			993
DEPOE BAY, OR			3
DETROIT LAKE, OR			782
DORENA LAKE, OR			704
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR			853
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR			1,436
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR			1,415
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR			586
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR			168
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA			5,571
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR			1,692
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR			2,842
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA			5,845
PORT ORFORD, OR			273
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR			180
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR			483
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR			62
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR			486
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR			93
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR			400
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR (PORT OF GARIBALDI)			1,500
UMPQUA RIVER, OR			979
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR			258
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR			94
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR			612
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR			1,566
YAQUINA RIVER, OR			836
PENNSYLVANIA			
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA			6,361

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA			641
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA			283
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA			1,080
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA			2,411
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA			1,144
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA			2,023
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA			1,192
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA			741
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA			906
ERIE HARBOR, PA			22
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA			799
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA			770
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA			223
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA			311
JOHNSTOWN, PA			1,864
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA			1,834
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA			1,699
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA			737
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA			12,520
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV			17,901
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV			520
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA			55
PROMPTON LAKE, PA			575
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA			14
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA			4,482
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA			57
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA			950
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA			2,015
STILLWATER LAKE, PA			405
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA			75
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA			2,541
TIONESTA LAKE, PA			1,458
UNION CITY LAKE, PA			242
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA			754
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA			663
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD			1,994
PUERTO RICO			
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR			4,000
RHODE ISLAND			
BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR, RI			850
BULLOCKS POINT COVE, RI			900
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI			15
POINT JUDITH POND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI			1,866
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI			400
SOUTH COAST, RHODE ISLAND, REGIONAL SEDIMENT MGMT, RI			250
SOUTH CAROLINA			
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC			539
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC			7,655
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC			3,345
FOLLY RIVER, SC			250
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC			3,644
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC			61
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC			532
TOWN CREEK, SC			520
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD			6,948
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUS, SD			2,500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD			327
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD			236
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD			6,737
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD			17
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN			561
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT			200
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND			9,133
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD			53
TENNESSEE			
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN			4,817
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN			5,677
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN			1,250
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN			5,014
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN			4,256
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN			141
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN			3,696
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN			7,178
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN			2
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN			19,306
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN			251
TEXAS			
AQUILLA LAKE, TX			844
ARKANSAS—RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI			1,153
BARDWELL LAKE, TX			1,741
BELTON LAKE, TX			3,570
BENBROOK LAKE, TX			2,185
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX			3,480
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX			2,164
CANYON LAKE, TX			3,494
CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX			310
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX			7,000
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX			5,855
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX			6
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX			3,146
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX			4,400
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX			2,600
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX			3,120
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX			1,822
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX			2,717
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX			35,190
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX			1,270
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX			15,225
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX			613
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX			1,553
JOE POOL LAKE, TX			729
LAKE KEMP, TX			207
LAVON LAKE, TX			3,266
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX			3,373
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX			5,367
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX			2,871
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX			2,261
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX			2,263
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX			1,431
PROCTOR LAKE, TX			2,156
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX			500
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX			1,251
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX			9,972
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX			7,524
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX			103

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX			3,242
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX			2,068
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX			850
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX			1,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX			2,694
WACO LAKE, TX			2,590
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX			2,437
WHITNEY LAKE, TX			6,293
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX			4,036
UTAH			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT			42
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT			672
VERMONT			
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT			1,299
CONNECTICUT RIVER FLOOD CONTROL DAMS			188
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT			49
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY			10
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT			850
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT			981
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT			873
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT			666
VIRGINIA			
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA			500
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA			1,798
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA			867
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA			852
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA			2,082
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM ..			920
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA			211
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA			3,043
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC			11,060
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA			1,366
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA			13,518
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS			221
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA			601
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA			4,688
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA			840
RUDEE INLET, VA			953
WASHINGTON			
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA			837
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA (PORT OF ILWACO)			750
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND THE HEAD OF SAND			750
EDIZ HOOK, WA			310
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA			895
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA			6,679
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA			1,232
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA			4,538
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA			311
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA			6,112
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA			2,755
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA			3,280
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA			2,398
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA			1,584
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA			301
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA			2,639
NEAH BAY, WA			33
OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA			1,918

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA			317
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA			907
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA			1,052
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA			570
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA			66
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA			128
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA			98
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA			627
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA			140
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR			3,432
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA			84
WEST VIRGINIA			
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV			1,078
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV			1,098
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV			1,738
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV			1,699
ELKINS, WV			17
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV			129
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV			9,185
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH			20,665
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH			2,140
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV			2,302
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV			830
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV			1,883
SUTTON LAKE, WV			1,750
TYGART LAKE, WV			1,350
WISCONSIN			
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI			723
FOX RIVER, WI			2,147
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI			3,607
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI			41
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI			650
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI			176
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI			105
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI			472
WYOMING			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY			11
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY			853
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY			87
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES			2,008,455
O&M Regions:			
NEW ENGLAND	42,703	45,078	
MID-ATLANTIC	146,700	143,250	
SOUTH ATLANTIC-GULF	318,443	297,043	
GREAT LAKES	96,660	101,407	
OHIO	249,331	252,886	
TENNESSEE	20,701	21,301	
UPPER MISSISSIPPI	247,967	233,803	
LOWER MISSISSIPPI	140,613	147,021	
SOURIS-RED-RAINY	2,999	2,999	
MISSOURI	180,200	151,180	
ARKANSAS-WHITE-RED	176,934	178,084	
TEXAS-GULF	147,422	141,113	
RIO GRANDE	10,209	10,209	
UPPER COLORADO	722	722	
LOWER COLORADO	3,327	3,327	
GREAT BASIN	761	761	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	252,093	242,593	.....
CALIFORNIA	98,232	102,461	.....
ALASKA	22,204	22,204	.....
HAWAII	1,995	1,995	.....
CARIBBEAN	4,000	4,000	.....
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER REGIONS	2,164,216	2,103,437	.....
REMAINING ITEMS:			
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	690	690	690
ASSET MANAGEMENT/FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE.	4,000	4,000	4,000
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,475	2,475	2,475
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	2,000	2,000	2,000
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	8,000	8,000	8,000
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM	18,000	18,000	.....
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,062	1,062	1,062
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVRIONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER).	6,080	6,080	6,080
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)	1,391	1,391	1,391
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	270	270	270
FACILITY PROTECTION	12,000	12,000	12,000
GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODEL	900	900	900
INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP PR	500	500	.....
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	3,708	3,708	3,708
MONITORING OF COMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,575	1,575	1,575
NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING	2,400	2,400	8,600
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	6,300	6,300	6,300
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP)	5,000	5,000	5,000
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	2,540	2,540	2,540
PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR WATER STORAGE REALLOCATION	300	300	300
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT (ABS,P2,WINABS)	300	300	300
PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION	5,541	5,541	5,541
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM (MSP)	1,600	1,600	1,600
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	1,391	3,641	2,041
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	608	608	.....
STEWARDSHIP SUPPORT PROGRAM	500	500	500
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS)	653	653	653
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	89,784	92,034	78,634
SAVINGS & SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	−57,089
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	2,254,000	2,195,471	2,030,000

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama and Mississippi.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for the construction of mooring cells at Columbus, Mississippi and additional funding for additional maintenance dredging, aquatic plant control activities and backlog maintenance.

Cordova Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee has included $500,000 for maintenance dredging of the harbor.

Helena Harbor, Arkansas.—The Committee includes $430,000 for maintenance dredging of this harbor.

McClellan-Kerr, Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas and Oklahoma.—An additional $4,000,000 is provided to complete the general reevaluation study to identify the long term fix for the Arkansas-White Cutoff Structure and for repairs along the existing Melinda Structure.

Ouachita and Black Rivers, Arkansas and Louisiana.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $2,000,000 for backlog maintenance.

Crescent City, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for dredging.

Oakland Harbor, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $8,543,000 for dredging the Inner and Outer Harbors.

Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, California.—$4,000,000 is provided for dredging the Los Angeles River Estuary.

Cherry Creek, Chatfield, and Trinidad Lakes, Colorado.—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, Delaware and Maryland.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,008,000 for this project.

AIWW, Norfolk, Virginia to St. Johns River, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia.—The Committee includes $2,100,000 for maintenance dredging.

Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee to Anclote, FLorida.—The Committee provides $1,500,000 for maintenance dredging.

Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Florida.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for maintenance dredging.

Miami River, Florida.—The Committee provides $7,000,000 for continued operations and maintenance of the Miami River Channel. This project will provide the first maintenance dredging of the Miami River since its original authorization in 1930. The Corps of Engineers is currently studying the economic benefits of the dredging project. In so doing, the Secretary should take into consideration the broad economic benefits of this project, including the increase in maritime cargo, the increased maritime business activity on the Miami River that will result from the project, such as megayacht servicing, and other economic and environmental benefits related to the revitalization of the area bordering the Miami River.

Apalachiacola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers and Alabama, Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida.—Prior notification of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and affected congressional Members is required before any funding shall be reprogrammed or otherwise used for updating masterplans having to do with projects in these river basins.

Pohiki Bay, Hawaii, Hawaii.—The Committee includes $200,000 to complete plans and specifications for the breakwater repair.

Mississippi River Between Missouri River and Minneapolis (MVR Portion), Illinois.—The Committee recommendation includes $40,790,000. Within the funds provided, $3,582,000 is for continuation of the major maintenance of Lock and Dam 11 and Lock and Dam 19 as well as dredging small boat harbors.

Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional funds for maintenance dredging activities.

Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana.—The Committee provides additional funding for maintenance dredging of this channel.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $2,548,000 for bank stabilization repairs, dredging entrances to oxbow lakes, routine operation and maintenance activities, annual dredging requirements, and backlog maintenance.

Herring Bay and Rockhold Creek, Maryland.—The Committee recommendation includes funds to dredge this project.

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

Weymouth-Fore River, Massachusetts.—$1,728,000 is provided for dredging this project.

Grand Marais Harbor, Michigan.—The Committee provides $1,500,000 to continue construction of the replacement breakwater.

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

Okatibbee Lake, Mississippi.—The Committee includes additional funds for maintenance of public use facilities.

Rosedale Harbor, Mississippi.—The Committee recommendation includes $600,000 for maintenance dredging of the harbor.

Cocheco River, New Hampshire.—The Committee provides $2,000,000 continue dredging of the Cocheco River project.

Albuquerque Levees, New Mexico.—The Committee recommendation provides $500,000 to complete plans and specifications.

Cochiti Lake, New Mexico.—The Committee provides additional funds to fully fund routine operation and maintenance, campground construction, Cochiti baseline, gate automation, grout control tower to stop all water leaks, and structural review of the project water tower.

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

Scheduling Reservoir Operations, New Mexico.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,471,000. Within these funds, $250,000 is provided to develop an outline for an Integrated Management Plan of the Rio Grande in New Mexico in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, other Federal, State and local agencies.

Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model, New Mexico.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for assessment of options to develop a conservation pool to assist in meeting ESA requirements in the Middle Rio Grande.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, North Carolina.—The Committee includes an additional $3,370,000 for dredging of the project. Within the funds provided, $500,000 is for dredging Snow's cut.

Manteo (Shallowbag Bay), North Carolina.—The Committee includes additional funds for dredging of the project.

Garrison Dam and Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.—The Committee provides $100,000 for mosquito control, $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, and $5,000,000, along with prior year unobligated balances, shall be used for the relocation of the Fort Stevenson marina.

Columbia and Lower Willamette River Below Vancouver, Washington and Portland, Oregon.—The Committee recommendation includes $17,800,000 for this project. Within the funds provided, up to $1,384,000 shall be used for dredging the 43 foot channel and $470,000 is for dredging at the Old Mouth of the Columbia River at Longview, Washington.

Columbia River at the Mouth, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee recommendation includes $20,189,000 for the project. Within these funds, $9,315,000 is provided to complete interim repairs on the South jetty; complete the Phase 1 Major Rehabilitation Report; and to initiate a Design Documentation Report for Phase 1 and the Phase 2 Major Rehabilitation Report.

Cheyenne River Siuox Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, South Dakota.—The Committee notes that title VI of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, as amended, requires that funding to inventory and stabilize cultural and historic sites along the Missouri River in South Dakota, and to carry out the terrestrial wildlife habitat programs, shall be provided from the Operation and Maintenance account. The Committee provides $2,500,000 to protect cultural resource sites and provide funding to the State and tribes for approved restoration and stewardship plans and in compliance with the requirements of title VI, directs the Corps to contract with or reimburse the State of South Dakota and affected tribes to carry out these duties.

Houston Ship Channel, Texas.—The Committee includes an additional $2,000,000 for additional dredging and dredging related activities.

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

Connecticut River Flood Control Dams, Vermont.—$188,000 is provided to complete the evaluation of structural modifications to the five Corps dams within the Connecticut River Basin in Vermont.

Norfolk Harbor, Virginia.—The Committee provides an additional $3,747,000 for maintenance dredging and to raise the containment dikes to provide the capacity needed for the Norfolk Harbor Deepening project.

Mud Mountain Dam, Washington.—Within the funds provided, the Corps is directed to use up to $500,000 to satisfy Federal fish passage obligations for the term of the cooperative agreement with Puget Sound Energy.

R.D. Bailey Lake, West Virginia.—The Committee includes an additional $770,000 for drift removal and for drift removal equipment.

Fox River, Wisconsin.—The Committee has included an additional $1,000,000 to reimburse Wisconsin, in accordance with the agreement, for the costs of repairs and rehabilitation of the transferred property.

Independent Assessment of Environmental Stewardship Program.—The Committee has not provided funding for this new study.

Reliability Models Program for Major Rehabilitation.—The Committee has not provided funding for this new study.

Regional Sediment Management Demonstration Program.—The Committee has provided $2,041,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, $500,000 is for the southeast coast of Oahu, Hawaii and $250,000 for Ocean and Bay Coastlines in Virginia. The Committee has not included funds for the Benson Beach demonstration project. It is the Committee's understanding that funds are available from prior year appropriations for this project. The Committee directs the Corps to work with the State of Washington to study the effects of nearshore disposal and littoral drift on nourishment of Benson Beach.

National Coastal Mapping.—$8,600,000 is provided for this program. Within the funds provided $1,600,000 is for collection of LIDAR bathymetry and $4,600,000 is for Coastal Zone Mapping and Imaging Laser to be conducted with the University of Southern Mississippi.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 2006	[1]
Budget estimate, 2007	$81,000,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	32,000,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriation of $5,422,989,000.

The Committee has included $32,000,000 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.

Since Hurricane Katrina made landfall in late August 2005, nearly $5,500,000,000 has been provided to this account through supplemental appropriations. The Committee believes that carryover funds should be available to address unexpected disasters that occur in fiscal year 2007. Therefore, the Committee provides $32,000,000. This is the amount considered necessary for annual readiness and preparedness activities of the Corps.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2006	$158,400,000
Budget estimate, 2007	173,000,000
House allowance	173,000,000
Committee recommendation	168,000,000

An appropriation of $168,000,000 is recommended for the regulatory program of the Corps of Engineers.

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

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

The Committee continues to be concerned about the backlog of permit applications and the delay in making permit decisions, especially in certain areas. Some of these permit actions have major national or regional impacts and the delays are, accordingly, having negative consequences on the Nation's economy and environmental quality. To partially address this concern, the Corps of Engineers is directed to initiate a series of pilot programs aimed at streamlining decisions for high impact permit applications with national or regional implications, especially those which are repetitive or which have common characteristics with other similar permit applications. These pilot programs are to be designed to gain efficiencies by sharing knowledge and expertise gained by Corps regulators in processing similar types of applications in one area with their colleagues facing similar applications in another, promoting consistency, developing and sharing "best practices" approaches to evaluating such permit applications, and use of virtual or dedicated teams to expedite broad-impact permit applications. In establishing these pilot programs, the Corps shall give priority to applications aimed at streamlining the expansion of interstate rail capacity in an economically and environmentally sound manner and in reaching similarly sound, streamlined decisions on large-scale commercial and residential land developments involving complex land use considerations.

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

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

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2006	$138,600,000
Budget estimate, 2007	130,000,000
House allowance	130,000,000
Committee recommendation	140,000,000

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

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

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

The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers during fiscal year 2007 to complete expeditiously its Site Ownership and Operational History review and continue its Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study toward the goal of initiating any necessary remediation of the former Sylvania nuclear fuel site at Hicksville, New York, in accordance with CERCLA.

The Committee directs the Corps to continue ongoing cleanup efforts at the Former Linde Air Products, Tonawanda, New York, consistent with current CERCLA cleanup standards.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2006	[1] $152,460,000
Budget estimate, 2007	164,000,000
House allowance	142,100,000
Committee recommendation	164,000,000

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

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 encour-

ages 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.

Millions of dollars have been spent over the last several years on an initiative to contract out Government jobs in order to make the Government more efficient. However, in more than 70 percent of the cases Government employees win the competition for their jobs. The Committee fails to see any evidence of cost savings or in-

creased efficiency by undergoing these expensive competitions. Therefore, the Committee directs that no funds provided in this account or otherwise available for expenditure shall be used to comply with the competitive sourcing initiative.

The Committee acknowledges that the General Expense account has not kept pace with inflation. Over the last 6 years this account has fluctuated. The low point was in fiscal year 2000, when the account was funded at $149,500,000 for a $4,100,000,000 program. The high point was in fiscal year 2005, when the account was funded at $167,000,000 for a $4,700,000,000 program. Both of these numbers represent about 3.6 percent of the total dollars appropriated. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2007 program is about $5,100,000,000. Using the same percentage, this translates to $181,000,000 for the GE account for fiscal year 2007. Obviously other variables must be considered than a single percentage, but it is one way to approximate the level of funding needed in the GE account to provide similar levels of service.

While the Committee did not provide $181,000,000 for the GE account, it did retain the requested level of $164,000,000, which includes $6,000,000 to fund the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works). The Committee directs that the funds proposed for the ASA[CW] along with the funds proposed for competitive sourcing in the budget request be used to provide up to 40 additional staff for the headquarters office. Additional staff should also be provided for the Mississippi Valley Division in order to oversee hurricane recovery efforts and the more than $6,000,000,000 that Congress has provided for that effort. Up to $1,500,000 may be used to augment the General Expense budget of the Mississippi Valley Division. The Committee expects the administration to budget for this increased staffing in future budget submissions.

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

The Committee has provided no funding for the Office of the Assitant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works. The Committee does not believe that the ASA[CW] has the time nor should be involved in the day-to-day operational matters of the civil works program. It is the Committee's opinion that the traditional role of the ASA[CW] is to provide the Chief of Engineers advice about policy matters and generally be the political spokesperson for the administration's policies; however, the Chief of Engineers is responsible for carrying out the program.

The decisions of fiscal year 2005 and 2006 to fund the expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works through Energy and Water appropriations were an experiment in striving for management improvements in the Civil Works program. The desired management improvements can be and are being achieved but, based on the experience of these 2 years, it is apparent that funding the Assistant Secretary's office out of Energy and Water appropriations, rather than the military appropriation that funds the rest of the Army Secretariat, is neither necessary to achieve these improvements nor is it an efficient way to fund the office. As a result, the Senate Appropriations Committee recommends that in fiscal year 2007 and thereafter the expenses of the Office of the As-

sistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works again should be funded through the Defense Department appropriations for Operation and Maintenance, Army [OMA].

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

The Assistant Secretary has broad responsibilities to oversee the Support for Others program of the Corps of Engineers, totaling nearly $2,400,000,000 in fiscal year 2005. Through this program, the Corps provides reimbursable engineering and construction services for more than 70 other Federal agencies and, under certain conditions specified in law, provides services for States, localities and tribes. The Assistant Secretary also has oversight over Corps international activities that are not directly in support of U.S. military forces overseas. These include more than $500,000,000 in design and construction for the Defense Department's Foreign Military Sales program and more than $150,000,000 in vertical construction for the Department of State's Cooperative Threat Reduction program. Oversight of domestic activities includes support for the Department of Homeland Security (in both national security activities and emergency response under the Stafford Act in support of the Federal Emergency Management Agency), the Environmental Protection Agency's Superfund program, the Department of Energy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and many other agencies.

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Section 101. The bill includes language concerning reprogramming.

Section 102. The bill includes language limiting reimbursements.

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

Section 104. The bill includes language prohibiting any steps to dismantle the St. Georges Bridge in Delaware.

Section 105. The bill includes language concerning report notifications.

Section 106. The bill includes language concerning reallocations in Lake Cumberland, Kentucky.

Section 107. The bill includes language regarding the Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia, project.

Section 108. The bill includes language allowing the use of the revolving fund to construct two buildings.

Section 109. The bill includes language concerning cooperative agreements.

Section 110. The bill includes language concerning in-kind services for the Rio Grande Basin Watershed study.

Section 111. The bill includes language regarding the Middle Rio Grande Collaborative Program, New Mexico.

Section 112. The bill includes language regarding Apalachiacola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers and Alabama, Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida.

Section 113. The bill includes language regarding the Rio De Flag, Arizona, project.

Section 114. The bill includes language regarding Avian Predation in the Columbia River Fish Mitigation project.

Section 115. The bill includes language regarding the Santa Ana, California, project.

Section 116. The bill includes language regarding the Upper Guadalupe, California, project.

Section 117. The bill includes language concerning the conveyance of surplus property in Tate County, Mississippi.

Section 118. The bill includes language regarding two environmental infrastructure projects in Nevada.

Section 119. The bill includes language regarding the Devils Lake, North Dakota, environmental infrastructure.

Section 120. The bill includes language regarding the Federal dredges.

Section 121. The bill includes language regarding the Federal dredges.

Section 122. The bill includes language regarding the Federal dredges.

Section 123. The bill includes language concerning Missouri River mitigation.

Section 124. The bill includes language limiting Corps of Engineers expenditure on a project.

Section 125. The bill includes language repealing two sections of Public Law 109–103.

Section 126. The bill includes language concerning the Shore Line Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program.

Section 127. The bill includes language regarding congressional budget justifications.

Section 128. The bill includes language regarding non-Federal sponsors.

Section 129. The bill includes language regarding reimbursements.

Section 130. The bill includes language regarding Johnson Creek, Texas.

Section 131. The bill includes language regarding McAlpine Lock and Dam.

Section 132. The bill includes language regarding Federal Civilian Employee Compensation.

Section 133. The bill includes language regarding crediting of non-Federal expenditures.

Section 134. The bill includes language regarding the San Lorenzo River, California.

Section 135. The bill includes a provision regarding the Missouri and Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement Project.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2006	$34,007,000
Budget estimate, 2007	40,155,000
House allowance	40,155,000
Committee recommendation	40,155,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2007 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act totals $40,155,000. An appropriation of $37,587,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction; $937,000 for fish, wildlife, and recreation, mitigation and conservation. The Committee recommendation provides $1,603,000 for program administration and oversight.

Legislative language in the bill that accompanies this report allows up to $1,500,000 to be used for administrative costs. The one time increase in administrative expenses is to provide funding for costs associated with securing new office space and relocating the Commission's office, due to the cancellation of its building lease.

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, 2006	[1] $874,679,000
Budget estimate, 2007	[2] 745,424,000
House allowance	[2] 761,122,000
Committee recommendation	888,994,000

[1] Includes Emergency Supplemental Appropriations of $9,000,000.
[2] Includes a rescission of $88,000,000.

An appropriation of $888,994,000 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 and the House allowance.

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
ARIZONA						
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	.....	7,920	.....	7,920	.....	7,920
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER BASIN	27,050	153	27,050	153	27,650	153
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	5,495	.....	5,495	.....	5,495	.....
FORT MCDOWELL SETTLEMENT ACT	396	.....	396	.....	396	.....
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	297	.....	297	.....	297	.....
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER REUSE PROJECT	198	.....	198	.....	198	.....
SALT RIVER PROJECT	297	.....	297	.....	297	.....
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT	297	.....	297	.....	297	.....
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	4,713	.....	4,713	.....	4,713	.....
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	1,074	.....	1,074	.....	1,074	.....
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	223	.....	473	.....	223	.....
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,652	21,080	2,147	21,080	1,652	21,080
YUMA EAST WETLANDS, AZ	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
CALIFORNIA						
CACHUMA PROJECT	1,021	558	1,521	558	1,521	558
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	574	.....	574	.....	574	.....
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PLANT	990	.....	990	.....	1,200	.....
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:						
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	1,815	7,158	3,065	7,158	1,815	7,158
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	4,025	.....	5,025	.....	4,025	.....
DELTA DIVISION	10,819	5,840	10,819	5,840	10,819	5,840
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,598	2,523	1,598	2,523	1,598	2,523
FRIANT DIVISION	1,894	3,814	1,894	3,814	1,894	3,814
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	13,658	1,259	13,658	1,259	13,658	1,259
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT	.....	18,315	.....	18,315	.....	18,315
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVERSION	2,445	1,740	2,445	1,740	4,395	1,740
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	1,015	.....	1,015	.....	1,015	.....
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	309	.....	309	.....	309	.....
SHASTA DIVISION	802	7,625	802	7,625	802	7,625
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	7,379	3,318	7,379	3,318	9,379	3,318

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	1,648	9,483	1,648	9,483	1,648	9,483
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	3,921	6,992	3,921	6,992	3,921	6,992
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	792	.....	792	.....	792	.....
HI-DESERT WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND REUSE	.....	.....	500	.....	.....	.....
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,500	.....
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	743	.....	743	.....	907	.....
LONG BEACH DESALINATION PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
IRVINE BASIN GROUND AND SURFACE WATER IMPROVEMENT	.....	.....	1,000	.....	250	.....
NAPA-SONOMA-MARIN AGRICULTURAL REUSE PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	1,238	.....	1,238	.....	1,238	.....
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT, PHAS	1,238	.....	1,238	.....	2,500	.....
ORLAND PROJECT	14	674	14	674	14	674
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVERSION STUDY	.....	.....	1,000	.....	.....	.....
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	743	.....	2,243	.....	743	.....
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	3,465	.....	3,465	.....	3,465	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	743	.....	743	.....	743	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION PROJECT	.....	.....	10,000	.....	.....	.....
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	495	.....	495	.....	495	.....
SANTA MARGARITA RIVER CONJUNCTIVE USE PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
SOLANO PROJECT	1,287	2,558	1,287	2,558	1,287	2,558
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	406	.....	1,308	.....	406	.....
WATSONVILLE AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	.....	.....	1,000	.....	.....	.....
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT	824	.....	824	.....	824	.....
COLORADO						
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP SECTION 5 & 8	57,420	.....	57,420	.....	65,000	.....
COLLBRAN PROJECT	170	1,370	170	1,370	170	1,370
COLORADO—BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	334	14,861	334	14,861	334	14,861
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	396	.....	396	.....	396	.....
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	81	144	81	144	81	144
FRYINGPAN—ARKANSAS PROJECT	196	6,868	196	6,868	196	6,868
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	167	882	167	882	167	882

LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY	74	1,970	74	1,970	74	1,970
MANCOS PROJECT	50	85	50	85	500	85
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	60	2,067	60	2,067	60	2,067
PINE RIVER PROJECT	182	125	182	125	182	125
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT	292	5,141	292	5,141	292	5,141
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	128	162	128	162	128	162
HAWAII						
HAWAIIAN RECLAIM AND REUSE STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	.....
IDAHO						
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	2,523	2,706	2,523	2,706	2,523	2,706
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	17,325	.....	17,325	.....	17,325	.....
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	574	.....	574	.....	574	.....
LEWISTON ORCHARDS PROJECTS	339	31	339	31	339	31
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,266	2,938	3,266	2,938	3,266	2,938
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	114	.....	114	.....	114	.....
MINIDOKA PROJECT, GRASSY LAKE SOD	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
KANSAS						
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	150	.....	150	.....	150	.....
WICHITA PROJECT	15	436	15	436	15	436
MONTANA						
FORT PECK DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	5,000	.....	6,000	.....	10,000	.....
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	.....	990	.....	990	.....	990
HUNTLEY PROJECT	50	131	50	131	50	131
MILK RIVER PROJECT	487	1,099	487	1,099	487	1,099
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	318	.....	318	.....	318	.....
NORTH CENTRAL MONTANA RURAL WATER PROJECT	.....	.....	5,500	.....	6,000	.....
ST. MARY'S FACILITIES REHABILIATION	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,000	.....
SUN RIVER PROJECT	98	249	98	249	98	249
NEBRASKA						
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	31	82	31	82	31	82
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	129	.....	129	.....	129	.....
NEVADA						
HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY	198	.....	198	.....	198	.....
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	4,982	2,807	4,982	2,807	4,982	2,807

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	476		476		2,274	
NORTH LAS VEGAS WATER REUSE					3,000	
NEW MEXICO						
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER & RECLAMATION REUSE					2,770	
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,031	1,604	2,031	1,604	2,031	2,804
CHIMAYO, NM					2,000	
EASTERN NEW MEXICO WATER SUPPLY					500	
EASTERN NEW MEXICO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMS	50		50		50	
JICARILLA APACHE RESERVATION RURAL WATER SYSTEM			500			
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	15,470	8,290	15,470	8,290	23,980	15,520
NAVAJO GALLUP WATER SUPPLY					500	
NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	50		50		50	
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT		189		189		189
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	960	3,564	960	3,564	960	3,564
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	149		149		149	
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	179		179		179	
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	23	13	23	13	23	13
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS	99		99		99	
NORTH DAKOTA						
DAKOTAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	378		378		378	
DAKOTAS TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM						
LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT	30	64	30	64	30	64
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT	19,255	4,966	20,255	4,966	24,255	4,966
OKLAHOMA						
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	37	151	37	151	37	151
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	26	545	26	545	26	545
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	6	370	6	370	6	370
NORMAN PROJECT	12	332	12	332	12	332
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	25		775		25	

WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	10	1,187	10	1,187	10	1,187
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	7	425	7	425	7	425
OREGON						
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	433	508	433	508	433	508
DESCHUTES PROJECT	330	231	330	231	330	231
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	662	364	662	364	662	364
KLAMATH PROJECT	23,504	1,246	23,504	1,246	23,504	1,246
MALHEYR, OWYHEE, POWDER,	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
BURNT RIVER BASIN FEASIBILITY ST	.....	.....	.....	.....	240	.....
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	389	.....	389	.....	389	.....
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	756	418	756	418	756	418
SAVAGE RAPIDS DAM REMOVAL	13,000	.....	13,000	.....	13,000	.....
TUALATIN PROJECT	165	216	165	216	165	216
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY PROJECT	.....	.....	280	.....	280	.....
UMATILLA PROJECT	721	3,006	721	3,006	721	3,006
SOUTH DAKOTA						
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	21,000	.....	22,000	.....	23,500	.....
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	.....	15	.....	15	.....	.....
MNI WICONI PROJECT	22,914	9,256	22,914	9,256	23,914	9,256
PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER DISTRICT	.....	.....	1,250	.....	1,000	.....
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM	.....	54	.....	54	.....	54
TEXAS						
BALMORHEA PROJECT	26	16	26	16	26	16
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	68	87	68	87	68	87
DALLAS TRINITY WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	.....	.....	.....	.....	205	.....
LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES	50	.....	50	.....	2,000	.....
NUECES RIVER	27	488	27	488	27	488
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	6	367	6	367	6	367
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	204	.....	204	.....	204	.....
WILLIAMSON COUNTY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	.....	.....	750	.....	.....	.....
UTAH						
HYRUM PROJECT	122	29	122	29	122	29
MOON LAKE PROJECT	3	29	3	29	3	29
NEWTON PROJECT	55	25	55	25	55	25
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	74	.....	74	.....	274	.....
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	199	70	199	70	199	70

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
PARK CITY FEASIBILITY STUDY	.....	.....	200	.....	200	.....
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	798	321	798	321	798	321
SCOFIELD PROJECT	72	33	72	33	72	33
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	149	.....	149	.....	149	.....
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	199	14	199	14	199	14
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,121	406	1,121	406	1,121	406
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	46	66	46	66	46	66
WASHINGTON						
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	4,050	6,104	4,050	6,104	4,050	6,104
MAKAH INDIAN COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	.....	.....	200	.....	200	.....
STORAGE DAM FISH PASSAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY	693	.....	693	.....	693	.....
WASHINGTON AREA PROJECTS	104	5	104	5	104	5
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	352	.....	352	.....	952	.....
YAKIMA PROJECT	2,267	6,890	2,267	6,890	2,267	6,890
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	11,484	.....	9,484	.....	11,484	.....
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER STORAGE	.....	.....	2,500	.....	2,000	.....
WYOMING						
KENDRICK PROJECT	109	4,265	109	4,265	109	4,265
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	328	2,446	328	2,446	328	2,446
SHOSHONE PROJECT	89	733	89	733	89	733
WYOMING INVESTIGATION PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
VARIOUS						
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I	.....	10,566	.....	10,566	.....	10,566
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II	8,910	.....	8,910	.....	8,910	.....
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5	2,455	3,291	2,455	3,291	2,455	3,291
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8	4,455	.....	4,455	.....	4,455	.....
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	401	.....	401	.....	401	.....
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:						
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,485	.....	1,485	.....	1,485

INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	.....	49,203	.....	49,203	.....	47,203
SAFETY OF EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	.....	18,315	.....	18,315	.....	18,315
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE	475	.....	475	.....	475	.....
EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	.....	1,346	.....	1,346	.....	1,346
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	11,299	.....	10,190	.....	11,299	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,695	.....	1,695	.....	1,695	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	836	.....	836	.....	836	.....
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	15	6,083	15	6,083	15	6,083
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,559	.....	1,559	.....	1,559
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	1,986	.....	1,466	.....	1,986	.....
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	8,461	.....	8,461	.....	8,461	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	297	.....	297	.....	297	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	17,028	.....	17,028	.....	17,028	.....
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	.....	653	.....	653	.....	653
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	6,307	.....	6,307	.....	6,307	.....
NATURAL RESOURCES DAMAGE ASSESSMENT	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,492	.....	1,492	.....	1,492	.....
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	.....	1,176	.....	1,176	.....	1,176
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN—OTHER PROJECTS	4,150	37,700	4,150	37,700	4,150	37,700
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	719	212	719	212	719	212
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	624	147	624	147	624	147
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	1,965	.....	1,965	.....	1,965	.....
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT—TITLE XXVIII	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,201	.....	1,201	.....	1,201	.....
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	25	.....	25	.....	7,025	.....
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	8,514	.....	8,514	.....	10,764	.....
SITE SECURITY	.....	39,600	.....	39,600	.....	39,600
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	1,832	.....	832	.....	1,832	.....
TITLE XVI, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	990	.....	990	.....	4,740	.....
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECHNICAL SUPPORT	89	.....	89	.....	89	.....
WATER CONSERVATION FIELD SERVICE PROGRAM [1]	7,221	.....	7,221	.....	8,421	.....
WATER 2025	14,500	.....	.....	.....	14,500	.....
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	.....	.....	.....	.....	−35,000	−3,664
RESCISSION—Public Law 109–148	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	456,526	376,898	471,724	376,898	509,345	379,649
GRAND TOTAL	833,424	.....	849,122	.....	888,994	.....

[1] Starting in fiscal year 2006 the new line item combines two previous line items: Efficiency Incentives Program and Water Management Conservation Program.

Central Arizona Project, Colorado River Basin.—The Committee recommendation includes $600,000 for activities related to the Gila River Settlement in New Mexico.

Central Valley Project—Sacramento River Division.—The Committee recommendation includes $450,000 for the Colusa Basin Intergrated Resources Management Plan.

Miscellaneous Project Programs.—An additional $1,500,000 above the budget request is provided for the Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Program, $735,000 of which shall be made available for a cooperative agreement or agreements with the Northern California Water Association to be provided to the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District for continued work on the Stony Creek Fan Conjunctive Water Management Program, $240,000 of which shall be available in the same manner for the Sacramento Valley Conjunctive Water Management Technical Investigation to be provided to the Stony Creek Fan Partnership and the Natural Heritage Institute, and $525,000 of which shall be made available in the same manner for the Lower Tuscan Formation Aquifer System Recharge Investigation and Environmental Monitoring Program to be provided to the counties of Butte and Tehama, California.

Trinity River Division.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 above the budget request to accelerate implementation of the Trinity River Restoration Program.

Animas-La Plata, Colorado.—The Committee has provided $65,000,000 for construction of this project.

Fort Peck, Dry Prairie Rural Water System, Montana.—The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for continued construction of the project.

Carlsbad Project, New Mexico.—$200,000 is provided above the request for rehabilitation of the radial gates at Sumner Dam. $1,000,000 is provided 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.

Chimayo, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 to continue this project.

Middle Rio Grande Project, New Mexico.—The Committee recommendation includes $39,500,000 for the Middle Rio Grande project, $23,980,000 for Resources Management and $15,520,000 for Operations, Maintenance and Replacements. Within the $23,980,000 for Resources Management, the Committee includes $14,980,000 for the Collaborative Program; $5,000,000 for water acquisition for the Collaborative Program; $1,000,000 to be transferred to the USGS for stream gages for the Collaborative Program; $1,000,000 for continued refinements to the Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model; and $2,000,000 for the Silvery Minnow off-channel sanctuaries. Within the $15,520,000 for Operations, Maintenance and Replacements, the Committee includes $14,770,000 for Operations and Maintenance; $250,000 for an integrated management plan; and $500,000 to evaluate a conservation pool.

The Committee is concerned with the significant amount of funds spent by the Bureau of Reclamation on the administration of the

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program. The Committee directs the Secretary of Interior to undertake a study of the administrative costs associated with the Bureau of Reclamation's administration of the program and opportunities to increase the percentage of funds that are spent to comply with the 2003 Biological Opinion referenced in section 205(b) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 2949) as amended by section 121(b) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–103; 119 Stat. 2256).

Deschutes Ecosystem Restoration Project, Oregon.—The Committee is supportive of this program, however the authorization has expired. The Committee is unable to provide funds for an unauthorized program.

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

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

Washington Investigations Program, Washington.—The Committee has provided $952,000 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.—In the fiscal year 2006 conference report (House Report 109–275), the conferees expressed their concern that the Bureau of Reclamation was making excess releases of approximately 100,000 acre-feet of water per year from storage in Colorado River reservoirs to help meet the United States' Colorado River water quality obligations to Mexico. The excess releases are being made because Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District's agricultural return flows—that bypass the Colorado River and are discharged to the Cienega de Santa Clara in Mexico (bypass flows)—are not counted as part of the 1.5 million acre-feet of water that the United States is required to deliver annually to Mexico. Because the bypass flows are not counted, system storage from the Colorado River has been used to make up for the bypass flows. The Yuma Desalting Plant was originally constructed to treat the flows and return a portion of them to the river, thus reducing excess releases from Colorado River reservoirs.

The current drought and projected long-term water demands have heightened concern about this demand on the river system. Consequently, in fiscal year 2006, the conferees indicated their support for Reclamation's ongoing public process to address this complex hydrologic problem, considering various methods of recovering or replacing the flows, including options that address potential impacts to wetlands in the Cienega de Santa Clara. This Committee encourages Reclamation to continue this stakeholder process. In fiscal year 2006, the conferees also directed the Bureau of Reclamation to dedicate sufficient resources to the Yuma Desalting Plant so that one-third operational capacity may be achieved by the end of calendar year 2006. To date, the plant is not one-third operational, and the Committee is concerned that it will not be one-

third operational by the end of calendar year 2006. Accordingly, the Committee, once again, directs the Bureau of Reclamation, within the funds provided for the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, title I, to dedicate sufficient funds to the Yuma Desalting Plant so that one-third operational capacity may be achieved by the end of calendar year 2006. The Bureau of Reclamation is also directed to provide the Committee with a status report of the plant's operational status by no later than March 1, 2007. If the plant is not one-third operational by the end of calendar year 2006, the report shall include an explanation as to why the Bureau of Reclamation has failed to comply with the Committee's directive.

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

Research and Development, Desalination Research and Development Program.—The Committee has provided $7,025,000 for this program. The Bureau of Reclamation is directed to develop a cooperative agreement with New Mexico State University under which Bureau transfers operations and maintenance of the Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Facility and transfers the administration of research activities undertaken at the Tularosa Facility to New Mexico State University following the completion of construction of the Tularosa Facility by the Bureau. Title to the facility shall remain in the United States.

Of the funds provided, $4,000,000 is provided to New Mexico State University of which $1,600,000 is provided for operations and maintenance of the newly constructed Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Facility and $1,300,000 is provided to New Mexico State University for research activities undertaken at or associated with the Tularosa Facility.

An amount of $3,000,000 is provided to New Mexico State University to undertake a research program for development and commercialization of water treatment technology in collaboration with Federal agencies, State agencies, local agencies, industry, other educational institutions or other water research entities New Mexico State University deems necessary to carry out the program. New Mexico State University may enter into any cost-sharing agreements, grants, contracts or any other agreements necessary to carry out the program.

Research and Development, Science and Technology Program.—$10,764,000 is provided for this program. Within the funds provided, $250,000 is provided to initiate a salt cedar management demonstration on the Canadian River. $1,000,000 is provided to further a salt cedar management demonstration on the Rio Grande River. $1,000,000 is provided to further a salt cedar management demonstration on the Pecos River.

Title XVI, Water Reclamation and Reuse.—The Committee has provided $4,740,000 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. $500,000 is for Sandoval County, New Mexico, Desalination Project and $250,000 is for Rio Rancho Recycled Water and Groundwater Recharge, New Mexico.

Water Conservation Field Service Program.—The Committee has provided $8,421,000 for the Water Conservation Field Services Program. Within the amounts provided, $400,000 shall be allocated for urban water conservation projects identified through the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Innovative Conservation Program, including the California Friendly program for water conservation in new home construction; $100,000 shall be allocated for industrial water efficiency surveys to assess opportunities to conserve water in industrial water use; and $200,000 shall be allocated for weather based irrigation controller activities to pilot ways to speed distribution and acceptance of these landscape water efficiency devices. $500,000 shall be for the Elephant Butte Irrigation District for irrigation water efficiency improvements.

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 $14,500,000 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 $2,000,000 to provide for continued efficiency and water improvements related to the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District. 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.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2006	$52,219,000
Budget estimate, 2007	41,478,000
House allowance	41,478,000
Committee recommendation	41,478,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $41,478,000, 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, 2006	$36,630,000
Budget estimate, 2007	38,610,000
House allowance	40,110,000
Committee recommendation	38,610,000

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

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2006	$57,338,000
Budget estimate, 2007	58,069,000
House allowance	58,069,000
Committee recommendation	58,069,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is $58,069,000. This is the same as the budget request.

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

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

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

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

Section 204. The bill includes language concerning Water 2025.

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

Section 206. The bill includes language concerning the project at Las Vegas Wash and Lake Mead.

Section 207. The bill includes language concerning the Truckee River Settlement Act.

Section 208. The bill includes language regarding the All American Canal. Z10rept.007

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

EPACT IMPLEMENTATION

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 [EPACT] is a landmark piece of legislation which has begun to shape the future of America's energy policy while supporting the President's Advanced Energy Initiative through a wide variety of clean and economically feasible alternative energy sources. It is critical at this juncture that the United States decreases its dependence on foreign oil, and the Energy Policy Act lays out a tangible plan for action. Whether in the arena of ethanol, nuclear power, solar power, or clean vehicles, the Energy Policy Act has set the stage for a new wave of energy solutions.

A renewed focus on alternative sources of energy has the potential to benefit communities throughout the country. The Energy Policy Act has created an environment which has stimulated renewed interest in the construction of nuclear power plants. Already, companies have announced that they have identified reactor technology for more than 20 new sites. If built, these reactors will not only generate enough power for 15–19 million households, these plants will also create thousands of new jobs across the country without contributing to greenhouse gas emissions. Rural communities also have much to gain from the EPACT legislation. Investment in ethanol production will lead to the displacement of 2 billion barrels of foreign oil over the next 6 years and to the construction and expansion of ethanol plants in the rural United States. Additionally, this legislation encourages clean coal generation, a move that will bring about significant benefits to the environment and attention to an industry that has been and continues to be the major source of energy in America.

ASIA PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The Committee is unaware of the mission and goals of the recently developed Asian Pacific Partnership, as it is not described in the Department's budget justification, and the Committee has no direction by which to designate funding. The Committee understands that the administration has not requested additional funding for this initiative, but has "earmarked" funding within available funds. Nevertheless, the Committee understands this is a top priority for the administration. Therefore the Committee directs the Department to fund this activity in three parts and from within available funds. One-third is to be provided from the Office of Policy and International Affairs, one-third from the Office of Science, Biological and Environmental Research, Climate Change Research Account, and one-third from the Office of Energy Supply and Con-

servation, Wind Energy activities. Prior to submitting an official reprogramming request for the movement of these funds, the Department shall provide a report to support the justification of these activities and the impact this will have on the programs from which the Department has withdrawn funding.

This new partnership is directed to work in conjunction with the existing Clean Energy Techology Exports program in order to pursue project development, implementation assistance, and capacity building and to work with foreign governments, international financial insitutions, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations to establish the appropriate technology and investment frameworks and to improve governance practices in emerging markets around the world.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES [HBCUS]

The Department has a long history of supporting HBCUs. HBCUs receive support for research and development, fellowships, scholarships, internships, administrative infrastructure, and private sector partnerships. In recent years, departmental programs have established innovative multi-year programs to support various mission-focused programs. For example, in 2005 and 2006 the National Nuclear Security Administration within the Department established partnerships with HBCUs to advance its national security and nonproliferation missions. In 2007, the Department should broaden its HBCU support to include each departmental programmatic area, not just the NNSA. The Department's mission includes activities where the HBCUs can be brought into the energy supply and conservation, nuclear security, and science based programs, which would represent a well-rounded program supported by key DOE programs to further the Department's mission. The Department should also consider initiating a similar program with Hispanic-serving Institutions. The Committee directs the Department to provide $2,000,000 for the Jackson State University Bioengineering Research Training Complex and $2,000,000 for the Morehouse College National Nuclear Security Administration Research and Education Project.

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT [LDRD]

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

ergy security. LDRD investments have been effective in providing solutions for today's energy problems and demonstrate the inherent flexibility of the program to provide national security mission support on a very timely basis. Energy research needs can best be addressed by continuing a vibrant LDRD program at the national labs.

The laboratories work in close partnership with DOE/NNSA to ensure that the LDRD projects are providing strong support for national security missions, which is the primary focus of our laboratories. Because of the fundamental nature of R&D, LDRD provides multiple benefits to the taxpayer across multiple national security missions. For example, R&D in high energy density physics [HEDP] is directly relevant to the R&D needs of the nuclear weapons program, but it also has the potential to support DOE's long-term energy security goal of controlled nuclear fusion as a cheap and reliable energy source. Similarly, LDRD projects that develop the tools to synthesize, characterize, and understand novel materials for nuclear weapons systems also have shown promise for the development of fuel cell membranes. Because of LDRD projects' multiple benefits, taxpayers obtain a greater return on their tax dollar investment. Furthermore, this is an indicator of a successful R&D program that continues to refocus on and provide solutions for the national security challenges facing our Nation.

Reprogramming Guidelines

The Committee requires the Department to promptly and fully inform the Committee when a change in program execution or funding is required during the fiscal year. A reprogramming includes the reallocation of funds from one activity to another within an appropriation, or any significant departure from a program, project, or activity described in the agency's budget justification, 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 2007, unless specifically identified in the House, Senate, or conference reports. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year de-obligations must be submitted to the Committees in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2006	$1,173,843,000
Budget estimate, 2007	1,176,421,000
House allowance	1,319,434,000
Committee recommendation	1,385,504,000

The Committee recommendation provides $1,410,254,000 for renewable energy resources, an increase of $211,660,000 from the current year level. Within the funds provided, $4,000,000 is for the National Center on Energy Management and Building Technologies and $3,000,000 for the UNR Renewable Energy Center for Geothermal Energy and Hydrogen.

Hydrogen.—The Committee recommends $189,860,000, an increase of $34,233,000 above current year levels. The President's budget also provides additional R&D support to the hydrogen program through the Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Energy, and Fossil Energy for a total of just under $290,000,000 in fiscal year 2007. The full benefits of a hydrogen economy will be realized when we are able to generate hydrogen from renewable sources and nuclear energy. At present, our hydrogen economy remains far too reliant on natural gas. The Committee recommends full funding for Technology Validation at $39,566,000, which combines infrastructure and vehicle validation accounts from the fiscal year 2006, as proposed by the President. 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 Department requires extensive data collection and sharing that will be used to help advance this technology toward commercialization. The program requires full cost sharing. The Committee recommends an increased investment into Hydrogen Storage R&D and provides $40,000,000 to advance this critical research through the Hydrogen Centers of Excellence. Consistent with the energy and water conference report for fiscal year 2006 and the recommendation from the National Academies, no funding is provided to support Distributed Energy Fuel Cell Systems, as this technology is already fully commercialized. The Committee provides $13,848,000 for Safety Codes and Standards and Hydrogen Education Activities. The Committee recommends $9,892,000 for Systems Analysis, which represents an increase of $4,925,000 above current year levels. The Committee directs the Department to provide $1,978,000 for Manufacturing R&D activities from within the funds provided for Systems Analysis.

Within available funds, $4,000,000 is provided for the UNLV Research Foundation to continue evaluation of solar-powered thermochemical production of hydrogen; $3,500,000 is for the UNLV Research Foundation for hydrogen fuel cell and storage research and development; $2,500,000 for the National Center for Hydrogen Technology; $500,000 for Michigan Technical University fuel cell research; and $3,400,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation to continue development of photovoltaic high pressure integrated electrolysis.

Biomass.—The Committee strongly endorses the President's commitment to decreasing our reliance on foreign oil and has made an

investment in biomass research and development commensurate with that goal. The President has set an ambitious goal of 100 billion gallons of ethanol production by 2025. This equals one-half of our domestic gasoline consumption today. Consistent with the goals of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the Committee recognizes an increased investment in demonstrating first-of-its-kind technology to develop the refining and production technologies that will lead to commercial deployment of cellulosic biomass ethanol production facilities. The Committee recommends $213,000,000, an increase of $63,313,000 above the President's request. The Committee provides the authorized level of funding as provided in EPACT. The Committee recommends $50,000,000 for the Integration of Biorefinery Technologies program to support deployment of several pilot scale demonstrations using a variety of feed stocks in order to promote a competitive cellulosic biofuels industry. The Department shall use a combination of competitive grants and loan guarantees as provided in section 17 of EPACT to support the deployment consistent with the goals of section 932(d) of EPACT. The Secretary shall consider the following projects as part of the open competition:

—Florida Farm to Fuel Project, Florida;
—Biorefinery and Hydrogen Fuel Cell Research, Development and Demonstration, Georgia;
—Expanding Unique Plant Production for Alternative Energy, Idaho;
—Chemistry Consortium Biomass Initiative, Maine;
—Minnesota Center for Renewable Energy Research, Minnesota;
—Center for Applied Biofuel Research, Minnesota;
—Laurentian Bioenergy Project, Minnesota;
—Biological and Economic Feasability Analysis of Wood Waste to Energy, Missouri;
—Ohio University—Biorefining for Energy Security, Ohio;
—Biodiesel Injection Blending Facilities Project, Pennsylvania;
—Messiah College Bio-Diesel Production Center, Pennsylvania.
—City of Stamford Waste-to-Energy Project, Connecticut;
—University of Connecticut Bio-Energy Project to Meet the Renewable Energy needs of Connecticut, Connecticut;
—Development of Applied Membrane Technology for Processing Ethanol from Biomass, Delaware;
—Chariton Valley Biomass Power for Rural Development Project, Iowa;
—Bio-Waste to Bio-Energy Project at SUNY Cobleskill, New York;
—Center for Bioproducts and Bioenergy, Washington;
—Snohomish County Biodiesiel Initiative, Washington
—Small Wood Biomass Project, Washington;
—Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe Energy Project, Nevada;
—North Spring Valley Pinyon Juniper Biomass Project, Nevada;
—UNR Renewable Energy Center Biofuels Project, Nevada;
—Aberdeen Biorefinery and ethanol production, Mississippi; and
—National Com-to-Ethanol Research Center project, Illinois.

Feedstock Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends an additional $13,000,000 to support demonstration activities within the Feedstock Infrastructure account. Within the additional funds pro-

vided, $10,000,000 is provided to the Sustainable Energy Center, Mississippi. The Committee also supports the Department's investment in research and development for a variety of cellulosic feed stocks that will encourage regional fuel supply diversity as provided in section 945 of the Energy Policy Act. The Committee directs the Department to provide $3,000,000 to designate several universities in different regions across the country as "Department of Energy Biomass Centers of Excellence". These centers will recommend a cellulosic biomass fuel strategy that identifies the variety of regionally available cellulosic feed stocks and develops a strategy for the collection, pretreatment, hydrolysis and fermentation process using regionally available material. These centers will recommend any additional research necessary to support the use of regional, sustainable feedstocks for the conversion of that material into cellulosic ethanol and biodiesel feedstock including using brackish water.

Provided within the budget request, within the Feedstock Infrastructure subprogram, is $4,500,000 to work with the Department of Agriculture on biomass feedstock. The Committee directs that the $4,500,000 be allocated among the Sun Grant Initiative Centers (identified in section 9011, of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8190)) to work in collaboration with the Department of Energy, on consultation with the USDA, to facilitate regional feedstock development.

The Committee understands the Department intends to pursue a new solicitation for biomass research. However, the Committee strongly recommends that the Department complete unfinished or ongoing competitively awarded research to the greatest extent possible before funding new biorefineries. In addition, the Committee urges the Department to focus on supporting the production of cellulosic ethanol to reduce our need for foreign oil. The Committee is aware the Department solicited input on implementation of reverse auction incentives. The Committee directs the Department to make recommendations on the implementation of section 942 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The Department shall provide this report to Congress concurrent with the President's budget submission for fiscal year 2008. Within available funds, $4,000,000 is provided to the Consortium for Plant Biomass Consortium Research and $500,000 for the Washington State University Bioproducts and Bioenergy project. The Committee supports the budget request for biomass-related activities at PNNL.

Solar.—The Committee applauds the efforts by the President to diversify our energy supply and minimize the generation of greenhouse gas emissions as part of his Advanced Energy Initiative. To that end, the President has recommended a significant funding increase in solar energy research as part of the Solar America Initiative. The Committee recommends $2,400,000 in support for the Southwestern Regional Photovoltaic Experimental Station.

The Committee recommends $148,372,000 for the Solar America Initiative. The Committee provides $130,472,000 for Photovoltaic Energy Systems. The Committee wants to ensure that the Department continues its support of a balanced research program that focuses not only on major system breakthroughs, but will support R&D efforts to improve the manufacture, reliability and cost-effec-

tiveness of solar technology components and balance-of-systems through which breakthroughs are likely to come from smaller corporations. Within available funds, $5,000,000 is provided for solar heating and lighting. The Committee is concerned that funding for the solar water heater program was eliminated and directs the Department to prepare a report, by January 31, 2007, on the potential energy savings generated by solar water heaters, market impediments, and strategy for wider deployment of this technology.

The Committee is concerned about the increasing cost of silicon feedstock, the raw material used in photovoltaic cells. Material costs have risen with the increasing demand for computer chips and photovoltaic cells. The Committee urges the Department to support research into solar technology that uses materials other than silicon as a hedge against rising material costs. The Committee directs the Department to provide a study to the Committee by March 31, 2007, on the short- and long-term market conditions of silicone and possible impacts it could have on the photovoltaic market.

The Committee recommends $17,900,000 for concentrating solar research and development. Within the available funding for the Concentrating Solar Power program, the Committee recommends that $9,000,000 be used in cooperation with the Office of Nuclear Energy to support the deployment of a solar-hydrogen pilot plant using sulfur based thermo-chemical process consistent with sections 812, 934, and 974 of the Energy Policy Act. Without a reactor available to support the nuclear hydrogen program, the Office of Nuclear Energy can utilize the National Thermal Test Facility as a suitable proxy for a high temperature reactor at this stage of research. The Committee recommendation includes $3,500,000 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; $4,000,000 is provided for research and development into advanced thermal management systems designed for, and integrated into, high efficiency photovoltaic collector modules.

The Committee directs that the funding of a 1 megawatt dish sterling demonstration facility can only be used to support the deployment in New Mexico.

Wind.—The Committee recommends $39,428,000 a reduction of $4,391,000 below the budget request. The Committee has shifted the funding to the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability to support the interconnection of wind, solar and other renewable and distributed sources of electricity consistent with the Senate and conference report for fiscal year 2006. As such, the Committee provides no funding in the System Integration Account. In addition, the Committee recommends no funding for the distributed wind technology accounts, of which the Department only allocated $481,000. The Committee does not believe this level of funding will support meaningful long-term research. Instead, the Department should focus its efforts within the Technology Acceptance program to support deployment in areas of the country where wind energy can compete in a competitive marketplace and can make the biggest impact in displacing natural gas and coal usage. By March 2007, the Committee requests that the Office of Energy Effi-

ciency and Renewable Energy and the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability provide a report to Congress as to the location of the most promising wind resources and the best opportunities to integrate that power into the electric grid. The Department should also identify which States provide incentives for the deployment of wind or other renewable energy resources.

The Committee encourages the Department to convene an interagency working group to promote renewable energy use and production in all aspects of Federal agency operation and particularly on Federal lands. In particular, such a working group would be valuable in avoiding the delays on a variety of wind energy projects that have been caused by inconsistent Federal policies and approval procedures and the slow pace of application of strategies and techniques to mitigate any adverse radar effects.

While the Committee strongly supports the research objective of the low wind speed technology program, which is to reduce the cost of electricity from large onshore and offshore wind systems, the Committee is concerned that the Department has not fully funded the competitively awarded 2 megawatt permanent magnet direct-drive [PMDD] wind turbine development program. Therefore, the Committee recommends that $2,400,000 be provided in fiscal year 2007 (as a competitive award) for continued development of the 2 megawatt PMDD wind turbine, which will eliminate the use of gearboxes, a main failure mechanism in current generation wind turbines.

Geothermal Energy.—The Committee recommends $22,500,000 for geothermal research and development.

Hydropower.—The Committee provides $4,000,000 to support research and development and a study of advanced hydropower technology, including ocean energy. The study shall provide an evaluation of the opportunities for development of these next generation technologies and the technical justification for such development. The study shall also evaluate the characteristics of the various regions in the United States so that likely candidates for demonstrating these technologies may be identified. The Committee would also benefit from knowing the electric generating potential and cost/kilowatt, as well as developing a better understanding of the regulatory issues and controlling legal authorities associated with the various technology. Finally, the Committee expects the Department to outline a thorough research and development roadmap and the possible role for the Department in supporting the R&D efforts. This report shall be delivered to the Committee by May 1, 2007.

Vehicles Technology.—The Committee recommends $180,024,000, an increase of $14,000,000. This program seeks to develop cars and trucks that are more energy-efficient in order to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Transportation needs consume over 50 percent of total U.S. oil consumption. The Committee recommends $109,724,000, as requested for FreedomCAR activities within this account. The Committee is encouraged by the President's support of hybrid and electric propulsion technologies, which support critical research into battery storage R&D and provides full funding for this activity. The Committee directs the Department to use the expertise in the Vehicles Technology and the Office of Electricity

Delivery and Energy Reliability to study possible impacts to the electricity supply and distribution networks if plug-in hybrids become commercially viable. The study should pay particular attention to urban areas, which are already transmission constrained and also the most likely market for plug-in hybrids. The study should also consider the net environmental demand as a result of shifting from gasoline consumption to electricity consumption. This report should be provided to the Congress by March 31, 2007.

The Committee continues to recognize 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.

The Committee provides $15,031,000, an increase of $3,000,000, for the Technology Introduction activity, including the Clean Cities activities that were previously funded in the weatherization account. For the Clean Cities program the Committee recommends $6,393,000, an additional $3,000,000, to encourage the expansion of alternative fuel and vehicle technology through competitive solicitation. The Committee recommends $10,000,000 to support Advanced Materials and Computer modeling at Mississippi State University; and $1,000,000 for the lightweight composite materials for heavy-duty vehicles program.

The Committee also recommends $4,534,000, an increase of $1,000,000 for the Testing and Evaluation program to support work with automakers to improve engine performance and increase fuel mileage for higher octane ethanol based fuels.

Buildings Technologies.—The Committee recommends $95,329,000, an increase of $26,063,000 to support technology deployment of increased energy efficiency technologies that can improve energy savings in the home and reduce the cost of operating lighting, heating and cooling, and electricity using energy efficient appliances in residential and commercial buildings. The Department has set a goal of achieving zero emission homes by 2020, using the most energy-efficient technology and applying state-of-the-art distributed renewable generation so as to achieve a net zero energy consumption. This goal is important, and the timetable by which the homebuilders across the country deploy the very best in energy saving technology should be accelerated by at least 5 years. Based on the administration's proposed reduction of the weatherization accounts, it is incumbent on the Department to improve home energy efficiency as soon as possible. By March 31, 2007, the Department shall provide the Committee a technology road map that will outline a strategy to accelerate the zero energy goals by 5 to 7 years. The Committee encourages the Department to support a Challenge X program for housing in the same manner as the Department supports technology development in the auto industry.

Within the Research and Development program, the Department should initiate design competitions in each of the five climate regions identified by the Department in which participants design a modest-sized home with the goal of demonstrating how the Department's Zero Emission House goal of 2020 can be accelerated by at least 5 years. The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for this activity. The Committee provides $5,000,000 to implement section 140 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to establish an Energy Efficiency Pilot Program.

The Committee recommends $27,000,000 for the solid state lighting program, an increase of $5,000,000. The Committee is encouraged by the potential to realize significant energy savings in the area. The Committee directs the Department to provide $5,000,000 to the competitively awarded National Center for Solid State Lighting consistent with funding provided in the current year. The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation for photonics research including evaluation of advanced fiber optics and LEDs.

Industrial Technologies.—The Committee recommends $47,563,000 for the Industries of the Future, an increase of $2,000,000 above the budget request. The mission of this program is to reduce the energy intensity of the U.S. industrial sector. The Committee recommends that from within available funds, $2,000,000 is provided to Sandia National Laboratories, in partnership with a computer chip manufacturer, to support research into energy efficiency applications that might decrease the amount of energy used by computer technology. In a recent study conducted for the Department of Energy, it was concluded that residential energy consumption has escalated dramatically, due to the use of home computers and other related technologies.

Federal Energy Management Program.—The Committee recommends $16,906,000, as requested. This program is intended to support the deployment of energy efficiency and renewable technology to U.S. Government buildings. The Department should lead by example within the Federal Government to demonstrate state-of-the-art technology deployment. The Committee notes that the PART score for program results and accountability were 50 percent in 2005. The Committee hopes that the Department can deliver stronger results.

Facilities Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends $5,935,000 for operations and maintenance costs and general infrastructure upgrades at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory.

Weatherization.—The Committee provides $204,550,000, an increase of $40,352,000, to support Weatherization and Intergovernmental Activities. This program provides critical assistance to encourage the use of energy efficient technology to reduce energy costs for low and moderate income families hit hardest by high energy costs.

The Committee provides $49,457,000 to the State Energy Program. The Committee also provides $2,473,000 for International Renewable Energy Program; $4,957,000 for Tribal Energy Activities, with $1,000,000 provided to the Council of Renewable Energy Resource Tribes [CERT]; and $4,946,000 for Renewable Energy Production Incentives.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation for Program Direction is $91,024,000. The Committee recommends the Department provide the necessary funding to support the Office of Loan Guarantees as authorized in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, be provided from within available funds.

Program Support.—The Committee recommendation for Program Support is $10,930,000.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION PROJECTS

Project name	Committee recommendation
Integrated Distribution Management System in Alabama [OE]	$1,000,000
Distributed energy systems for telecommunications applications in Kansas [OE]	1,500,000
University of Missouri Rolla Energy Research and Development Center [OE]	1,000,000
Load Control System Reliability, Montana [OE]	1,000,000
Hawaii/New Mexico Sustainable Energy Project [OE]	2,000,000
Dine Power Authority, New Mexico [OE]	1,000,000
National Center for Reliable Electric Power Transmission, Arkansas [OE]	400,000
Electric Power Surety Institute, New Mexico [OE]	200,000
Navajo Electrification Program, New Mexico [OE]	1,000,000
New York Polytechnic University [OE]	500,000
Nevada Energy Independence Partnership [OE]	500,000
Gerlach Green Energy Project, Nevada [OE]	400,000
Transportable Emissions Testing Laboratory, West Virginia [OE]	2,000,000
Eastern Michigan University Coatings Research Institute [OE]	400,000
The University of Louisville Sustainable Buildings Project, Kentucky (Buildings Tech)	400,000
Affordable, Energy Efficient Self-Help Housing, Mississippi (Buildings Tech)	300,000
University of Dubuque Environmental Science Center, Iowa (Buildings Tech)	500,000
Arts & Sciences Center at Quincy University, Illinois (Buildings Tech)	250,000
Green Shingle Initiative, Tennessee (Buildings Tech)	500,000
Improved Materials for Fuel Cell Membranes at USM, Mississippi (Hydrogen)	500,000
University of Mississippi Bio-processing Research Center (Biomass)	1,500,000
Cooling, Heating, and Power [CHP] at MSU, Mississippi (Biomass)	2,000,000
Mississippi Ethanol (Biomass)	1,000,000
Alternative Fuel for Cement Processing, Alabama (Biomass)	1,000,000
The Kentucky Rural Energy Consortium (Biomass)	1,000,000
Trees and Waste Wood to Energy in Missouri (Biomass)	400,000
Biodiesel Injection Blending Facilities Project, Pennsylvania (Biomass)	1,000,000
Foster Glocester School District Biomass Project, Rhode Island (Biomass)	1,000,000
Sugar Ethanol Research at the University of Florida/Earth University (Biomass)	250,000
National Ag-Based Industrial Lubricants Center at the University of Northern Iowa (Biomass)	400,000
Pecos Valley Biomass Cooperative, New Mexico (Biomass)	250,000
Michigan Biotechnology Initiative (Biomass)	500,000
Vermont Biomass Energy Resource Center (Biomass)	400,000
Oxydiesel Demonstration, Nevada (Biomass)	400,000
UNLV Research Foundation continued development of biofuels utilizing ionic transfer membranes, Nevada (Biomass)	2,000,000
Biomass Research through Thermal Gasification Technology Project, Nevada (Biomass)	450,000
Chatauqua County, New York Landfill at Ellery (Biomass)	500,000
Demonstration of Plug-In Hybrid Vehicles, Kansas (Vehicles Tech)	1,000,000
Southern Regional Center for Lightweight Innovative Design, Mississippi (Vehicles Tech)	2,100,000
Engine Turbocharger Research, Montana (Vehicles Tech)	1,000,000
Biodiesel Engine Testing Program, Missouri (Vehicles Tech)	1,500,000
National Ethanol Vehicle Coaltion: E-85 Fueling Infrastructure in Montana (Clean Cities)	250,000
Solar to Biofuels Research Program at USU, Utah (Solar)	1,000,000
High Efficiency Cascade Solar Cells, New Mexico (Solar)	1,500,000
Stirling Demonstration Concentrating Solar Program, New Mexico (Solar)	3,500,000
NCSU Nanostructures for Energy, North Carolina (Solar)	250,000
Ohlone College Energy Innovation & Conservation, California (Solar)	250,000
Tonopah Green Energy Feasibility Study, Nevada (Solar)	400,000
Texas Tech University Great Plains Wind Power Test Facility (Wind)	1,500,000
Renewable Energy for Rural Economic Development Program, Utah (Wind)	500,000
Emissions Reduction Technologies related to megawatt-scale solid oxide fuel cells, Ohio (Hydrogen)	500,000
University of Tennessee, Chattanooga Fuel Cell Reliability study (Hydrogen)	500,000

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION PROJECTS—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Hydrogen Fuel Cell Bus Project, Washoe County, RTC, Nevada (Hydrogen)	2,500,000
UNLV Research Foundation Photoelectric Chemical Production of Hydrogen, Nevada (Hydrogen)	2,500,000
Des Moines Hydrogen Fleet Vehicle Demonstration, Iowa (Hydrogen)	250,000
National Center for Manufacturing Technologies, Michigan (Hydrogen)	400,000
Portland State University Science and Technology Center, Oregon (Hydrogen)	400,000
Hydrogen and Alkane Generation from Biomass Derived Carbohydrates, Wisconsin (Hydrogen)	400,000

OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

Appropriations, 2006	$161,878,000
Budget estimate, 2007	124,928,000
House allowance	144,028,000
Committee recommendation	135,004,000

The Committee recognizes the hard work by staff of the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability following Hurricane Katrina. This Office worked to coordinate the Federal Government's energy supply response to restore electricity and pipeline capacity for natural gas and gasoline as quickly as possible to ensure rescue and recovery efforts could proceed unimpeded. In addition to responding during emergencies, this Office supports fundamental R&D activities to increase the efficiency, reliability and security of our electricity grid and to minimize impacts during energy loss or operational disturbances.

This Office has also been charged with the implementation of several provisions in the Energy Policy Act 2005, to encourage the identification and designation of energy corridors that would help improve the reliability and capacity of our national energy infrastructure. This Office also has the expertise to lead the Department's technology deployment of renewable technology including wind and various distributed energy sources.

The Committee directs the Department to provide this Office with the full responsibility to work at the local, State, and Federal level to define constructive standards and policies that are technically sound to support the effective integration of renewable and distributed technology into the electricity grid. The Committee strongly urges the Department to heed this advice for fiscal year 2007 and beyond. The Committee recommendation also includes $4,500,000 for research and development of thermal and electrical components specific to micro-grid systems and for optimizing the integration of components of such systems.

The Committee recommendation is $135,004,000, an increase of $10,076,000 above the budget request. The Committee provides $105,636,000 for Research and Development activities, including $45,468,000 for Superconductivity R&D and $27,551,000 for Visualization Controls, as requested in the budget. The Committee appreciates the fact that this Office has developed a SCADA roadmap to prioritize critical research and industry standardization. The Committee recommends $10,000,000 to support continued research and development into the SCADA systems R&D to be divided equally between Sandia and Idaho National laboratories, consistent with current year levels. The Committee encourages the Department to continue its efforts at the Integrated Energy Operations Center at

PNNL. The Committee provides $5,000,000, within available funds, at the National Energy Technology Laboratory associated with electricity transmission, distribution, and energy assurance activities.

The Committee recommends $17,000,000, an increase of $4,991,000, for Operations and Analysis. This funding is provided for Permitting, Siting, and Analysis. These funds were transferred from the Wind Energy Office to coordinate renewable energy integration with the electricity system.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2006	$535,660,000
Budget estimate, 2007	632,698,000
House allowance	499,805,000
Committee recommendation	711,285,000

The Committee recommendation for the Office of Nuclear Energy is $711,285,000, an increase of $151,533,000 above the request.

Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.—The Committee recognizes and appreciates the considerable investment this administration has made in this area and supports efforts to close the nuclear fuel cycle. It is imperative that the Federal Government support long-term research to discover ways to reduce the amount of nuclear waste and recycle the vast amount of untapped energy that remains in the current once-through nuclear fuel cycle. Faced with the reality of long-term storage needs and the fact that our Nation is unlikely to permit and license more than one permanent repository, our best alternative is to vastly reduce the amount of waste, the heat content, and the radiotoxicity of the spent fuel before permanent disposal. The President has proposed the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership as a multi-pronged technical approach to close the nuclear fuel cycle and encourage the recycling of uranium and destruction of long-lived actinides through advanced reactor technology. The budget supports the development of recycling technologies that have the opportunity to enhance the proliferation resistance of existing recycling or separation technologies. By utilizing the proposed UREX approach, scientists will not separate pure plutonium. The Committee expects the Department to continue to fully integrate proliferation resistant controls within the recycling technology. The Committee has provided additional funding within the National Nuclear Security Administration, Office of Nuclear Nonproliferation to support long-term research and deployment of improved nuclear safeguards to enhance proliferation resistance and to allow for the safe expansion of nuclear power. The Committee encourages the Department to involve private industry in the GNEP program through competitive grants.

University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support.—From within available funds provided to the NERI program, the Committee recommends $10,000,000 to support fuels research for the Next Generation Nuclear Reactor. The Committee is disappointed the Department has eliminated funding for this program without warning. Universities depend on technical support from the Department, and the nuclear industry relies on the Universities to provide academic training to the next generation of nuclear scientists, reactor operators, and experts trained in health physics. The Committee is

pleased with the success this program has had thus far and recognizes that a more modest level of funding is appropriate. The Committee supports this activity again this year and directs the Department to provide $27,000,000 to support the University Reactor Infrastructure and Education Initiative that was eliminated in the fiscal year 2007 budget request and strongly encourages the administration to budget for these activities in fiscal year 2008.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy research and development includes a total of $446,655,000, an increase of $99,533,000.

Nuclear Power 2010.—The Committee has included $88,000,000, an increase of $33,969,000 to support the development license application for new nuclear power plant designs under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Combined Operating License [COL] process. The Committee believes this program is critical and has consistently provided additional funding to accelerate this effort in the past. The Committee understands the appetite for funding this program continues to grow beyond what the Department has budgeted and the level of funding the Committee can provide. It is clear that the original budget baselines were not sufficient and additional work is needed. Therefore, the Department must ensure that the limited Federal funds are applied in the most effective and useful fashion. The Department should focus funding on supporting the design and engineering work of the two reactors designs. The Department should also eliminate any unnecessary overhead charges incurred by the Department and its industry partners for this program. The Committee supports the Department's decision to contract directly with two reactor vendors to support a standardized nuclear plant design that can validate the untested regulatory licensing process. The Committee also has significant concerns with financial conduct of the industry consortium involved in the NP2010 program. The Committee expects that the Department work with its industry partners to instill fiscal discipline and ensure conformity to the Federal budget rules and standards.

Nuclear Hydrogen Initiative.—The Committee recommends $31,665,000 for nuclear hydrogen research and development, an increase of $9,000,000. The added funding will be matched with $9,000,000 from the Solar program to support the creation of a hydrogen pilot plant using a sulfur-based thermo chemical process coupled with the Department of Energy's National Solar Thermal Test Facility as the proxy for a high temperature nuclear reactor. Deployment of this pilot-scale demonstration by 2010 will accelerate the completion of a commercial scale facility by 2015, the date at which automakers are expected to make a decision on commercial deployment of hydrogen cars. This demonstration is also consistent with objectives established in sections 643, 812(a), 934 and 974 of the Energy Policy Act, 2005. The Committee recommendation also includes $5,000,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation to continue research and development of high temperature heat exchangers and chemical processing equipment to permit demonstration of nuclear-powered production of hydrogen from water.

Generation IV.—The recommendation includes $48,000,000 for the Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative. The Committee directs that within the available funds $40,000,000 be provided to support the Next Generation Nuclear Plant [NGNP]. This level of funding is consistent with funding in fiscal year 2006 and is $16,564,000 above the budget request. The increased level of funding is provided to support research on the Very High Temperature Reactor [VHTR] at Idaho National Lab. This technology, if developed, is the only reactor technology which supports the production of electricity and hydrogen. The increased funds shall be used to support fuels and material research and accelerate design activities necessary to develop a Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application. The Committee directs the Department to continue its efforts to work with the private sector in VHTR technology. The Committee directs the Department to provide a report as to how the Department of Energy is implementing subtitle C of EPACT 2005. The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 for completion of the IAC LCS upgrade.

Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative.—The Committee recommends $279,000,000, an increase of $36,000,000 above the budget request. The initiative should continue its focus on the technological underpinnings of the closed fuel cycle through a robust research and development program that includes the national laboratories, the university community, industries, and the international research community. The initiative should also continue to develop designs for the facilities necessary for demonstrating the technologies and the associated environmental analyses.

In working with the Department, the Committee has recommended significant changes to the budget priorities for GNEP to encourage increased research and development on fuels, separation, and transmutation research. The Committee encourages the Department to coordinate the fuels research within the Office of Nuclear Energy, including research of the Next Generation Nuclear Plant. Within the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative, the Committee provides $53,800,000 for separations technology, $60,000,000 for advanced fuels development, $25,000,000 for transmutation engineering, $35,000,000 for systems analysis. Within the initiative, the Committee provides $40,000,000 for design of an engineering scale demonstration of a spent fuel separations facility, which will provide feedstock of transuranic materials for remanufacture into reactor fuel and dispose of waste products; $10,000,000 for design of this advanced fuel cycle facility and the operational support for the separations facility and burner reactor facility; and $15,000,000 for design of an advanced burner reactor to be powered by transuranic fuel. In addition, the Committee recommends $10,000,000 to support the modernization of Wing 9 of the CMR facility, which contains hot cells capable of accommodating fuel fabrication for the GNEP program. The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for the material test station at Los Alamos to support materials and fuel experiments using fast neutron spectrum systems. Without the use of the Fast Flux Test Facility, the United States has lost its domestic fast neutron source needed to conduct actinide transmutation. The Committee provides $2,000,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation to extend fuel cycle studies to high temperature gas reac-

tors. Additionally, the Department is directed to enter into a 5 year cooperative agreement with the UNLV Research Foundation for these activities. Finally, the Committee provides $4,000,000 for the Center for Materials Reliability at the University of Nevada Reno.

The Committee instructs the Department not to support any further research with Russia or Russian entities until the Russian Federation and U.S. Government are able to come to an agreement on the disposal of 34 tons of Russian weapons-grade plutonium.

Advanced Fuel Cycle Facility.—The Committee supports the deployment of an engineering-design scale recycling facility to demonstrate the feasibility and technical capacity of a demonstration-scale advanced recycling facility. The Committee has provided direction in section 311 in the report to the Department to clarify the amount of spent nuclear fuel that can be used for the demonstration and requires that the material be removed from the site within 1 year, upon completion of the demonstration.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $67,608,000 in Program Direction, which includes $7,000,000 for the Federal and contractor staff to plan, implement, and manage the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative research, development, and demonstration activities.

CONSOLIDATION OF COMMERCIAL SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL

The Committee has included language to provide the Secretary with expanded authority to consolidate commercial spent nuclear fuel at a separate facility within a State or at a regional site. Section 313 of the bill section requires the Secretary of Energy to appoint a Director of Consolidation and Preparation. Within 180 days of enactment, the CAP Director is required to issue a report making recommendations to the Secretary regarding the siting of a facility for the consolidation and preparation of spent nuclear fuel ("AP facility") in each State containing a civilian nuclear power reactor. Within 90 days of the issuance of the report, the Secretary, in consultation with the Governor of each State containing a civilian nuclear power reactor shall designate a site for a CAP facility within that State. Recognizing that Governors can recommend sites, the Committee also believes that it is desirable for the Secretary, in selecting a site, to first consider sites recommended by the Governors.

The Secretary may determine that it is in the National interest to designate a regional CAP facility. No regional CAP facility may be designated in a State in which a State-wide CAP facility has previously been designated. The Committee believes it is desirable that States address their own waste needs and the Committee directs the Secretary to provide sufficient time for a State site to be designated and licensed before making a decision to designate a regional facility. A regional facility cannot be located in a State with a designated and licensed State site. Any site owned by the Federal Government, and any site that can be purchased from a willing seller may be designated as a CAP facility site. Nevada, as the State that has been designated as the site of the permanent repository is ineligible, along with any State in which a commercial, away-from-reactor, dry cask storage facility is authorized. Lands

within national parks, wildlife refuges, or wilderness areas are also ineligible.

The Secretary shall submit a license application to the NRC no later than 30 days after the designation of a CAP facility site. The license for a CAP facility shall be for a term of 25 years, and shall be non-renewable. The Secretary must submit an environmental report with the license application to the NRC. The NRC is required to issue an environmental impact statement in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 prior to issuing a license. Judicial review of the EIS will be consolidated with the review of the NRC's licensing decision. The NRC is required to grant or deny a license application for a CAP facility within 32 months.

In addition, at the request of the owner of a shut-down reactor, the Secretary of Energy (the "Secretary") is required to assume title to, and responsibility for, spent nuclear fuel at the site of the shut-down reactor.

The provisions of this section, along with the Secretary's obligation to develop a permanent repository under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, provide sufficient and independent grounds for further findings by the NRC that spent nuclear fuel will be disposed of safely for purposes of licensing civilian nuclear power reactors.

Finally, this section provides that the Secretary shall make expenditures from the Nuclear Waste Fund for the siting, construction and operation of CAP facilities. Funding for this activity is provided within the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management.

RADIOLOGICAL FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The purpose of the Radiological Facilities Management program is to maintain critical nuclear facilities in a safe, environmentally-compliant and cost-effective manner. The primary user is the Office of Nuclear Energy with facilities at Idaho, Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, Sandia, and Brookhaven National Laboratories. The Committee recommends $54,722,000 an increase of $5,000,000, for the Radiological Facilities Management program.

Space and Defense Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends $35,640,000, an increase of $5,000,000. The Committee recommends $12,200,000 to support activities at Idaho, $13,800,000 at Los Alamos, and $9,650,000 for Oak Ridge, including an additional $5,000,000 to upgrade hot cells. The Committee is aware of the fact that the Department has conducted its mid-term report to Congress on the relocation of the Nuclear Operations for Plutonium 238 activities, which found that the total cost of moving the purification, pelletization and encapsulation operations from Los Alamos to Idaho would cost $100,000,000 to $250,000,000 in relocation costs. The Committee appreciates the benefits that would be gained by consolidating the mission, but requires more information on the overall benefits to the program, including what new activities will replace the existing PU–238 mission within TA–55. The Committee directs the Department to provide a more detailed breakdown of the costs to transition this mission to Idaho by activity (i.e. transportation, security requirements and facility construction). In addi-

tion, the Department shall provide to the Congress options for replacing the PU–238 mission within TA–55. The Department shall provide this new analysis no later than March 31, 2008.

The Committee recommends $15,634,000, as requested for the medical isotopes infrastructure, $491,000 for Enrichment Facility Infrastructure, and $2,947,000 for the Research Reactor Infrastructure programs.

IDAHO FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends $115,290,000 to support nuclear power research and development at the Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee recommendation includes an increase in funding of $15,000,000 for planning, design and implementation of safety posture improvements at the Advanced Test Reactor at Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee recommends an additional $5,000,000 to support infrastructure upgrades at Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee also recommends $6,030,000, as requested, to support 06–E–200 Nuclear Energy Project Engineering and Design [PED].

IDAHO SITE-WIDE SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $75,949,000, consistent with the budget request and provided in 050 Defense Activity under the Other Defense Activities account.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

The Office of Environment, Safety, and Health is committed to ensuring that the safety and health of the Department of Energy workforce, the public, and the environment are integrated into activities throughout the Department. The Committee recommendation includes $19,993,000 for program direction, the amount of the budget request. The Committee has also provided $94,814,000 from Other Defense Activities.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee provides $33,139,000 for Energy Supply-related activities of the Office of Legacy Management, the same the budget request. Funds will be used to protect human health and the environment through efficient long-term surveillance and maintenance, to protect and make accessible legacy records and information, and to ensure contractor worker pension and medical benefits. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the completion of the Office of Legacy Management Records Management Facility.

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(INCLUDING DEFERRAL AND RECISSION)

The Committee recommends the deferral of $203,000,000 in clean coal technology funding until fiscal year 2008. The Committee recommends that the Department rescind $50,000,000 of prior year balances from excess contingency estimates in demonstration projects.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2006	$593,014,000
Budget estimate, 2007	469,686,000
House allowance	558,204,000
Committee recommendation	644,267,000

The Committee recommendation for Fossil Energy Research and Development is $644,267,000, an increase of $174,581,000 above the request.

The Committee is concerned with the reduction in the fossil energy research and development activities proposed as part of this budget. Last year, the Congress passed and the President signed the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This legislation provided for several incentives to support the deployment of clean coal technology that would provide reliable domestic energy supply and the potential to diversify our transportation fuel supply. The Department is challenged with developing new technology that will support the continued deployment of coal through affordable and environmentally-sound generating facilities, while creating opportunities for production of hydrogen or other coal to liquid technologies at an affordable cost. The Committee has provided additional funding to sustain technology development and to send a clear message to the administration that the Congress is serious about making a long-term investment in fossil energy. The Committee also recognizes much of the oil and gas research has been replaced by the Ultradeep program authorized in section 999 of EPACT 2005. The Committee still expects that this program will continue to support transfer of oil and gas technology to small producers to enhanced production technology development as directed in section 999A(b)(3). The Committee recognizes that EPACT provides 7.5 percent of the annual allocation of $50,000,000 provided from oil and gas lease income.

Clean Coal Power Initiative.—The Committee recommends $70,000,000. The Committee is frustrated by the remarkably low level of funding provided to this initiative which demonstrates advanced coal technologies including carbon capture, mercury control and other co-production opportunities. The budget only provided $4,957,000. The Committee is aware that not all of the previously awarded projects have been successfully developed for a variety of reasons, and available balances will not be used. The Department has identified one project that will not be able to spend the remaining balances of $50,000,000. The Committee directs the Department to rescind the available balances and apply that funding to the Clean Coal Power Initiatives for a future competitive award. In addition, the Committee provides an additional $20,000,000.

Combined with existing balances of $70,000,000 provided in the current year, the Department will have $140,000,000 to commit to the next CCPI solicitation.

FutureGen.—The Committee recommends $54,000,000 for the FutureGen program, as requested. The Committee understands and recognizes the value of FutureGen project. However, the Committee is concerned about maintaining adequate funding for the core fossil energy research, development, and demonstration programs, especially with the new programmatic demands of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The Committee will continue to give full consideration to the FutureGen project, contingent upon the admin-

istration maintaining adequate funding requests for other related fossil energy programs.

Fuels and Power Systems.—The Committee recommends $311,000,000 for fuels and power systems activity, an increase of $39,838,000. The recommendation includes $25,000,000 for Innovations for Existing Plants, including $10,000,000 to be provided to support research and development of ways to minimize the water usage at electric generating plants, with particular attention paid to problems of the desert Southwest. Within the available funds, $8,000,000 is provided to Sandia National Lab energy-water technology research program to support water reduction strategies for power plant operations. Within available funds, the Committee urges the National Environmental Technology Laboratory to work with the West Virginia University on an Advanced Energy/Water Management Initiative. The Committee recommends $54,000,000 for the Advanced Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle activities. The Committee recommends $90,000,000 for Carbon Sequestration activities, including $10,000,000 for Los Alamos National Lab to study the long term stability of deposited carbon dioxide in geological reservoirs and $6,000,000 is provided to the Zero Emissions Coal Research and Technology program. The Committee recommends $29,000,000 for Fuels, $63,000,000 for Fuel Cell Research and $30,000,000 for Advanced Research. Within available funds for advanced research, the Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 for the advanced metals for energy and industrial systems program, including $2,000,000 for West Virginia University. From within available funds, the Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the Center for Advanced Separation Technology [CAST], and $700,000 for West Virginia University to continue the long-term study of the environmental and economic impacts of the development of coal liquefaction in China. The Committee directs the Department to consider the potential for a demonstration program of coal to liquid low-rank coal water fuels produced from hydrothermal treatment of lignite and sub-bituminous coals in Choctaw County, Mississippi. The Committee directs the Department to consider coal to liquid technology to be located in Natchez, Mississippi for support under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

The Committee recommends, from within available funds $2,000,000 to complete research under the Ion Transportation Membrane Syngas Project.

United States/China Energy and Environmental Centers.—No funding is provided to support this activity.

Natural Gas Technology.—The Committee recommends $17,000,000 to support natural gas production from gas hydrates located in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico. Of this amount, $1,000,000 is to be provided to University of Mississippi to support gas hydrates research. From within available funds the Committee recommends $7,000,000 for the Arctic Energy Office.

Oil Technology.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000 to support oil technology research and development to reduce the cost of domestic unconventional resources including oil shale and tar sands extraction. The Committee recommends $1,500,000 to sup-

port the Risk Based Management System, a nationwide data base of oil and gas regulations and technology developments.

Program Direction.—The committee recommendation includes $142,396,000. The additional funds shall be provided to the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

Plant and Capital Equipment.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000 for plant and capital equipment, an increase of $12,000,000 above the budget request. Within these funds, $8,000,000 is for the infrastructure improvement program at the National Energy Technology Laboratory and $4,000,000 is for General Plant Projects.

Fossil Energy Environmental Restoration.—The Committee recommendation for fossil energy environmental restoration is $11,700,000, $2,000,000 above the request. The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the remediation of environmental issues at the Albany Research Center.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED FUELS AND POWER PROJECTS

Project name	Committee recommendation
Western State IGCC CO_2 Capture, Colorado	$1,850,000
Colorado Center for Sustainable Energy at Colorado School of Mines	1,000,000
University of Kentucky Coal-Derived Low Energy Materials for Sustainable Construction Project	1,000,000
High Temperature Electrochemistry Center, Montana	4,000,000
Contribution of the Petroleum Industry to the Montana Economy	150,000
Solid Oxide Fuel Cells, Pennsylvania	750,000
Heavy Oil Research at University of Utah	2,000,000
Mine of the Future, New Mexico	1,750,000
Hardin Generating Station Coal-Fired Power Plant Mercury Emission Control Demonstration project, Montana	1,000,000
Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Methane Conversion Project, Nevada	1,000,000
NOX Reduction Vehicle Project, Nevada	1,000,000

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

Appropriations, 2006	$21,285,000
Budget estimate, 2007	18,810,000
House allowance	18,810,000
Committee recommendation	39,810,000

The Committee recommends $39,810,000, an increase of $21,000,000 above the requested level. The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 to support the activities under the NPR/Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming program. Within the available funds, $4,169,000 is provided to support the Rocky Mountain Oil Technology Centers, $4,559,000 is recommended to support NPR–3, and $3,276,000 is provided to cover operational costs, including program direction, business management activities, and salaries.

Development of Oil Shale and Tar Sands.—The Committee recommends an increase of $10,000,000 above the budget estimate to initiate a program to accelerate the commercial development of oil shale and tar sands, as required in section 369 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and consistent with the recommendations from the Taskforce on Strategic Unconventional Fuels to support technology development and production from unconventional resources. Within the available funding $2,000,000 is provided to Los Alamos to support an investigation of basin-scale environmental impacts of in-

situ production methods for oil shale development. The Committee also includes $6,000,000 for the Energy and Environment Research Center/Western Research Institute.

ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND

Appropriations, 2006	$83,160,000
Budget estimate, 2007	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

The Committee requests no funds for the Elk Hills School Lands Fund for fiscal year 2007, consistent with the budget request. The State of California is to receive 9 percent of the net sales proceeds generated from the sale of Elk Hills. The level of future budget requests is dependent on the results of the equity finalization process.

The State of California maintains that they are due $9,000,000 under the Elk Hills program in fiscal year 2007. The Department disagrees. If this legal dispute is resolved prior to the completion of the conference report, this issue may be re-visited.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

Appropriations, 2006	$164,340,000
Budget estimate, 2007	155,430,000
House allowance	155,430,000
Committee recommendation	155,430,000

The Strategic Petroleum Reserve was created to reduce the economic impact of a major petroleum supply interruption to the United States and to carry obligations created by the international energy program. The Committee recommends $155,430,000 for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, consistent with the budget request.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

Appropriations, 2006	
Budget estimate, 2007	$4,950,000
House allowance	4,950,000
Committee recommendation	4,950,000

The Committee recommends $4,950,000 for the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve, the same as the President's request, for storage, operation, and management in case of severe energy supply interruption in the Northeast.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2006	$85,314,000
Budget estimate, 2007	89,769,000
House allowance	89,769,000
Committee recommendation	93,032,000

The Committee recommends $93,032,000, for the Energy Information Administration. The additional funds will be used to support improved data collection and research into gasoline markets and gasoline storage capacity, as well as ethanol-based renewable fuels markets. A recent external study team recommended that the EIA take precautions to protect the data stored on the EIA computer systems and protect against malicious use and unauthorized access. The Committee requests that the Department provide a re-

port to Congress on the precautions being taken to protect the market sensitive data and any needs related to upgrading the EIA computer facilities to provide the necessary precautions. This report is due to the Congress by March 1, 2008.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2006	$349,687,000
Budget estimate, 2007	310,358,000
House allowance	309,946,000
Committee recommendation	310,358,000

The Committee recommends $310,358,000, as requested by the President. The Committee recommendation includes $35,201,000 for the Paducah gaseous diffusion plant uranium conversion and stabilization activities and $72,215,000 for Portsmouth gaseous plants, including $32,700,000 for depleted uranium conversion. The recommendation includes $34,843,000 for the Fast Flux Test Reactor and $73,400,000 for West Valley Demonstration Project.

Small Sites.—The Committee recommendation provides the President's request for the following projects: $10,726,000 for Argonne National Laboratory; $28,272,000 for Brookhaven National Laboratory; $16,000,000 for Energy Technology Engineering Center; $22,865,000 for the Moab site and $500,000 is provided from within available for Grand County, Utah, for soil and water remediation measures at the former Atlas Uranium Mill Tailings site for infrastructure improvements, regulatory support, public education and related activities; and $5,720,000 for Stanford Linear Accelerator Center.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriations, 2006	$556,606,000
Budget estimate, 2007	579,368,000
House allowance	579,368,000
Committee recommendation	573,368,000

For the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, the Committee recommends $573,368,000. The Committee provides $151,320,000 for cleanup activities at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, and $110,000,000 for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, an increase of $14,000,000. The Department shall use the additional funds at Paducah 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. In 2004, the Government Accountability Office was commissioned to report on the outlook of the cleanup of the uranium enrichment facilities using the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning fund that was authorized in the 1992 Energy Policy Act. The GAO found that under no plausible scenario would the funds meet the cleanup needs at the three facilities. The GAO made a recommendation that the fund be extended for 3 additional years beyond its expiration in 2007 to provide the Department time to develop a plan to support long-term cleanup needs at these enrichment facilities. Since the GAO's recommendation, the Department has neither developed a plan, nor extended the fee. The Committee directs the Department to provide

a long-term plan to the Committee on the baseline cleanup schedules for each of the three facilities and how the Department intends to cover the costs of the cleanup without sufficient funding from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning fund. The Committee expects the Department to deliver this plan by March 31, 2007.

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

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2006	$3,596,393,000
Budget estimate, 2007	4,101,710,000
House allowance	4,131,710,000
Committee recommendation	4,241,062,000

The Committee recommends $4,241,062,000 for the Office of Science. These funds represent an investment in basic research that is critical to both the future economic competitiveness of the United Sates and to the success of our national and energy security.

Economists estimate that about half of U.S. economic growth since World War II has been the result of technological innovation. Basic research and science education lay the groundwork for tomorrow's technology breakthroughs. The DOE Office of Science is the largest Federal provider of research in the physical sciences. In July 2005, the Congress passed and the President signed the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This directed the Department to increase its investment in funding for basic physical sciences. In his State of the Union address, the President unveiled his vision for science, embodied in the American Competitiveness Initiative [ACI], which proposes doubling the appropriation to the Office of Science over 10 years. Congressional initiatives such as the PACE-Energy Act propose a similar objective. The fiscal year 2007 request will put the Office of Science on course to doubling the funding over the next decade. This is critical to augmenting fundamental research while also supporting the President's new investment in energy technologies such as solar, hydrogen, coal and nuclear power as outlined in the Advanced Energy Initiative [AEI]. Increased support from both the Office of Energy Supply and Conservation and the Office of Science should foster a healthy partnership to transfer fundamental research in genomic, advanced materials and biology into current and future technology applications that will result in field-test demonstrations. It will be incumbent of Federal managers and the Department of Energy leadership to ensure that research in both of these offices is shared in a mutually beneficial manner, especially as it relates to energy technology.

Report on Scientific Cooperation.—The Department is directed to prepare a report supported by the Office of Science and the Office of Energy Supply and Conservation regarding the specific steps the Department is taking to ensure cooperation between the two offices in identifying broad research objectives and goals as well as specific R&D priorities required in the short term. This report should contain information as to how the various Department of Energy laboratories are supporting these activities and budget projections in

the next 5 years. This report is due to the Committee concurrent with the President's fiscal year 2008 budget submission.

Science Education.—It is increasingly clear that the economic future of the United States will be tied to our ability to innovate and maintain a technological lead to ensure reliable and affordable energy supplies, advanced technologies that can be sold worldwide, and innovations that can deliver increases in productivity. These advantages must be earned and can only be guaranteed through investing in our education system and teachers. In 1999, only 41 percent of U.S. eighth graders received instruction from a teacher with specialization in mathematics, compared to the international average of 71 percent. This is a frightening statistic, but one that can be changed. A recent National Academy of Sciences report, Rising Above the Gathering Storm, made several recommendations that closely track the recommendations of the Secretary of Energy's Advisory Board, Science and Mathematics Education Task Force. The Task Force recently concluded that the Department of Energy has a significant opportunity to enhance science and math education in the Nation, and it is already well positioned to take a leadership role. The Department of Energy's national laboratories are home to many of the best scientific minds, but are also geographically distributed over the country, allowing access to teachers across the Nation. Moreover, the network of national laboratories is also tightly linked with industrial and academic resources, giving DOE the ability to forge educational partnerships that can extend its reach, and therefore also its capacity to enhance science, engineering and math education nationwide. The Committee believes more should and can be done to tap the significant teaching potential within the labs, and therefore has supported several initiatives within the Office of Science. As such, the Committee recommends additional funding in the Workforce Development account to support teacher training and primary and secondary science and math education.

The Committee is concerned that the Department is no longer abiding by the peer-reviewed 20 year Facilities plan the Department produced less than 3 years ago. This document established a prioritization of large investments and facilities the Department intended to support based on input from all of the scientific advisory boards within the Department. These investments are sufficiently large that they require long-term funding commitment that will exceed beyond a specific administration. As such, continual reprioritization will undermine the long-term goals and is likely to hinder the ability of the Office of Science to plan and this Committee's efforts to fund such long term investments. The Committee expects the Department to clarify its current priorities and update the 20 year plan to reflect these new priorities.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

For High Energy Physics, the Committee recommends $766,789,000. Understanding the way the universe works is the key mission of the High Energy Physics program, and it succeeds by probing interactions among matter, energy, space and time. The Committee fully funds the investments at the user facilities including the Tevatron Collider, the Neutrinos in the Main Injector at Fermi Laboratory and the B-Factor at Stanford Linear Accelerator

Center. In addition, the Committee provides full funding for the Large Hadron Collider at the European Organization for Nuclear Research Laboratory. The High Energy Physics program has many promising opportunities to advance our understanding of the universe and its makeup. However, the Department must make important decisions about the future of this program, including balancing the immediate opportunities provided through the Joint Dark Energy Mission and large future investments in the International Linear Collider.

International Linear Collider.—The Committee provides $45,000,000, an increase of $15,000,000 above current year levels, to support pre-conceptual research to support the U.S. ILC effort within the Accelerator Development, International Linear Collider R&D activities. The Committee appreciates the scientific challenge of building the ILC in the United States, establishing our leadership in this discipline among an international team. The budget calls for doubling the request above current year to support pre-conceptual R&D, yet the Committee does not have a clear understanding of the cost of this international project, which has been reported to exceed $8,000,000,000, twice the annual budget of the Office of Science. Despite the large financial commitment by the President in scientific research, the Committee is concerned that the ILC will crowd out other valuable research as has been demonstrated with both the National Ignition Facility within the NNSA, the Rare Isotope Accelerator and ITER, both within the Office of Science. Therefore, before the Committee agrees to adopt large budget increases for the ILC, the Department must provide a cost estimate including an out year funding plan and an explanation of how this initiative will impact other facilities and scientific research. In addition, the Committee would like to see the initial results from the Large Hadron Collider, which is set to begin operations in mid 2007 before the Committee commits to a long-term investment toward the ILC. The Committee looks forward to reviewing the data and visiting this matter again in 2008.

Joint Dark Energy Mission.—The Committee has consistently demonstrated its support of the Department's initiative to launch a space probe to answer the fundamental physics question of our time—what is the "dark energy" that constitutes the majority of the universe? The Committee strongly believes that this initiative should move forward. Unfortunately, the multi-agency aspect of this initiative faces insurmountable problems that imperil its future, and the Department risks losing a world-class scientific team. The Committee is concerned that the joint mission between the Department of Energy and NASA is untenable because of NASA's reorganization and change in focus toward manned space flight. The Committee directs the Department to immediately begin planning for a single-agency space-based dark energy mission and to conduct a peer-reviewed competition to select a single winning proposal based both upon the quality of the science and the overall cost to the Department. The competition should be initiated by the end of the calendar year 2006 and completed in 2007 with the goal of a launch in fiscal year 2013. The Committee encourages the Department to aggressively explore potential domestic and international partnerships and launch options to help defray the cost of the mis-

sions. The Committee provides $74,271,000 for Non-Accelerator Physics, an increase of $15,000,000 above the request to support the Joint Dark Energy Mission. The Committee has moved $8,310,000 from Theoretical Physics to the High Energy Density Physics account.

HIGH ENERGY DENSITY SCIENCE

The Committee recommends the creation of a new discipline within the Office of Science to support the growing research in high energy density sciences currently being pursued within the Office of Science, the National Nuclear Security Administration and universities worldwide. With his recent elevation of position, from Director to Under Secretary, the Under Secretary is increasing his field of view and now has the responsibility of developing science at all the labs within the Department, not just the Office of Science. As such, the Committee recommends that a new office be created to consolidate and support research in high energy density physics. This office will be charged with supporting research in inertial fusion energy, fast ignition, petawatt laser development, plasma accelerators and other laboratory and university sponsored research related to high energy density science that is presently funded within the Fusion Energy, Nuclear Physics, High Energy Physics and the NNSA, ICF accounts. This research has important applications ranging from materials research to fusion energy and fundamental research into the make up and reactions of nuclear matter. One of the of the primary responsibilities for this new program will be to establish a peer-reviewed technology and research and development roadmap to support a robust experimental program. This R&D roadmap is due to the Committee by March 31, 2007. The Committee directs the Department to break out the funding within the existing budgets and programs and consolidate within this new office. The Committee provides $79,924,000 to support this new research account, funded equally between the Office of Science and the NNSA and consistent with the high energy density research allocation within the Office of Science. Funding shall be drawn from the following accounts: $11,949,000 from the Fusion Energy Account, $20,000,000 from Nuclear Physics, and $8,310,000 from High Energy Physics. In addition, the Committee has provided funding from the ICF budget that includes the following: $8,903,000 to support university grants and $30,000,000 to support research on z pinches, high average power lasers and other HED research that has been exclusively funded within the NNSA accounts. The Committee provides $7,000,000 for the continued operation and experimental program on the Atlas Pulse Power Machine. This funding is in addition to the funding provided within the NNSA. Additionally, the Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the Nevada Terawatt Facility for joint research on dynamics of materials under extreme conditions; and $2,000,000 for UNR to continue its advanced research on Z-pinch and wire array physics. The Committee directs the Department to renew its base Nevada Terawatt Facility high energy density physics research cooperative agreement at financial levels consistent with the current year. The Committee recommendation includes $5,300,000 above the budget request for fast ignition research. The Committee

provides $3,000,000 in the ICF and High Yield Science Campaign of the NNSA to continue the development of a short pulse laser at the University of Texas at Austin, and $2,000,000 for continued collaborative research under the z-Petawatt Consortium for operations at the Z-Beamlet laser facility at Sandia National Laboratories, and $1,000,000 for collaborative research.

The Department is directed to convene an advisory board to develop a technology roadmap for this program and provide the Congress with a plan to support HED science while contributing to the operations at the various facilities in the NNSA. The Committee strongly urges the Department to eliminate barriers to discovery that have developed by historic jurisdictional boundaries and line management responsibility.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee provides $434,060,000 for Nuclear Physics. The Nuclear Physics program fosters fundamental research that will advance our understanding of nuclear matter, helping the United States maintain a leading role in developing nuclear energy, nuclear medicine, and national security. The Committee has shifted a portion of the funding budgeted for High Energy Density R&D to the new High Energy Density Science program.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

For Biological and Environmental Research [BER], the Committee provides $560,000,000, the same as the budget request. BER uses competitive and peer-reviewed research at national laboratories, universities, and private institutions to further the Nation's competitiveness in the scientific arena.

Genomes to Life.—The Committee strongly supports the GTL program and provides full funding as requested. Even before the Department mapped the first human genome, the Committee encouraged the Department to expand its genomic research and recommended that the Department accelerate the deployment of the four Genomes to Life facilities as was proposed in the 20 year plan. Now, a National Academies report has also concluded that the Department could greatly accelerate the research needed to unlock the genome. The Committee supports the Department's efforts to adjust its plan to move quickly to award two energy-related GTL collaborative research facilities. The Committee recommends full funding, as requested.

Medical Applications and Measurement Science.—Modern nuclear medicine builds on the exploitation of nuclear energy to promote human health, a concept that has been successful since the middle of the 20th century. The Committee is disappointed the Department has eliminated funding for nuclear medicine for the second year in a row from its budget request. The Committee understands the Department is working with the National Institutes of Health on a research strategy between the two entities, furthering research in the nuclear medicine arena in a manner that does not duplicate efforts. However, because the Committee lacks necessary information about this partnership, the Committee is concerned that either research might be duplicated or that the NIH might not have the means to fund its share. Section 314 of the bill proposes

to provide funding derived from a research account charged against Department of Energy research as provided in section 1001(e) of title X of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The Committee expects that $25,000,000 will be available to support nuclear medicine research.

Asia Pacific Project.—The Committee recommends that up to one-third of the funding be provided from the climate research activities from within this account.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED OFFICE OF SCIENCE PROJECTS

Project name	Committee recommendation
Positron Emission Tomography [PET] Scanning for Neurological Diseases, Alabama	$1,000,000
UCLA Institute for Molecular Medicine, California	3,700,000
Ultra Dense Supercomputing Memory Storage, Colorado	1,000,000
Kansas University Cancer Center Laboratory Reconfiguration, Kansas	500,000
The University of Louisville Computational Biomarker Discovery Center, Kentucky	1,000,000
Tulane Environmental and Material Science Clean Room Facility, Louisiana	800,000
Contrast Media Savings Study-[MEDRAD], Mississippi	500,000
Health Sciences Research and Education Facility at University of Missouri-Columbia	1,500,000
Billings Clinic Cancer Research Institute, Montana	1,300,000
PET Scanner, Middletown Regional Health System, Ohio	510,000
Enhanced Outpatient Cancer Services, Ohio	500,000
National Center for Regenerative Medicine, Ohio	500,000
Cuyahoga Community College, Ohio Alternative Energy Training Program	500,000
Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	1,000,000
Texas A&M University Intelligent Power System Monitoring and Diagnostics	1,500,000
Center for River Dynamics and Restoration at USU, Utah	400,000
Blackstone River Science and Exploration Center, Rhode Island	250,000
Fisk University Science Laboratory Improvements, Tennessee	540,000
MIND Institute, New Mexico	12,000,000
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences	1,000,000
Oakland Children's Hospital, California	225,000
St. Mary Medical Center, California	225,000
UCSD–NEES/NSF Outdoor Shake Table, California	600,000
St. John's Hospital Center, Santa Monica, California, Women's Health Center	200,000
Costilla County Biodiesel Pilot Project, Colorado	80,000
Lower AK Valley Water Conservancy District Small-Scale Biodiesel Plant, Colorado	250,000
Yale New Haven Health System Center for Public Health, Connecticut	250,000
Stamford Health Systems, Connecticut	250,000
Waterbury Hospital Clinical Information System Initiative, Connecticut	250,000
Norwalk Hospital Foundation, Connecticut	250,000
University of Delaware Brown Laboratory Renovation	500,000
St. Francis Hospital, Delaware	500,000
Mt. Sinai Medical Center, Florida	500,000
Upgrade Electrical at Hawaii's Major Trauma Centers	1,000,000
Edward Hospital Cancer Center, Illinois	250,000
University of Chicago Hospitals, Illinois	250,000
Franklin County Hospital, Illinois	250,000
Rush University Medical Center, Illinois	500,000
Benedictine University Science Lab., Lisle, Illinois	250,000
Marian College Biomedical Research Initiative, Indiana	400,000
University of Maryland-Baltimore Center for Nanomedicine & Cellular Delivery	250,000
Kennedy-Krieger Institute, Maryland	250,000
St. Agnes Hospital, Maryland	500,000
University of Massachusetts at Boston Multidisciplinary Research Facility	500,000
Noble Hospital Diagnostic Imaging Project, Massachusetts	500,000
Montana Cardiology Telemedicine Network	500,000
University of Nebraska Medical Center	500,000
Virtua Memorial Hospital, New Jersey	500,000
Atlantic Health System Comprehensive Cardiovascular Initiative, New Jersey	500,000
Hauptman-Woodward Medical Research Institute, New York	750,000
Central New York Biotechnology Research Center	250,000
Hospital for Special Surgery, New York	250,000

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED OFFICE OF SCIENCE PROJECTS—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Heart Center of Niagara, New York	750,000
Rochester General Hospital Heart Failure MYOTECH Treatment, New York	400,000
University of North Dakota Center for Biomass Utilization	1,000,000
University of Rhode Island Transgenic & Genomic Center	500,000
University of Vermont Functional MRI Research	500,000
University Medical Center, Nevada	500,000
Nevada Cancer Institute	500,000
Black Mountain Institute, Nevada	2,000,000
Tahoe Center for Environmental Sciences, Nevada	250,000

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommends $1,445,930,000 for Basic Energy Sciences, an increase of $24,950,000 from the budget request. Basic Energy Sciences supports work on the natural sciences emphasizing fundamental research in materials sciences, chemistry, geosciences, and aspects of biosciences. The Committee recommends $1,004,212,000 to support the Materials, Sciences and Engineering research program. The Committee recommends the following: $174,409,000 in fully operational funding for Spallation Neutron Source; full funding for the four Nanoscale Science Research Centers to support construction and operations; full funding for Linac Coherent Light Source; the requested level of $25,000,000 for National Synchrotron Light Source-II; $10,582,000 to support operations for the Manuel Lujan, Jr. Neutron Scattering Center and $8,000,000, as requested for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research.

The Committee recommends $293,449,000, an increase of $24,950,000 for Chemical Sciences, Geosciences and Energy Biosciences program. This program supports basic research in atomic and molecular chemistry, chemical physics, radiation chemistry, organic and inorganic chemistry, geochemistry and geophysics.

Energy and Water Technology Development.—Consistent with section 979 of the Energy Policy Act, 2005, the Committee recommends $24,950,000 authorized by this section to support research, development and demonstration of water technology used in the production of energy. The Committee believes water planning and water conservation are critical factors in economic development, human health and environmental well being. There are many regions in this country and across the world facing severe water shortages that are forced to look to water reclamation and desalination activities for adequate supplies. The Committee urges the Department to draw on the existing expertise within Department of Energy laboratories and other Federal agencies to develop a program consistent with the authorities provided in section 979 of Public Law 109–58; the Committee provides $15,950,000 within the available funds to support this activity. The Committee directs the Department to provide Sandia National Lab with $10,000,000 for advanced concept desalination and arsenic treatment research to be used in partnership with other national laboratories and universities.

The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the University of Vermont Plant Sciences Building and $500,000 for the Environmental Learning Center, Nevada.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $148,269,000 to support construction activities within the Basic Energy Science activities, as requested. Full funding is provided to the Nanocenters and the Linac Coherent Light Source at SLAC. Construction funding for the Spallation Neutron Source is no longer needed as the construction phase is complete.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

For Advanced Scientific Computing Research, the Committee provides $318,654,000, the same as the President's request. In the past two decades, leadership in scientific computation has become a cornerstone of the Department's strategy to ensure the security of the Nation and success in the areas of science and environmental quality. The Committee is supportive of advanced computing as the Department has taken technological risks as part of the weapons program. The decisions have paid off as the Department deploys the Red Storm and Blue G architecture across the complex to support fusion, nuclear energy, and other disciplines in need of high speed computational capabilities to support complex simulations.

The Committee is concerned with the relationship between the Office of Science and the NNSA. As an example, the ASCR strategic plan discusses the need to work with other Federal agencies including several defense agencies, but only discusses in general terms three areas of research where NNSA and the Office of Science cooperated. In the area of basic research, the strategic plan states that it is an area that is "not important enough to justify ASCI investment at this time." The Committee is also aware that the Office of Science has budgeted $13,000,000 for the DARPA to support a petaflop computer deployment by 2010. The Committee believes this funding would be better spent within the Department to support a petaflop initiative. The Department is directed to divide the funds equally between the Office of Science and the NNSA Advanced Simulation and Computing activities to support development of component architecture for high-performance software and storage.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

For Fusion Energy Sciences, the Committee recommends $307,001,000. This program advances plasma science, fusion science, and fusion technology through collaborations among U.S. universities, industry, national research laboratories, and the international fusion community. Consistent with budget descriptions, the Committee has shifted $11,949,000 provided for High Energy Density Science to the new office within the Department of Energy.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommends $50,888,000, to support infrastructure activities at the 10 Office of Science laboratories and the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education. Within available funds,

$10,000,000 is provided as the Office of Science fiscal year 2007 contribution to the Capability Replacement Laboratory (300 Area) project. The Committee reiterates its recent criticisms that the Department has done a very poor job of coordinating this project between offices internally and with the Department of Homeland Security, the other 300 Area tenant.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation provides $76,592,000 for Safeguards and Security activities, the same as the budget request. The Safeguards and Security program provides funding for physical security, information protection, and cyber security for the national laboratories and facilities of the Office of Science.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends $170,877,000 for the Office of Science Program Direction, the same as the budget request. This level of funding will support approximately 1,000 FTEs for fiscal year 2007.

SCIENCE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

These initiatives support the missions of the Department's Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists program. The Committee provides $6,000,000 to establish the Protecting America's Competitive Edge [PACE] fellows program as a competitive, merit-based graduate fellowship program for students pursuing doctoral degrees in a science or engineering field related to a mission area of the Department. Fellowship recipients must rank in the upper 10 percent of their class and be citizens or permanent resident aliens of the United States. Fellowships awarded under this program shall be portable with the fellow.

The Committee recognizes that the scientific and professional staff of the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration laboratories are an untapped resource that should be used to support mathematics, science and engineering education and training in our primary and secondary schools. The Committee provides $35,000,000 to support this effort. Half of the funding will be used to establish or expand summer institutes at National Laboratories to provide additional training to strengthen the mathematics and science teaching skills of teachers employed at public schools in kindergarten through grade 12. The Committee directs the remaining funds to be used to support at each of the National Laboratories the establishment of a Center of Excellence in Mathematics and Science at one public secondary school located in the region of the National Laboratory. The Secretary is directed to provide scientific and engineering staff of the National Laboratories to assist in teaching courses at these Centers, and to use National Laboratory scientific equipment in the teaching of the courses. The Secretary shall consider the results of performance assessments of the Centers in any performance review of a National Laboratories management and operations contractor.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2006	$148,500,000
Budget estimate, 2007	156,420,000
House allowance	186,420,000
Committee recommendation	136,420,000

The Committee recommendation for the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management includes $136,420,000 from fees collected by the Secretary which are deposited into the fund established by Public Law 97–425 as amended and $358,080,000 provided from the defense contribution for a total of $494,500,000. The Committee is frustrated by challenges facing the Yucca Mountain project. The project is still recovering from several setbacks in the license application including: the remanding of the Environmental Protection Agency radiation standards, the quality control of the U.S. Geological Survey practices, and the subsequent rejection of the Department's certification of its License Support Network. The Committee is concerned that the Department is redesigning the repository with significant changes, including plans for the surface facility as well as changes to the in-mountain storage configuration and cost re-estimate for the entire project that will be included in the Total System Performance Assessment [TSPA] model. As a result of the program setbacks and redesign of repository, the Department does not intend to submit a License Application until the second quarter of fiscal year 2008 at the earliest. These delays have forced the Committee to reconsider the project's budget needs.

As a result of program design changes, the Department will have a new conceptual design for the surface facilities and for the canister retrieval and handling activities. The clean canister approach is intended to minimize the need to handle bare spent nuclear fuel with a goal to provide a uniform storage solution by requiring fuel to be handled at the individual utility or facility sites. However, the Department needs to account for and plan how to package fuel for locations where fuel handling facilities no longer exist. Without the necessary cost data and a clear understanding of the specifics of the TSPA, the Committee is greatly concerned with the redesign effort and will withhold support of the initiative until the TSPA is available for a more careful review.

The Committee directs the Department to support only the preliminary design activities of the Canister Handling Facility and not to proceed with performance based engineering or any procurement or construction activities. In addition, the Committee limits the Department to spending current year levels for Disposable Canister work and Waste Package activities. The Committee does support the budget request for the Initial Infrastructure Readiness, Site Safety Upgrades work. The Committee recognizes this investment is important to maintaining a safe workplace. However, the Committee directs the Department to exercise great discretion to ensure that any construction undertaken at or near Yucca Mountain is consistent with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act's requirements that no repository construction can be undertaken prior to the issuance of a repository license by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Committee directs the Government Accountability Office to review the fiscal year 2007 budget plan for the Office of Civilian Nuclear

Waste Management to ensure that all of the activities planned for the fiscal year are consistent with the requirements of the NWPA.

The Committee directs the Department to make funding reductions in transportation activities and not reduce funding for licensing support activities or infrastructure and safety upgrades.

In the fiscal year 2006 energy and water conference report, the conferees directed the Department to enter into a 3-year cooperative agreement with Inyo County, California, to address groundwater contamination concerns. Instead, the Department provided a 5-year cooperative agreement. The Committee expects the Department to be far more respectful of explicit congressional direction and intent in the future and provides $750,000 (in addition to the amounts provided in the cooperative agreement) to accelerate the necessary drilling.

The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 for Nuclear Transportation Hazard Research at the University of Nevada Reno, and $1,000,000 for the Nye County Resource Assessment.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 2006	$250,289,000
Budget estimate, 2007	278,382,000
House allowance	278,382,000
Committee recommendation	281,382,000

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2006	−$121,770,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−123,000,000
House allowance	−123,000,000
Committee recommendation	−123,000,000

The Committee recommends the President's request of $278,382,000 for Departmental Administration, a net appropriation of $158,382,000. The Departmental Administration account funds eleven Department-wide management organizations support administrative functions such as human resources, accounting, budgeting, workforce diversity and project management activities. The Committee is concerned with the lack of qualified program managers within the Department.

Chief Financial Officer.—Last year, the Department encountered a number of challenges resulting from the 2005 implement of the Standard Accounting and Reporting System [STARS]. Despite the work of the staff, the auditors issued a disclaimer of opinion on the Department's fiscal year 2005 consolidated financial statements. Despite the staff's best effort, the Committee is skeptical that the fiscal year 2007 budget request of $36,790,000 is sufficient to address all the issues identified in the financial audit. The Committee believes the additional funding is needed to fully support the transition to the Oracle-based accounting system and to hire additional staff to broaden the skill mix among the staff. The Committee recommends an additional $3,180,000 to support this transition.

Policy and International Affairs.—The Committee recommendation includes $600,000 within available funds for continuation of the Clean Energy Technology Exports Initiative [CETE]. The pri-

mary goals of CETE are to strengthen U.S. Government interagency cooperation and private stakeholder outreach, to support the deployment of clean energy projects, and to open and expand clean energy markets abroad. CETE must be enhanced and carried out in a manner that is consistent with the 2002 strategic plan and should guide the implementation of other international energy technology and market deployment activities within the Department and other Federal agencies. The Committee also reminds the Department that up to one-third of the cost of the Asia Pacific Partnership can be taken from this office.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2006	$41,580,000
Budget estimate, 2007	45,507,000
House allowance	45,507,000
Committee recommendation	45,507,000

For the Office of Inspector General, the Committee recommends $45,507,000, consistent with the budget request. The Office of Inspector General identifies opportunities for cost savings and operational efficiencies and provides the Department of Energy with the assurance that those attempting to defraud the Government are apprehended.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2006	$6,369,603,000
Budget estimate, 2007	6,407,889,000
House allowance	6,412,001,000
Committee recommendation	6,503,051,000

The Weapons Activities account provides for the maintenance, refurbishment and scientific validation regarding the reliability, security and safety of the nuclear weapons stockpile. In addition, the NNSA is charged with certifying the reliability of the stockpile without the use of underground testing, so all changes and updates that are integrated into the stockpile must utilize data from existing tests that are also supported through independent experimentation and validated using computer simulation. The NNSA is also working to upgrade their capability to develop new designs and the responsive nuclear weapons infrastructure needed to respond to an evolving, threat based environment as determined by the Nuclear Posture Review. The directors of Los Alamos, Sandia and Livermore National Labs and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command share the belief that maintaining incremental modifications to the existing and highly optimized legacy systems is not sustainable. In order to reduce the concerns, the laboratory initiated the development of the Reliable Replacement Warhead. This program is intended to assure the reliability of the stockpile. In addition the laboratory design teams have been charged with developing a weapons system that is much easier to manufacture and maintain, as well as integrating 21st Century use controls to reduce the threat of unintended use. A key component of this design will be to increase

the performance margins that will maintain the same level of reliability and counter the effects of aging so as to avoid the need for underground testing in the future. However, until the NNSA can demonstrate the ability to design and manufacture a weapon with the same or better performance margins, the Department of Defense will continue to maintain a significant hedge of reserve legacy systems and parts to protect against technical challenges within the stockpile. The Committee recognizes the need to protect against unforeseen challenges and urges the NNSA to accelerate the transition to a responsive infrastructure and to proceed expeditiously with the RRW design. The Committee also realizes that a dual track strategy of supporting eight legacy systems and a RRW program is not sustainable and therefore has taken steps in this legislation to reduce the number of legacy systems and begin the replacement with RRW designs. The Committee has also initiated a second design competition for another RRW design in lieu of the W80 life extension activities, which are no longer supported by the Nuclear Weapons Council and the Department of Defense.

NNSA Act Reform.—The Committee is pleased that the Administrator has recognized that the NNSA operational and oversight culture was becoming risk-adverse and focused more on oversight and compliance activities than on implementing the mission and milestones. The Committee is aware of the numerous activities underway in the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy to address issues and recommendations of the Defense Science Board [DSB] Task Force on Nuclear Capabilities and the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board's [SEAB] Nuclear Weapons Complex Infrastructure Task Force. Their reports identified weaknesses and opportunities in the NNSA's ability to meet the future needs for the Nation's nuclear capabilities, including fundamental concerns with line management authority and accountability, staff and advisory groups directing line management, embedding safety and security functions in line management, and consolidating and modernizing the weapons complex. The Committee is also aware of responses to these actions to date including: organizational alignments to improve line management decision making; procedure changes to improve interfaces with oversight groups within and outside of the Department; formation of the Office of Transformation; formation of a senior management team to improve throughput at Pantex; review of certain orders, regulations and polices to eliminate practices that weaken line responsibilities; establishment of multi-site performance measures to increase delivery of work for the Department of Defense. Hopefully, these actions will address the fundamental concerns addressed by the Defense Safety Board.

Material Consolidation.—The Committee recognizes the Department's challenge in consolidating both the nuclear weapons complex and the challenge to consolidate special nuclear material [SNM]. The Committee is supportive of the initiative taken by the Department to create the Nuclear Materials Disposition and Consolidation Committee [NMDCC] to develop a strategy to consolidate and dispose of special nuclear material. The Committee has yet to see a plan for consolidation of material outside of the broad goals included in Complex 2030. The planning team is encouraged to pro-

vide updates to the Committee on a regular basis and provide a consolidation roadmap to the Congress as soon as possible. The Committee also expects the Department to identify a disposal pathway for all excess SNM. The Committee has provided additional funding to initiate the first shipment of SNM out of Lawrence Livermore National Lab in fiscal year 2007.

Indirect Security Funding.—The Committee understands the Department continues to consider the policy of indirectly funding security costs at NNSA facilities. The Committee strongly opposes this proposal and directs the Department to continue to provide transparency when it comes to its costs, especially security costs, and directly fund all security costs within the Department Energy and the NNSA.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

The Committee recommendation includes $1,323,224,000 for this activity. The Directed Stockpile Work [DSW] includes all activities that directly support weapons in the nuclear stockpile, including maintenance, research and development, engineering, certification, dismantlement and disposal activities.

Life Extension Program.—Within the Life Extension Program [LEP], the Committee recommends $230,618,000 for LEP activities. The Committee recommends $58,934,000 for the B61 LEP activities, as requested. The Committee recommends $151,684,000 as requested to support W76 LEP efforts.

W80.—Based on the recent decision by the Nuclear Weapons Council decision to terminate the W80 LEP, the Committee allocates $20,000,000 to support the closeout of the W80 LEP activities. Delay of the W80 Life Extension Plan will result in a cost savings of $82,000,000 in fiscal year 2007 and additional savings in the FYNSP. The savings from the W80 plan should be used to support the Reliable Replacement Warhead and responsive infrastructure, so that the transformation of the stockpile and the NNSA infrastructure can proceed. Additionally, Stockpile Services funding must be maintained to enable NNSA to properly support the legacy stockpile, and this requirement is unaffected by the cancellation of the W80 LEP. Support for these legacy weapons is crucial since they will be needed for many more years until they can be replaced with Reliable Replacement Warhead systems. The Committee acknowledges that any further cuts in the Directed Stockpile Work and, in particular, the Stockpile Services, will further add to the significant challenges NNSA has in supporting the legacy stockpile.

Stockpile Systems.—The Committee supports the budget request for the Stockpile Systems account and provides $325,545,000, as requested. These activities are critical to support the specific and routine repair and replacement of various limited-life components and to sustain the necessary surveillance activities of each weapons system. The Committee recommends the following: $63,782,000 for the B61; $3,738,000 for the W62; $56,174,000 for the W76; $50,662,000 for the W78; $27,230,000 for the W80; $23,365,000 for the B83; $1,465,000 for the W84; $59,333,000 for the W87; and $39,796,000 for the W88.

Reliable Replacement Warhead [RRW].—The Committee recommendation provides $62,707,000 for the Reliable Replacement

Warhead initiative, an increase of $35,000,000 from the budget request. The additional funding is realigned from savings realized by the Nuclear Weapons Council's decision to cancel W80 LEP. The Committee expects the laboratories and plants will utilize the unneeded resources in the Directed Stockpile, Campaigns, and Readiness in Technical Based and Facilities accounts where applicable to further the RRW design options to support a Nuclear Weapons Council decision. The Committee expects the initial RRW design approved by the Department to be selected based on a combination of considerations, including the ability to certify the warhead without underground nuclear testing, cost production and ease of maintenance and dismantlement. The Committee would oppose the use of workload leveling among the labs as a factor in any design selection decision. The design teams at both Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory have worked extremely hard on their respective designs with the expectation that the best design would be selected. Any selection that isn't decided purely on merits would be a disservice to the Department of Defense, the RRW design teams and the NNSA. The Committee continues to have concerns regarding the slow pace of the Nuclear Weapons Complex consolidation efforts and how those efforts pertain to the future of the RRW. Rapid RRW development and deployment will reduce the further need for many complex manufacturing capabilities currently maintained by the NNSA. By utilizing a RRW design, the stockpile will also contain systems that are much easier to maintain and manufacture, apply enhanced surety applications and retain the same level of reliability as can be certified by the three laboratory directors. The Committee believes that in order to maintain RRW on going basis and to hedge against any unforeseen problems in any one particular design, the Secretary and the Administrator should expand the RRW program immediately to ensure that our strategic forces have at least two different certified RRW warheads. Having multiple strategic systems that continue to meet the existing military requirements maintains the current strategic doctrine of hedging against a single point failure in any one system. The Committee provides $10,000,000 to support a second RRW design competition. The Committee expects the NNSA to proceed with this design competition in the same manner in which the initial RRW was implemented. The funding shall be used to support the following: establish a Project Officers Group to undertake a feasibility evaluation for a first production goal of fiscal year 2014; identify the appropriate military characteristics in order to maintain existing military capability; support a conceptual design competition within the laboratory; establish a basis for selection, including support of a responsive infrastructure and appropriate workload balancing among the labs if necessary; and develop a comparative cost assessment comparing implementing the RRW with implementing the LEP program.

Dismantlement.—The Committee recommendation provides $35,000,000 for the warhead dismantlement program. The Committee expects the NNSA to implement an aggressive warhead dismantlement program as part of a concerted effort to relieve the weapons complex of excess cold war era warheads and continue the development of a responsive infrastructure consistent with the

President's Nuclear Posture Review. The Committee appreciates the efforts of the NNSA to implement a streamlined dismantlement program, which requires numerous changes within the complex to support this initiative. First, the NNSA has made dismantlement and materials consolidation a priority. Second, the NNSA plans incorporate a complex-wide approach to balancing surveillance activities, meeting life extension commitments and increasing the rate of dismantlement. The Committee supports the NNSA's efforts to dismantle unnecessary weapons, but reminds the NNSA that it must follow through with elimination of excess weapons-grade material that will be left over. Once disassembled, the material still poses a proliferation threat and must be secured at a significant cost to taxpayers. In order to fully address this problem, the Department must develop and implement a comprehensive dismantlement and consolidation program for the total elimination and destruction of excess weapons-grade material.

The Committee supports the Department's efforts to construct and operate the pit disassembly facility and mixed oxide fabrication facility to turn weapons-usable pits into commercial spent nuclear fuel. Before the Committee provides full funding for the dismantlement program, the Committee would like to ensure the pit disassembly and MOX fabrication facility will be built. Therefore before the NNSA accelerates dismantlement activities, the Committee directs the Department to allocate only $35,000,000 for dismantlement work.

Stockpile Services.—The Committee recommends $669,354,000, as provided in the budget. The Stockpile Services account supports the research and development and production activities for multiple weapon systems, but the costs are not allocated by tail number in the same manner as the Stockpile Systems or Life Extension Program. Therefore, despite a reduction in the LEP activities for the W80, there are no savings within this activity. The Committee recommends $236,115,000 for Production Support work. This account supports the personnel costs associated with weapons assembly, disassembly, and component productions. Research and Development Support activities are provided $63,948,000 to support R&D of component and surety research such as neutron generations and other weapons systems. The Committee recommendation for R&D Certification and Safety is $194,199,000. Activities funded within this account are very critical and support a broad range of stewardship activities including plutonium experiments, sub critical tests, safety and reliability analysis, and funding for the Nuclear Weapons Study Groups of the various military services. The Committee recommendation includes $9,000,000 above the budget request for BEEF. This additional funding, coupled with $3,000,000 in RTBF, will provide funding for critical high pressure experiments in the Phoenix Program.

CAMPAIGNS

Campaigns focus on scientific, technical and engineering efforts to develop and maintain critical capabilities and tools needed to support the existing stockpile through continued assessment and annual certification in the absence of underground testing. The major elements of the campaign are: Science, Engineering, Inertial

Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Advanced Simulation and Computing, Pit Manufacturing, and Certification and Readiness Campaigns.

Science Campaign

The Committee recommendation includes $268,762,000, as requested in the budget. The Science campaign is the principal program for supporting the science required to maintain the technical viability of the physics package. Developing a better understanding of the operating margins through the Quantification of Margins and Uncertainties, using experimentation and simulation, is critical to certification of the current stockpile and the basis for which a RRW design can be developed without underground testing. The focus of the scientific research is code development in support of the Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign for primaries and secondaries associated with the RRW design and other experimental technical milestones.

Primary Assessment Technologies.—The Committee recommends $50,527,000, as requested in the budget, to improve the understanding of boost physics, a complex challenge for weapons designers. Funding supports experiments associated with plutonium using hydrotests, proton radiography and subcritical tests in Nevada.

Test Readiness.—The Committee recommends $14,757,000 for Test Readiness as requested and a reduction of $5,000,000 from current year levels.

Dynamic Materials Properties.—The Committee recommends $85,727,000 for Dynamic Materials. Funding will be used to support a variety of experiments on JASPER, TA–55 gas guns, Z/R, LANSCE and U1A to understand plutonium dynamics. Specifically, the Committee recommends an increase of $5,000,000 above the budget request of $11,500,000 to support a doubling of the shot rate for plutonium experiments at JASPER, greatly improving efficiency in operation of the JASPER test bed and DAF glove box for target assembly.

Advanced Radiography.—The Committee recommends $36,745,000 as requested in the budget to support hydrotest and radiographic activities. The budget supports completion and commissioning of the second axis cell refurbishment on DARHT. The Committee expects the NNSA to deliver on the promise of commissioning this facility in fiscal year 2008, when hydrotests are needed.

Secondary Assessment Technologies.—The Committee recommends $81,006,000 for Secondary Assessment Technologies. Funding is provided in this subprogram to support high energy density physics experiments on inertial confinement fusion experimental facilities. The Committee recommends full funding for the Z machine activities at $14,700,000, as requested in the budget.

Engineering Campaign

The Committee recommends $207,033,000, an increase of $46,114,000 above the requested level. This campaign provides validation of engineering science, modeling and simulation tools necessary to support design qualification and certification of the stock-

pile. Critical elements of this program are the Enhanced Surety and Surveillance activities that are critical in applying the highest level of use controls possible using engineered solutions developed at MESA at Sandia National Laboratories.

Enhanced Surety.—The Committee recommends $41,200,000, an increase of $14,469,000 above the budget request. The surety systems are the means by which the safety, security and use control of nuclear weapons are achieved. These high-consequence systems require careful design and ultra-reliable components.

Weapons Systems.—The Committee recommends $28,000,000, an increase of $6,800,000 above the budget request, to support advance computer simulation and related code development. This activity also supports manufacturing of critical design components and microsystems.

Nuclear Survivability.—The Committee recommends $23,000,000 to support the budget request. Within the available funds, the Department is directed to use $6,000,000 to support research into radiation hardening capabilities and to prevent damage to critical electronics from electromagnetic pulse.

Enhanced Surveillance.—The Committee recommends $103,200,000, an increase of $3,995,000 above the current year. This funding will be used to accelerate the deployment of advanced micro-engineering devices that can be used to adopt advance surveillance devices into the RRW design. Applying enhanced surveillance technology can provide a more accurate, cost-effective and real time means of tracking performance of existing stockpile systems.

Project 01–D–108 Microsystem and Engineering Science Applications, SNL, Albuquerque, New Mexico.—The Committee recommends $6,920,000, to complete the MESA project in fiscal year 2007. The Committee recommends $4,613,000 for other MESA project costs.

Inertial Confinement Fusion and High Yield Campaign

The Committee recommends $412,256,000, a reduction of $38,935,000 from the budget request. The NNSA has implemented the National Ignition Campaign and declared it an "enhanced management" activity, which appears to be nothing more than a NIF-at-all-costs-strategy. The NNSA has pursued this agenda as a means to justify an aggressive spending baseline at the expense of other compelling stewardship responsibilities in the ICF campaign. The NNSA has proven unable to maintain a balanced ICF and high yield research program. As such the Committee has reallocated funding out of NIF demonstration and Construction activities to ensure that there is adequate program balance.

Ignition.—The Committee recommends $69,763,000, a reduction of $10,000,000, from the budget request. This reduction has been used to offset an imbalance in research priorities.

Support of Other Stockpile Programs.—The Committee recommends $25,872,000. This account has also suffered as a result of the NIF program. The additional funding provides for the support of research into high energy density physics within other campaigns. The additional funding will be to increase the utilization of the Z machine and work to integrate the Z petawatt laser and sup-

port stockpile stewardship activities that are being delayed as a result of the NIF priorities. The JASONS recommended in their review of NIF that the NNSA develop an "aggressive program of experiments on high energy density laser and Z pinch facilities" in order to understand the physics challenges and understand computer models. The report also found that the "the plans to use LIL and Z/ZR are not yet adequately developed." The Committee recognizes that the Department just completed a refurbishment of Z/ZR making a substantial investment of over $60,000,000 to improve the operational capabilities. The Committee directs the Department to fully utilize the Z machine. Funding is provided to support expanded operations and HED stockpile stewardship R&D that has been delayed until 2011.

NIF Diagnostics, Cryogenics and Experimental Support.—Unlike the funding provided in the Support of Other Stockpile Programs, the budget request provides a slight increase from the current year levels. However, the Committee recommends $42,578,000, the same level as current year, a reduction of $3,381,000. These funds will be applied toward the joint HEDP program.

Pulsed Power Inertial Confinement Fusion.—The Committee recommends $10,603,000 to support experiments on the refurbished Z facility.

University Grants.—The Committee believes these activities would be better supported in a broader program that would provide students and faculty broader research and experimental opportunities.

Facility Operations and Target Production.—The Committee recommendation is $53,021,000, as requested in the budget. The Committee provides $10,000,000 above the budget request for advanced ICF target design, fabrication and testing on the OMEGA laser system at the LLE and the Z-machine at SNL.

NIF Demonstration Program.—The remaining work under the Demonstration program activities includes assembly and installation of optics into the remaining roughly 180 of the 192 beamlines. The Department is directed to work to find cost savings by increasing the efficiency and productivity for assembly activities. The Committee recommends $129,000,000 for demonstration activities.

High-Energy Petawatt Laser Development.—The Committee recommendation no funding for this activity. The funds that were budgeted for this account have been shifted to the Office of Science High Energy Density Physics program, an increase of $27,693,000 above current year levels.

Construction—Project 96–D–111.—The Committee recommends $81,419,000 and directs the NNSA to utilize available contingency funds of $30,000,000 to make up any funding shortfalls. Remaining contingency balances are sufficient to cover the remaining costs of the construction project. This funding will be used to support the NNSA's contribution to the joint High Energy Density Physics program office.

Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign

The Committee recommends $695,995,000, an increase of $78,040,000 above the request. The Committee supports the program reforms made to improve budget clarity and program focus.

Of the additional funds provided, $60,000,000 shall be used to support the purchase of a petaflop computing capability at Los Alamos National Laboratory. This builds on the additional funding provided by the Committee in fiscal year 2006 to increase computing capacity at Los Alamos. With these resources, the United States will be in the best position to deploy the first petaflop computer in the world. If successful, this additional capacity will enable the Department of Energy to develop new computer architectures to facilitate a leap forward in high speed computing. The Department is directed to continue activities consistent with fiscal year 2006 funding under its renewed 5-year cooperative agreement with the University of Nevada Las Vegas and the University of Nevada Reno.

Pit Manufacturing and Certification Campaign

The Committee provides a total of $237,598,000 for the Pit Manufacturing and Certification Campaign, consistent with the request. Using the existing capabilities at Los Alamos, the NNSA will demonstrate the ability to manufacture pits, to confirm the nuclear performance of a W88 warhead without nuclear testing, and establish a basis for certification of future pits. The Committee supports the NNSA's decision to commit out year funding for the Modern Pit Facility toward demonstrating the capability to manufacture other stockpile pits, including an RRW design at Los Alamos.

Readiness Campaign

The Committee recommends $205,965,000, as provided in the budget.

Stockpile Readiness Campaign.—The Committee recommends $17,576,000, as requested. The funding is intended to be used to restore or replace aging production infrastructure within the complex. The Committee is concerned with the decline in funding considering the need and age of the existing complex.

High Explosives and Weapons Operations.—The Committee recommendation is $17,188,000, a slight increase over current funding and consistent the budget request.

Tritium Readiness.—The Committee supports the request of $86,385,000. This funding will be used to maintain the national inventory of tritium by irradiating tritium producing rods in a commercial light-water reactor.

Advanced Design and Production Technologies.—The Committee recommends $53,645,000 as requested in the budget.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

For Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities, the Committee provides $1,780,772,000, and increase of $95,000,000 above the budget request to restore funding cut in fiscal year 2006. The activities funded in the RTBF account provide of the operational funding, including salaries of thousands of staff as well as the operating costs for the production complex. The NNSA is facing a challenge in attempting to address the consolidation of special nuclear material throughout the complex, a lasting and costly legacy from the cold war. The NNSA is also looking at consolidating and coordinating the production mission in order to cut costs to meet tight budgets and rising costs attributed to security needs and as well

has the rising cost of medical and pension costs. At the Committee's insistence, the Department is pursuing a RRW program that is the embodiment of a responsive infrastructure desired by the Department of Defense. By demonstrating the capability to respond to a threat based deterrent, the Department will have the confidence to further reduce the overall number of weapons and weapons systems in the stockpile.

Special Nuclear Materials Consolidation.—In fiscal year 2007, the Committee directs the NNSA to initiate the removal of excess Special Nuclear Materials [SNM] from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory [LLNL] and develop a plan for removal of all Category I/II SNM from LLNL by fiscal year 2012. The Committee recommends $10,000,000 to support this activity and to support disposition of nuclear materials at LLNL, SNL, Y–12, and Pantex as well.

Operations of Facilities.—The Committee includes $1,263,004,000, an increase of $59,218,000 above the budget request, for Operations of Facilities. The budget provides for modest growth in this account and supports both workforce funding and facilities operation, which are the backbone of the NNSA capability. The Department moved operational funding for the Z machine to this account, but failed to increase the budget to accommodate the additional responsibility. As such the Committee recommends $30,000,000 to support Z operational charges, as requested. The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 above the budget request of $17,900,000 for BEEF. This additional funding, coupled with $9,000,000 above the request in DSW, will provide funding for critical high pressure experiments in the Phoenix Program. The Committee also recommends an increase of $6,000,000 above the budget request of $34,300,000 for the Device Assembly Facility. This funding will allow a "Mission Capable" level of support which is the minimum required to reliably ensure compliance with Federal regulations and standards. In addition, the Committee recommends $13,500,000 to be divided evenly among the three NNSA laboratories to upgrade facilities as necessary and demonstrate the manufacturability of the new RRW designs.

Special Projects.—The Committee provides $28,782,000 for the following activities. The Committee recommends $3,500,000 for the Technologies Ventures Corporation to support technology transfer from each of the three weapons laboratories. These balances will be expended, and the Committee provides funding for the fourth year of a 5-year commitment. The Committee recommends that $5,832,000 be provided to the grant-funded University Research Program in Robotics [URPR], for research, development, and technology transfer to NNSA laboratories. The Committee provides $7,500,000 for the continued operation and experimental program on the Atlas Pulse Power Machine. Included within that amount, the Committee has provided $2,300,000 to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, for research, experimentation, development, design and demonstration of technologies for containment and confinement related to the future employment of special nuclear materials on the Atlas Pulse Power machine. This funding is in addition to the funding provided in Science. Additionally, the Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 in enhanced funding for sub-

critical experiments at NTS; $2,500,000 for the Consortium for Terrorism and Fire Science at UNR-Elko; $250,000 for the Atomic Testing History Institute; $1,000,000 to continue the on-going infrastructure support grant for the UNLV Research Foundation; $1,000,000 for the UNR/DRI Technology Transfer Initiative; $1,000,000 to the UNLV Research Foundation to continue support of the radioanalytical services laboratory; $400,000 for virtual reality technologies for command and control of security operations at the Nevada Test Site; and $1,500,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation to support the ongoing programs of the Institute for Security Studies. The Committee is concerned that the ISS has not adequately fulfilled its key mission objective of establishing an academic center of excellence on national security and terrorism-related issues. Therefore the Committee directs the ISS to allocate funding necessary to fully implement its undergraduate and graduate level academic program as well as its research and training mission. From within available funds, the Committee recommends $1,000,000 for the Arrowhead Center, New Mexico.

Program Readiness.—The Committee includes $75,167,000, the same as the budget request, for Program Readiness.

Material Recycle and Recovery.—The Committee recommends $69,982,000, consistent with the budget request, for Material Recycle and Recovery. These activities include reuse of plutonium, enriched uranium and tritium, limited life components and dismantlement operations.

Construction Projects.—The Committee recommends $288,422,000 for various construction projects, an increase of $7,000,000. The Committee provides $112,442,000 for 04–D–125, Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Facility Replacement, as requested in the budget. This facility is critical to support the only plutonium work at Los Alamos, and will provide necessary laboratory support to the pit manufacturing mission. The Committee has reviewed the Department's Complex 2030 proposal and notes several assumptions regarding mission scope of the CMR–R facility that don't seem to match current planned activities. The Committee directs the Administrator to deliver a report by June 1, 2007, clarifying the cost and mission requirements this facility will be expected to address. The Committee firmly believes this facility will continue to play a central role in the plutonium mission at Los Alamos and is needed to support the research and chemistry mission of plutonium activities. The Committee is skeptical the NNSA will be able to site new plutonium facilitie that include storage and manufacturing capabilities in the foreseeable future, let alone find sufficient funding within the constrained budgets to build a new facility. The Committee also reminds the Department that it has been unable to secure funding in the current year to support planning for a Modern Pit Facility. As such, the Committee directs the Department to consider alternatives to making changes to the CMR–R facility to accommodate an expanded mission scope. Design changes related to security enhancements and inadequate management controls during the construction of the Highly Enriched Uranium Manufacturing Facility [HEUMF] at the Y–12 National Security Complex (01–D–124) has resulted in a significant delay in the completion of this facility and a significant increase in the overall cost. The de-

sign of the related Uranium Process Facility [UPF] is stretched out pending resolution of the project management shortfalls and $35,000,000 of $40,000,000 PED requested by the administration is to be applied against the HEUMF project. The Committee directs the Department to use prior year funding from the Y–12 Readiness Campaign and the down sized Security Improvement Program at Y–12 for a total of $17,866,000 to support HEUMF construction. The Committee is aware that even with this additional funding the HEUMF project is still under funded in fiscal year 2007 and the NNSA will identify additional sources in the near future to support project completion in fiscal year 2008.

The Committee recommends $14,828,000 for 07–D–220, Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility Upgrades. The Committee is concerned by what it views as wavering support by the Department for a major experimental science facility. The Los Alamos Neutron Science Center [LANSCE] is an important facility that supports the Laboratory's core weapons mission, as well as a broad range of science in virtually every technical division of the Laboratory. LANSCE also includes an Office of Science User Facility and annual operating funds from the Office of Science. LANSCE is in need of repair and refurbishment to continue as a scientific engine and recruiting tool for the Laboratory. The Committee urges the Department to approve Critical Decision Zero for LANSCE refurbishment so that the appropriate investment can be made. The Committee provides $7,000,000 for project engineering and design work for LANSCE-R. Full funding is provided to 06–D–402, NTS Replacement Fire Stations. The Committee is concerned with the recent problems associated with 01–D–124, Highly Enriched Uranium Materials Facility. The Committee understands cost increases are a result of a combination of poor NNSA oversight and poor contractor execution. The Committee provides $21,267,000, as requested, but expects an explanation of the cost increases.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION

The Committee recommends $283,205,000 for the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization, to restore, rebuild, and revitalize the physical infrastructure of the nuclear weapons complex.

SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Committee recommends $209,264,000 for Secure Transportation Asset, the same as the budget request. Funds are used for the safe, secure transport of nuclear weapons, weapons components, and Special Nuclear Materials for requirements set by the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, and other customers.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS INCIDENT RESPONSE

The Nuclear Weapons Incident Response program responds to and mitigates worldwide nuclear and radiological incidents. The Committee recommends $135,354,000, the same as the budget request, for Nuclear Weapons Incident Response.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $759,412,000, for Safeguards and Security activities at laboratories and facilities managed by the National Nuclear Security Administration.

The Committee recommends $5,000,000 to be provided to Sandia National Laboratories to support research and development activities to support enhanced security measures that will provide improved early warning detection and use denial strategies in order to reduce the overall security costs for the Complex.

The Committee remains concerned that, despite the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars for information security needs, a large percentage of all Federal agencies received failing grades from both the GAO and OMB for their cyber security management. The Department of Energy has received an F as its computer security grade since 2001 by the House Government Reform Committee and no higher than a 59 (out of 100) for its FIMSA score over that same period of time.

The Committee provides $1,250,000, within available funds, to allow the Department to develop a vulnerability and risk management solution that continuously discovers and prioritizes network exposures including integrated network topology risk analysis. The solution should be appliance-based technology, running a hardened operating system with an integrated database and reporting services and must be certified at Common Criteria EAL Level 3 (the NIST/NIAP standard). It must facilitate Certification and Accreditation under FIMSA by performing the Continuous Monitoring requirement as specified by NIST SP 800–37 Section 2.7.

The Committee directs the Department to begin to the necessary steps to protect personnel data at a level comparable to classified material to prevent the misuse and unauthorized access of such data. Within 60 days after enactment, the Department is directed to provide a report to Congress detailing activities and steps being taken to secure employee data and other personnel records and the costs associated with such security modifications.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends an offset of $33,000,000, the same as the request, for the Safeguards and Security charge for reimbursable work.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriations, 2006	$1,631,839,000
Budget estimate, 2007	1,726,213,000
House allowance	1,593,101,000
Committee recommendation	1,572,654,000

NONPROLIFERATION AND VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends $274,967,000 for Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development activities, an increase of $14,000,000 above the request. The Committee recommends $10,000,000 to restore funding for Nuclear Detection R&D to be divided among Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories. The Committee recommends $166,446,000 for Proliferation Detection,

$106,601,000 for Nuclear Explosion Monitoring; $7,920,000 for construction of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Physical Sciences Facility; $2,500,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation to continue support of nonproliferation activities at the Institute for Security Studies; and $1,500,000 for the UNLV Research Foundation megacargo imaging development program at the NTS.

NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

For Nonproliferation and International Security, the Committee recommends $127,411,000, the same as the President's request. The Department has reorganized several activities under one program, including $38,967,000 for Dismantlement and Transparency activities that provide technical support of nonproliferation and arms control treaties. Of this amount, $17,531,000 is provided to support the Highly Enriched Uranium down blending under the HEU Purchase Agreement, and $14,814,000 is available to support Warhead Dismantlement and Fissile Material Transparency activities. The Committee recommends $50,232,000 for Global Security Engagement and Cooperation, to engage former weapons scientists in non-weapons research and commercial activities to discourage the sale and black-market trade of nuclear technology. The Committee provides $31,787,000 for International Regimes and Agreements. The Committee commends NNSA's support for the Northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue [NEACD], which provides a (an unofficial) security forum for the United States in a region of great strategic and economic importance, and encourages NNSA to continue to support the program. Within available funds, the Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Caucasus Seismic Network.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS PROTECTION AND COOPERATION

The primary function of this program is to prevent the diversion, sale or theft of nuclear material from Russia and other countries by eliminating this threat through increasing security at weapons facilities. The program also supports the installation of detection equipment at border crossings and ports to prevent illegal shipments. The Committee recommends $427,182,000 for International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation, an increase of $14,000,000 above the request. The additional funding is to be used to install mobile points of need detector systems in overseas ports to demonstrate mobile, enhanced detection of port cargo as part of the Megaports program. The Committee recommends $17,330,000 for Navy Complex subprogram, $129,245,000 to support the implementation of securities measures at Russian Strategic Rocket Forces, $56,505,000 for Rosatom Weapons Complex, and $123,973,000 for Second Line of Defense Activities, including $55,118,000 for the Megaports program.

ELIMINATION OF WEAPONS-GRADE PLUTONIUM PRODUCTION

The Committee is disappointed with the lack of cooperation from the Russian Government in implementing the Fissile Materials Disposition program. The Russians have recently claimed that they will no longer commit to paying for the operations of the mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility the G–8 partners have committed to

build. This brand new facility would provide the Russians with a western fuel fabrication capability and the opportunity to sell MOX fuel worldwide in exchange for the Russians fulfilling their commitment to destroy 34 tons of weapons-grade plutonium. This Committee has run out of patience with the Russians and believes that maintaining the unilateral commitment by the U.S. Government to destroy 34 tons of weapons grade material is a worthy endeavor. In order to restore essential funding for construction of the U.S. MOX fuel fabrication facility caused by Russian delays, funding Plutonium Production Elimination has been eliminated. Using their windfall gains from oil and gas sales, the Russian Government can complete the remaining work on Sversk, which is nearly complete and Zheleznogorsk on their own. The Committee recommendation for the Elimination of Weapons-Grande Plutonium Production is no funding, a decrease of $206,654,000.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The Committee recommends $618,356,000 for the Fissile Materials Disposition, an increase of $15,095,000 above the budget request. The Committee strongly supports the objective of the bilateral Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement, which commits the United States and Russia to dispose of 34 tons of weapons-grade plutonium. Until, now, the United States and Russia have maintained parallel schedules as required by the September 2000 Agreement. Recently, right before the United States was to proceed with a new construction start, the Russian Government declared it will not contribute operational funding for the Russian facility, raising the stakes for the United States and G–7 partners, who have already committed over $800,000,000 toward construction of a new mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility. Failure for the United States to proceed with construction and long lead procurement will have a devastating effect on the project and jeopardize the largest nonproliferation project ever undertaken by the U.S. Government. Further delays in construction would increase the cost of the facility, threaten the Department's ability to meet commitments to South Carolina, as set forth in existing law, and significantly increase the likelihood that the Department would have to pay penalties or take other actions under 50 U.S.C. 2566. In addition, proceeding with plutonium disposition will further demonstrate to our international partners that the United States is committed to nonproliferation. The planned facilities in South Carolina also play a crucial role in the Department's efforts to downsize the nuclear weapons complex, increase nuclear material safety and reduce safeguards and security costs. The Committee endorses the Department of Energy proceeding with construction of the U.S. facility and continuing its work with the Russians to find a mutually acceptable solution that will guarantee the destruction of 34 tons of weapons grade plutonium from each of the United States and Russian stockpiles over the same period of time it will take the United States to destroy its own stockpile. The Committee is aware of the recent Russian proposal to burn plutonium using advanced reactor technology. The Committee understands that this proposal can only destroy a small portion of the material and does not provide a full solution. Likewise, the Committee does not be-

lieve that the development of new reactor technology is likely and does not support this initiative. The Committee does not support activities to resume the design of an immobilization facility under the Office of Fissile Materials Disposition. The Committee recognizes that in the past, Russia has indicated that it did not support immobilization as a disposition option and would be unlikely to go forward if the United States chooses to immobilize its 34 metric tons of plutonium. Furthermore, MOX is a mature, accepted technology with fuel in use in over 30 reactors worldwide. The technology supporting the immobilization of weapon-grade plutonium is still in the research and development stage. Even in an optimistic scenario, the Department would not be able to begin construction of an immobilization facility for at least 10 years. Moreover, irradiating MOX fuel in commercial nuclear reactors would also serve as an important stepping-stone for demonstrating this technology in the United States and utilizing the energy value of the plutonium. The Committee continues to view fissile materials disposition as an important nonproliferation priority.

The Committee provides $235,051,000 for U.S. Plutonium Disposition. The Committee doesn't provide any funding for the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program.

Construction.—

Project 99–D–141, Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility.—The Committee recommends $93,000,000, an increase of $14,300,000 above the budget request. The Pit Disassembly facility is critical not only to the Fissile materials program, but it provides the only means to convert weapons-grade plutonium metal into a powder that can be turned into fuel.

Project 99–D–143, MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility.—The Committee recommends $325,000,000, an increase of $35,490,000 above the budget request.

GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

The Committee recommends $116,818,000 for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, an increase of $10,000,000 above the budget request. This program is charged with responsibility of identifying and removing high-risk nuclear material and other radioactive material around the world that pose a threat if released either by accident or done maliciously. The additional funding shall be used to support the International Radiological Threat Reduction program to secure radioactive material that might be used in medical or industrial applications or in a radiological dispersal device. The Committee directs the Department to use the funds to support work with other countries to secure high-risk radioactive materials.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2006	$781,605,000
Budget estimate, 2007	795,133,000
House allowance	795,133,000
Committee recommendation	795,133,000

Through the Naval Reactors program, the National Nuclear Security Administration is working to provide the U.S. Navy with nuclear propulsion plants that are capable of responding to the chal-

lenges of 21st century security concerns. The Committee recommends $795,133,000 for the Naval Reactors program.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 2006	$388,450,000
Budget estimate, 2007	386,576,000
House allowance	399,576,000
Committee recommendation	386,576,000

The Committee recommends $386,576,000 for the Office of the Administrator, the same as the President's request. The increase in funds is for expanding Federal staffing to support defense nuclear nonproliferation, as well as positions transferred to the NNSA from other organizations.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Reprogramming Authority.—The Committee understands and continues to support the need for project managers to maintain flexibility to meet the changing funding requirements at sites. In fiscal year 2007, the Department may transfer up to $5,000,000 between the accounts listed below to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings, as long as a program or project is not increased or decreased by more than $5,000,000 in total during the fiscal year. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or to change funding levels for programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the act or report. The Committee on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be notified within 30 days after the use of this internal reprogramming authority.

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

—Closure sites;
—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 Tank Farms Operations and Management;
—Office of River Protection [ORP] Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant;
—Program Direction;
—Program Support;
—UE D&D Fund contribution;
—Technology Development;
—All Construction Line Items;
—NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites; and
—Safeguards and Security.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2006	$6,130,448,000
Budget estimate, 2007	5,390,312,000
House allowance	5,551,812,000
Committee recommendation	5,479,070,000

For Defense Environmental Cleanup, the Committee provides $5,479,070,000. The Committee is pleased with the program's success in completing the cleanup at Rocky Flats and Fernald in fiscal year 2006. The Department's effort to complete cleanups in the future will be challenged by the failure to request sufficient funding for future cleanups. The Department continues to be plagued by project management challenges that will require significant attention from senior management to better define cleanup costs and schedules. The Committee will continue to carefully monitor future high-risk cleanup strategies undertaken by the Department to ensure the Department is applying best business practices. Within available funds, $1,300,000 is provided to support historic preservation activities related to the Manhattan Project sites, including Los Alamos, New Mexico, Hanford, Washington and Eastern Tennessee Historical Park and $300,000 to support the Rocky Flats historic preservation activities. The Committee also recommends $1,000,000 for the Self Reliance Foundation/Hispanic Communications Network. The Committee also provides $5,000,000 to support the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory, $2,500,000 to fund the WERC/Department of Energy Cooperative Agreement, and $5,000,000 for the Western Environmental Technology Office; and $10,000,000 for hazardous waste worker training.

Closure Sites.—The Committee includes $320,937,000, the same as the request. This includes funding for Ashtabula, Columbus, Fernald, Miamisburg, and Rocky Flats all at the requested level.

Savannah River Site.—The Committee includes $1,064,394,000, consistent with the request. The Committee recommends $216,468,000 consistent with the requested level for 2012 cleanup activities, including $212,468,000 for SR–0011B Stabilization and Disposition activities. The Committee provides $277,338,000 for 2035 projects cleanup activities as provided in the budget. The Committee recommends the requested level of $570,924,000 for SR–00114C Tank Waste Stabilization and Disposition activities.

H Canyon located at Savannah River is the last remaining large-scale chemical separations facility in this country and provides a one-of-a-kind capability to facilitate the down blend and disposal of the legacy nuclear fuel within the Department of Energy complex. The Committee is concerned that the Department, while maintaining the facility in a high state of readiness, is not maximizing its potential for the disposition of excess special nuclear material and spent nuclear fuel. Recently the Department of Energy Inspector General report found that the delays in developing a strategy to address spent nuclear fuel at Savannah River will require the Department to maintain the H Canyon facility in an idle capacity for an additional 2 years at a cost of $300,000,000. Based on a declining environmental cleanup budget, it is clear that the Department can ill-afford to waste such sums without a clear mission. However, the Committee recognizes that this facility can play an important

role in permanently disposing tons of spent fuel as well as plutonium. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to submit, consistent with the fiscal year 2008, an operations plan including costs and schedule for utilizing H Canyon to dispose of nuclear material and uranium alloy spent nuclear fuel stored throughout the complex, or a plan for immediate shutdown and deactivation of the H Canyon. Either path will ensure that the Department will not waste funding to maintain an unused capability.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant [WIPP].—The Committee recommendation includes $232,278,000, an increase of $17,000,000 above the requested amount. The Committee provides $5,000,000 to support the consolidation of all Department of Energy records in Carlsbad relevant to the operations of WIPP and TRU waste stored in the repository. The Committee also recommends $3,500,000 made available to the community of Carlsbad for educational support, infrastructure improvements and related initiatives to address the impacts of accelerated operations at WIPP. The Committee directs the Department to provide $2,000,000 from within available funds to support work of the Center for Excellence in Hazardous Materials. The Committee recommends $1,500,000 for work on neutrino research. An additional $7,000,000 shall be used to support remote-handled operations once the permits have been approved.

Idaho National Laboratory.—The Committee includes $512,604,000, the same as the requested amount to support cleanup of nuclear and hazardous waste from the Snake River Plain at the Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee recommends $193,910,000 for Solid Waste Stabilization (ID–0013), and $120,510,000 for Soil and Water Remediation 2012 (ID–0030B).

NNSA Sites.—The Committee recommendation is $282,466,000. The additional $50,000,000 is provided to offset reductions in the Department's request for Los Alamos National Laboratory cleanup activities. The Committee is very concerned with the overall performance of the Legacy Waste Disposition project at the Los Alamos National Laboratory [LANL]. The transfer of transuranic [TRU] waste from LANL to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant [WIPP] has been significantly below the Committee's expectations. Characterization costs from the facility are significantly higher than at other Department of Energy [DOE] sites, and the waste removal schedules are not meeting overall program goals. Although the project has demonstrated some recent improvement in the volume of shipments to WIPP, the Committee expects the Department and the new LANL management contractor to demonstrate significant progress in the near term. The Department is directed to provide a report within 120 days of enactment of this legislation detailing the progress being made at LANL with a particular emphasis on steps the Department has taken to assist the new management team in streamlining the overall TRU waste handling process. The Committee is also concerned that joint reviews by DOE Headquarters and the National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA] have revealed significant issues preventing the independent validation of cost estimates and schedules for LANL's Environmental Management [EM] Project Baseline Summaries [PBS] in recent years. LANL must address these issues and develop a

compliant and independently validated baseline against which future performance can be measured. The Committee is disappointed with the deep cuts proposed by the Department with the assumption that the new contractor will be able to fund savings to make up the difference. This assumption by the Department has the potential to backfire and increase costs by extending the cost of cleanup and fines and penalties that can be imposed by the State of New Mexico, as provided in the Consent Order signed between the Department and the State of New Mexico. The Committee understands that the State could charge between $8,000,000 to $35,000,000 in penalties for noncompliance. The Committee expects the Department to take a more involved role in solving cleanup problem at the lab to reduce costs and increase cleanup. Consequently, the Committee allocates a total of $141,000,000 for environmental management activities at LANL, an increase of $50,000,000 above the budget request. However, since the Department has failed to make specific recommendations to accelerate cleanup and provide appropriate oversight, the Committee has required that any penalties paid at Los Alamos as a consequence of non-compliance, shall be paid out of the Program Direction account. The Committee provides the requested level of funding for the following projects: California Sites ($545,000), Kansas City Plant ($4,481,000), Lawrence Livermore ($29,283,000), Nevada Off-Sites ($2,818,000), Nevada ($84,177,000), NNSA Service Center ($8,221,000), and Pantex ($23,726,000).

Oak Ridge Reservation.—The Committee includes $179,222,000, an increase of $19,360,000 above the budget request. The additional funding will be used to support Nuclear Waste Facilities D&D activities at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The Committee provides $41,316,000 to support these activities.

Hanford Site.—The Committee includes $804,716,000, the same as the President's request. The Committee recommendation includes $423,618,000 for 2012 Completion Projects, including $221,022,000 for River Corridor Closure projects. The Committee recommends $81,651,000 for Nuclear Material Stabilization and Disposition and $81,069,000 for SNF Stabilization and Disposition. Within available funds, the Committee recommends $6,000,000 for the HAMMER Facility. The Committee recommendation includes $381,098,000 for the 2035 Completion Projects, including $188,989,000 for the Solid Waste Stabilization and Disposition 200 Area. The Committee provides $75,973,000 for Vadose Zone cleanup and $94,270,000 for Nuclear Facility D&D activities.

Office of River Protection.—The Committee includes $964,127,000, as requested. The Government Accountability Office identified three primary concerns with the Department's management of the Waste Treatment Facility. The GAO's three concerns include: (1) The Department has allowed the contractor to utilize a design-build approach that does not allow adequate time for Federal managers, independent oversight, or construction teams to validate the designs; (2) the contractor has failed to maintain oversight and adherence to cost and schedules; and (3) the contract fails to provide proper incentives and controls to encourage responsible management and cost containment. The Committee does recognize that the change in leadership within the Department of En-

ergy has forced the Department to take the necessary corrective steps to manage this large, technically challenging construction project in a more responsible and active manner. The Department is taking corrective action in the following ways: First, the Department has delayed construction, permitting the design teams to take more time with the design and allowing for adequate review. Second, the Secretary has taken steps to identify cost issues and validate the data with several independent teams, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and an independent team of industry experts, as well as a new headquarters senior level management oversight team, all of whom will implement an Earned Value Management System [EVMS]. The EVMS is a key project management tool for assessing the cost and schedule performance of a project. The lack of an effective EVMS was highlighted by the dramatic increase in the cost of the WTP in 2005 within a matter of months. This Committee understands that if an effective EVMS had been in place, the Department would have had early warning signs that the project was headed toward dramatic increases in cost and delays in schedule. Therefore, the Committee expects the Department to have a certified system in place by the end of calendar year 2006, and this expectation will be satisfied when the Defense Contract Management Agency has certified that the earned value management system used to track and report costs of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant is in place. Finally, the Committee is also troubled by the fact that the Department has not yet developed a contracting strategy to reward cost savings and shrewd project oversight. Based on the initial Army Corps evaluation, this project continues to carry massive contingency to protect the contractor, not the taxpayer, from risk. GAO found the contractor has added contingency to the project, which has added over $2,000,000,000 to the cost of the project. The Committee remains concerned that a large contingency request is a clear indication the contractor lacks confidence in their own cost estimates. If the Department expects the Committee to support future appropriations for this project, it must be more demanding and drive down costs and contingencies. The Committee would like to see an incentive-based contract that will encourage the contractor to reduce costs.

Seismic Evaluation.—Of the amount appropriated to the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant, none of the amount may be obligated or expended for construction or procurement of critical equipment affected by seismic criteria on the Pretreatment Facility and the High-Level Waste Facility of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant until the date on which the Department certifies to the Congress that the final seismic and ground motion criteria have been approved by the Department. Additionally, funds are not to be used until the contracting officer of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Project has formally directed the final criteria for the design of the Pretreatment Facility and the High-Level Waste Facility of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant. Due to expected delays as a result of seismic work and necessary evaluation, the Committee recommends a reduction in the allocation for these two facilities. The Committee recommends $690,000,000 for the major construction activities of the Waste Treatment Plant. The Committee is concerned that the WTP

project still does not have a validated project baseline. The Committee does feel, however, that the Department is on track to completing this validation, but does not think it will be completed in time to be useful in current budget deliberations. Although this issue is significant, as are those raised by the Government Accountability Office and the Department's own chartered external reviews, the Committee recognizes and is encouraged by the recent activities the Department has initiated to improve project and contract management, to resolve the higher-priority technical issues, and to validate the project baseline that supports a funding level of $690,000,000, as requested. The Department must understand that funding beyond fiscal year 2007 is contingent on the successful execution of this validated baseline. The Committee recommends the following funding distribution for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant: $120,000,000 for the low activity waste facility; $46,000,000 for the analytical laboratory; $53,000,000 for the balance of facilities; $191,000,000 for the high level waste facility; and $280,000,000 for the pretreatment facility. This Committee is troubled by the apparent failure of the Department to act in a timely manner on issues raised by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board [DNFSB]. The Committee does not support the removal of the DNFSB from its congressionally mandated oversight responsibilities at the WTP, but it does recognize that changes do need to be made. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to submit a quarterly report to the Committee on Appropriations describing all interactions between the Department and the DNFSB regarding the WTP. The report should include, but not be limited to, issues resolved, issues unresolved and corrective actions taken by the Department.

Program Direction.—The Committee includes $291,216,000, the same as the requested amount.

Program Support.—The Committee includes $37,881,000, consistent with the request.

Technology Development and Deployment.—The Committee includes $21,389,000, the same as the President's request. The Committee recommends $5,000,000 to support the AEA Technology Program in Pennsylvania; $1,500,000 for the Nye County Groundwater Monitoring Program; $3,000,000 for the James E. Rogers and Louis Weiner Jr., Large Scale Structures Laboratory; $4,000,000 for the continuation of the remediation of low level nuclear waste using ceramic ionic transport membranes project; $1,000,000 for the Inland Northwest Research Alliance consortium of universities; $4,000,000 for the Nevada Water Resources Data, Modeling, and Visualization Center; $750,000 for polymeric hydrogels for radiation decontamination; $1,000,000 for the UNR Center for Plasma Spectronomy; and $1,000,000 for the Nevada Statewide Intermediate Scale Research Facility.

The Department is directed to both continue activities under its renewed NRAMP cooperative agreement at levels consistent with prior years funding and renew its other existing cooperative agreements with UNR and UNLV consistent with current year levels.

Federal Contribution to Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.—The Committee includes $452,000,000, the same as the requested amount.

Safeguards and Security.—The Committee recommends $295,840,000, the same as the budget request.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2006	$635,577,000
Budget estimate, 2007	717,788,000
House allowance	720,788,000
Committee recommendation	734,791,000

The Committee recommends $734,791,000 for Other Defense Activities, consistent with the budget request.

OFFICE OF SECURITY AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Committee recommends $298,497,000 for the Office of Security and Performance Assurance.

The Security Program consists of 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 the DOE to uphold its national security responsibilities and provide security clearances for Federal and contractor personnel.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Committee provides $94,814,000 for defense-related Environment Safety and Health, of which $20,076,000 is provided for program direction. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the DOE Worker Records Digitization project in Nevada.

Former Medical Worker Screening.—The Committee allocates an additional $14,000,000 for the former worker medical screening program, which is equal to the appropriated levels in fiscal year 2006. The Committee recommends $500,000 to screen workers at Paducah, Portsmouth, and Oak Ridge, gaseous diffusion plants. The Committee directs $500,000 to continue medical screening and commence a 5-year Early Lung Cancer Detection Screening Program for current and former Nevada Test Site workers who worked during the nuclear weapons testing era. The Committee intends to build on the success of the use of ELCD for high risk workers in finding lung cancers when they are small and can be removed at an early stage leading to a normal life expectancy. The Committee urges DOE to request sufficient funding for this program in fiscal year 2008.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

For Legacy Management, the Committee recommends $167,851,000, consistent with the budget request. Funds are used to manage the long-term stewardship responsibilities at Department of Energy cleanup sites.

FUNDING FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES IN IDAHO

The Committee recommends $75,949,000, the same as the request, for defense-related activities at the Idaho National Laboratory and associated Idaho cleanup sites.

DEFENSE RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

For Defense Related Administrative Support, the Committee recommends $93,258,000, the same as the request. These funds provide for departmental services which support the National Nuclear Security Administration. The Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretaries, and General Counsel are among the offices receiving funds.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

The Committee provides $4,422,000 for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, the same as the President's request. The Office of Hearings and Appeals conducts hearings to issue decisions of the Department that the Secretary may delegate.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2006	$346,500,000
Budget estimate, 2007	388,080,000
House allowance	388,080,000
Committee recommendation	358,080,000

The Committee recommends $358,080,000 for defense nuclear waste disposal; this is a reduction of $30,000,000 below the request. The Committee directs the Department to find reductions in the transportation activities.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Department of Energy's marketing agency for electric power in the Pacific Northwest. Bonneville provides electricity to a 300,000 square mile service area in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets the power from Federal hydropower projects in the Northwest, as well as power from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also exchanges and markets surplus power with Canada and California. The Committee recommends no new borrowing authority for BPA during fiscal year 2007.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2006	$5,544,000
Budget estimate, 2007	5,723,000
House allowance	5,723,000
Committee recommendation	5,723,000

For the Southeastern Power Administration, the Committee recommends $5,723,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee provides $48,003,000 for purchase power and wheeling.

The Southeastern Power Administration markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers projects in 11 Southeastern

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2006	$29,864,000
Budget estimate, 2007	31,539,000
House allowance	31,539,000
Committee recommendation	31,539,000

For the Southwestern Power Administration, the Committee recommends $31,539,000, the same as the budget request. Within these funds, the Committee provides $13,600,000 for purchase power and wheeling.

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

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

Appropriations, 2006	$231,652,000
Budget estimate, 2007	212,213,000
House allowance	212,213,000
Committee recommendation	212,213,000

The Western Power Administration is responsible for marketing the electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission. Western also operates and maintains a system of transmission lines nearly 17,000 miles long, providing electricity to 15 Central and Western States over a service area of 1.3 million square miles.

The Committee recommends $212,213,000 for the Western Area Power Administration, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Western in fiscal year 2007 is $688,511,000, which includes $60,205,000 for construction and rehabilitation, $45,734,000 for system power operation and maintenance, $427,931,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and $147,748,000 for program direction. The Committee recommendation includes $6,893,000 for the Utah Mitigation and Conservation Fund. Additionally, the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration is directed to participate in the construction of transmission lines and facilities in eastern Colorado and western Kansas.

Offsetting collections total $472,593,000. With the use of $3,705,000 of offsetting collections from the Colorado River Dam Fund (as authorized in Public Law 98–381), this requires a net appropriation of $212,213,000.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriations, 2006	$2,665,000
Budget estimate, 2007	2,500,000
House allowance	2,500,000
Committee recommendation	2,500,000

The Falcon Dam and Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande River generate power through hydroelectric facilities and sell this power to public utilities through the Western Power Administration. This fund, created in the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, defrays the costs of operation, maintenance, and emergency activities and is administered by the Western Area Power Administration. For the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund, the Committee recommends $2,500,000, the same as the request.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2006	$218,196,000
Budget estimate, 2007	230,800,000
House allowance	230,800,000
Committee recommendation	

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2006	−$218,196,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−230,800,000
House allowance	−230,800,000
Committee recommendation	

As noted by the Committee in our 2004 report, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has the preemptive authority to approve and site liquefied natural gas terminals on-shore or in State waters. Congress reaffirmed this authority last year as part of the Energy Policy Act. While the FERC is often criticized by individual Members of Congress about specific local decisions it makes with respect to natural gas infrastructure, few express support for the overall success the Commission has achieved in ensuring the timely development of these critical energy facilities. We therefore want to state our support for the thoughtful and balanced manner in which the FERC has exercised its authority to approve natural gas pipelines and LNG terminals, and encourage all relevant Federal and State permitting agencies to fully cooperate with the Commission in reviewing proposed natural gas infrastructure projects.

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:							
1Hydrogen technology	80,288	195,801	195,801	189,860	+109,572	−5,941	−5,941
Fuel cell technologies	75,339	.....	.....	.....	−75,339	.....	.....
Subtotal, hydrogen technology	155,627	195,801	195,801	189,860	+34,233	−5,941	−5,941
Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D	90,718	149,687	149,687	213,000	+122,282	+63,313	+63,313
Solar energy	83,113	148,372	148,372	148,372	+65,259	.....	.....
Wind energy	38,857	43,819	43,819	39,428	+571	−4,391	−4,391
Geothermal technology	23,066	.....	.....	22,500	−566	+22,500	+22,500
Hydropower	495	.....	.....	4,000	+3,505	+4,000	+4,000
Vehicle technologies	182,104	166,024	177,538	180,024	−2,080	+14,000	+2,486
Building technologies	69,266	77,329	93,029	95,329	+26,063	+18,000	+2,300
Industrial technologies	56,855	45,563	51,563	47,563	−9,292	+2,000	−4,000
Federal Energy Management Program:							
Departmental energy management program	1,999	.....	.....	.....	−1,999	.....	.....
Federal energy management program	16,976	16,906	18,906	16,906	−70	.....	−2,000
Subtotal, Federal Energy Management Program	18,975	16,906	18,906	16,906	−2,069	.....	−2,000
Facilities and infrastructure:							
National Renewable Energy Laboratory	5,742	5,935	10,935	5,935	+193	.....	−5,000
Research Support Buildings	9,900	.....	5,000	.....	−9,900	.....	−5,000
Construction: 02–E–001 Science and technology facility, NREL	10,410	.....	.....	.....	−10,410	.....	.....
Total, Facilities and infrastructure	26,052	5,935	15,935	5,935	−20,117	.....	−10,000
Weatherization programs:							
Weatherization assistance	237,996	159,648	250,000	200,000	−37,996	+40,352	−50,000
Training and technical assistance	4,554	4,550	4,554	4,550	−4	.....	−4

[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, Weatherization programs	242,550	164,198	254,554	204,550	−38,000	+40,352	−50,004
Other:							
State energy program grants	35,640	49,457	25,000	49,457	+13,817	.....	+24,457
State energy activities	495	.....	.....	.....	−495	.....	.....
Gateway deployment	25,400	.....	.....	.....	−25,400	.....	.....
International renewable energy program	3,871	2,473	4,473	2,473	−1,398	.....	−2,000
Tribal energy activities	3,960	3,957	3,957	4,957	+997	+1,000	+1,000
Renewable energy production incentive	4,950	4,946	4,946	4,946	−4	.....	.....
Subtotal, Other	74,316	60,833	38,376	61,833	−12,483	+1,000	+23,457
Program Direction	98,529	91,024	91,024	91,024	−7,505	.....	.....
Program Support	13,321	10,930	10,930	10,930	−2,391	.....	.....
Congressionally directed technology deployments	.....	.....	54,900	54,250	+54,250	+54,250	−650
TOTAL, ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	1,173,844	1,176,421	1,344,434	1,385,504	+211,660	+209,083	+41,070
ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY							
High temperature superconductivity R&D	49,995	45,468	45,468	45,468	−4,527	.....	.....
Transmission reliability R&D	12,870	.....	.....	.....	−12,870	.....	.....
Electricity distribution transformation R&D	60,059	.....	.....	.....	−60,059	.....	.....
Energy storage R&D	2,970	.....	.....	.....	−2,970	.....	.....
Gridwise	5,445	.....	.....	.....	−5,445	.....	.....
Gridworks	4,950	.....	.....	.....	−4,950	.....	.....
Visiualization and controls	.....	17,551	17,551	27,551	+27,551	+10,000	+10,000
Energy storage and power electonics	.....	2,965	4,965	2,965	+2,965	.....	−2,000
Distributed energy resources	.....	29,652	29,652	24,737	+24,737	−4,915	−4,915
Total, Research and development	136,289	95,636	97,636	100,721	−35,568	+5,085	+3,085
Electricity restructuring	12,276	.....	.....	.....	−12,276	.....	.....
Operations and analysis	.....	12,009	12,009	17,000	+17,000	+4,991	+4,991
Program direction	13,313	17,283	17,283	17,283	+3,970	.....	.....

Congressionally directed technology deployments	.....	.....	17,100	.....	.....	.....	−17,100
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY	161,878	124,928	144,028	135,004	−26,874	+10,076	−9,024
NUCLEAR ENERGY							
University reactor infrastructure and education assist	26,730	.....	27,000	27,000	+270	+27,000	.....
Research and development:							
Nuclear power 2010	65,340	54,031	54,031	88,000	+22,660	+33,969	+33,969
Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative	54,450	31,436	31,436	48,000	−6,450	+16,564	+16,564
Nuclear hydrogen initiative	24,750	18,665	18,665	31,665	+6,915	+13,000	+13,000
Advanced fuel cycle initiative	79,200	243,000	120,000	279,000	+199,800	+36,000	+159,000
Total, Research and development	223,740	347,132	224,132	446,665	+222,925	+99,533	+222,533
Infrastructure:							
Radiological facilities management:							
Space and defense infrastructure	39,303	30,650	44,650	35,650	−3,653	+5,000	−9,000
Medical isotopes infrastructure	14,251	15,634	15,634	15,634	+1,383	.....	.....
Subtotal, Medical isotopes infrastructure	14,251	15,634	15,634	15,634	+1,383	.....	.....
Enrichment facility and uranium management	495	491	491	491	−4	.....	.....
Research reactor infrastructure	.....	2,947	.....	2,947	+2,947	.....	+2,947
Subtotal, Radiological facilities management	54,049	49,722	60,775	54,722	+673	+5,000	−6,053
Idaho facilities management:							
INL Operations and infrastructure	101,878	89,260	97,260	104,260	+2,382	+15,000	+7,000
INL infrastructure:							
Construction:							
06–E–200 Project engineering and design (PED), INL, ID	7,791	6,030	6,030	6,030	−1,761	.....	.....
Research support buildings	.....	.....	20,000	5,000	+5,000	+5,000	−15,000
06–E–201 Gas test loop in the ATR, INL, ID	3,054	.....	.....	.....	−3,054	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	10,845	6,030	26,030	11,030	+185	+5,000	−15,000
Subtotal, Idaho facilities management	112,723	95,290	123,290	115,290	+2,567	+20,000	−8,000
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	74,258	72,946	72,946	72,946	−1,312	.....	.....
Total, Infrastructure	241,030	217,958	257,011	242,958	+1,928	+25,000	−14,053

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
Program direction	60,498	67,608	64,608	67,608	+7,110		+3,000
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy	551,998	632,698	572,751	784,231	+232,233	+151,533	+211,480
Funding from other defense activities	−122,634	−72,946	−72,946	−72,946	+49,688		
Funding from Naval Reactors	−13,365				+13,365		
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	415,999	559,752	499,805	711,285	+295,286	+151,533	+211,480
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH							
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)	7,029	9,128	9,128	9,128	+2,099		
Program direction	20,691	19,993	19,993	19,993	−698		
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	27,720	29,121	29,121	29,121	+1,401		
OFFICE OF LEGACY MANAGEMENT							
Legacy management	33,187	33,139	33,139	33,139	−48		
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION	1,812,628	1,923,361	2,050,527	2,294,053	+481,425	+370,692	+243,526
CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY							
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2005	257,000			257,000		+257,000	+257,000
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2007	−257,000	257,000	257,000	−203,000	+54,000	−460,000	−460,000
Rescission Request		−203,000	−257,000			+203,000	+257,000
Rescission, uncommitted balances	−20,000			−50,000	−30,000	−50,000	−50,000
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D (FutureGen)		−54,000		−54,000	−54,000		−54,000
Total, Clean Coal Technology	−20,000			−50,000	−30,000	−50,000	−50,000
FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT							
Clean coal power initiative	49,500	4,957	36,400	70,000	+20,500	+65,043	+33,600

FutureGen	17,820	54,000	54,000	54,000	+36,180	.....	.....
Fuels and Power Systems:							
Innovations for existing plants	25,146	16,015	25,000	25,000	−146	+8,985	.....
Advanced integrated gasification combined cycle	55,886	53,982	56,000	54,000	−1,886	+18	−2,000
Advanced turbines	17,820	12,801	20,000	20,000	+2,180	+7,199	.....
Carbon sequestration	66,330	73,971	73,971	90,000	+23,670	+16,029	+16,029
Fuels	28,710	22,127	29,000	29,000	+290	+6,873	.....
Fuel cells	61,380	63,352	63,352	63,000	+1,620	−352	−352
Advanced research	52,622	28,914	28,914	30,000	−22,622	+1,086	+1,086
U.S./China Energy and environmental center	984	.....	.....	.....	−984	.....	.....
Subtotal, Fuels and power systems	308,878	271,162	296,237	311,000	+2,122	+39,838	+14,763
Subtotal, Coal	376,198	330,119	386,637	435,000	+58,802	+104,881	+48,363
Natural Gas Technologies	32,670	.....	.....	17,000	−15,670	+17,000	+17,000
Petroleum—Oil Technologies	31,680	.....	2,700	10,000	−21,680	+10,000	+7,300
Methane hydrates R&D	.....	.....	12,000	.....	.....	.....	−12,000
Program direction	105,872	129,196	126,496	142,396	+36,524	+13,200	+15,900
Plant and Capital Equipment	19,800	.....	.....	12,000	−7,800	+12,000	+12,000
Fossil energy environmental restoration	9,504	9,715	9,715	11,715	+2,211	+2,000	+2,000
Import/export authorization	1,781	.....	.....	.....	−1,781	.....	.....
Advanced metallurgical research	7,920	.....	.....	.....	−7,920	.....	.....
Special recruitment programs	649	656	656	656	+7	.....	.....
Cooperative research and development	5,940	.....	.....	.....	−5,940	.....	.....
Congressionally directed technology deployments	.....	.....	20,000	15,500	+15,500	+15,500	−4,500
TOTAL, FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	592,014	469,686	558,204	644,267	+52,253	+174,581	+86,063
NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES	21,285	18,810	18,810	39,810	+18,525	+21,000	+21,000
ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUNDS	83,160	.....	.....	.....	−83,160	.....	.....
STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE	164,340	155,430	155,430	155,430	−8,910	.....	.....
NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE	.....	4,950	4,950	4,950	+4,950	.....	.....
ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION	85,314	89,769	89,769	93,032	+7,718	+3,263	+3,263
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP							
West Valley Demonstration Project	76,329	73,400	73,400	73,400	−2,929	.....	.....
Gaseous Diffusion Plants	48,325	74,860	74,860	74,860	+26,535	.....	.....
Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion, 02–U–101	84,945	32,556	32,556	32,556	−52,389	.....	.....
Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility (WA)	45,652	34,843	34,843	34,843	−10,809	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Small Sites:							
Argonne National Lab	10,382	10,726	11,726	10,726	+344	.....	−1,000
Brookhaven National Lab	33,985	28,272	28,860	28,272	−5,713	.....	−588
Idaho National Lab	5,221	7,000	7,000	7,000	+1,779	.....	.....
Consolidated Business Center:							
California Site support	99	160	160	160	+61	.....	.....
Inhalation Toxicology Lab	302	2,931	3,431	2,931	+2,629	.....	−500
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab	3,861	.....	.....	.....	−3,861	.....	.....
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center	3,465	5,720	5,720	5,720	+2,255	.....	.....
Energy Technology Engineering Center	8,910	16,000	16,000	16,000	+7,090	.....	.....
Los Alamos National Lab	485	1,025	1,025	1,025	+540	.....	.....
Moab	27,726	22,865	19,865	22,865	−4,861	.....	+3,000
UMTRA site litigation	.....	.....	500	.....	.....	.....	−500
Subtotal, small sites	94,436	94,699	94,287	94,699	+263	.....	+412
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	349,687	310,358	309,946	310,358	−39,329	.....	+412
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND							
Decontamination and decommissioning	536,806	559,368	559,368	573,368	+36,562	+14,000	+14,000
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	19,800	20,000	20,000	.....	−19,800	−20,000	−20,000
SUBTOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT D&D FUND	556,606	579,368	579,368	573,368	+16,762	−6,000	−6,000
Uranium sales and barter (scorekeeping adjustment)	(3,000)	.....	.....	.....	(−3,000)	.....	.....
TOTAL, UED&D FUND/URANIUM INVENTORY CLEANUP	(556,606)	(579,368)	(579,368)	(573,368)	(+16,762)	(−6,000)	(−6,000)
SCIENCE							
High energy physics:							
Proton accelerator-based physics	388,172	376,536	376,536	376,536	−11,636	.....	.....
Electron accelerator-based physics	131,494	117,460	117,460	117,460	−14,034	.....	.....
Non-accelerator physics	38,203	59,271	59,271	59,271	+21,068	.....	.....

Theoretical physics	48,612	52,056	52,056	43,746	−4,866	−8,310	−8,310
Advanced technology R&D	110,213	159,476	159,476	159,476	+49,263	.....	.....
Subtotal	716,694	764,799	764,799	756,489	+39,795	−8,310	−8,310
Construction: 07–SC–07 Project engineering and design (PED) lectron neutrino appearance (EvA)	.....	10,300	10,300	10,300	+10,300	.....	.....
Total, High energy physics	716,694	775,099	775,099	766,789	+50,095	−8,310	−8,310
Nuclear physics	365,054	439,540	439,540	419,540	+54,486	−20,000	−20,000
Construction:							
07–SC–001 Project engineering and design (PED) 12 GeV continuous electron beam accelerator facility upgrade, Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator facility, Newport News, VA	.....	7,000	7,000	7,000	+7,000	.....	.....
07–SC–002 Electron beam ion source Brookhaven National Laboratory, NY	.....	7,400	7,400	7,400	+7,400	.....	.....
06–SC–02 Project engineering and design (PED), Electron beam ion source, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY	1,980	120	120	120	−1,860	.....	.....
Total, Nuclear physics	367,034	454,060	454,060	434,060	+67,026	−20,000	−20,000
Biological and environmental research	579,831	510,263	540,263	560,000	−19,831	+49,737	+19,737
Basic energy sciences:							
Research:							
Materials sciences and engineering research	738,682	1,004,212	1,004,212	1,004,212	+265,530	.....	.....
Chemical sciences, geosciences and energy biosciences	219,583	268,499	268,499	293,449	+73,866	+24,950	+24,950
Subtotal, Research	958,265	1,272,711	1,272,711	1,297,661	+339,396	+24,950	+24,950
Construction:							
07–SC–06 Project engineering and design (PED) National Synchrotron light source II (NSLS-II)	.....	20,000	20,000	20,000	+20,000	.....	.....
07–SC–12 Project engineering and design (PED) Advanced light source user building, LBNL	.....	3,000	3,000	3,000	+3,000	.....	.....
05–R–320 LINAC coherent light source (LCLS)	82,170	105,740	105,740	105,740	+23,570	.....	.....
05–R–321 Center for functional nanomaterials (BNL)	36,187	18,864	18,864	18,864	−17,323	.....	.....
04–R–313 The molecular foundry (LBNL)	9,510	257	257	257	−9,253	.....	.....
03–SC–002 Project engineering & design (PED) SLAC	2,519	161	161	161	−2,358	.....	.....
03–R–313 Center for Integrated Nanotechnology	4,580	247	247	247	−4,333	.....	.....
99–E–334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	41,327	.....	.....	.....	−41,327	.....	.....

[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, Construction	176,293	148,269	148,269	148,269	−28,024		
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,134,558	1,420,980	1,420,980	1,445,930	+311,372	+24,950	+24,950
High Energy Density Physics				79,924	+79,924	+79,924	+79,924
Advanced scientific computing research	234,684	318,654	318,654	318,654	+83,970		
Fusion energy sciences program	287,645	318,950	318,950	307,001	+19,356	−11,949	−11,949
Science laboratories infrastructure:							
Laboratories facilities support:							
Infrastructure support	1,505	1,520	1,520	1,520	+15		
General plant projects	2,970				−2,970		
Construction:							
07–SC–04 Science laboratories infrastructure project engineering and design (PED)		8,908	8,908	8,908	+8,908		
04–SC–001 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	2,970				−2,970		
03–SC–001 Science laboratories infrastructure MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	14,720	19,033	19,033	19,033	+4,313		
07–SC–05 Physical sciences facility at PNNL			7,000				−7,000
Subtotal, Construction	17,690	27,941	34,941	27,941	+10,251		−7,000
Subtotal, Laboratories facilities support	22,165	29,461	36,461	29,461	+7,296		−7,000
Oak Ridge landlord	5,028	5,079	5,079	5,079	+51		
Excess facilities disposal	14,491	16,348	9,348	16,348	+1,857		+7,000
Total, Science laboratories infrastructure	41,684	50,888	50,888	50,888	+9,204		
Safeguards and security	73,574	76,592	76,592	76,592	+3,018		
Workforce development for teachers and scientists	7,120	10,952	10,952	35,952	+28,832	+25,000	+25,000

Science program direction:							
Field offices	90,677	95,832	95,832	95,832	+5,155	.....	.....
Headquarters	68,441	75,045	75,045	75,045	+6,604	.....	.....
Total, Science program direction	159,118	170,877	170,877	170,877	+11,759	.....	.....
Subtotal, Science	3,601,942	4,107,315	4,137,315	4,246,667	+644,725	+139,352	+109,352
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−5,549	−5,605	−5,605	−5,605	−56	.....	.....
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,596,393	4,101,710	4,131,710	4,241,062	+644,669	+139,352	+109,352
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL							
Repository program	19,800	80,986	80,986	50,986	+31,186	−30,000	−30,000
Interim storage	.....	.....	30,000	10,000	+10,000	+10,000	−20,000
Program direction	79,200	75,434	75,434	75,434	−3,766	.....	.....
Integrated spent fuel recycling	49,500	.....	.....	.....	−49,500	.....	.....
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	148,500	156,420	186,420	136,420	−12,080	−20,000	−50,000
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION							
Administrative operations:							
Salaries and expenses:							
Office of the Secretary	5,345	5,539	4,752	5,539	+194	.....	+787
Board of Contract Appeals	642	147	126	147	−495	.....	+21
Chief financial officer	.....	36,790	31,562	39,970	+39,970	+3,180	+8,408
Management	.....	55,237	47,391	55,237	+55,237	.....	+7,846
Human capital management	.....	22,029	18,892	22,029	+22,029	.....	+3,137
Chief information officer	38,991	47,722	40,942	47,722	+8,731	.....	+6,780
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,778	4,866	4,174	4,866	+88	.....	+692
Economic impact and diversity	5,298	5,144	4,415	5,144	−154	.....	+729
General counsel	22,985	24,725	21,214	24,725	+1,740	.....	+3,511
Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation	108,207	.....	.....	.....	−108,207	.....	.....
Policy and international affairs	14,843	18,744	16,083	18,744	+3,901	.....	+2,661
Public affairs	4,459	4,419	3,790	4,419	−40	.....	+629
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	205,548	225,362	193,341	228,542	+22,994	+3,180	+35,201

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Program support:							
Minority economic impact	815	825	709	825	+10	.....	+116
Policy analysis and system studies	388	612	527	612	+224	.....	+85
Environmental policy studies	556	520	446	520	−36	.....	+74
Cybersecurity and secure communications	24,486	38,183	32,760	38,183	+13,697	.....	+5,423
Corporate management information program	22,824	22,917	19,659	22,917	+93	.....	+3,258
Subtotal, Program support	49,069	63,057	54,101	63,057	+13,988	.....	+8,956
Competitive sourcing initiative (A–76)	2,455	2,982	2,559	2,982	+527	.....	+423
Total, Administrative operations	257,072	291,401	250,001	294,581	+37,509	+3,180	+44,580
Cost of work for others	79,916	80,239	68,839	80,239	+323	.....	+11,400
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	336,988	371,640	318,840	374,820	+37,832	+3,180	+55,980
Funding from other defense activities	−86,699	−93,258	−93,258	−93,258	−6,559	.....	.....
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	250,289	278,382	225,582	281,562	+31,273	+3,180	+55,980
Miscellaneous revenues	−121,770	−123,000	−123,000	−123,000	−1,230	.....	.....
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	128,519	155,382	102,582	158,562	+30,043	+3,180	+55,980
Office of Inspector General	41,580	45,507	45,507	45,507	+3,927	.....	.....
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES							
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION							
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES							
Life extension program:							
B61 Life extension program	50,302	58,934	58,934	58,934	+8,632	.....	.....

W76 Life extension program	148,270	151,684	151,684	151,684	+3,414	.....	.....
W80 Life extension program	99,238	102,044	22,044	20,000	−79,238	−82,044	−2,044
Subtotal, Life extension program	297,810	312,662	232,662	230,618	−67,192	−82,044	−2,044
Stockpile systems:							
B61 Stockpile systems	65,390	63,782	63,782	63,782	−1,608	.....	.....
W62 Stockpile systems	8,877	3,738	3,738	3,738	−5,139	.....	.....
W76 Stockpile systems	62,903	56,174	56,174	56,174	−6,729	.....	.....
W78 Stockpile systems	32,306	50,662	50,662	50,662	+18,356	.....	.....
W80 Stockpile systems	26,052	27,230	27,230	27,230	+1,178	.....	.....
B83 Stockpile systems	26,127	23,365	23,365	23,365	−2,762	.....	.....
W84 Stockpile systems	4,358	1,465	1,465	1,465	−2,893	.....	.....
W87 Stockpile systems	50,171	59,333	59,333	59,333	+9,162	.....	.....
W88 Stockpile systems	32,503	39,796	39,796	39,796	+7,293	.....	.....
Subtotal, Stockpile systems	308,687	325,545	325,545	325,545	+16,858	.....	.....
Reliable replacement warhead	24,750	27,707	52,707	62,707	+37,957	+35,000	+10,000
Warheads Dismantlement	59,400	75,000	105,000	35,000	−24,400	−40,000	−70,000
Stockpile services:							
Production support	227,700	236,115	200,698	236,115	+8,415	.....	+35,417
Research and development support	60,640	63,948	54,356	63,948	+3,308	.....	+9,592
Research and development certification and safety	225,450	194,199	165,069	194,199	−31,251	.....	+29,130
Management, technology, and production	167,891	159,662	135,713	159,662	−8,229	.....	+23,949
Responsive infrastructure	.....	15,430	40,430	15,430	+15,430	.....	−25,000
Subtotal, Stockpile services	681,681	669,354	596,266	669,354	−12,327	.....	+73,088
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,372,328	1,410,268	1,312,180	1,323,224	−49,104	−87,044	+11,044
Campaigns:							
Science campaign:							
Primary assessment technologies	49,221	50,527	50,527	50,527	+1,306	.....	.....
Test readiness	19,800	14,757	14,757	14,757	−5,043	.....	.....
Dynamic materials properties	83,055	80,727	80,727	85,727	+2,672	+5,000	+5,000
Advanced radiography	49,025	36,745	36,745	36,745	−12,280	.....	.....
Secondary assessment technologies	75,569	81,006	81,006	81,006	+5,437	.....	.....
Subtotal, Science campaigns	276,670	263,762	263,762	268,762	−7,908	+5,000	+5,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Engineering campaign:							
Enhanced surety	39,600	26,731	26,731	41,200	+1,600	+14,469	+14,469
Weapons system engineering assessment technology	17,365	21,156	21,156	28,000	+10,635	+6,844	+6,844
Nuclear survivability	22,162	14,973	14,973	23,100	+938	+8,127	+8,127
Enhanced surveillance	99,205	86,526	86,526	103,200	+3,995	+16,674	+16,674
Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), other project costs	4,667	4,613	4,613	4,613	−54		
Construction: 01–D–108 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM	64,908	6,920	6,920	6,920	−57,988		
Subtotal, MESA	69,575	11,533	11,533	11,533	−58,042		
Subtotal, Engineering campaign	247,907	160,919	160,919	207,033	−40,874	+46,114	+46,114
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign:							
Ignition	74,859	79,763	79,763	69,763	−5,096	−10,000	−10,000
Support of stockpile programs	19,673	5,872	5,872	25,872	+6,199	+20,000	+20,000
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experiment support	42,578	45,959	55,959	42,578		−3,381	−13,381
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	10,902	10,603	10,603	10,603	−299		
University grants/other support	7,623	8,903	8,903		−7,623	−8,903	−8,903
Facility operations and target production	63,977	43,021	58,021	53,021	−10,956	+10,000	−5,000
Inertial fusion technology	47,520		40,000		−47,520		−40,000
NIF demonstration program	101,307	143,438	143,438	129,000	+27,693	−14,438	−14,438
High-energy petawatt laser development	34,650	2,213	14,213		−34,650	−2,213	−14,213
Subtotal	403,089	339,772	416,772	330,837	−72,252	−8,935	−85,935
Construction: 96–D–111 National ignition facility, LLNL	140,494	111,419	111,419	81,419	−59,075	−30,000	−30,000
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	543,583	451,191	528,191	412,256	−131,327	−38,935	−115,935
Advanced simulation and computing	599,772	617,955	635,155	695,995	+96,223	+78,040	+60,840

Pit manufacturing and certification:							
W88 pit manufacturing	119,717	147,658	147,658	147,658	+27,941	.....	.....
W88 pit certification	61,276	56,605	56,605	56,605	−4,671	.....	.....
Pit manufacturing capability	22,840	33,335	33,335	33,335	+10,495	.....	.....
Pit campaign support activities at NTS	34,830	.....	.....	.....	−34,830	.....	.....
Subtotal, Pit manufacturing and certification	238,663	237,598	237,598	237,598	−1,065	.....	.....
Readiness campaign:							
Stockpile readiness	31,086	17,576	17,576	17,576	−13,510	.....	.....
High explosives and weapons operations	16,926	17,188	17,188	17,188	+262	.....	.....
Non-nuclear readiness	28,344	31,171	31,171	31,171	+2,827	.....	.....
Advanced design and production technologies	53,500	53,645	55,645	53,645	+145	.....	−2,000
Tritium readiness	62,067	86,385	86,385	86,385	+24,318	.....	.....
Construction: 98–D–125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	24,645	.....	.....	.....	−24,645	.....	.....
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	86,712	86,385	86,385	86,385	−327	.....	.....
Subtotal, Readiness campaign	216,568	205,965	207,965	205,965	−10,603	.....	−2,000
Total, Campaigns	2,123,163	1,937,390	2,033,590	2,027,609	−95,554	+90,219	−5,981
Consolidated Production Center (CPC)	.....	.....	100,000	.....	.....	.....	−100,000
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF):							
Operations of facilities	.....	.....	.....	1,263,004	+1,263,004	+1,263,004	+1,263,004
Kansas City Plant	.....	98,057	98,057	.....	.....	−98,057	−98,057
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	.....	96,906	106,906	.....	.....	−96,906	−106,906
Los Alamos National Laboratory	.....	306,258	306,258	.....	.....	−306,258	−306,258
Nevada Test Site	.....	67,687	67,687	.....	.....	−67,687	−67,687
Pantex	.....	96,124	116,124	.....	.....	−96,124	−116,124
Sandia National Laboratory	.....	163,627	163,627	.....	.....	−163,627	−163,627
Savannah River Site	.....	100,013	100,013	.....	.....	−100,013	−100,013
Y–12 Production Plant	.....	191,092	234,092	.....	.....	−191,092	−234,092
Institutional Site Support	.....	84,022	84,022	.....	.....	−84,022	−84,022
Total, Operations and facilities	1,159,192	1,203,786	1,276,786	1,263,004	+103,812	+59,218	−13,782
Program readiness	104,681	75,167	75,167	75,167	−29,514	.....	.....
Material recycle and recovery	72,003	69,982	69,982	69,982	−2,021	.....	.....
Containers	17,075	20,130	20,130	20,130	+3,055	.....	.....
Storage	24,970	35,285	35,285	35,285	+10,315	.....	.....

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
Special Projects				28,782	+28,782	+28,782	+28,782
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,377,921	1,404,350	1,477,350	1,492,350	+114,429	+88,000	+15,000
Construction:							
07–D–140–03 Project engineering and design (PED) LANSCE–R				7,000	+7,000	+7,000	+7,000
07–D–140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations		4,977	4,977	4,977	+4,977		
07–D–220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL		14,828	14,828	14,828	+14,828		
06–D–140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	13,972	51,577	51,577	16,577	+2,605	−35,000	−35,000
06–D–402 NTS replace fire stations 1&2 Nevada Test Site, NV	8,201	13,919	13,919	13,919	+5,718		
06–D–403 Tritium facility modernization Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA	2,574	7,810	7,810	7,810	+5,236		
06–D–404 Building remediation, restoration, and upgrade, Nevada Test Site, NV	15,840				−15,840		
05–D–140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	6,930	9,615	9,615	9,615	+2,685		
05–D–401 Building 12–64 production bays upgrades, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	10,890				−10,890		
05–D–402 Berylium capability (BEC) project, Y–12 National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN	7,623	5,084	5,084	5,084	−2,539		
04–D–103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	1,980				−1,980		
04–D–125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	54,450	112,422	12,422	112,422	+57,972		+100,000
04–D–128 TA-18 mission relocation project, Los Alamos Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	12,870	24,197	24,197	24,197	+11,327		
03–D–103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	28,710	14,161	14,161	14,161	−14,549		
01–D–103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	8,910	1,565	1,565	1,565	−7,345		
01–D–124 HEU materials facility, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	80,537	21,267	21,267	56,267	−24,270	+35,000	+35,000
Subtotal, Construction	253,487	281,422	181,422	288,422	+34,935	+7,000	+107,000
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,631,408	1,685,772	1,658,772	1,780,772	+149,364	+95,000	+122,000
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	99,840	245,283	100,283	237,270	+137,430	−8,013	+136,987

Construction:							
07–D–253 TA 1 heating systems modernization (HSM) Sandia National Laboratory	.....	14,500	14,500	14,500	+14,500	.....	.....
06–D–160 Project engioneering and design (PED), various locations	5,753	2,700	2,700	2,700	−3,053	.....	.....
06–D–601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,960	6,429	6,429	6,429	+2,469	.....	.....
06–D–602 Gas main and distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,663	3,145	3,145	3,145	−518	.....	.....
06–D–603 Steam plant life extension project (SLEP), Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN	722	17,811	17,811	17,811	+17,089	.....	.....
05–D–160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program project engineering design (PED), various locations	10,538	648	648	648	−9,890	.....	.....
05–D–601 Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y–12, National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN	9,644	702	702	702	−8,942	.....	.....
05–D–602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	8,415	.....	.....	.....	−8,415	.....	.....
05–D–603 New master substation (NMSU), SNL	6,831	.....	.....	.....	−6,831	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	49,526	45,935	45,935	45,935	−3,591	.....	.....
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	149,366	291,218	146,218	283,205	+133,839	−8,013	+136,987
Secure transportation asset:							
Operations and equipment	142,328	130,484	130,484	130,484	−11,844	.....	.....
Program direction	67,651	78,780	78,780	78,780	+11,129	.....	.....
Total, Secure transportation asset	209,979	209,264	209,264	209,264	−715	.....	.....
Nuclear weapons incident response	117,608	135,354	135,354	135,354	+17,746	.....	.....
Environmental projects and operations: Long term response actions	.....	17,211	17,211	17,211	+17,211	.....	.....
Safeguards and security	756,841	665,701	702,701	670,701	−86,140	+5,000	−32,000
Cybersecurity	.....	88,711	89,711	88,711	+88,711	.....	−1,000
Construction: 05–D–170 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	40,590	.....	.....	.....	−40,590	.....	.....
Material security and consolidation project, Idaho National Lab, ID	.....	.....	40,000	.....	.....	.....	−40,000
Total, Safeguards and security	797,431	754,412	832,412	759,412	−38,019	+5,000	−73,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities	6,401,283	6,440,889	6,445,001	6,536,051	+134,768	+95,162	+91,050

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−31,680	−33,000	−33,000	−33,000	−1,320		
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	6,369,603	6,407,889	6,412,001	6,503,051	+133,448	+95,162	+91,050
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION							
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	305,910	260,967	290,160	274,967	−30,943	+14,000	−15,193
Construction: 06–D–180 06–01 Project engineering and design (PED) National Security Laboratory, PNNL	12,870	7,920	17,920	7,920	−4,950		−10,000
Subtotal, Nonproliferation & verification R & D	318,780	268,887	308,080	282,887	−35,893	+14,000	−25,193
Nonproliferation and international security	74,250	127,411	127,411	127,411	+53,161		
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	422,730	413,182	583,182	427,182	+4,452	+14,000	−156,000
Global initiatives for proliferation prevention	39,600				−39,600		
HEU transparency implementation	19,288				−19,288		
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	174,423	206,654	206,654		−174,423	−206,654	−206,654
Fissile materials disposition:							
U.S. surplus materials disposition	193,050	235,051	171,651	235,051	+42,001		+63,400
Russian surplus materials disposition	34,163	34,695			−34,163	−34,695	
Construction:							
99–D–141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	23,760	78,700		93,000	+69,240	+14,300	+93,000
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	217,800	289,510		325,000	+107,200	+35,490	+325,000
Subtotal, Construction	241,560	368,210		418,000	+176,440	+49,790	+418,000
Plutonium Immobilization, Savannah River Site, SC			111,000				−111,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	468,773	637,956	282,651	653,051	+184,278	+15,095	+370,400

Use of prior year balances	.....	−34,695	−34,695	−34,695	−34,695	.....	.....
Total, Fissile materials disposition	468,773	603,261	247,956	618,356	+149,583	+15,095	+370,400
Global threat reduction initiative	96,995	106,818	147,618	116,818	+19,823	+10,000	−30,800
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,614,839	1,726,213	1,620,901	1,572,654	−42,185	−153,559	−48,247
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,614,839	1,726,213	1,620,901	1,572,654	−42,185	−153,559	−48,247
NAVAL REACTORS							
Naval reactors development	721,512	761,176	761,176	761,176	+39,664	.....	.....
Construction:							
07–D–190 Materials research technology complex (MRTC)	.....	1,485	1,485	1,485	+1,485	.....	.....
06–D–901 Central office building II	6,930	.....	.....	.....	−6,930	.....	.....
Transfer to Nuclear Energy	13,365	.....	.....	.....	−13,365	.....	.....
05–N–900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY	9,801	1,287	1,287	1,287	−8,514	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	30,096	2,772	2,772	2,772	−27,324	.....	.....
Total, Naval reactors development	751,608	763,948	763,948	763,948	+12,340	.....	.....
Program direction	29,997	31,185	31,185	31,185	+1,188	.....	.....
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	781,605	795,133	795,133	795,133	+13,528	.....	.....
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR							
Office of the Administrator	345,277	386,576	399,576	386,576	+41,299	.....	−13,000
Use of prior year balances	−6,827	.....	.....	.....	+6,827	.....	.....
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	338,450	386,576	399,576	386,576	+48,126	.....	−13,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	9,104,497	9,315,811	9,227,611	9,257,414	+152,917	−58,397	+29,803
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP							
Closure Sites:							
Ashtabula	15,840	295	1,295	295	−15,545	.....	−1,000
Columbus	9,405	.....	.....	.....	−9,405	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Closure sites administration	.....	25,896	25,896	25,896	+25,896	.....	.....
Fernald	324,333	258,877	258,877	258,877	−65,456	.....	.....
Miamisburg	104,475	34,869	34,869	34,869	−69,606	.....	.....
Rocky Flats	564,251	1,000	1,000	1,000	−563,251	.....	.....
Total, closure sites	1,018,304	320,937	321,937	320,937	−697,367	.....	−1,000
Hanford Site:							
Nuclear material stabilization & disposition PFP	196,681	81,651	81,651	81,651	−115,030	.....	.....
SNF stabilization and disposition	57,894	81,069	78,937	81,069	+23,175	.....	+2,132
Nuclear facility D&D, river corridor closure project	176,716	221,022	221,022	221,022	+44,306	.....	.....
Solid waste stablilzation and disposition	.....	39,876	39,876	39,876	+39,876	.....	.....
HAMMER facility	7,425	.....	7,500	.....	−7,425	.....	−7,500
B-reactor museum	1,980	.....	500	.....	−1,980	.....	−500
Subtotal, 2012 accelerated completions	440,696	423,618	429,486	423,618	−17,078	.....	−5,868
Solid waste stabilization & disposition—2035	165,442	188,989	191,121	188,989	+23,547	.....	−2,132
Soil & water remediation—groundwater/vadose zone	73,750	75,973	75,973	75,973	+2,223	.....	.....
Nuclear facility D&D—remainder of Hanford	70,104	94,270	94,270	94,270	+24,166	.....	.....
Operate waste disposal facility	5,802	3,534	3,534	3,534	−2,268	.....	.....
SNF stabilization and disposition/storage	1,795	.....	.....	.....	−1,795	.....	.....
Richland community and regulatory support	15,257	18,332	18,332	18,332	+3,075	.....	.....
Columbia River Cleanup Technologies	.....	.....	20,000	.....	.....	.....	−20,000
Subtotal, 2035 accelerated completions	332,150	381,098	403,230	381,098	+48,948	.....	−22,132
Total, Hanford Site	772,846	804,716	832,716	804,716	+31,870	.....	−28,000
Office of River Protection:							
01–D–16A Low activity waste facility	161,370	77,800	112,200	120,000	−41,370	+42,200	+7,800
Analytical laboratory	44,550	21,800	45,200	46,000	+1,450	+24,200	+800
Balance of facilities	64,350	48,900	52,400	53,000	−11,350	+4,100	+600
High-level waste facility	102,960	253,700	171,700	191,000	+88,040	−62,700	+19,300

Pretreatment facility	147,510	287,800	218,500	280,000	+132,490	−7,800	+61,500
Subtotal, Waste treatment & immobilization plant	520,740	690,000	600,000	690,000	+169,260	.....	+90,000
Tank Farm activities:							
Rad liquid tank waste stabil. and disposition	325,710	273,656	293,656	273,656	−52,054	.....	−20,000
River protection community and regulatory support	466	471	471	471	+5	.....	.....
Subtotal, Tank Farm activities	326,176	274,127	294,127	274,127	−52,049	.....	−20,000
Total, Office of River Protection	846,916	964,127	894,127	964,127	+117,211	.....	+70,000
Idaho National Laboratory:							
SNF stabilization and disposition/storage	12,539	.....	.....	.....	−12,539	.....	.....
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	1,539	1,000	1,000	1,000	−539	.....	.....
SNF stabilization and disposition—2012	18,966	18,415	18,415	18,415	−551	.....	.....
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	138,615	193,910	193,910	193,910	+55,295	.....	.....
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	91,273	73,514	73,514	73,514	−17,759	.....	.....
06–D–401, Sodium bearing waste treatment project, ID	53,727	31,000	31,000	31,000	−22,727	.....	.....
04–D–414, Sodium bearing waste treatment facility, PED ID	9,108	.....	32,000	.....	−9,108	.....	−32,000
Soil and water remediation—2012	159,874	120,510	120,510	120,510	−39,364	.....	.....
Nuclear facility D&D	4,976	67,562	67,562	67,562	+62,586	.....	.....
Non-nuclear facility D&D	38,714	3,010	3,010	3,010	−35,704	.....	.....
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,511	3,683	3,683	3,683	+172	.....	.....
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	532,842	512,604	544,604	512,604	−20,238	.....	−32,000
NNSA:							
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	29,282	11,580	11,580	11,580	−17,702	.....	.....
NNSA Service Center	8,221	26,122	26,122	26,122	+17,901	.....	.....
Nevada	84,174	79,668	79,668	79,668	−4,506	.....	.....
Kansas City Plant	4,481	.....	.....	.....	−4,481	.....	.....
California site support	545	370	370	370	−175	.....	.....
Pantex	19,457	23,726	23,726	23,726	+4,269	.....	.....
Sandia National Laboratories	9,671	.....	.....	.....	−9,671	.....	.....
Nevada off-sites	2,818	.....	.....	.....	−2,818	.....	
Los Alamos National Laboratory	140,787	90,602	90,602	141,000	+213	+50,398	+50,398
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	299,436	232,068	232,068	282,466	−16,970	+50,398	+50,398
Oak Ridge Reservation:							
Solid waste stabilization and completion—2006	4,584	.....	.....	.....	−4,584	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Revised enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Soil and water remediation—Melton Valley	46,308				−46,308		
Solid waste stabilization and disposition—2012	67,676	48,888	68,809	48,888	−18,788		−19,921
Soil and water remediation—offsites	16,318	15,381	7,033	15,381	−937		+8,348
Nuclear facility D&D, E. Tenn. Technology Park	5,974	10,094	11,056	10,094	+4,120		−962
Nuclear facility D&D Y–12	40,152	40,000	19,817	40,000	−152		+20,183
Nuclear facility D&D ORNL	15,874	21,956	41,316	41,316	+25,442	+19,360	
Solid waste stabilization & disp.—science current gen	18,084	18,544	21,332	18,544	+460		−2,788
OR reservation community & regulatory support	5,613	4,999	4,999	4,999	−614		
Building 3019	17,820		25,000		−17,820		−25,000
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	238,403	159,862	199,362	179,222	−59,181	+19,360	−20,140
Savannah River site:							
Nuclear facility D&D		3,664	3,664	3,664	+3,664		
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition 2012	247,800	208,233	208,233	208,233	−39,567		
04–D–423 Container surveillance capability in 235F		21,300	21,300	21,300	+21,300		
04–D–414 Project Engineering and Design, 105–K	18,414	2,935	2,935	2,935	−15,479		
Subtotal, 2012 accelerated completions	266,214	236,132	236,132	236,132	−30,082		
SNF stabilization, disposition/storage	13,750				−13,750		
SR community and regulatory support	12,916	12,542	12,542	12,542	−374		
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	74,354	41,160	41,160	41,160	−33,194		
Spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition	11,160	22,668	22,668	22,668	+11,508		
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	111,863	85,276	85,276	85,276	−26,587		
Soil and water remediation	93,421	103,150	103,150	103,150	+9,729		
Nuclear facility D&D	56,644	12,542	12,542	12,542	−44,102		
Subtotal, 2035 accelerated completions	374,108	277,338	277,338	277,338	−96,770		
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabil. & disposition	495,965	507,724	618,724	507,724	+11,759		−111,000
05–D–405, Salt waste processing facility	495	25,700	25,700	25,700	+25,205		
04–D–408, Glass waste storage building	6,905				−6,905		
03–D–414, Salt waste processing facility PED SR	34,989	37,500	37,500	37,500	+2,511		

SWPF fiscal year 2005 uncosted balances	−19,800				+19,800		
Subtotal, Tank farm activities	518,554	570,924	681,924	570,924	+52,370		−111,000
Total, Savannah River site	1,158,876	1,084,394	1,195,394	1,084,394	−74,482		−111,000
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant:							
Operate WIPP	116,769	132,026	132,026	139,026	+22,257	+7,000	+7,000
Central Characterization Project	38,117	23,190	23,190	23,190	−14,927		
Transportation	37,255	32,940	32,940	32,940	−4,315		
Community and regulatory support	36,183	25,122	25,122	37,122	+939	+12,000	+12,000
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	228,324	213,278	213,278	232,278	+3,954	+19,000	+19,000
Program direction	241,378	291,216	301,216	291,216	+49,838		−10,000
Program support	32,518	37,881	37,881	37,881	+5,363		
Safeguards and Security:							
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,181	4,324	4,324	4,324	+143		
Oak Ridge Reservation	28,566	22,889	22,889	22,889	−5,677		
Fernald	1,377	1,216	1,216	1,216	−161		
West Valley	1,782	1,600	1,600	1,600	−182		
Paducah	10,904	8,707	8,707	8,707	−2,197		
Portsmouth	17,664	15,642	15,642	15,642	−2,022		
Richland/Hanford Site	81,333	77,836	77,836	77,836	−3,497		
Rocky Flats	3,168				−3,168		
Savannah River Site	135,376	163,626	163,626	163,626	+28,250		
Total, Safeguards and Security	284,351	295,840	295,840	295,840	+11,489		
Technology development	29,764	21,389	31,389	21,389	−8,375		−10,000
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	446,490	452,000	452,000	452,000	+5,510		
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP	6,130,448	5,390,312	5,551,812	5,479,070	−651,378	+88,758	−72,742
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES							
Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance:							
Nuclear safeguards and security	185,009	182,548	185,548	182,548	−2,461		−3,000
Security investigations	46,258	40,000	40,000	40,000	−6,258		
Program direction	72,757	75,949	75,949	75,949	+3,192		
Subtotal, Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance	304,024	298,497	301,497	298,497	−5,527		−3,000

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
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	56,908	60,738	60,738	74,738	+17,830	+14,000	+14,000
Program direction—EH	19,351	20,076	20,076	20,076	+725	.....	.....
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	76,259	80,814	80,814	94,814	+18,555	+14,000	+14,000
Office of Legacy Management:							
Legacy management	31,107	156,790	156,790	156,790	+125,683	.....	.....
Program direction	13,518	11,061	11,061	11,061	−2,457	.....	.....
Subtotal, Office of Legacy Management	44,625	167,851	167,851	167,851	+123,226	.....	.....
Nuclear energy:							
Infrastructure:							
Idaho facilities management	17,584	.....	.....	.....	−17,584	.....	.....
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	74,258	75,949	75,949	75,949	+1,691	.....	.....
Subtotal, Infrastruture	91,842	75,949	75,949	75,949	−15,893	.....	.....
Program direction	30,792	.....	.....	.....	−30,792	.....	.....
Subtotal, Nuclear energy	122,634	75,949	75,949	75,949	−46,685	.....	.....
Defense related administrative support	86,699	93,258	93,258	93,258	+6,559	.....	.....
Office of Hearings and Appeals	4,309	4,422	4,422	4,422	+113	.....	.....
Subtotal, Other Defense Activities	638,550	720,791	723,791	734,791	+96,241	+14,000	+11,000
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−2,973	−3,003	−3,003	−3,003	−30	.....	.....
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	635,577	717,788	720,788	731,788	+96,211	+14,000	+11,000
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL							
Defense nuclear waste disposal	346,500	388,080	388,080	358,080	+11,580	−30,000	−30,000

TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	16,217,022	15,811,991	15,888,291	15,826,352	−390,670	+14,361	−61,939
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS							
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION							
Operation and maintenance:							
Purchase power and wheeling	32,386	48,003	48,003	48,003	+15,617		
Program direction	5,544	5,723	5,723	5,723	+179		
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	37,930	53,726	53,726	53,726	+15,796		
Less alternative financing (PPW)		−13,611		−13,611	−13,611		−13,611
Offsetting collections	−32,386		−48,003		+32,386		+48,003
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)		−34,392		−34,392	−34,392		−34,392
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	5,544	5,723	5,723	5,723	+179		
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION							
Operation and maintenance:							
Operating expenses	6,972	7,145	7,145	7,145	+173		
Purchase power and wheeling	2,970	13,600	13,600	40,600	+37,630	+27,000	+27,000
Program direction	19,758	20,782	20,782	20,782	+1,024		
Construction	3,134	3,612	3,612	3,612	+478		
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	32,834	45,139	45,139	72,139	+39,305	+27,000	+27,000
Less alternative financing (PPW)		−10,600		−10,600	−10,600		−10,600
Offsetting collections	−2,970		−13,600		+2,970		+13,600
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)		−3,000		−30,000	−30,000	−27,000	−30,000
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	29,864	31,539	31,539	31,539	+1,675		
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION							
Operation and maintenance:							
Construction and rehabilitation	53,417	60,205	60,205	60,205	+6,788		
Operation and maintenance	46,822	45,734	45,734	45,734	−1,088		
Purchase power and wheeling	276,210	427,931	427,931	427,931	+151,721		
Program direction	128,900	147,748	147,748	147,748	+18,848		
Utah mitigation and conservation	6,633	6,893	6,893	6,893	+260		

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
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	511,982	688,511	688,511	688,511	+176,529		
Less alternative financing (for O&M)		−1,091		−1,091	−1,091		−1,091
Less alternative financing (for O&M)		−33,928		−33,928	−33,928		−33,928
Less alternative financing (for O&M)		−9,643		−9,643	−9,643		−9,643
Less alternative financing (for O&M)		−153,079		−153,079	−153,079		−153,079
Offsetting collections	−276,210		−472,593		+276,210		+472,593
Offsetting collections (Public Law 98–381)	−4,120	−3,705	−3,705	−3,705	+415		
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)		−274,852		−274,852	−274,852		−274,852
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	231,652	212,213	212,213	212,213	−19,439		
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND							
Operation and maintenance	2,665	2,500	2,500	2,500	−165		
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	269,725	251,975	251,975	251,975	−17,750		
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION							
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	218,196	230,800	230,800	230,800	+12,604		
FERC revenues	−218,196	−230,800	−230,800	−230,800	−12,604		
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	24,046,773	24,074,717	24,373,489	24,725,146	+678,373	+650,429	+351,657
(Total amount appropriated)	(24,031,133)	(24,277,717)	(24,630,489)	(24,775,146)	(+744,013)	(+497,429)	(+144,657)
(Advance appropriations from previous years)	(35,640)				(−35,640)		
(Rescissions)	(−20,000)	(−203,000)	(−257,000)	(−50,000)	(−30,000)	(+153,000)	(+207,000)

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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

Section 301. Language is included under section 301 to prohibit the use of funds to make payments for a noncompetitive management and operating contract unless certain conditions have been met.

Section 302. Language is included under section 302 which prohibits the use of funds for severance payments under the worker and community transition program under section 3161 of Public Law 102–484.

Section 303. Language is included under section 303 to prohibit the augmentation of several payments under section 3161 of Public Law 102–484 unless a reprogramming request is submitted to Congress.

Section 304. Language is included under section 304, which prohibits the use of funds in this act to initiate a request for proposal of expression of interest for new programs which have not yet been presented to Congress in the annual budget submission and which have not yet been approved and funded by Congress.

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

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

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

Section 308. Language is included specifically authorizing intelligence activities pending enactment of the fiscal year 2007 Intelligence Authorization Act.

Section 309. Language is included in section 309 regarding laboratory directed research and development activities.

Section 310. Language is included in section 310 regarding the terms and conditions of loan guarantees provided under section 1702(b)(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Section 311. Language is included regarding the terms and conditions by which the Secretary of Energy is directed to manage spent nuclear fuel with regard to demonstration of advanced recycling technologies.

Section 312. Language is included in section 312 prohibiting the Department of Energy to modify a ratemaking policy by changing the interest rate on future obligation for the Southeastern, Southwest, and Western Area Power Administrations. The Committee rejects a pending proposal to require Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration to apply the interest rate charged Government corporations for new investment and instead instructs the Secretary to apply the yield rate for all new investment in hydroelectric plant. The average yield shall be computed as the average during the fiscal year of the daily bid prices. The Committee has

consistently opposed the use of budget gimmicks carried in the budget request that will increase rates paid by power customers. The Committee recommends the Department of Energy heed this direction and refrain from requesting new regulations to modify ratemaking procedures for Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration.

Section 313. Language is included regarding the establishment of consolidation and preparation facilities intended to store spent nuclear fuel for up to 25 years. Language is also included regarding waste confidence standards.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2006	$64,817,000
Budget estimate, 2007	65,472,000
House allowance	35,472,000
Committee recommendation	65,472,000

Established in 1965, the Appalachian Regional Commission is an economic development agency composed of 13 Appalachian States and a Federal co-chair appointed by the President. For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends the budget request of $65,472,000 for the ARC, of which $6,000,000 is for salaries and expenses and $58,472,000 is for programs development and $1,000,000 is for the Appalachian Highway System.

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users authorized $470,000,000 annually, from 2005–2009, from the Highway Trust Fund for construction projects on the Appalachian Development Highway System. The ARC exercises policy and programmatic control over these funds.

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

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

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

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

directs that any future earmarks in any State be taken from within that State's regular ARC allocation.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2006	$21,812,000
Budget estimate, 2007	22,260,000
House allowance	22,260,000
Committee recommendation	22,260,000

For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends $22,260,000, the same as the President's request, for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. This Board is responsible for evaluating the implementation of standards for design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Department of Energy's defense nuclear facilities. Based on these evaluations, the Board makes specific recommendations to the Secretary of Energy to ensure that both public and employee heath and safety are protected.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2006	$11,880,000
Budget estimate, 2007	5,940,000
House allowance	5,940,000
Committee recommendation	12,000,000

For the Delta Regional Authority, the Committee recommends $12,000,000, an increase of $6,060,000 from the budget request. The Delta Regional Authority was established to assist the eight State Mississippi Delta Region in obtaining basic infrastructure, transportation, skills training, and opportunities for economic development. The Government Accountability Office recently reported that the DRA has a commendable record in the percentage of funds spent in rural America, and the Committee recognizes the DRA's role in bettering this underserved area of the Nation.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2006	$49,500,000
Budget estimate, 2007	2,536,000
House allowance	7,536,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000

The Denali Commission is a Federal-State partnership responsible for promoting infrastructure development, job training, and other economic development services in rural areas throughout Alaska. For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends $50,000,000, an increase of $47,464,000 above the requested level.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2006	$727,032,000
Budget estimate, 2007	768,410,000
House allowance	808,410,000
Committee recommendation	808,410,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2006	−$611,010,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−628,328,000
House allowance	−656,328,000
Committee recommendation	656,328,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2006	$116,022,000
Budget estimate, 2007	148,896,000
House allowance	152,082,000
Committee recommendation	152,082,000

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for fiscal year 2007 is $808,410,000, an increase of $40,000,000 over the budget request. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $656,328,000, resulting in a net appropriation of $152,082,000.

The Committee provides an additional $38,000,000 to prepare for the anticipated growth in new reactor licensing. The additional funds are available to hire, relocate, and train additional staff, support pre-application activities not chargeable to a specific licensee, and build out, equip, and rent additional office space.

The Committee also provides an additional $2,000,000 from the General Fund for the Commission to update its regulatory infrastructure for spent fuel recycling and keep pace with the Department of Energy's Global Nuclear Energy Partnership [GNEP] initiative. These funds are excluded from the Commission's fee recovery requirements.

The Committee directs the Commission to continue to provide quarterly reports on the status of its licensing and other regulatory activities. The Committee further directs the Commission to include in these quarterly reports the status of actions and tasks that must be completed prior to and during the new reactor licensing application process.

Within available funds provided new reactor licensing, the Committee directs the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to implement the Multinational Design Approval Process [MDAP]. The objective of the MDAP is to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the regulatory design reviews of new nuclear power reactors and enhance surety, clarity, predictability and transparency by converging regulations, codes, and standards. The Committee believes that MDAP will help to enhance both national and international reactor safety.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2006	$8,233,000
Budget estimate, 2007	8,144,000
House allowance	8,144,000
Committee recommendation	8,144,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2006	−$7,410,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−7,330,000
House allowance	−7,330,000
Committee recommendation	−7,330,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2006	$823,000
Budget estimate, 2007	814,000
House allowance	814,000
Committee recommendation	814,000

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2006	$3,572,000
Budget estimate, 2007	3,670,000
House allowance	3,670,000
Committee recommendation	3,670,000

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board was established to evaluate the scientific and technical validity of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board reports its findings no fewer than two times a year to Congress and to the Secretary of Energy. For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends $3,670,000.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2006	.....
Budget estimate, 2007	$15,100,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

OFFSET FROM TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 2006	.....
Budget estimate, 2007	−$15,100,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

The Committee recommendation does not include the administration's proposal to establish a congressionally funded Office of the Inspector General to oversee the Tennessee Valley Authority. In recent years, the TVA has funded the requests of the TVA–IG office out of power revenues and receipts. This process has worked well, and the Committee sees no compelling reason to change that mechanism for funding the TVA–IG.

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.

Section 502. The provision addresses part 750 of title 23.

Section 503. The provision addresses transfer authority under this act.

Section 504. The provision addresses the submittal of budget justifications.

Section 505. The bill includes a provision regarding the North and Middle Forks of the American River.

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:

The US Army Corps of Engineers: General Investigations; Construction, General; Mississippi River and Tributaries; Operations and Maintenance; Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program;

Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation;

Water and Related Resources;

Department of Energy: Energy Conservation and Supply Activities:

Office of Fossil Energy: Fossil Energy R&D, Clean Coal, Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Research;

Office of Environment, Safety and Health;

Non-Defense Environmental Management;

Office of Science;

Department of Administration;

National Nuclear Security Administration: Weapons Activities; Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation; Naval Reactors; Office of the Administrator;

Defense Environmental Management, Defense Site Acceleration Completion;

Other Defense Activities;

Defense Nuclear Waste Fund;

Office of Security and Performance Assurance;

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;

Power Marketing Administrations: Southeastern, Southwestern, Western Area; and

Energy Information Administration.

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on June 29, 2006, the Committee ordered reported, en bloc: H.R. 5427, making appropriations for Energy and Water for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title; H.R. 5522, making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a sub-

stitute and an amendment to the title; H.R. 5386, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and H.R. 5441, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, with each bill subject to further amendment and each subject to the budget allocation, 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.

TITLE 42—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 19B—WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

§ 1962d–5a. Reimbursement to States

(a) Combination of reimbursement of installation costs and reduction in contributions; single project limitation

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may, when he determines it to be in the public interest, enter into agreements providing for reimbursement to States or political subdivisions thereof for work to be performed by such non-Federal public bodies at water resources development projects authorized for construction under the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Such agreements may provide for reimbursement of installation costs incurred by such entities or an equivalent reduction in the contributions they would otherwise be required to make, or in appropriate cases, for a combination thereof. The amount of Federal reimbursement, including reductions in contributions, for a single project shall not exceed $5,000,000 or 1 percent of the total project cost, whichever is greater; except that the amount of actual Federal reimbursement, including reductions in contributions, for such project may not exceed [$5,000,000] *$7,000,000* in any fiscal year.

* * * * * * *

SAN LUIS REY INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT, PUBLIC LAW 100–675

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—ALL AMERICAN CANAL LINING

* * * * * * *

SEC. 210. * * *

SEC. 211. ALL AMERICAN CANAL PROJECTS.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall without delay implement the All American Canal Lining Project identified as the preferred alternative in the Record of Decision dated July 29, 1994, and as defined in the Allocation Agreement allocating water from the All American Canal Lining Project entered into as of October 10, 2003. If a State conducts a review or study of the implications of the All American

Canal Lining Project as implemented, then upon request from the Governor of said State, the Commissioner of Reclamation shall cooperate, to the extent practicable, in such review or study: Provided, That in no event shall the review or study delay implementation of the All American Canal Lining Project.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall, pursuant to authority granted by the Act of January 21, 1927 (44 Stat. 1010 et seq.), as amended by the Act of July 1, 1940 (54 Stat. 708), the Act of June 28, 1946 (60 Stat. 338), and the Act of May 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 101), without delay proceed to design and provide for the construction, operation and maintenance of a regulated water storage facility, including all incidental works that are reasonably necessary to operate the storage facility, to provide additional storage capacity to reduce nonstorable flows on the Colorado River below Parker Dam. The storage facility shall be located near or on the All American Canal, including all incidental works.

(c) The Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Mexico relating to Utilization of the Waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande, Treaty Series 994 (59 Stat. 1219), is the exclusive authority for identifying, considering, analyzing, or addressing impacts occurring outside the boundary of the United States of works constructed, acquired or used within the territorial limits of the United States.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1990, PUBLIC LAW 101–640

* * * * * * *

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) * * *

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(10) MCALPINE LOCK AND DAM, INDIANA AND KENTUCKY.—The project for navigation, McAlpine Lock and Dam, Indiana and Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 29, 1990, at a total cost of **[**$219,600,000**]** *$430,000,000*, with a first Federal cost of **[**$219,600,000**]***$430,000,000*. The Federal share of costs of construction of the project is to be paid one-half from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and one-half from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1992, PUBLIC LAW 102–580

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS

SEC. 219. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) * * *

* * * * * * *

(71) * * *

(72) CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA.—$50,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Clark County, Nevada.

(73) HENDERSON, NEVADA.—$15,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Henderson, Nevada.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1996, PUBLIC LAW 104–303

* * * * * * *

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) SAN LORENZO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control, San Lorenzo River, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 30, 1994, at a total cost of $21,800,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $10,900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $10,900,000 and habitat restoration, at a total cost of $4,050,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,040,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,010,000.

(B) CREDIT TOWARD NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The Secretary shall credit toward the non-Federal share of the project the costs expended by non-Federal interests for the replacement and reconstruction of the Soquel Avenue Bridge, if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

(C) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—The credit under paragraph (B) may not exceed $2,000,000.

(D) LIMITATION OF TOTAL PROJECT COST.—The Secretary shall not include the costs to be credited under paragraphs (B) and (C) in total project costs in determining the amounts of the Federal and non-Federal contributions.

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 227. SHORE PROTECTION.

(a) * * *

"SEC. 5. NATIONAL SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF EROSION CONTROL PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish and conduct a national shoreline erosion control development and demonstration program for a period of **[**7**]** *12* years beginning on the date that funds are made available to carry out this section.

* * * * * * *

"(e) FUNDING.—

"(1) RESPONSIBILITY.—The cost of and responsibility for operation and maintenance (excluding monitoring) of a demonstration project under the erosion control program shall be borne by non-Federal interests on completion of construction of the demonstration project.

"(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated **[**$25,000,000**]** *$40,000,000* to carry out this section.

* * * * * * *

OMNIBUS CONSOLIDATED AND EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999, PUBLIC LAW 105–277

* * * * * * *

DIVISION C—OTHER MATTERS

TITLE I—OTHER MATTERS

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—DENALI COMMISSION

* * * * * * *

SEC. 306. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Cochairperson of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint *and terminate* such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 309. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission to carry out the duties of the Commission consistent with the purposes of this title and pursuant to the work plan approved under section 4 under this Act, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years **[**2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003**]** *2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.*

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999, PUBLIC LAW 106–53

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 514. MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(g) 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 that authority shall extend until Federal fiscal year 2015.*

* * * * * * *

SEC. 582. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVERS SALMON SURVIVAL.

* * * * * * *

"(c) MANAGEMENT OF PREDATION ON COLUMBIA/SNAKE RIVER SYSTEM NATIVE FISHES.—

"(1) NESTING AVIAN PREDATORS.—In conjunction with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior, and consistent with a management plan to be developed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary shall carry out methods to reduce nesting populations of avian predators on dredge spoil islands in the Columbia River under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

"(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated [$1,000,000] *$2,000,000* to carry out research and development activities under this subsection.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 597. NATIONAL HARBOR, MARYLAND.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) EFFECT ON ENVIRONMENTAL LAW.—Nothing in this section abrogates any requirement of any environmental law.

SEC. 598. DEVILS LAKE, NORTH DAKOTA.

(a) DEFINITION OF PROJECT.—In this section, the term "project" means a project to provide a continued safe and reliable municipal water supply system for Devils Lake, North Dakota.

(b) PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall enter into a project cooperation agreement with the non-Federal interest to provide assistance in designing and constructing the project.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY FOR DESIGN WORK.—At the option of the non-Federal interest, the non-Federal interest may complete the design work for the project.

(3) NEPA.—The Secretary shall comply with all applicable requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) before beginning construction on the project.

(4) REQUIREMENTS.—The project cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall provide for—

(A) the development by local officials of a water supply project and related facilities, and if the non-Federal interest elects to complete the design work for the project, appropriate engineering plans and specifications; and

(B) the establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(5) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project cooperation agreement shall provide that the Federal share of the cost of the project—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR DESIGN AND ENGINEERING WORK.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit, not to exceed 6 percent of the total construction costs of design and engineering work completed by the non-Federal interest before entering into a project cooperation agreement with the Secretary under this subsection for the project.

(C) CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit, not to exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project, for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land).

(D) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for the project shall be 100 percent.

* * * * * * *

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004, PUBLIC LAW 108–137

* * * * * * *

TITLE II

* * * * * * *

GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 209. ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM. (a) Using funds previously appropriated, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, for purposes of im-

proving the efficiency and expediting the efforts of the Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program Workgroup, is directed to establish an executive committee of seven members consisting of—

[(1) one member from the Bureau of Reclamation;

[(2) one member from the Fish and Wildlife Service; and

[(3) one member at large representing each of the following seven entities (selected at the discretion of the entity in consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service) currently participating as signatories to the existing Memorandum of Understanding:

[(A) other Federal agencies;

[(B) State agencies;

[(C) municipalities;

[(D) universities and environmental groups;

[(E) agricultural communities;

[(F) Middle Rio Grande Pueblos (Sandia, Isleta, San Felipe, Cochiti, Santa Ana, and Santo Domingo); and

[(G) Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District.

[(b) Formation of this Committee shall not occur later than 45 days after enactment of this Act.

[(c) Fiscal year 2004 appropriations shall not be obligated or expended prior to approval of a detailed spending plan by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

[(d) The above section shall come into effect within 180 days of enactment of this Act, unless the Bureau of Reclamation, in consultation with the above listed parties, has provided an alternative workgroup structure which has been approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.]

* * * * * * *

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006, PUBLIC LAW 109–103

* * * * * * *

TITLE I

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

* * * * * * *

GENERAL PROVISIONS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the requirements regarding the use of continuing contracts under the authority of section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2331) shall apply only to projects funded under the Operation and Maintenance account and the Operation and Maintenance subaccount of the Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries account.]

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 108. None of the funds made available in title I of this Act may be used to award any continuing contract or to make modifications to any existing continuing contract that commits an amount for a project in excess of the amount appropriated for such project pursuant to this Act: *Provided,* That the amounts appropriated in this Act may be modified pursuant to the authorities provided in section 101 of this Act or through the application of unobligated balances for such project.]

* * * * * * *

SEC. 121. [(a) The Secretary of the Army may carry out and fund projects to comply with the 2003 Biological Opinion described in section 205(b) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 2949) as amended by subsection (b) and may award grants and enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, or interagency agreements with participants in the Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program Workgroup referenced in section 209(a) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108– 137; 117 Stat. 1850) in order to carry out such projects. Any project undertaken under this subsection shall require a non-Federal cost share of 25 percent, which may be provided through in-kind services or direct cash contributions and which shall be credited on a programmatic basis instead of on a project-by-project basis, with reconciliation of total project costs and total non-Federal cost share calculated on a three year incremental basis. Non-Federal cost share that exceeds that which is required in any calculated three year increment shall be credited to subsequent three year increments.] *(a) The Secretary of the Army may carry out and fund planning studies, watershed surveys and assessments, or technical studies at 100 percent Federal expense to accomplish the purposes of the 2003 Biological Opinion described in section 205(b) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 2949) as amended by subsection (b). In carrying out a study, survey, or assessment under this subsection the Secretary shall consult with Federal, State, tribal and local governmental entities, as well as entities participating in the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program referred to in section 205 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2007. The Secretary may also provide planning and administrative assistance to the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program, which assistance shall not be subject to cost sharing requirements with non-Federal interests.*

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 134. PROJECT MODIFICATION. (a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, recreation, Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas, authorized by section 101(b)(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 280–281) is modified—

[(1) to deauthorize the ecosystem restoration portion of the project that consists of approximately 90 acres of land located between Randol Mill and the Union Pacific East/West line; and

[(2) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to design and construct an ecosystem restoration project on lands identified

in subsection (c) that will provide the same or greater level of national ecosystem restoration benefits as the portion of the project described in paragraph (1).

[(b) CREDIT TOWARD FEDERAL SHARE.—The Secretary of the Army shall credit toward the Federal share of the cost of the modified project the costs incurred by the Secretary to carry out the project as originally authorized under section 101(b)(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 280). The non-Federal interest shall not be responsible for reimbursing the Secretary for any amount credited under this subsection.

[(c) COMPARABLE PROPERTY.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the City of Arlington, Texas, shall identify lands, acceptable to the Secretary of the Army, amounting to not less than 90 acres within the City, where an ecosystem restoration project may be constructed to provide the same or greater level of National ecosystem restoration benefits as the land described in subsection (a)(1).]

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 budget totals for 2007: Subcommittee on Energy and Water:				
Mandatory	.....	.....	NA	[1] 5
Discretionary	30,731	30,731	NA	[1] 31,756
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2007	.....	.....	.....	[2] 19,132
2008	.....	.....	.....	9,277
2009	.....	.....	.....	2,117
2010	.....	.....	.....	179
2011 and future years	.....	.....	.....	81
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2007	NA	120	NA	25

[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 2006 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2006 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2006 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers—Civil							
Investigations	162,360	94,000	128,000	168,517	+6,157	+74,517	+40,517
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–148)	37,300				−37,300		
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–234)	3,300				−3,300		
Construction	2,348,280	1,555,000	1,947,171	2,042,429	−305,851	+487,429	+95,258
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–148)	101,417				−101,417		
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–234)	549,400				−549,400		
Rescission			−56,046	−56,046	−56,046	−56,046	
Subtotal, Construction	2,999,097	1,555,000	1,891,125	1,986,383	−1,012,714	+431,383	+95,258
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	396,000	278,000	290,607	450,530	+54,530	+172,530	+159,923
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–148)	153,750				−153,750		
Operations and Maintenance	1,969,110	2,258,000	2,195,471	2,030,000	+60,890	−228,000	−165,471
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–148)	327,517				−327,517		
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–234)	3,200				−3,200		
Regulatory program	158,400	173,000	173,000	168,000	+9,600	−5,000	−5,000
FUSRAP	138,600	130,000	130,000	140,000	+1,400	+10,000	+10,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies		81,000	32,000	32,000	+32,000	−49,000	
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–148)	2,277,965				−2,277,965		
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–234)	3,145,024				−3,145,024		
General expenses	152,460	164,000	142,100	164,000	+11,540		+21,900
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–148)	1,600				−1,600		
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	3,960		1,500		−3,960		−1,500
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	11,929,643	4,733,000	4,983,803	5,139,430	−6,790,213	+406,430	+155,627

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2006 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2006 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Appropriations	(5,329,170)	(4,733,000)	(4,983,803)	(5,139,430)	(−189,740)	(+406,430)	(+155,627)
Emergency appropriations	(6,600,473)				(−6,600,473)		
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Central Utah Project Completion Account							
Central Utah project construction	31,351	37,587	37,587	37,587	+6,236		
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	937	965	965	965	+28		
Subtotal	32,288	38,552	38,552	38,552	+6,264		
Program oversight and administration	1,719	1,603	1,603	1,603	−116		
Total, Central Utah project completion account	34,007	40,155	40,155	40,155	+6,148		
Bureau of Reclamation							
Water and related resources	874,679	833,424	849,122	888,994	+14,315	+55,570	+39,872
Rescission		−88,000	−88,000			+88,000	+88,000
Subtotal, water and related resources	874,679	745,424	761,122	888,994	+14,315	+143,570	+127,872
Central Valley project restoration fund	52,219	41,478	41,478	41,478	−10,741		
California Bay-Delta restoration	36,630	38,610	40,110	38,610	+1,980		−1,500
Policy and administration	57,338	58,069	58,069	58,069	+731		
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	1,020,866	883,581	900,779	1,027,151	+6,285	+143,570	+126,372
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	1,054,873	923,736	940,934	1,067,306	+12,433	+143,570	+126,372

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy supply and conservation	1,812,627	1,923,361	2,050,527	2,294,053	+481,426	+370,692	+243,526
Clean coal technology:							
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2005	257,000	.....	.....	257,000	.....	+257,000	+257,000
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2007	−257,000	257,000	257,000	−203,000	+54,000	−460,000	−460,000
Rescission, uncommitted balances	−20,000	−203,000	−257,000	−50,000	−30,000	+153,000	+207,000
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D	.....	−54,000	.....	−54,000	−54,000	.....	−54,000
Total, Clean coal technology	−20,000	.....	.....	−50,000	−30,000	−50,000	−50,000
Fossil Energy Research and Development	592,014	469,686	558,204	644,267	+52,253	+174,581	+86,063
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	21,285	18,810	18,810	39,810	+18,525	+21,000	+21,000
Elk Hills School Lands Fund	83,160	.....	.....	.....	−83,160	.....	.....
Strategic petroleum reserve	164,340	155,430	155,430	155,430	−8,910	.....	.....
Northeast home heating oil reserve	.....	4,950	4,950	4,950	+4,950	.....	.....
Energy Information Administration	85,314	89,769	89,769	93,032	+7,718	+3,263	+3,263
Non-defense environmental clean up	349,687	310,358	309,946	310,358	−39,329	.....	+412
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	556,606	579,368	579,368	573,368	+16,762	−6,000	−6,000
Science	3,596,393	4,101,710	4,131,710	4,241,062	+644,669	+139,352	+109,352
Nuclear Waste Disposal	148,500	156,420	186,420	136,420	−12,080	−20,000	−50,000
Departmental administration	250,289	278,382	225,582	281,382	+31,093	+3,000	+55,800
Miscellaneous revenues	−121,770	−123,000	−123,000	−123,000	−1,230	.....	.....
Net appropriation	128,519	155,382	102,582	158,382	+29,863	+3,000	+55,800
Office of the Inspector General	41,580	45,507	45,507	45,507	+3,927	.....	.....
Atomic Energy Defense Activities							
National Nuclear Security Administration:							
Weapons activities	6,369,603	6,407,889	6,412,001	6,503,051	+133,448	+95,162	+91,050
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,614,839	1,726,213	1,620,901	1,572,654	−42,185	−153,559	−48,247
Naval reactors	781,605	795,133	795,133	795,133	+13,528	.....	.....
Office of the Administrator	338,450	386,576	399,576	386,576	+48,126	.....	−13,000
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	9,104,497	9,315,811	9,227,611	9,257,414	+152,917	−58,397	+29,803
Defense environmental cleanup	6,130,448	5,390,312	5,551,812	5,479,070	−651,378	+88,758	−72,742
Other defense activities	635,577	717,788	720,788	731,788	+96,211	+14,000	+11,000
Defense nuclear waste disposal	346,500	388,080	388,080	358,080	+11,580	−30,000	−30,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2006 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2006 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	16,217,022	15,811,991	15,888,291	15,826,352	−390,670	+14,361	−61,939
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	37,930	40,115	53,726	40,115	+2,185	.....	−13,611
Offsetting collection	−32,386	−34,392	−48,003	−34,392	−2,006	.....	+13,611
Subtotal, O&M, Southeastern Power Administration	5,544	5,723	5,723	5,723	+179	.....	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	32,834	34,539	45,139	34,539	+1,705	.....	−10,600
Offsetting collection	−2,970	.....	−13,600	.....	+2,970	.....	+13,600
Offsetting collection (Public Law106–377)	.....	−3,000	.....	−3,000	−3,000	.....	−3,000
Subtotal, O&M, Southwestern Power Administration	29,864	31,539	31,539	31,539	+1,675	.....	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	511,982	490,770	688,511	490,770	−21,212	.....	−197,741
Offsetting collection	−276,210	.....	−472,593	.....	+276,210	.....	+472,593
Offsetting collection (Public Law 98–381)	−4,120	−3,705	−3,705	−3,705	+415	.....	.....
Offsetting collection (Public Law 106–377)	.....	−274,852	.....	−274,852	−274,852	.....	−274,852
Subtotal, O&M, Western Area Power Administration	231,652	212,213	212,213	212,213	−19,439	.....	.....
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,665	2,500	2,500	2,500	−165	.....	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	269,725	251,975	251,975	251,975	−17,750	.....	.....
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	218,196	230,800	230,800	230,800	+12,604	.....	.....
Revenues applied	−218,196	−230,800	−230,800	−230,800	−12,604	.....	.....

Total, title III, Department of Energy	24,046,772	24,074,717	24,373,489	24,724,966	+678,194	+650,249	+351,477
Appropriations	(24,031,132)	(24,277,717)	(24,630,489)	(24,774,966)	(+743,834)	(+497,249)	(+144,477)
Advance appropriations from previous years	(35,640)	.....	.....	.....	(−35,640)	.....	.....
Rescissions	(−20,000)	(−203,000)	(−257,000)	(−50,000)	(−30,000)	(+153,000)	(+207,000)
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission	64,817	65,472	35,472	65,472	+655	.....	+30,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	21,812	22,260	22,260	22,260	+448	.....	.....
Delta Regional Authority	11,880	5,940	5,940	12,000	+120	+6,060	+6,060
Denali Commission	49,500	2,536	7,536	50,000	+500	+47,464	+42,464
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	727,032	768,410	808,410	808,410	+81,378	+40,000	.....
Revenues	−611,010	−620,328	−656,328	−656,328	−45,318	−36,000	.....
Subtotal	116,022	148,082	152,082	152,082	+36,060	+4,000	.....
Office of Inspector General	8,233	8,144	8,144	8,144	−89	.....	.....
Revenues	−7,410	−7,330	−7,330	−7,330	+80	.....	.....
Subtotal	823	814	814	814	−9	.....	.....
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	116,845	148,896	152,896	152,896	+36,051	+4,000	.....
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,572	3,670	3,670	3,670	+98	.....	.....
Tennessee Valley Authority: Office of Inspector General	.....	15,100	.....	15,100	+15,100	.....	+15,100
Offset	.....	−15,100	.....	−15,100	−15,100	.....	−15,100
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	268,426	248,774	227,774	306,298	+37,872	+57,524	+78,524
Grand total	37,299,714	29,980,227	30,526,000	31,238,000	−6,061,714	+1,257,773	+712,000
Appropriations	(30,683,601)	(30,271,227)	(30,871,000)	(31,288,000)	(+604,399)	(+1,016,773)	(+417,000)
Emergency appropriations	(6,600,473)	.....	.....	.....	(−6,600,473)	.....	.....
Rescission	(−20,000)	(−291,000)	(−345,000)	(−50,000)	(−30,000)	(+241,000)	(+295,000)
Advance appropriations from previous years	(35,640)	.....	.....	.....	(−35,640)	.....	.....

○