Calendar No. 263

110TH CONGRESS *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 110–127

ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008

JULY 9, 2007.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1751]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1751) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2008

Total of bill as reported to the Senate	$32,791,321,000
Amount of 2007 appropriations	[1] 32,562,190,000
Amount of 2008 budget estimate	30,887,838,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2007 appropriations	+229,131,000
2008 budget estimate	+1,903,483,000

[1] Includes Emergency Appropriations of $1,761,665,000.

CONTENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2008 beginning October 1, 2007, and ending September 30, 2008, 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 2008 budget estimates for the bill total $30,887,838,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $32,791,321,000. This is $1,903,483,000 above the budget estimates and $229,131,000 above the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water held five sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2008 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 throughout the United States. Information, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 2008 therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of 28 to 1 the Committee on June 28, 2007, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

TRANSPARENCY IN CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTIVES

On January 18, 2007, the Senate passed S. 1, The Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act of 2007, by a vote of 96–2. While the Committee awaits final action on this legislation, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee issued interim re-

quirements to ensure that the goals of S. 1 are in place for the appropriations bills for fiscal year 2008.

The Constitution vests in the Congress the power of the purse. The Committee believes strongly that Congress should make the decisions on how to allocate the people's money. In order to improve transparency and accountability in the process of approving earmarks (as defined in S. 1) in appropriations measures, each Committee report includes, for each earmark:

—(1) the name of the Member(s) making the request, and where appropriate, the President;

—(2) the name and location of the intended recipient or, if there is no specifically intended recipient, the intended location of the activity; and

—(3) the purpose of such earmark.

The term "congressional earmark" means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator, providing, authorizing, or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific state, locality or congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative, formula-driven, or competitive award process.

For each earmark, a Member is required to provide a certification that neither the Member (nor his or her spouse) has a pecuniary interest in such earmark, consistent with Senate Rule XXXVII(4). Such certifications are available to the public at http://appropriations.senate.gov/senators.cfm or go to appropriations.senate.gov and click on "Members".

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.

OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The fiscal year 2008 budget request for the Corps of Engineers is composed of $4,871,000,000 in new budget authority. This is the largest budget that the administration has ever recommended for the Corps. However it is more than $460,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 enacted budget for the Corps. This budget request continues this administration's policy of drastic underfunding of domestic infrastructure. At a time when this existing infrastructure, the foundation of our economic security and quality of life, is depreciating much faster than it is being recapitalized, when our increasing population is placing much greater stress on the Nation's vital water resources, when shifts in population centers mean new and different problems and when a growing environmental awareness requires new solutions to persistent problems, this underfunding is unacceptable and threatens our continued well-being.

In a particularly egregious example of this inattention, the administration budget continues the trend of ever lower General Investigations [GI] funding thereby depriving us of the Nation's primary tool to identify future challenges and develop innovative solutions to water resources challenges and needs. The fiscal year 2002 GI request was $130,000,000. This has declined to $90,000,000 in fiscal year 2008. This decline is not due to a reduction in water resources needs, rather, it appears to be a deliberate attempt to choke off the Corps planning program. Of the $90,000,000 recommended in the budget request only about one-third of it is for actual studies that might eventually become projects. This is unconscionable given the enormous water resource needs facing our Nation. Worse still, it eviscerates the Corps ability to do proper planning. It is clear that in assembling this budget, no thought was given to how these recommendations would impact the workload and workforce in the various district offices of the Corps.

Planning in the Corps is a specialized skillset and once that ability is lost, it is difficult to reestablish. Most of the criticisms of the Corps project development process in recent years have centered on the planning process. The administration is providing funding for some improvements to the Planning program such as funding the

Planning Associates Program and Planning Centers of Expertise. However, if there are no planning studies to be undertaken this funding is wasted. The Committee believes that the Corps should have a robust planning program to not only address new water resource needs but to evaluate changes throughout the project development process. Continued budgets like this will lead to a complete loss of this vital Corps of Engineers' competency. The administration should seriously revise their priorities for this account in the fiscal year 2009 budget.

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

Priorities for the CG account are based on six criteria for fiscal year 2008. The primary criteria is the project's benefit to cost ratio [BCR]. This is a welcome change from previous budgets that judged a program on its remaining cost to remaining benefits, which put rural projects a significant disadvantage. Projects with on going contracts and a BCR greater than 1.5 or are significant or cost effective aquatic ecosystem restoration projects are given funding for current contract needs. Projects that address significant risks to human health and safety are given sufficient funding to support an uninterrupted level of funding in fiscal year 2008. Projects with a BCR less than 1.5 are considered for deferral. No new construction starts met the administration's new start criteria for fiscal year 2008. Projects complying with treaties and biological opinions and/or meeting mitigation requirements as well as dam safety, seepage control and static instability correction were given the maximum funding for efficient and effective execution.

The O&M account appears to have been increased by nearly $500,000,000 above the fiscal year 2007 enacted amount. However this is very misleading. The administration has again proposed shifting major project rehabilitations and environmental compliance activities associated with completed projects from CG to O&M. Also shifted to O&M are dredged material disposal projects, beach erosion restoration due to completed navigation projects and initial nourishment of beach projects. This shifting of projects was allegedly done in the name of budget transparency—trying to show the true costs of project operations. This seems to be a very weak justification in that the Bureau of Reclamation which has similar projects in their construction accounts did not get similar guidance in their budget preparation. By shifting some of these projects such as major rehabs and beach nourishments to O&M it appears that the administration was able to circumvent their own new start criteria. Further, by funding environmental compliance activities in the individual O&M projects seems to make the budget process less transparent by hiding how much these activities are costing the Nation by distributing these costs across multiple projects as opposed to a single line item in previous budgets. Finally, the administration's budget proposal limits coastal storm damage reduction projects that require periodic sand renourishments to those where the erosion is due to navigation projects. It also proposes to limit Federal participation to initial beach nourishment.

Shifting of projects from the two accounts totals almost $300,000,000 of the $500,000,000 increase to O&M. This also corresponds to a similar decrease in CG funding for fiscal year 2008. That still leaves an increase of $200,000,000 for traditional O&M projects. The Committee is pleased that the administration has provided this increase to O&M for fiscal year 2008. This is the first real increase in many years. Unfortunately, the Committee notes that the Corps maintenance backlog is more than $1,000,000,000 and increases by about $100,000,000 annually as the inventory of projects ages.

O&M is again presented as 21 separate regions based on watersheds as opposed to discrete projects. The Committee has indicated in the past that this so called "regional budget" is no more than an aggregation of the projects within a specific watershed. It does not appear that this budget is any different. The budget for these projects appears to be developed in the same way that it has always been and then aggregated with the other discrete projects in the watershed. The regional budgeting proposed in the last 2 years appears to serve no real budgetary purpose other than to circumvent the reprogramming guidance provided by the Committee.

The regulatory budget gets a substantial increase to $180,000,000 for fiscal year 2008. This is more than $20,000,000 over the amount provided in fiscal year 2007. However, the Committee recognizes the substantial increased burden to establishing new regulatory guidance in the wake of the *Rapanos* Supreme Court decision.

The Committee is disappointed that funding for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] was cut by nearly $10,000,000 from the fiscal year 2007 amount of $138,672,000. This program was transferred to the Corps from the Department of Energy, because the Committee was concerned with management and cost issues of the program within the Energy Department. This is a program that is being well managed by the Corps and should have stable, adequate budget resources to continue these radiological clean-up activities.

The Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account is funded at $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2008. The Committee supports this funding for disaster readiness and preparedness activities of the Corps of Engineers.

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

The Committee is pleased to see an increase in the GE budget for fiscal year 2008. With the increases in responsibilities for the headquarters of the Corps in overseeing larger budgets as well as the massive rebuilding of the flood and storm damage reduction measures in the New Orleans area, it is appropriate that this ac-

count should be increased. The Committee notes that the Corps operates one of the most efficient headquarters staffs in the National Capital region. Only about 3.5 percent of their staffing is at their headquarters level as opposed to 10 percent or more for comparable agencies in the National Capital region.

PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING

The Committee has watched with interest over the last 4 years as the Corps has moved to a "performance based budget" model. Unfortunately, the Committee does not see improvement in the budgeting of the Nation's Civil Works infrastructure program. 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 current method of performance based budgeting utilized in this budget preparation turns the Nation away from infrastructure investments that return two and even three times their cost.

In fiscal year 2005, more than 130 projects were budgeted by the administration for construction; this year there are only about 66. However, Congress funded more than 300 projects in fiscal year 2006 and has averaged about 315 annually since fiscal year 2000. Due to the joint funding resolution for fiscal year 2007, Congress did not propose any projects for construction within the $2,336,368,000 in Construction, General funding provided to the executive branch but left that task to the administration. The administration funded 244 construction projects in their fiscal year 2007 work plan. They could have chosen to only fund the 85 proposed in the fiscal year 2007 budget request, but they didn't. This demonstrates a recognition by the administration that their budget proposal only partially addressed the Nation's needs. The work plan also demonstrated that the administration finds value in many of the projects that Congress annually funds. Unfortunately, the budget request pretends that these on going projects which have been funded annually for many years in enacted legislation do not exist. Further the budget assumes it costs nothing to ignore these projects. If Congress funded only the budget request for Construction, General, the administration would quickly discover that termination costs for unfunded on going projects could easily exceed the request. This is irresponsible budgeting on the part of the administration.

From the Committee's perspective, the Corps' budget seems to be developed exactly in the opposite manner that it should be. It appears that overall spending targets are set by the administration and then their priority projects are inserted within these targets. Criteria are then established to justify funding the lower priority projects within the remaining funding targets. The problem with budgeting in this manner is evident in the construction account for fiscal year 2008. Six priority projects consume nearly 30 percent of the requested dollars in this account. Another nine projects related to dam safety consume another 20 percent. That means that some 51 projects have to split the remaining construction dollars.

The logic behind this budgeting rational appears to be that concentrating scarce resources on finishing a few higher performing projects will allow the Nation to reap the benefits of these projects sooner. The trouble with this is that these are long-term projects that take many years to complete. At the rate the budget is headed, we will only be funding the administration's six priority projects and the dam safety repairs in another couple of years with little else in the pipeline. The Committee questions this rationale when compared to the value of the benefits that are deferred by suspending or terminating these other projects in order to concentrate resources on such a few projects. In some cases these deferred benefits may never be realized due to these terminations.

Local sponsors who share in these projects' cost may lose their ability to share these costs or may lose public support for finishing these projects. Once these priority projects are completed, one has to wonder whether there will be any projects or sponsors interested in resuming construction in an infrastructure program that suspends projects based on changeable annual criteria.

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

Another benefit of budgeting in this manner is that it allows the Corps to undertake workforce planning to distribute their work across the Nation. When one chooses to put 40–50 percent of the budget in a handful of projects, there is no way the workload can be balanced across the remainder of the Nation with what is left. Unlike other Federal agencies that have a salaries and expense component to their budget, the Corps does not, at least not at the District office level. Virtually all costs at District offices (rent, utilities, labor, materials, etc.) are charged to projects and studies as directed by Congress. This enables the public to be informed of the true cost of all projects. Accordingly, it is necessary that the budget process be consistent with the accounting practice. When dealing with such large differences in workload from fiscal year to fiscal year it is clear that the administration gave 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. Neither a pure "bottom up" budget process, nor a performance-based budget process is perfect. Experienced decision makers are expected to exercise informed judgment to achieve a balanced program considering all factors. Once more, the adminis-

tration appears to have submitted a very unbalanced program using oversimplified decision metrics to consider only a few objectives (e.g. BCR and efficient completion of a few projects) that do not take into account the long- term needs of the Nation or the organization expected to manage the program.

The Congress will likely consider the passage of a water resources development bill this year. In this bill the BCR necessary for a project to be authorized for construction is 1.0 to 1. The criteria mentioned above requires a BCR to be 3.0 to 1 for budgeting. 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 deferrals 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.

The Committee is not opposed to a systemized budget for projects. However, the Corps must demonstrate the value of this approach to the Committee. The Corps is directed to prepare four systemized, integrated budgets for four different areas of the Nation, the Ohio River, the Great Lakes, the Texas Coast and the California coast, to demonstrate the value of system or watershed based planning and budgeting. Should the Corps want to select different areas they must coordinate their recommendations with the Committees prior to implementation. This process should start at the initial development phases of the budget so that goals can be developed and carried through the entire budget development process.

The Committee rejects the initiative 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 undertaken when the projects were constructed as is now required by subsequent laws. Were these projects constructed today, formulation of the projects would have required avoidance and minimization measures for the endangered species.

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

The budget has proposed moving major rehabilitation for locks and dams from the Construction, General account to the Operations and Maintenance account. Corresponding to this is a legislative proposal to allow the proceeds from the Inland Waterway Trust Fund to be utilized in the Operations and Maintenance account. Current law only allows these funds to be utilized in the Construction, General account. The Congress moved major rehabilitation from the Construction, General account to the Operation and Maintenance account in fiscal year 1985. Subsequently as the backlog increased, it was returned to the Construction, General account in the fiscal year 1993 budget. The stipulations involved in moving it back to the Construction account included that these major rehabilitations would involve more than a simple restoration of project function. Operational improvements were considered as a part of the rehab. As such, the rehabilitated, or recapitalized, projects were considered new investment opportunities for the country, the same as other new projects, and had to compete as new starts in the Construction, General program. This is entirely appropriate as these recapitalized projects provide increased levels of service and performance not envisioned in their original construction. If they didn't, under existing adminstration policy, the repairs would be considered major maintenance and would be funded under the Operation and Maintenance Account. To help fund these major rehabs, legislation allowed half the costs of the major rehab to be borne by the Inland Waterway Trust Fund with the other half to come from the General Treasury. The Committee does not believe moving these projects back to the Operations and Maintenance account will solve the backlog of major rehabs and rejects this proposal. The Committee believes that the real intent of this proposal is to skirt the new start issue in the CG account.

The Committee is disappointed that the administration has recycled their beach policy from the fiscal year 2007 budget. This was only a slight tweak to the fiscal year 2006 proposal 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 to 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.

Interestingly, the administration has been pursuing authorization for coastal wetland restoration projects to protect coastal areas from hurricane storm surge. Yet the placement of sand in coastal areas for the exact same reason is given no priority by the administration in the budget process. While the Committee supports restoration of the coastal wetlands, it is difficult to imagine that wetlands will provide a greater national economic impact than placing sand on public beaches to mitigate storm surges on our densely populated coastal areas.

The Committee believes that this budget proposal is no way to run a robust national infrastructure program. The Committee recommended that the Corps include additional criteria into the project prioritization process and commends the administration for having done so for the fiscal year 2008 budget request. The Committee also commends the administration for changing from the Remaining Benefits/Remaining Costs Ratio to the projects actual Benefit to Cost Ratio. However, the net result is that the mix of projects is substantially unchanged and fewer projects are proposed for funding in fiscal year 2008. The Committee does not believe that this prioritization method can be salvaged into a useable system. Further, the Committee has seen no evidence that it has improved the budget process.

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

BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS

The Committee continues to be concerned about the manner that budget justifications were prepared for the fiscal year 2008 budget. In the past, the Corps provided justification sheets for each project and presented them in budget order by Division across the country. Again for fiscal year 2008, a single book of justification sheets was provided by business lines. The Committee finds this manner of displaying the budget not very helpful 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 2008 provides less useful information, not more. For fiscal year 2009, 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. This should include information on fund items in preceding acts that will have out year funding requirements as well as budgeted items. If the administration chooses to continue to provide the business line information, it may be provided as a separate appendix to the justifications.

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 management 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. While aircraft carriers, nuclear submarines and even spacecraft have been constructed without the use of continuing contracts Congress recognized that those amounts of budget resources would never be available to the Corps, so they provided continuing contract authority to allow them to construct large scale projects without the Congress having to provide all of the budget authority up front. Additionally, this method of funding the Corps allowed the Congress to have more projects underway at the same time with the same budget authority. Congress recognized that by providing this flexibility it was relinquishing some measure of control over future appropriations; however, Congress believed that this was an acceptable trade off for the efficient use of limited funds.

This system worked well from the 1920s until 2005. For the few years prior to fiscal year 2006, the Corps had gotten somewhat sloppy in their management of continuing contracts as well as reprogramming of project funds. This sloppiness gave the appearance that construction contractors were dictating program execution. As the Committee has discussed in prior years, this perception was due to a number of factors some of them initiated by the Congress and other by the Corps' interpretation of congressional directives. Unfortunately restrictions placed on the Corps in the fiscal year 2006 budget, that are still in effect, have severely limited, if not prohibited the Corps from entering into new continuing contracts as well as virtually prohibited reprogramming of project funds.

These factors have led to a dramatic increase in carryover of project funds which can only mean that projects are still being delayed even with the new guidance from fiscal year 2006. Carryover from fiscal year 2005 into fiscal year 2006 was about $300,000,000. With the new guidance from the fiscal year 2006 act, carryover ballooned to $1,400,000,000 from fiscal year 2006 into fiscal year 2007. Preliminary indications are that carryover from fiscal year 2007 into fiscal year 2008 will exceed $1,000,000,000 and may be as high as $1,200,000,000. While the Committee accepts that some level of carryover is unavoidable and desirable, carrying over nearly 20 percent of the Corps' annual appropriations is unacceptable. Changes must be made by Congress and the Corps to efficiently and effectively utilize annual appropriations and reduce carryover balances to more reasonable levels. Noting these exceptionally large carryover balances, the Committee has continued to include small percentages of savings and slippage on all accounts to maximize resources. The fiscal year 2006 guidance has also had a significant impact on continuing contracts in effect prior to the guidance being implemented as contracts cannot be unilaterally modified by the Corps to adopt these changes to the law.

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 believes that properly utilized continuing contracts serve a vital purpose in executing civil works projects. The Committee also believes that judicious use of reprogramming authority also contributes to an efficient and effectively run program. Therefore the Committee is repealing section 108 of Public Law 109–103 pertaining to limitation on funding to continuing contracts. The Committee is leaving in place the provisions of section

106 as they restore the traditional uses of continuing contracts. The Committee directs that in utilizing continuing contracts that they should be for long term, large scale projects. The Committee's expectation is that for a continuing contract to be utilized, the contract value should exceed $5,000,000 and have a minimum contract duration of 24 months. Anything less than these amounts should be considered for full funding. However, this should not be considered an endorsement by the Committee that only continuing contracts should be awarded above these thresholds. The Committee expects the Corps to use the proper contracting vehicle for each situation. For continuing contracts this should include the reasonable expectation of future funding. Authority for awarding continuing contracts should be at the lowest practical level. Exceptions to these limits should be forwarded to the Chief of Engineers for review and approval.

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 Committee is also revamping reprogramming guidance for the Corps. The Committee believes that the reprogramming guidance that is currently being utilized is too restrictive and does not address the inherent differences in the various accounts of the Corps of Engineers. For fiscal year 2008, reprogramming limitations will be tied to the base funding amounts available for the project, study, or activity for which funding is available. In other words, the base for each project, study or activity amounts to the new budget authority made available, excluding supplemental funds, coupled with previously provided unexpended funding for the project, study or activity. For reprogramming actions that must come to the Committee for approval, the Committee expects the Corps to fully coordinate the actions with the affected Members of Congress before the action is formally submitted to the Committees. In no case should a reprogramming action for less than $50,000 be submitted to the Committees for approval. The authority for each account is as follows:

General Investigations.—For a base funding level less than $100,000, the reprogramming limit is $25,000. For a base level over $100,000, 25 percent up to a limit of $150,000 per study or activity. Amounts over this limit will require approval of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, except that the Committee does not object to reprogramming up to $25,000 to any continuing study or activity that did not receive an appropriation in the current year.

Construction, General.—For a base less than $2,000,000, the reprogramming limit is $300,000. For a base level over $2,000,000, 15 percent up to a limit of $3,000,000 per project or activity. The Committee will allow reprogramming up to $3,000,000 for settled contractor claims, accelerated earnings or real estate deficiency

judgments. Amounts over this limit require approval of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Reprogramming within each section of the Continuing Authorities is unlimited however, the percentages between studies and implementation must be maintained as directed in this report. Further, no reprogramming is allowed between sections nor into or out of the overall CG account. 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 emergency situations. The Chief of Engineers must notify the House and Senate Appropriations Committees of these emergency actions as soon thereafter as practicable. For all other situations, for a base less than $1,000,000, the reprogramming limit is $150,000. For a base over $1,000,000, 15 percent up to a limit of $5,000,000 per project or activity. Amounts over this limit require approval of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. The Committee does not object reprogramming up to $150,000 to any continuing project or program that did not receive an appropriation in the current year.

Mississippi River and Tributaries.—The Corps should follow the same reprogramming guidelines for the 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.

This revised continuing contract and reprogramming guidance should help the Corps effectively manage their program while honoring the intent of Congress. These items reinvigorate the idea that once the Congress funds a study, that it intends for the study phase to be completed to determine if Federal investment is warranted. By the same token, once the Congress commits to initiation of construction of a project that it intends for the project to be completed and the national economy to accrue the project benefits.

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. Any-

thing 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 timeframes and notifications were imposed on these reviews. This is shown in the table below.

Project	Date to OMB	Date review completed	Date to Congress
Smith Island, MD	22 Oct 02	18 Apr 05 [1]	02 Aug 06
Hamilton Airfield, CA	24 Jan 05	20 Apr 05	03 May 05
Silver Strand/Imperial Beach, CA	03 Jan 05	22 Apr 05	06 May 05
Western Sarpy, NE	25 Feb 04	22 Apr 05	15 Jul 05
J.T. Myers/Greenup L&Ds KY, OH, IN	23 Aug 03	03 May 05	04 Jan 06
Southwest Valley, NM	06 Apr 05	14 Jun 05	29 Jun 05
Centralia, WA	25 Apr 05	15 Jun 05	01 Jul 05
Jacksonville Harbor, FL	18 May 05	25 Jul 05	03 Aug 05
Denver County Streams, CO	21 Jun 05	02 Sep 05	13 Oct 05
Indian River Lagoon, FL	22 Jun 05	17 Oct 05	01 Feb 06
Louisiana Coastal Area, LA	26 Aug 05	01 Nov 05	21 Nov 05
Napa River Salt Marsh, CA	17 Aug 05	01 Nov 05	21 Nov 05
Duwamish-Green Rivers, WA	09 May 02	28 Nov 05	21 Dec 05
Stillaguamish River, WA	18 Apr 02	28 Nov 05	21 Dec 05
Dare County Beaches, NC	01 Nov 05	06 Jan 06	27 Jan 06
Chickamauga L&D, TN	16 Jun 04	11 Jan 06	25 Jan 06
Miami Harbor, FL	17 Feb 06	24 Apr 06	25 May 06
Rilito River, Pima County, AZ	17 Feb 06	01 May 06	19 May 06
Great Lakes Fish & Ecosystem Rest	07 Apr 06	15 Jun 06	Complete [2]
Missouri & Middle Mississippi River	30 Aug 05	15 Jun 06	Complete [2]
Ohio River Restoration, OH	04 Mar 02	15 Jun 06	Complete [2]
Puget Sound, WA	02 May 05	15 Jun 06	Complete [2]
Bayou Sorrel, LA	10 Jul 06	15 Sep 06	04 Oct 06
Poplar Island, MD	03 Aug 06	03 Oct 06	11 Oct 06
Matilija Dam, CA	25 Sep 06	27 Nov 06	09 Apr 07
Hamilton City, CA	25 Sep 06	22 Nov 06	21 Dec 06
Bloomsburg, PA	11 Oct 06	20 Dec 06	11 Jan 07
Matagorda Bay Re-Route, TX	08 Sep 03	06 Feb 07	05 Mar 07
GIWW, High Island to Brazos, TX	08 Oct 04	06 Feb 07	09 Mar 07
Deep Creek Bridge, VA	27 Aug 03	23 Feb 07	23 Mar 07
Jackson Hole, Snake River, WY	04 Mar 02	08 Mar 07	12 Mar 07
Picayune Strand, FL	17 Jan 07	19 Mar 07	19 Apr 07
Montauk Point, NY	05 Feb 07	19 Apr 07	03 May 07
MS Coastal Improvements Program	20 Feb 07	23 Apr 07	04 May 07
Breckinridge, MN	15 Jul 04	20 Mar 07	07 May 07
Chesterfield, MO	13 Jun 06	01 May 07	30 May 07
Lido Key, Lee County Shore, FL	04 Aug 06	25 May 07	

[1] Received June 27, 2006.
[2] Returned to DCW as complete by letter dated 17 Jul 06. Programmatic documents not to be reviewed by OMB.

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	07 Jun 99 & 08 Jan 02	Pending
Whitewater River Basin, CA	09 May 02	Pending
Port Monmouth, NJ	19 May 03	Pending
Rio de Flag, AZ	18 Sep 03	Pending
Port Sutton, FL	01 Oct 03	Pending
Peoria Riverfront Development, IL	28 Feb 04	Pending [1]
Park River at Grafton, ND	28 May 04	Pending
Tanque Verde, AZ	02 Jun 04	Pending
Dallas Floodway Extension, TX	23 Aug 04	Pending
Corpus Christi Ship Channel, TX	16 Sep 04	Active Review
Swope Park Industrial Area, MO	28 Oct 04	Pending
South River, Raritan River Basin, NJ	05 Nov 04	Pending
St. Clair River/Lake St. Clair, MI	22 Mar 06	Pending
Manasquan to Barnegat Inlet, NJ	25 Sep 06	On Hold [2]
CERP—Site 1 Impoundment	25 Apr 07	Pending
Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers, IA	25 Apr 07	Pending
Craney Island Expansion, VA	07 Jun 07	Pending

[1] Project Scope reduced by partial implementation authorized by section 519 of WRDA 2000.
[2] District answering questions on cumulative effects and air quality.

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, 2007. The Committee directs that reviews of all of these documents should be completed no later than December 31, 2008.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $5,448,092,000. This is $577,092,000 over the administration's budget request and $109,722,000 over the fiscal year 2007 enacted amount. Funding is displayed in the following tables in the accounts where projects have been traditionally located and comparisons to the budget request are made as if the request was presented in the traditional manner. Funding by account is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2007 request	Committee recommedation	Request vs. recommendation
General Investigations	90,000	172,147	+82,147
Construction, General	1,818,811	2,059,474	+240,663
Mississippi River and Tributaries	260,000	375,000	+115,000
Operation and Maintenance	2,175,189	2,291,971	+116,782
Regulatory	180,000	180,000	.....
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies	40,000	50,000	+10,000
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	130,000	140,000	+10,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	6,000	4,500	−1,500
General Expenses	171,000	175,000	+4,000
Total	4,871,000	5,448,092	+577,092

DISCLOSURE PROVISIONS

The Committee received more than 2,500 requests for projects, programs, studies or activities for the Corps of Engineers for fiscal

year 2008. These were items that were in addition to the budget request as well as those included in the budget request. The Committee obviously was unable to accommodate all of these requests.

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

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

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

It should be noted that many line items only have President listed as the requestor. It should not be inferred that the affected Members are not interested in these projects studies or activities. Rather this is due to Committee direction that the President's budget requests are assumed to be requested by the affected Members unless they notify the Committee to the contrary.

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

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2007	$162,916,000
Budget estimate, 2008	90,000,000
Committee recommendation	172,147,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $8,165,000.

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

The planning program is the entry point for Federal involvement in solutions to the Nation's water resource problems and needs. Unfortunately, the General Investigations [GI] account is eviscerated in the budget request. Nationwide studies and programs consume nearly two-thirds of the administration's GI request. This budget is saying that the Nation should concentrate scarce resources on completing studies but not carrying forward ongoing studies or allowing new starts. The Committee 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.

The Committee has provided for a robust and balanced planning program for fiscal year 2008. The Committee has used the traditional view within the Corps planning program that only considers new starts as those that have never received GI funds before. The Committee believes that to maintain a robust planning program, a mix of new reconnaissance studies must be included with the existing feasibility and PED studies. As such the Committee has included several new reconnaissance studies in this account. To provide additional transparency in the budget process, the Committee has segregated the budget into three columns in the following table.

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

The Committee believes that by segregating the table in this manner that more attention will be focused on the various study phases, and a more balanced planning program will be developed by the administration. As the last two columns are generally cost shared, they demonstrate the commitment by cost sharing sponsors to be a part of the Federal planning process. By the same token, it also shows the level of commitment of the Federal Government to these cost sharing sponsors. The Committee directs that the fiscal year 2009 planning budget be presented to the Committee in this fashion.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation			Requested by
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED	
ALASKA						
ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	STEVENS
ATKA BOAT HARBOR, AK	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	STEVENS
BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	.....	.....	.....	400	.....	STEVENS
DELONG MOUNTAIN DOCK, AK	.....	.....	.....	100	400	STEVENS
HAINES HARBOR, AK	.....	.....	.....	.....	350	STEVENS
HOMER HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK	.....	.....	.....	400	.....	STEVENS
KENAI RIVER BLUFF EROSION, AK	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	STEVENS
LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK	.....	.....	.....	600	.....	STEVENS
MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	STEVENS
MCGRATH, AK	.....	.....	600	.....	.....	STEVENS
WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK	.....	.....	.....	400	.....	STEVENS
YAKUTAT HARBOR, AK	300	.....	.....	600	.....	PRESIDENT, STEVENS
ARIZONA						
RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	.....	300	.....	.....	300	PRESIDENT
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION, AZ	.....	658	.....	.....	658	PRESIDENT
ARKANSAS						
LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESOURCE STUDY	.....	.....	250	.....	.....	COCHRAN, LINCOLN, PRYOR
MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	.....	.....	.....	.....	250	LINCOLN, PRYOR
PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	LINCOLN, PRYOR
RED RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS, AR	.....	.....	.....	200	200	LANDRIEU, LINCOLN, PRYOR, INHOFE
WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO	.....	.....	.....	325	.....	BOND, LINCOLN, PRYOR
WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOWS, AR	.....	.....	.....	.....	475	LINCOLN, PRYOR
WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	LINCOLN, PRYOR
CALIFORNIA						
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA	300	.....	.....	450	.....	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
CARPINTERIA SHORELINE STUDY	.....	.....	.....	200	.....	FEINSTEIN
COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	700	250	.....	700	250	PRESIDENT

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation			Requested by
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED	
COYOTE DAM, CA	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	FEINSTEIN
ESTUDILLO CANAL, CA	425	.....	.....	425	.....	PRESIDENT
HAMILTON CITY, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	800	FEINSTEIN
HEACOCK AND CACTUS CHANNELS, CA	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	FEINSTEIN
HUMBOLT BAY LONG TERM SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT, CA	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	FEINSTEIN
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CORNFIELDS, CA	.....	.....	.....	750	.....	FEINSTEIN
LOS ANGELES RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	BOXER
LOS ANGELES RIVER WATERCOURSE IMPROVEMENT—HEADWORKS)	.....	.....	.....	300	.....	FEINSTEIN
LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, WOODLAND AND VICINITY	.....	.....	.....	40	.....	FEINSTEIN
LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	FEINSTEIN
MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	158	FEINSTEIN
MATILIJA DAM, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	FEINSTEIN, BOXER
MIDDLE CREEK, CA	.....	.....	.....	30	500	FEINSTEIN
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SAMP, CA	.....	.....	.....	227	.....	FEINSTEIN
ROCK CREEK, KEEFER SLOUGH, CA	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	FEINSTEIN
SAC-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA ISLANDS AND LEVEES, CA	.....	.....	.....	2,000	.....	FEINSTEIN
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SAMP, CA	.....	.....	.....	200	.....	FEINSTEIN
SAN JOAQUIN RB, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, ORESTIMBA CREE	.....	.....	.....	300	.....	FEINSTEIN
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN (SJRB), FRAZIER CREEK/STRATHMO	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	FEINSTEIN
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN (SJRB), LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVE	.....	.....	.....	300	.....	FEINSTEIN
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN (SJRB), WHITE RIVER/DRY CREEK	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	FEINSTEIN
SOLANA-ENCINITAS SHORELINE, CA	.....	.....	.....	171	50	FEINSTEIN
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO SHORELINE, CA	.....	.....	.....	1,250	.....	FEINSTEIN
SUTTER COUNTY, CA	339	.....	.....	339	.....	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
TAHOE BASIN, CA & NV	.....	.....	.....	.....	300	REID
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING, CA AND NV (SEC 503)	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	REID, ENSIGN
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	191	.....	.....	191	.....	PRESIDENT
COLORADO						
CACHE LA POUDRE, CO	340	.....	.....	340	.....	PRESIDENT
CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO	.....	.....	.....	273	.....	ALLARD, SALAZAR
FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO	.....	.....	.....	149	.....	ALLARD, SALAZAR

SOUTH BOULDER CREEK, CO	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	SALAZAR
CONNECTICUT						
CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN WATERSHED STUDY, CT, MA, NH AN	.....	.....	.....	200	.....	GREGG, DODD, LIEBERMAN
DELAWARE						
DELAWARE RVR COMP, NY, NJ, PA & DE (WATERSHED FLD MGT	.....	.....	.....	300	.....	LAUTENBERG, SPECTER, MENENDEZ, SCHUMER
RED CLAY CREEK, CHRISTINA RIVER WATERSHED, DE	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	BIDEN, CARPER
FLORIDA						
INDIAN RIVER LAGOON NORTH, FL	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	MARTINEZ
FLAGLER BEACH, FL	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
LAKE WORTH INLET, FL	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	BILL NELSON
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	.....	.....	.....	300	.....	BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
WALTON COUNTY FL	.....	.....	.....	.....	375	BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
GEORGIA						
AUGUSTA, GA	.....	750	.....	.....	750	PRESIDENT
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	531	.....	.....	531	.....	PRESIDENT
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	.....	700	.....	.....	700	PRESIDENT
GUAM						
HAGATNA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL,	100	.....	.....	100	.....	PRESIDENT
HAWAII						
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	300	.....	.....	700	.....	PRESIDENT, INOUYE
BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	50	.....	.....	141	.....	PRESIDENT, INOUYE
KAHUKU, HI	60	.....	.....	.....	260	PRESIDENT, INOUYE
MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	.....	150	.....	.....	150	PRESIDENT
NAWILIWILI HARBOR MODIFICATION, KAUAI, HI	.....	.....	.....	450	.....	INOUYE, AKAKA
WAILUPE STREAM, OAHU, HI	.....	.....	.....	.....	350	INOUYE, AKAKA
WEST MAUI WATERSHED , HI	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	INOUYE, AKAKA
KAHULUI HARBOR MODIFICATION STUDY, HI	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	INOUYE, AKAKA
IDAHO						
BOISE RIVER, ID	.....	.....	.....	400	.....	CRAIG
ILLINOIS						
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	DURBIN

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation			Requested by
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED	
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	400			1,000		PRESIDENT, DURBIN
PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL					250	DURBIN
SOUTH FORK OF SOUTH BRANCH OF CHICAGO RIVER (BUBBLY CR				500		DURBIN
UPPER MISS RIVER—ILLINOIS WW SYSTEM, IL, IA, MN, MO					12,000	DURBIN, BOND, OBAMA, GRASSLEY, KLOBUCHAR
UPPER MISS RVR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN & WI			386			DURBIN, BOND, GRASSLEY
INDIANA						
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	300			300		PRESIDENT
IOWA						
CEDAR RIVER (TIME CHECK AREA), CEDAR RAPIDS, IA				150		HARKIN, GRASSLEY
DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA					440	HARKIN, GRASSLEY
KANSAS						
MANHATTAN, KS				200		BROWNBACK
MISSOURRI RIVER DEGRADATION STUDY, KS			300			BOND, ROBERTS
TOPEKA, KS		100			100	PRESIDENT
UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS				231		BROWNBACK
LOUISIANA						
BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA		1,371			1,371	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
BOSSIER PARISH, LA				300		LANDRIEU, VITTER
CALCASIEU RIVER AND SHIP CHANNEL ENLARGEMENT, LA				361		LANDRIEU, VITTER
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	395			395		PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
CROSS LAKE, LA WATER SUPPLY IMPROVEMENTS				384		LANDRIEU, VITTER
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM REST, LA (SCIENCE PRO	5,000					PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, VITTER
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	8,000			12,000		PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, VITTER
LOUISIANA COASTAL PROTECTION AND RESTORATION, LA (LACP				2,000		LANDRIEU
PLAQUEMINES PARISH, LA (FC)				250		LANDRIEU
PORT OF IBERIA, LA					1,000	LANDRIEU
SOUTHWEST COASTAL HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA				400		LANDRIEU, VITTER

ST. CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	.....	.....	.....	200	.....	LANDRIEU
WEST BATON ROUGE (RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT), LA	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	LANDRIEU
WEST PEARL RIVER NAVIGATION, LA AND MS	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	COCHRAN
WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	.....	.....	.....	498	280	LANDRIEU, VITTER
MAINE						
PENOBSCOT RIVER RESTORATION, ME	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	SNOWE, COLLINS
SEARSPORT HARBOR, ME	.....	.....	.....	125	.....	SNOWE, COLLINS
MARYLAND						
ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
BALTIMORE METRO WTR RES.—PATAPSCO AND BACK RIVERS	.....	.....	.....	.....	600	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
CHESAPEAKE BAY MARSHLANDS, MD	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, MARYLAND COASTAL MANAGEMENT,	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
EASTERN SHORE, MID CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND, MD	.....	.....	.....	.....	600	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE REALLOCATION, MD AND WV	.....	.....	80	60	.....	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S WATERSHED,	.....	.....	.....	50	125	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER—GREATER SENECA/MUDDY BRANCH, MD	.....	.....	.....	300	.....	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER WATERSHED, MD, VA, PA, WV, AMD DC	.....	.....	.....	50	150	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
MASSACHUSETTS						
BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	REED
BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA	377	.....	.....	377	.....	PRESIDENT
COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA	100	.....	.....	100	.....	PRESIDENT
MICHIGAN						
GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	800	.....	800	.....	.....	PRESIDENT, CLINTON, VOINOVICH
GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS, MI	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....	OBAMA, LUGAR, LEVIN, STABENOW, COLEMAN, SCHUMER, CLINTON, VOINOVICH, BROWN, KOHL
MINNESOTA						
BLUE EARTH RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MN (MN RIVER A	.....	.....	.....	100	.....	COLEMAN, KLOBUCHAR
FARGO,ND-MOORHEAD,MN & UPSTREAM SUB-BASIN (RRN BASIN A	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	DORGAN, COLEMAN
MARSH LAKE, MN (MN RIVER AUTHORITY)	.....	.....	.....	150	.....	COLEMAN, KLOBUCHAR
MINNEHAHA CREEK WATERSHED, UMR LAKE ITASCA TO L&D 2, M	.....	.....	.....	125	.....	COLEMAN, KLOBUCHAR
MINNESOTA RIVER BASIN, MN & SD	.....	.....	.....	100	.....	COLEMAN
WILD RICE RIVER, RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN	270	.....	.....	135	.....	PRESIDENT, COLEMAN

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation			Requested by
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED	
MISSISSIPPI						
MISSISSIPPI COASTAL HURRICANE STUDY, MS	.....	.....	.....	1,153	.....	COCHRAN
MISSOURI						
BRUSH CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	.....	.....	.....	200	.....	BOND, BROWNBACK,
KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS	589	100	.....	589	100	PRESIDENT, ROBERTS, BOND
SPRINGFIELD, MO	354	.....	.....	354	.....	PRESIDENT
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460–471, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	350	BOND
RIVER DES PERES, MO	.....	.....	.....	180	.....	BOND
ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	.....	281	.....	.....	281	PRESIDENT
ST LOUIS MISSISSIPPI RIVERFRONT, MO & IL	.....	.....	.....	148	.....	BOND
SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	BOND
MONTANA						
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	200	.....	.....	500	.....	PRESIDENT, BAUCUS, TESTER
NEBRASKA						
LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	130	.....	.....	130	.....	PRESIDENT, HAGEL
NEVADA						
TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,000	REID, ENSIGN
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA	200	.....	.....	200	.....	PRESIDENT, KENNEDY, KERRY
NEW JERSEY						
DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE, NJ	.....	.....	.....	175	.....	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	200	.....	.....	350	.....	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	200	.....	.....	500	.....	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ	.....	.....	.....	.....	125	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ	.....	.....	.....	.....	125	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ

NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLE	256			256		PRESIDENT
NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT				250		LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
PASSAIC RIVER MAIN STEM, NJ				125		LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ					200	LAUTENBERG
PECKMAN RIVER BASIN, NJ				375		LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ				175		LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ				200		LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, KEYPORT, NJ				200		LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ				125		LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ				100		LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ				125		LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ					375	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ				150		LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
NEW MEXICO						
BERNALILLO, NM			100			DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
EAST MESA LAS CRUCES,NM				200		DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
ESPANOLA VALLEY RIO GRANDE AND TRIBS, NM				500		DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE BOSQUE, NM	311			311		PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX				250		DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
SANTA FE, NM				175		DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
SOCORRO COUNTY, NM			100			DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, ALBUQUERQUE, NM					200	DOMENICI
NEW YORK						
BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY				375		SCHUMER, CLINTON
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	100			100		PRESIDENT
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY					100	SCHUMER, CLINTON
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, GOWANUS CANAL, NY				375		SCHUMER, CLINTON
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	200			500		PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ, SCHUMER, CLINTON
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY				175		SCHUMER, CLINTON
MONTAUK POINT, NY					250	SCHUMER, CLINTON
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY					125	SCHUMER, CLINTON
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY				200		SCHUMER, CLINTON
SAW MILL RIVER AT ELSFORD/GREENBURGH, NY					250	SCHUMER, CLINTON
SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY				150		SCHUMER, CLINTON
SUSQUEHANNA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND LOW FL			100			SCHUMER, CLINTON
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON REST, COOPERSTOW		102			102	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation			Requested by
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED	
NORTH CAROLINA						
BOGUE BANKS, NC				125		DOLE, BURR
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	150			150		PRESIDENT
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	554			554		PRESIDENT
NORTH CAROLINA INTERNATIONAL PORT, NC			100			DOLE, BURR
SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC				200		DOLE, BURR
NORTH DAKOTA						
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD & MANITOBA, C				3,550		DORGAN
OHIO						
BELPRE, OH					200	VOINOVICH
CUYAHOGA RIVER BULKHEAD STUDY, OH				150		VOINOVICH
HOCKING RIVER BASIN, MONDAY CREEK, OH					200	VOINOVICH
MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH					250	VOINOVICH
OHIO RIVERFRONT STUDY, CINCINNATI, OH					500	VOINOVICH
WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH, IN, & MI				492		VOINOVICH
OKLAHOMA						
GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER BASIN WATERSHED, OK, KS, MO & AR				225		ROBERTS
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK				150		INHOFE
WASHITA RIVER BASIN, OK				268		INHOFE
OREGON						
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	100			100		PRESIDENT
WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA					100	MURRAY, WYDEN, SMITH, CANTWELL
WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR				375		WYDEN, SMITH
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR				84		WYDEN, SMITH
PENNSYLVANIA						
BLOOMSBURG, PA					400	SPECTER, CASEY

UPPER OHIO NAVIGATION STUDY, PA	.....	.....	.....	3,000	.....	SPECTER, CASEY
SOUTH CAROLINA						
EDISTO ISLAND, SC	218	.....	.....	218	.....	PRESIDENT
SOUTH DAKOTA						
CANYON LAKE DAM, RAPID CITY, SD	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	JOHNSON
JAMES RIVER, SD & ND	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	JOHNSON, THUNE
WATERTOWN, SD	.....	.....	.....	.....	450	JOHNSON, THUNE
TENNESSEE						
MILL CREEK WATERSHED, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	257	.....	.....	257	.....	PRESIDENT
TEXAS						
ABILENE, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN-ELM CREEK)	.....	.....	.....	150	.....	CORNYN
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX	400	.....	.....	400	.....	PRESIDENT, CORNYN
DALLAS FLOODWAY, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	.....	100	.....	.....	100	PRESIDENT
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	721	.....	.....	721	.....	PRESIDENT
GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	.....	488	.....	.....	488	PRESIDENT
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	300	.....	.....	300	.....	PRESIDENT
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	300	.....	.....	450	.....	PRESIDENT, HUTCHISON, CORNYN
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, WHARTON/ONION, TX	.....	.....	.....	.....	600	CORNYN
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	250	.....	.....	500	.....	PRESIDENT, HUTCHISON
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	.....	.....	.....	.....	750	HUTCHISON, CORNYN
RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	223	.....	.....	223	.....	PRESIDENT
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	.....	.....	.....	.....	625	HUTCHISON
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	.....	.....	.....	175	.....	CORNYN
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX	.....	.....	.....	125	.....	HUTCHISON, CORNYN
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX	.....	300	.....	.....	300	PRESIDENT, CORNYN
UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	.....	.....	.....	1,500	.....	HUTCHISON
UTAH						
PARK CITY REGIONAL WATER TRANSPORT PROJECT, UT	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	BENNETT, HATCH
VIRGINIA						
AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	.....	.....	.....	.....	46	WARNER, WEBB
DISMAL SWAMP AND DISMAL SWAMP CANAL, VA	62	.....	.....	62	.....	PRESIDENT, WARNER, WEBB
EASTWARD EXPANSION CRANEY ISLAND, VA	.....	3,000	.....	.....	3,000	PRESIDENT, WARNER, WEBB
ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENV RESTORATION, VA (PHASE II)	.....	.....	.....	90	.....	WARNER, WEBB
ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA	.....	97	.....	.....	97	PRESIDENT, WARNER, WEBB

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation			Requested by
	Investigations	Planning	RECON	FEAS	PED	
FOURMILE RUN, VA	.....	.....	.....	350	.....	WARNER, WEBB
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216)	300	.....	.....	300	.....	PRESIDENT
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	300	.....	.....	300	.....	PRESIDENT, WARNER, WEBB
NEW RIVER, CLAYTOR LAKE, VA	.....	.....	.....	49	51	WARNER, WEBB
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	WARNER, WEBB
UPPER RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, VA (PHASE II)	.....	.....	.....	200	.....	WARNER, WEBB
VICINITY AND WILOUGHBY SPIT, VA	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	WARNER, WEBB
WASHINGTON						
CENTRALIA, WA	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	MURRAY
ELLIOTT BAY SEAWALL	.....	.....	.....	750	.....	MURRAY, CANTWELL
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	.....	.....	.....	400	.....	MURRAY, CANTWELL
LOWER PUYALLUP RIVER ALTERNATIVES STUDY, WA	.....	.....	.....	100	.....	CANTWELL
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	400	.....	.....	1,500	.....	PRESIDENT, MURRAY, CANTWELL
SKAGIT RIVER, WA	.....	.....	.....	700	.....	MURRAY, CANTWELL
SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	.....	.....	.....	375	.....	CANTWELL
WEST VIRGINIA						
CHERRY RIVER BASIN, WV	.....	.....	50	.....	.....	BYRD
LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV	.....	.....	.....	88	.....	BYRD
OHIO RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, WV, KY, OH, PA,	.....	.....	400	.....	.....	BYRD
UPPER GUYANDOTTE RIVER BASIN, WV	.....	.....	150	.....	.....	BYRD
WYOMING						
BEAR RIVER STUDY, WY	26,553	8,747	100	.....	.....	THOMAS, ENZI
SUBTOTAL FOR PROJECTS	.....	.....	5,116	73,450	42,582	
AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUPPORT TRI-CADD	350	.....	.....	350	.....	PRESIDENT
CHIEF'S 12 ACTIONS	3,100	.....	.....	.....	.....	PRESIDENT
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	1,400	.....	.....	4,900	.....	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, INOUYE, CANTWELL
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	75	.....	.....	75	.....	PRESIDENT

FEME/MAP MOD COORDINATION	1,500	.....	.....	1,500	.....	PRESIDENT
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA PROGRAM	220	.....	.....	220	.....	PRESIDENT
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	5,625	.....	.....	10,196	.....	PRESIDENT, INOUYE, LANDRIEU, BEN NELSON, REED, BIDEN, CARPER, CHAMBLISS, GRASSLEY, VITTER, HAGEL, WYDEN, SMITH, WHITEHOUSE
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT STUDY	1,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....	PRESIDENT
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	250	.....	.....	250	.....	PRESIDENT
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	200	.....	.....	200	.....	PRESIDENT
NATIONAL FLOOD INVENTORY	10,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	PRESIDENT
NATIONAL SHORELINE STUDY	375	.....	.....	875	.....	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	3,880	.....	.....	5,130	.....	PRESIDENT, REID, DOMENICI
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	4,550	.....	.....	5,742	.....	PRESIDENT, INOUYE, BROWNBACK, MIKULSKI, LAUTENBERG, SPECTER, LIEBERMAN, BIDEN, CARPER, CARDIN, LUGAR, BAYH, GRASSLEY, MENENDEZ, CLINTON, DOLE, INHOFE
PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM	2,500	.....	.....	2,500	.....	PRESIDENT
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	225	.....	.....	225	.....	PRESIDENT
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	150	.....	.....	150	.....	PRESIDENT
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	17,300	.....	.....	31,050	.....	PRESIDENT, REID, COCHRAN, DOMENICI, MIKULSKI, CARDIN, CASEY, WARNER, WEBB
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	50	.....	.....	50	.....	PRESIDENT
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	600	.....	.....	600	.....	PRESIDENT
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM	350	.....	.....	350	.....	PRESIDENT
TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	1,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	.....	−15,364	.....	
Total	81,253	8,747	5,116	124,449	42,582	
GRAND TOTAL	190,000	.....	.....	172,147	.....	

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 $500,000 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 $200,000 to complete feasibility studies and $200,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design.

Heacock and Cactus Channels, California.—The Committee includes $100,000 to continue feasibility studies. Feasibility studies were initiated under the Continuing Authorities Program.

Los Angeles River Watercourse Improvement, Headworks, California.—$300,000 is provided to continue the feasibility studies.

Malibu Creek Watershed, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $158,000 to complete the feasibility study.

Rock Creek and Keefer Slough, California.—$250,000 is provided to execute the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement and initiate the feasibility phase of the study. The study was initiated under the Continuing Authorities Program.

Sacramento, San Joaquin Delta Islands and Levees, California.—The Committee included $2,000,000 to complete the feasibility study.

Chatfield, Cheery Creek and Bear Creek, Reservoirs.—The recommendation includes $273,000 to complete feasibility studies.

Fountain Creek and Tributaries, Colorado.—The Committee provides $149,000 to complete the feasibility study.

Boulder Creek, Colorado.—The Committee included $100,000 to initiate this reconnaissance study. The Committee notes that studies were initiated under the Continuing Authorities Program.

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.—$375,000 is provided to continue the preconstruction, engineering and design phase. This study is a test bed for the Institute of Water Resources Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction model.

West Maui Watershed, Hawaii.—The Committee provided $300,000 to initiate the reconnaissance study to investigate the

comprehensive scope and extensive water resource problems in the watershed.

Boise River, Idaho.—The Committee provided $400,000 to continue the feasibility study.

Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway Navigation System, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000 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.

Louisiana Coastal Area Ecosystem Restoration, Louisiana.—The Committee provides $12,000,000 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 2009 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. Any funds from the fiscal year 2007 allocation 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 $200,000 for this study that was initiated under the Continuing Authorities Program in fiscal year 2006.

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 secretary, the ministry of transportation Canada, and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation, is to be limited in scope to evaluating the economic, engineering and environmental impacts of maintaining the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway at current size draft and length of locks. The Secretary is directed to complete the supplemental report by September 2008, 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.

Kansas Citys, Missouri and Kansas.—The Committee recommendation includes $689,000 for this effort. $589,000 is included for completion of the feasibility phase and $100,000 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 $500,000 to continue feasibility studies.

Delaware Basin Comprehensive, New Jersey.—The Committee included $175,000 to continue evaluation of alternative solutions to the region's problems regarding flooding and environmental restoration along the New Jersey portion of the Delaware River and tributaries.

Western Lake Erie Basin Study, Ohio, Indiana and Michigan.—$492,000 is included to complete feasibility studies.

Walla Walla River Basin, Oregon and Washington.—$100,000 is provided to execute a design agreement and initiate preconstruction, engineering and design studies.

Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas.—$625,000 is provided to negotiate and execute a design agreement and initiate preconstruction engineering and design.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Bridge Replacement at Deep Creek, Chesapeake, Virginia.—The Committee recommendation includes $46,000 to complete the preconstruction engineering and design phase.

Eastward Expansion—Craney Island, Virginia.—$3,000,000 is provided to continue the preconstruction engineering and design phase.

Vicinity of Willoughby Spit, Norfolk, Virginia.—The Committee recommendation includes $150,000 to continue the general reevaluation study.

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

Chief's 12 Actions.—The Committee did not include funding for this item. The Committee believes that the activities proposed in the budget request for this line item should be incorporated into the various funded planning activities that the Corps has underway.

National Inventory of Flood/Storm Damage Reduction Projects.—No funds have been provided for this effort under this account. The Committee has chosen to fund this item under the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account where all previous funds have been provided.

National Shoreline Study.—Additional funds have been provided above the budget request for the National Planning Center of Expertise for Coastal Storm Damage Reduction to develop a process for managing shore protection projects as part of a systems approach to coastal protection for the purpose of achieving improved project performance, increased cost effectiveness, and enhanced benefits.

Other Coordination Programs.—An additional $250,000 is provided along with budgeted funds for Lake Tahoe coordination activities. Also additional funds are provided above the budget re-

quest 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.

Planning Assistance to States.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,742,000 for this nationwide cost-shared program, $1,192,000 over the budget request. The Committee recognizes that there are hundreds of these studies on-going at any given time. Within the funds provided the following studies are to be given priority if cost sharing funds are available from the local sponsors: Southington Water Supply Project, Connecticut; Honolulu, Hawaii; Wabash River Enhancement Project, Indiana; Sac and Fox Tribe, Iowa; Kansas River Basin Technical Assistance, Kansas; Delaware Estuary Salinity Monitoring Study; Port of Rochester Environmental Remediation Planning, New York; Bartlesville Water Supply, Bartlesville, Oklahoma; Lehigh Releases at FE Walter Dam, Pennsylvania; Oklahoma Comprehensive Water Plan, Oklahoma.

Coastal Field Data Collection.—The Committee has provided $4,900,000 for this nationwide program. An additional $3,500,000 has been provided to continue the Coastal Data Information Program; the Southern California Beach Processes Study; Surge and Wave Island Modeling Studies, Hawaii; and the Pacific Island Land Ocean Typhoon Experiment Program. These are all studies that have been underway for a number of years and the Committee supports their continuation.

Flood Plain Management Services Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,196,000. This is $4,571,000 above the budget request. Within this amount the Corps attention is directed to the following studies: White Clay Creek, New Castle, Delaware; Albany, Georgia [GIS]; Hurricane Evacuation Studies, Hawaii; Wapello, Iowa; Iowa Levee Certification; Maquoketa River Flood Warning, Iowa; Iowa Multi-site dam safety analyses; City of Gretna, Louisiana GIS; East Baton Rouge Parish Metropolitan GIS, Livingston Parish, Louisiana; Livingston Parish, Louisiana GIS; Papillion Creek Watershed, Flood Plain Mapping, Nebraska; Halfway Sediment Transport Assessment, Oregon; Rhode Island Ecosystem Restoration Study, Rhode Island.

Research and Development.—The Committee has included $31,050,000 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 $15,050,000 above the budget request. Within the funds provided,

the Corps should continue submerged aquatic vegetation research in the Chesapeake Bay; 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; innovative technology demonstrations for urban flooding and channel restoration in Nevada to be conducted in close coordination and cooperation with the Urban Water Research Program of the Desert Research Institute and the University of New Mexico.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2007	$2,336,368,000
Budget estimate, 2008	1,523,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,059,474,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $36,500.

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

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

Consequently, the Committee has elected to display the President's budget request as if these projects had been requested in the CG account rather than the O&M account. This makes the actual budget request for CG, $1,818,811,000 rather than $1,523,000,000 as requested in the budget. The projects moved from the O&M request include:

[In thousands of dollars]

Caragory	Project Name	Amount
ESA	Columbia River Basin Restoration OR & WA	92,560
ESA	Missouri R Fish and Wildlife Recovery, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND, SD	85,000
ESA	Chief Joseph Dam Gas Abatment	3,000
ESA	Howard Hanson Dam Ecosystem Restoration, WA	16,000
ESA	Williamette River Temperature Control, OR	7,632
ESA	Lower Snake River	400
Nav. Mitigation	Assategue, MD	1,900
Nav. Mitigation	Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, NJ	5,111
Nav. Mitigation	Folly Beach, SC	35
Nav. Mitigation	Broward County, FL (Canaveral Hbr)	250
Nav. Mitigation	Cape May Inlet to Lower Township, NJ	270
Nav. Mitigation	Delaware Bay Coastline, Roosevelt Inlet to Lewes Beach, DE	105
Nav. Mitigation	Nassau County, FL	6,000
Nav. Mitigation	Surfside-Sunset-Newport Beach, C A	9,000
Nav. Mitigation	Lake Worth Sand Transfer Plant, FL	2,000
Nav. Mitigation	St. John's County, FL	200
Nav. Mitigation	Section 111 Program	4,874
O&M Material	Poplar Island, MD	9,825
O&M Material	Dredged Material Disposal Facilities	8,241
O&M Material	Indiana Harbor (Confined Disposal Facility), IN	18,065
O&M Material	Section 204/145	2,663

[In thousands of dollars]

Caragory	Project Name	Amount
Rehab	Lock and Dam 19, Mississippi River, IA	698
Rehab	Lock and Dam 24, IL &MO	340
Rehab	Markland Locks & Dam, KY & IL	7,800
Rehab	Locks No. 27, Mississippi River, IL	7,542
Rehab	Lock and Dam 11, Mississippi River, IA	6,300
TOTAL	Projects Migrating from Construction to O&M	295,811

The projects that included in the line item above for Dredged Material Disposal Facilities are:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Amount
CALCASIEU RIVER & PASS	2,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	1,200
DILLINGHAM HARBOR (O&M)	300
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	1,100
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	125
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	125
HOMER HARBOR	550
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	2,716
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	125
TOTAL, DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM [DMDF]	8,241

Due to constrained funding, the Committee reduced the requested amounts for some administration projects. This should not be perceived as a lack of support for any of these projects, rather it is an attempt by the Committee to balance out the program across the Nation and fund most of the projects or studies that were funded in the work plan produced by the administration for the fiscal year 2007 joint funding resolution but were not addressed by the administration proposal.

Even with a $577,000,000 increase to the Corps' accounts, the Committee is unable to address all of the needs. By the Committee's estimate, only about 60 percent of the needed funding is available for this account. Construction schedules will slip due to this constrained funding. This will result in deferred benefits to the national economy. The Committee does not believe that there is any way to prioritize our way out of this problem without serious unintended consequences. Adequate resources have been denied for too long. Only providing adequate resources for these national investments will resolve this situation.

The Committee has included a limited number of new construction starts as well as provided completion funding for a number of projects. As in the General Investigations account, the Committee has embraced the traditional view of new starts. New starts are generally defined as those projects that have not received Construction, General funding in the past. 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), emer-

gency streambank and shoreline protection (section 14), beach erosion control (section 103), mitigation of shore damages (section 111), navigation projects (section 107), snagging and clearing (section 208), aquatic ecosystem restoration (section 206), beneficial uses of dredged material (section 204), and project modifications for improvement of the environment (section 1135).

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
ALABAMA			
TUSCALOOSA, AL		5,000	SHELBY
MOBILE HARBOR TURNING BASIN, AL		2,000	SHELBY, SESSIONS
ALASKA			
ALASKA COASTAL EROSION, AK		5,000	STEVENS, MURKOWSKI
CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK		1,000	STEVENS
NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK		1,500	STEVENS
ST PAUL HARBOR, AK		3,000	STEVENS
SITKA HARBOR BREAKWATER UPGRADE, AK		800	STEVENS
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK		2,500	STEVENS
UNALASKA, AK		7,000	STEVENS
ARIZONA			
NOGALES WASH, AZ		4,461	KYL
RIO DE FLAG FLAGSTAFF, AZ		3,000	KYL
TUSCON DRAINAGE AREA		3,000	KYL
ARKANSAS			
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	17,300	17,300	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR
RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LA, AR & TX		2,500	LANDRIEU, LINCOLN, PRYOR
RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA		4,000	LANDRIEU, LINCOLN, PRYOR
CALIFORNIA			
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA	12,000	12,000	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, BOXER
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), C	6,000	6,000	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, BOXER
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM RAISE), CA	18,500	18,500	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, BOXER
CALFED LEVEE STABILITY PROGRAM		5,000	FEINSTEIN
CORONADO TRANSBAY WASTEWATER PIPELINE REIMBURSEMENT		500	FEINSTEIN
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA		3,000	FEINSTEIN
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	4,900	4,900	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, BOXER
HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING STUDY, LOS ANGELES, C		3,000	FEINSTEIN
LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA		1,000	FEINSTEIN, BOXER

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION	.....	500	FEINSTEIN
MURRIETA CREEK, CA	.....	2,000	FEINSTEIN
NAPA RIVER, CA	7,500	11,000	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, BOXER
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	42,000	40,000	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, BOXER
PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA	.....	2,000	FEINSTEIN
SACRAMENTO DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	900	900	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	21,528	21,528	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	500	500	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	.....	600	FEINSTEIN
SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	.....	1,000	FEINSTEIN
SAN RAMON VALLEY RECYCLED WATER, CA	.....	3,000	FEINSTEIN
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	17,000	17,000	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
SANTA MARIA RIVER, CA	.....	300	FEINSTEIN (BOXER)
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	8,000	8,000	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, BOXER
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	18,000	18,000	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, BOXER
SURFSIDE-SUNSET-NEWPORT BEACH, CA	9,000	8,000	PRESIDENT
TAHOE BASIN RESTORATION 108	.....	4,500	REID, ENSIGN
UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	.....	1,000	FEINSTEIN
UPPER NEWPORT BAY, CA	.....	4,000	FEINSTEIN
WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	.....	900	FEINSTEIN, BOXER
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	.....	1,100	FEINSTEIN
CONNECTICUT			
BRIDGEPORT ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, CT	.....	200	LIEBERMAN
DELAWARE			
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, BROADKILL BEACH, DE	.....	250	BIDEN, CARPER
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES BEACH	105	105	PRESIDENT, BIDEN, CARPER
DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HELOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, Fenwick Island, DE	.....	105	BIDEN, CARPER
DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HELOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, Rehobeth Beach to Dewey Beach, DE	.....	2,700	PRESIDENT, BIDEN, CARPER
DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	.....	390	BIDEN, CARPER
FLORIDA			
BREVARD COUNTY, FL (MID REACH)	.....	200	BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ

BROWARD COUNTY, FL (SEGMENT III REIMBURSEMENT)	.....	1,000	BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	250	250	PRESIDENT
CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	5,000	5,000	PRESIDENT, MARTINEZ
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	90,588	80,588	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
ESTERO AND GASPARILLA SEGMENTS, FL (LEE COUNTY)	.....	1,000	BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA COSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	4,310	4,310	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON
FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS, FL	.....	3,000	MARTINEZ
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	55,776	55,776	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	.....	3,000	BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	32,502	32,502	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
LAKE WORTH SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL	2,000	2,000	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON
MODIFIED WATER DELIVERIES TO ENP	35,000	.....	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
NASSAU COUNTY, FL	6,000	6,000	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	.....	1,500	MARTINEZ
ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL	200	200	PRESIDENT
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	.....	304	MARTINEZ
GEORGIA			
ATLANTA, GA EI	.....	2,000	CHAMBLISS, ISAKSON
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	6,400	6,400	PRESIDENT
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	6,900	6,900	PRESIDENT
TYBEE ISLAND, GA	.....	2,000	CHAMBLISS, ISAKSON
HAWAII			
IAO STREAMS, HI	.....	500	INOUYE, AKAKA
HAWAII WATER MANAGEMENT, HI	.....	2,000	INOUYE
IDAHO			
RURAL IDAHO, ID	.....	5,000	CRAIG, CRAPO
ILLINOIS			
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	4,500	4,500	PRESIDENT
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL, SECOND BARRIER, IL	750	3,250	PRESIDENT, DURBIN, OBAMA, LUGAR, LEVIN, STABENOW, COLEMAN, SCHUMER, CLINTON, VOINOVICH, BROWN, KOHL
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	9,000	9,000	PRESIDENT, DURBIN
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	6,620	6,620	PRESIDENT, DURBIN
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	2,500	2,500	PRESIDENT
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, LOCKPORT LOCK AND DAM, IL (REPLACEM	20,445	20,445	PRESIDENT
LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	340	340	PRESIDENT, BOND

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
LOCK & DAM 27, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (REHABILITATION)	7,542	7,542	PRESIDENT, DURBIN, BOND
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	33,500	31,500	PRESIDENT, DURBIN
NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	.....	300	DURBIN
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	104,000	94,000	PRESIDENT, MCCONNELL
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO &	23,464	18,000	PRESIDENT, DURBIN, GRASSLEY, COLEMAN, FEINGOLD
INDIANA			
INDIANA HARBOR (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY), IN	18,065	18,065	PRESIDENT
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	13,000	13,000	PRESIDENT
IOWA			
DAVENPORT, IA	.....	1,000	HARKIN, GRASSLEY
DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA	.....	3,000	HARKIN, GRASSLEY
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	6,300	5,000	PRESIDENT, HARKIN, BOND, GRASSLEY
LOCK AND DAM 19, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	698	698	PRESIDENT, HARKIN, BOND, GRASSLEY
MISSOURI R FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA,KS,MO,MT,NE,	85,000	50,000	PRESIDENT, GRASSLEY
KANSAS			
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	9,000	9,000	PRESIDENT, BOND, BROWNBACK, ROBERTS
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS (DAM SAFETY)	28,500	28,500	PRESIDENT, BROWNBACK, ROBERTS
KENTUCKY			
KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	52,000	47,000	PRESIDENT, MCCONNELL, SHELBY
MARKLAND LOCKS & DAM, KY & IL	7,800	7,000	PRESIDENT
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	45,000	41,000	PRESIDENT, MCCONNELL
WOLF CREEK, KY (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	54,100	54,100	PRESIDENT, MCCONNELL, ALEXANDER, CORKER
LOUISIANA			
COMITE RIVER, LA	.....	7,000	LANDRIEU, VITTER
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	.....	1,000	LANDRIEU
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	.....	2,000	LANDRIEU, VITTER

J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	1,500	7,000	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, VITTER
LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA	.....	2,200	LANDRIEU
OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA	.....	1,400	LANDRIEU, VITTER
SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	.....	18,500	LANDRIEU, VITTER
MARYLAND			
ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD AND DC, PHASE I	.....	308	CARDIN
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	1,900	1,900	PRESIDENT, MIKULSKI, CARDIN
ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	.....	200	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES, GWYNNS FALLS,	.....	1,000	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTIO	.....	2,031	MIKULSKI, CARDIN, CASEY, WARNER, WEBB
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	.....	2,000	MIKULSKI, CARDIN, CASEY, WARNER, WEBB
CUMBERLAND, MD	.....	700	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	9,825	10,374	PRESIDENT, MIKULSKI, CARDIN
MASSACHUSETTS			
MUDDY RIVER, MA	10,000	10,000	PRESIDENT, KENNEDY, KERRY
MICHIGAN			
GENESEE COUNTY, MI	.....	600	LEVIN, STABENOW
NEGAUNEE, MI	.....	385	LEVIN, STABENOW
MINNESOTA			
BRECKENRIDGE, MN	.....	4,000	COLEMAN, KLOBUCHAR
LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	.....	2,250	COLEMAN, KLOBUCHAR
MARSHALL, MN	.....	80	COLEMAN, KLOBUCHAR
MISSISSIPPI			
MISSISSIPPI ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, MS	.....	19,000	COCHRAN, LOTT
DESOTO COUNTY REGIONAL WASTEWATER SYSTEM, MS	.....	10,000	COCHRAN, LOTT
JACKSON COUNTY WATER SUPPLY PROJECT, MS	.....	5,519	COCHRAN, LOTT
MISSOURI			
BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	.....	4,117	BOND
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	3,500	3,500	PRESIDENT, BOND
BOIS BRULE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, MISSOURI	.....	5,000	BOND
CAPE GIRARDEAU (FLOODWALL), MO	.....	2,000	BOND
CHESTERFIELD, MO	.....	2,500	BOND
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	25,000	25,000	PRESIDENT
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	2,100	3,000	PRESIDENT, BOND

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
MISSOURI & MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT, MO	.....	500	BOND,GRASSLEY
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	.....	100	BOND
ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	.....	2,000	BOND
STE GENEVIEVE, MO	.....	438	BOND
MONTANA			
RURAL MONTANA, MT	.....	5,000	BAUCUS, TESTER
FT. PECK CABIN CONVEYANCE, MT	.....	500	TESTER
NEBRASKA			
ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	9,000	9,000	PRESIDENT, BEN NELSON, HAGEL
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	.....	1,000	HAGEL
SAND CREEK WATERSHED, SAUNDERS COUNTY, NEBRASKA	.....	1,000	BEN NELSON, HAGEL
WESTERN SARPY COUNTY AND CLEAR CREEK	.....	3,000	BEN NELSON, HAGEL
NEVADA			
RURAL NEVADA	.....	19,000	REID, ENSIGN
TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	.....	13,000	REID, ENSIGN
NEW JERSEY			
BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR, NJ (NJ SHORE PROT	.....	5,000	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	270	270	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, NJ, PA & DE	.....	2,500	SPECTOR, CASEY
HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	.....	397	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
JOSEPH G MINISH HISTORIC WATERFRONT PARK, NJ	.....	3,000	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	5,111	5,111	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	.....	2,000	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, MAHWAH, NJ AND SUFFERN, NY	.....	250	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ, SCHUMER, CLINTON
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	.....	250	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	10,000	10,000	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	.....	3,000	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	.....	3,000	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ

GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO PECK BEACH (OCEAN CITY), NJ	.....	3,000	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, PORT MONMOUTH, NJ	.....	2,000	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET (ABSECON),	.....	2,000	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, BRIGANTINE	.....	80	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
NEW MEXICO			
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	.....	2,400	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
ALAMOGORDO, NM	4,200	4,200	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM	.....	7,500	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
COCHITI LAKE (DAM SAFETY), NM	.....	200	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
JEMEZ CANYON (DAM SAFETY), NM	.....	150	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	.....	300	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
NEW MEXICO, EI, NM	.....	10,000	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	800	800	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
NEW YORK			
ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	8,500	8,500	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	4,150	4,400	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	91,000	85,000	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ, SCHUMER, CLINTON
NORTH CAROLINA			
BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	.....	400	DOLE, BURR
DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	.....	2,000	DOLE, BURR
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	.....	3,000	DOLE, BURR
WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC	.....	300	BURR
NORTH DAKOTA			
GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (REPLACEMENT)	6,200	6,200	PRESIDENT
HOMME DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY)	.....	235	DORGAN
LAKE SAKAKAWEA PROJECT, ND	.....	3,000	DORGAN
MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, ND	.....	300	DORGAN
NORTH DAKOTA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, ND	.....	6,000	DORGAN
OHIO			
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	11,847	11,847	PRESIDENT
OKLAHOMA			
CANTON LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	17,300	17,300	PRESIDENT
TAR CREEK CLEANUP, OK	.....	3,500	INHOFE

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
OREGON			
COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR & WA	15,000	15,000	PRESIDENT, MURRAY, CRAPO, BAUCUS, TESTER, WYDEN, SMITH, CANTWELL
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	.....	3,800	WYDEN, SMITH, CANTWELL
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	11,030	11,030	PRESIDENT
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	1,000	1,500	PRESIDENT, MURRAY
WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	7,632	7,632	PRESIDENT
PENNSYLVANIA			
EMSWORTH L&D, OHIO RIVER, PA (STATIC INSTABILITY CORRE	43,000	43,000	PRESIDENT, SPECTER, CASEY
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	70,300	65,300	PRESIDENT, SPECTER, CASEY
PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	.....	1,000	SPECTER, CASEY
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	.....	2,500	SPECTER, CASEY
LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	.....	2,000	SPECTER, CASEY
PUERTO RICO			
PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	35,000	35,000	PRESIDENT
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	11,500	11,500	PRESIDENT
SOUTH CAROLINA			
FOLLY BEACH, SC	35	35	PRESIDENT
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	.....	3,000	JOHNSON, THUNE
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	.....	4,000	JOHNSON, THUNE
MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, SD	.....	100	JOHNSON
TENNESSEE			
CENTER HILL DAM, TN (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	25,000	25,000	PRESIDENT, ALEXANDER, CORKER
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	35,200	35,200	PRESIDENT, SHELBY, ALEXANDER, CORKER
TEXAS			
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	14,841	14,841	PRESIDENT, CORNYN

CENTRAL CITY, FORT WORTH, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, T	.....	500	HUTCHISON, CORNYN
CLEAR CREEK, TX	.....	1,000	CORNYN
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX	.....	13,000	HUTCHISON, CORNYN
HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	16,320	16,320	PRESIDENT, HUTCHISON
JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	.....	1,000	HUTCHISON
RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX & OK	.....	1,000	INHOFE
SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	.....	10,000	HUTCHISON, CORNYN
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	24,154	20,000	PRESIDENT, CORNYN
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX	.....	2,500	HUTCHISON
UTAH			
RURAL UTAH, UT (EI)	.....	10,000	BENNETT, HATCH
VERMONT			
BURLINGTON HARBOR, VT	.....	500	LEAHY
LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED INITIATE, VT	.....	2,500	LEAHY
VIRGINIA			
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (REPLACEMENT)	13,000	13,000	PRESIDENT
LYNCHBURG CSO, VA	.....	300	WARNER, WEBB
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA (DEEPENING)	.....	1,700	WARNER, WEBB
RICHMOND CSO, VA	.....	300	WARNER, WEBB
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	10,150	10,150	PRESIDENT, WARNER, WEBB
SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VA	.....	2,000	WARNER, WEBB
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	.....	3,000	WARNER, WEBB
WASHINGTON			
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM GAS ABATEMENT, WA	3,000	6,000	PRESIDENT, MURRAY
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	92,560	83,500	PRESIDENT, MURRAY
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	.....	2,000	MURRAY, CANTWELL
HOWARD HANSON DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA	16,000	16,000	PRESIDENT
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	400	400	PRESIDENT
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	10,200	10,200	PRESIDENT, MURRAY
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (FISH PASSAGE)	11,500	11,500	PRESIDENT, MURRAY, CANTWELL
PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS RESTORATION, WA	.....	3,000	MURRAY, CANTWELL
SHOALWATER BAY, WA (SEC 545 OF WRDA 2000)	.....	1,500	MURRAY
WEST VIRGINIA			
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	12,000	12,000	PRESIDENT, BYRD
GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	.....	1,500	BYRD

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
ISLAND CREEK BASIN IN AND AROUND LOGAN, WEST VIRGINIA	.....	200	BYRD
LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	.....	26,500	BYRD, WARNER, WEBB
LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WV	.....	1,050	BYRD
MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	25,000	30,000	PRESIDENT, BYRD
ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	1,000	1,000	PRESIDENT
WYOMING			
JACKSON HOLE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, JACKSON, WY	.....	475	THOMAS
SUBTOTAL, FOR PROJECTS	1,687,308	1,987,854	
ABANDONED MINE RESTORATION	.....	656	REID, FEINSTEIN, BAUCUS
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	11,278	25,000	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, FEINSTEIN, ALLARD, INOUYE, CRAIG, DURBIN, HARKIN, LANDRIEU, MIKULSKI, LAUTENBERG, REED, ALEXANDER, LEAHY, SALAZAR, DODD, LIBERMAN, BILL NELSON, CHAMBLISS, ISAKSON, CRAPO, GRASSLEY, CARDIN, KENNEDY, KERRY, COLEMAN, MENENDEZ, BINGAMAN, SCHUMER, CLINTON, WYDEN, SMITH, CASEY, WHITEHOUSE, CORNYN, WARNER, WEBB, CANTWELL, FEINGOLD
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL	3,000	4,000	PRESIDENT
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204, 207, 933)	2,663	5,000	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, KOHL, GRASSLEY, FEINGOLD
CHIEF'S 12 ACTIONS	4,600	.....	PRESIDENT
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	39,000	39,000	PRESIDENT
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM (DMDF)	8,241	8,241	PRESIDENT
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14)	907	12,000	PRESIDENT, BYRD, COCHRAN, DORGAN, LANDRIEU, GREGG, LAUTENBERG, KOHL, CHAMBLISS, GRASSLEY, SNOWE, COLLINS, MENENDEZ, VOINOVICH
EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION FUND	21,000	21,000	PRESIDENT

ESTUARY RESTORATION PROGRAM (PUBLIC LAW 106–457)	5,000	1,000	PRESIDENT
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	11,716	45,000	PRESIDENT, BYRD, COCHRAN, DOMENICI, FEINSTEIN, INOUYE, BROWNBACK, LANDRIEU, MIKULSKI, BOND, BEN NELSON, LAUTENBERG, ALEXANDER, HUTCHISON, LINCOLN, PRYOR, BIDEN, CARPER, AKAKA, LUGAR, BAYH, GRASSLEY, ROBERTS, BUNNING, CARDIN, KENNEDY, KERRY, COLEMAN, HAGEL, MENENDEZ, BINGAMAN, SCHUMER, CLINTON
INLAND WATERWAY USER BOARD (COE EXP)	185	185	PRESIDENT
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD (BOARD EXPENSES)	40	40	PRESIDENT
MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES (SECTION 111)	4,874	2,500	PRESIDENT, SNOWE, COLLINS, SCHUMER, CLINTON
NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	477	10,000	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN, INOUYE, LANDRIEU, MIKULSKI, REED, PRYOR, AKAKA, SNOWE, COLLINS, CARDIN, KENNEDY, KERRY, LEVIN, STABENOW, VOINOVICH
PROJECT MODS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 1135)	11,190	25,000	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, FEINSTEIN, INOUYE, HARKIN, LANDRIEU, MIKULSKI, BOND, LAUTENBERG, LEAHY, MURRAY, LINCOLN, PRYOR, BIDEN, CARPER, AKAKA, GRASSLEY, CARDIN, KENNEDY, KERRY, WARNER, WEBB, CANTWELL, FEINGOLD
SHORE PROTECTION (SECTION 103)	422	5,000	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, MIKULSKI, CARDIN, CASEY
SNAGGING AND CLEARING (SECTION 208)	10	500	PRESIDENT
SUBTOTAL, FOR PROJECTS NOT LISTED UNDER STATES	124,603	204,122	
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	−126,030	
USE OF PRIOR BALANCES	.....	−6,472	
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL	1,818,811	2,059,474	

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

Akutan Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,500,000 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, Barrow, Kaktovik, Point Hope, Unalakleet, and Bethel.

Nogales Wash, Arizona.—The Committee provides $4,461,000 for completion 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 $18,500,000. Within the funds provided, $14,000,000 is for completion of the bridge.

CALFED Levee Stability Program, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 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 $500,000 for a limited reevaluation report as well as other necessary studies in advance of reconstruction.

Oakland Harbor, California.—The Committee recommends $40,000,000 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 $17,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

West Sacramento, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $900,000 for a general reevaluation of the project and other project needs.

Delaware Coast, Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Rehobeth Beach to Dewey Beach, Delaware.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,700,000 to complete the second nourishment cycle.

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. This is not a traditional authorization of work for the Corps. It is direction for the Corps to be involved in the implementation of the project. As the work involved primarily benefits Everglades National Park, budgeting for this work should be continued by the Interior Department as was the practice prior to fiscal year 2006. 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 $3,000,000 to continue work on the project as well as for a second general reevaluation report.

Tampa Harbor, Florida.—$304,000 is provided to complete the General Reevaluation Report.

Atlanta, Georgia.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 to continue 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 $5,000,000 for this project. Within the funds provided the Corps should give consideration to projects at Emmett, Burley, Deary, Rupert, Donnelly, East Idaho Regional Water Authority, and Smelterville. Other communities that meet the program criteria should be considered as funding allows.

Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $3,250,000 for construction on Barriers I and II. Legislative language has been included for these projects as requested in the budget.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois.—The Committee includes $31,500,000 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 $94,000,000 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 $50,000,000 for this project. Legislative language is included in the bill that accompanies this report to make modifications to the Intake Dam, as requested by the administration, to provide additional habitat for the pallid sturgeon. Funding for the modifications to Intake Dam are provided in this account rather than as a separate line as proposed in the budget.

Turkey Creek, Kansas and Missouri.—The Committee recommendation includes $9,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, Kentucky.—The Committee recommendation includes $47,000,000 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.

Markland Locks and Dam, Kentucky and Illinois.—The Committee has provided $7,000,000 to initiate construction on this major rehabilitation requested by the administration. The Committee has provided these funds here rather than in O&M as proposed in the budget request.

McAlpine Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Kentucky and Indiana.—The Committee has provided $57,000,000 to continue construction of this project and legislative language, as requested in the budget request, to raise the cost ceiling for the project so the funds can be utilized in fiscal year 2008. 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.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $7,000,000 for navigation channel refinement features, land purchases and development for mitigation of project impacts, and construction of project recreation and appurtenant features.

Southeast Louisiana project, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $18,500,000 to continue construction of this vital interior drainage project. Additionally, the Committee has included legislative language directing the Secretary of the Army to include the

Southeast Louisiana Flood Control project authorized in section 533 of Public Law 104–303, as amended, and other related internal pumping requirements as integral components of the comprehensive protection plan required to achieve certification for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program directed by Public Law 109–234. As the recent inundation study for the city of New Orleans and vicinity by the Corps of Engineers concluded, the improvements to the pumping capacity and levee system in the area have contributed to an improved mitigation of risk of catastrophic flooding in the region. However, a peripheral line of protection alone does not provide a truly comprehensive protection system without adding the ability to efficiently collect and evacuate the significant amounts of flood water that accumulate inside of this line of protection. The southeast Louisiana project and related interior pumping capacity projects are essential component pieces to such a comprehensive system and to the National Flood Insurance Program and, accordingly, must be designed and constructed concurrently with other projects in the area.

Chesapeake Bay Environmental Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 for continuation of this project. Within the funds provided, $450,000 is included to complete 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 $500,000 for continuation of Fort Peck cabin sales.

Rural Montana, Montana.—The Committee provides $5,000,000 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; Ranch Water District, Bigfork; Town of Medicine Lake; County Water District of Billings Heights; Power Water System improvements; Seely Lake, Greater Woods Bay Wastewater System; Basin Creek Reservoir, Butte; Dayton Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facility; Phillipsburg Wastewater Improvements; Glasgow Wastewater; Whitehall Wastewater; Cut Bank Water; Hamiliton Wastewater; Conrad Wastewater; Billings, West Wicks Lane Water and Sewer; and Port of Montana Water. 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 $19,000,000 for this project. Within the funds provided the Corps should give consideration to projects at North Lemmon Valley; Spanish Springs Valley Phase II; Huffaker Hills Water Conservation; Lawton-Verdi; Boulder City; Lyon County; Gerlach; Searchlight; Incline Village; Esmeralda County; Cold Springs; Fallon; Goldfield; Churchill County; West Wendover; Yearington; Virgin Valley Water District; Lovelock; Truckee Meadows Water Authority; McGill-Ruth Consolidated Sewer and Water District;

Carlin; Moapa; Indian Springs; Eldorado Valley; Ely and Carson City. Other communities that meet the program criteria should be considered as funding allows.

Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, Nevada.—The Committee recommendation includes $13,000,000 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.

Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-basin, New Jersey.—The Committee includes $10,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, New Jersey.—The Committee provides $5,111,000 for this periodic renourishment here rather than in O&M as proposed by the administration's budget request.

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 [EI], New Mexico.—The Committee includes $7,500,000 to continue construction of this project.

New Mexico [EI], New Mexico.—The Committee includes $10,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.—The original health care facility for the Three Affiliated Tribes tribe was permanently inundated due to the impoundment of Lake Sakakawea. A replacement healthcare facility was promised but never constructed. Legislative text has been included in the Bill this report accompanies that directs the Corps to construct this replacement facility. The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for design of the replacement health care facility. The Corps should work closely with the Indian Health Service and the Three Affiliated Tribes on the design and construction of this facility. The Committee suggests that the Corps utilize the expertise in their military programs office for this project.

North Dakota [EI], North Dakota.—The Committee has provided up to $6,000,000 for work related to the replacement of the Devils Lake Water supply pipeline. The Committee has included legislative text that reallocates the unexpended balance of $4,972,000 from the Devils Lake outlet to this project.

Locks and Dams 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River, Pennsylvania.—The Committee recommendation includes $65,300,000 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 $1,000,000 to continue this project.

Big Sioux River, South Dakota.—The Committee includes $3,000,000 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 fund-

ing 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 $4,000,000 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 $35,200,000 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. The Committee continues to be interested in the merits of combining the authorized Central City project with the proposed Riverside Oxbow project. The Committee understands that the Corps has an ongoing evaluation of the combined project and encourage that it be completed expeditiously and the results furnished to the Committee.

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

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

Sims Bayou, Houston, Texas.—The Committee recommendation includes $20,000,000 for 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.

Rural Utah, [EI], 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.

Lake Champlain Watershed Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,500,000 for continuation of this project. The Committee has included legislative text that reallocates the unexpended balance of $1,500,000 from the completed Waterbury Dam Seepage Correction repairs to this project.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—The Committee has chosen not to follow the budget proposal to include this work within the various O&M items in the system. The Committee believes that it is prudent to maintain visibility of the costs of environmental compliance activities for this project and have included funding in this account in the traditional items. $83,500,000 is provided for this project.

Mud Mountain, Washington.—The Corps has provided $11,500,000 for fish passage at this project.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Cumberland River, West Virginia, Kentucky and Virginia.—The Committee provides $26,500,000 for the continuation of the project. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommendation includes $7,500,000 for the Buchanan County, Dickenson County, and Grundy, Virginia elements. Further, the recommendation includes

$18,000,000 for Kermit, Lower Mingo County, McDowell County, Upper Mingo and Wayne County, West Virginia.

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

Chief's 12 Actions.—The Committee did not include funding for this item. The Committee believes that the activities proposed in the budget request for this line item should be incorporated into the various funded construction activities that the Corps has underway.

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

Shore Line Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program.)—The Committee understands that this program will be considerably expanded and modified in the pending Water Resources Development Act. Therefore the Committee has included legislative text to extend the duration of this program so that the COE can continue monitoring of complete projects and finish work on projects, where possible with previousl appropriated funds. No new funds are provided.

Collection and Study of Basic Data.—The recommendation includes $1,400,000 for these efforts. Funds provided above the budget request are for LIDAR mapping to be undertaken in the Delta portion of Mississippi.

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

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM

When Congress authorized the initial Continuing Authorities in the 1940s and 1950s, they were envisioned to provide a small pool of money available to the Corps of Engineers to solve very small localized problems without being encumbered by the longer study and project authorization process. As more programs were added to

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

The table below shows the unfunded costs in each of the various sections of the CAP program along with the Statutory Limit of each section and the Mean Annual Allocation from 2001–2007 for each section. At current levels of funding it will take nearly 16 years to clear out this backlog.

Section	Statutory limit	Mean annual allocation 2001–2007	Total unfunded Federal cost
14	$15,000	$13,730	$43,193
103	30,000	4,179	45,435
107	35,000	8,389	148,262
111	([1])	1,417	38,279
145	([1])	904	2,700
204	15,000	1,876	26,754
205	50,000	31,664	547,862
206	25,000	29,658	734,545
208	7,500	233	1,151
1135	25,000	28,951	323,226
Totals	+202,500	121,001	1,911,409

[1] None.

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. Due to the Joint funding resolution for fiscal year 2007, the moratorium was continued through the current year. The Committee does not recommend that the moratorium be continued into fiscal year 2008.

Prioritization of these projects by the Corps is still essential. The Committee directs the Corps to 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 are ready to execute Project Cooperation Agreements. The next priority should be for projects that are ready to execute design agreements. Third priority would be for those that are ready to execute feasibility agreements. The fourth priority would be for those projects progressing from design to construction. 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 no new starts in any of the sections.

Starting with fiscal year 2008 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 de-

termining 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.

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 of Engineers should provide a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 30 days of enactment of this bill detailing how funds will be distributed to the individual items in the various CAP sections for the fiscal year. The Chief should also provide an annual report at the end of each fiscal year detailing the progress made on the backlog of projects. The report should include the completions and terminations as well as progress of on going work. The Committee would be willing to work with the Corps on any reforms that they might suggest to improve this program.

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	10,000,000	75
Section 1135	25,000,000	70
Section 14	12,000,000	80
Sections 204, 207, 933	5,000,000	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 Corps is directed not to initiate any new continuing authorities projects without explicit congressional direction. 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:

Project	Requested by
Section 103 Shoreline Protection:	
Goleta Beach, CA	Feinstein
Pismo Beach, CA	Feinstein
Conquest Preserve, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Franklin Point Park, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Mayo Beach Park, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Pleasure Island, Baltimore County, MD	Mikulski, Cardin

Project	Requested by
Philadelphia Shipyard Sea Wall, Philadelphia, PA	Casey
Section 107 Small Navigation Projects:	
Blytheville Harbor, AR	Pryor
Kahoolawe Harbor, Kahoolawe, HI	Inouye, Akaka
Port Fourchon Extension, Lafourche Parish, LA	Landrieu
Bucks Harbor, ME	Snowe, Collins
Naticoke Harbor, Wicomico, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Rhodes Point, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
St. Jerome's Creek, St. Mary's County, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Woods Hole, Great Harbor, Woods Hole, MA	Kennedy, Kerry
Northwestern Michigan College, Great Lakes Maritime Academy, Harbor Renovation, Traverse City, MI:.	Levin, Stabenow
Ontonagon Channel Extension, MI	Levin, Stabenow
Yazoo Diversion Canal, MS	Cochran
Ottawa River Recreational Dredging, NC	Voinovich
Charlestown Breachway, RI	Reed
Section 111 Mitigation of Shore Damages Attributable to Navigation Projects:	
Camp Ellis Restoration Project, ME	Snowe, Collins
Mattituck Harbor, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Sections 204, 207, 933 Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material:	
Blackhawk Bottoms, IA	Grassley
Barataria Bay Waterway, LA	Landrieu
Calcasieu River, Cameron Parish, LA	Landrieu
Restoration of the Cat Islands Chain, Green Bay, WI	Kohl
Section 205 Small Flood Control Projects:	
Wynne, AR	Lincoln, Pryor
Las Gallinas Creek/Santa Venetia Levee, CA	Feinstein
Little Mill Creek, Elsemere, DE	Biden, Carper
Kuliouou Stream, Oahu, HI	Inouye
Palai Stream, Hawaii, HI	Inouye, Akaka
Waiakea Stream, Hawaii, HI	Inouye, Akaka
White River, Anderson, IN	Lugar, Bayh
Indian Creek, Cedar Rapids, IA	Grassley
Mad Creek, Muscatine, IA	Grassley
Red Oak Creek, Red Oak, IA	Grassley
Winnebago River, Mason City, IA	Grassley
Eureka Creek, Manhattan, KS	Roberts, Brownback
Red Duck Creek, Mayfield, KY	Bunning
Bayou Choupique, St Mary Parish, LA	Landrieu
Bayou Queue de Tortue, Vermillion Parish, LA	Landrieu
Coushatta Indian Reservation, LA [FC]	Landrieu
Jean Lafitte, Fisher School Basin, LA	Landrieu
Pailet Basin, Barataria, LA	Landrieu
Rosethorn Basin, LA	Landrieu
Town of Carencro, Lafayette Parish, LA	Landrieu
Elkton, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
North River, Peabody, MA	Kennedy, Kerry
Ada, MN	Coleman
Montevideo, MN	Coleman
McKinney Bayou, Tunica County, MS	Cochran
Blacksnake Creek, St. Joseph, MO	Bond
Festus-Crystal City, MO	Bond
Little River Diversion, Dutchtown, MO	Bond
Fremont South,NE	Hagel, Ben Nelson
Schuyler, NE	Hagel, Ben Nelson
Jackson Brook, Morris County, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Mill Brook, Highland Park, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Upper Passaic River and Tributaries, Long Hill Township, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Hatch, NM	Domenici, Bingaman
Steel Creek, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Poplar Brook, Deal and Ocean Township, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Beaver Creek, TN	Alexander
Pecan Creek, Gainesville, TX	Hutchison
WV Statewide Flood Warning System	Byrd
Section 206 Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration:	
Upper York Creek, Dam Removal, CA	Feinstein

Project	Requested by
Arkansas River Habitat Restoration Project, CO	Allard, Salazar
Goose Creek, Boulder, CO	Salazar
Lower Boulder Creek, CO	Salazar
Tamarisk Eradication, CO	Salazar
Stamford Mill River Restoration, CT	Dodd, Lieberman
Rose Bay, FL	Nelson
Chattahoochee Fall-Line Ecosystem Estoration, GA	Chambliss, Isakson
Mokuhinia/Mokuula Restoration, HI	Inouye
Paradise Creek Ecosystem Restoration, Moscow, Idaho	Craig, Crapo
Salmon River, Challis, ID	Craig, Crapo
Emiquon Preserve, Fulton County, IL	Durbin
Squaw Creek Restoration, IL	Durbin
Chariton River/Rathbun Lake, Iowa	Grassley
Duck Creek, Davenport, IA	Grassley
Iowa River/Clear Creek, Iowa City, IA	Grassley
Storm Lake, IA	Grassley
Ventura Marsh Habitat Restoration, IA	Harkin, Grassley
Whitebreast Creek Watershed, IA	Grassley
Bayou Grosse Tete Restoration, Iberville Parish, LA	Landrieu
Lake Fausse Pointe, Iberia Parish, LA	Landrieu
Lake Killarney, Louisiana State Penitentiary, LA	Landrieu
Lake Verret Assumption Parish, LA	Landrieu
Mandeville Ecosystem Restoration, LA	Landrieu
University Lakes, Baton Rouge, LA	Landrieu
Vermillion River Ecosystem Restoration, LA	Landrieu
Zemurray Park Lake Restoration, Tangipahoa Parish, LA	Landrieu
Deep Run/Tiber Hudson, Howard County, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Dog Island Shoals, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Greenbury Point, Anne Arundel County, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Hanover Street Wetlands, Baltimore City, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
North Beach Wetland Restoration, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Northwest Branch Anacostia River, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Paint Branch Fish Passage, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Tidal Middle Branch, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Urieville Lake, Kent Conrad, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Wright's Creek, Dorchester Creek, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Milford Pond, Milford, MA	Kennedy, Kerry
Painters Creek, Minnehaha Creek, Watershed, MN	Coleman
Rancocas Creek Fish Passage Restoration Project, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Blue Hole Lake State Park, NM	Domenici, Bingaman
Bottomless Lakes State Park, NM	Domenici, Bingaman
Janes-Wallace Memorial Dam, Santa Rosa, NM	Domenici, Bingaman
Chenango Lake, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Gerritsen Creek, Booklyn, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Lower Hempstead Harbor, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Manhasset Bay, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Mud Creek, Great South Bay, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Northport Harbor, Huntington, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Soundview Park, Bronx, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Pennsville, Salem County, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Christine and Hickson Dams, ND	Dorgan
Drayton Dam, ND	Dorgan
Arrowhead Creek, OR	Wyden, Smith
Camp Creek-Zumwalt Prairie, OR	Wyden, Smith
Springfield Mill Race Stabilization and Protection, OR	Wyden, Smith
Dents Run, Elk County, PA	Casey
North Park Lake Restoration, PA	Casey
Brush Neck Cove, RI	Reed, Whitehouse
Narrow River Restoration, RI	Reed
Ten Mile River restoration, RI	Reed, Whitehouse
Winneapaug Pond Restoration, RI	Reed, Whitehouse
Pistol Creek, Maryville, TN	Alexander
San Marco River Ecosystem Restoration, TX	Cornyn
West Branch of Little River, VT	Leahy
Wild Branch of Lamoille River, VT	Leahy
Elizabeth River, Scuffletown Creek, Chesapeake, VA	Warner, Webb

Project	Requested by
Tangier Island, Accomack County, VA	Warner, Webb
Swift Creek Asbestos Sediment Management, WA	Cantwell
Section 1135 Project Modifications for the Improvement of the Environment:	
Lower Cache Restoration, AR	Lincoln, Pryor
Millwood Lake, Grassy Lake, AR	Lincoln, Pryor
Tujunga Wash Environmental Restoration, CA	Feinstein
Oyster Revitalization in the Delaware Bay, DE	Biden, Carper
Kanaha Pond Wildlife Sanctuary Restoration, HI	Inouye
Kaunakakai Stream Environmental Restoration, HI	Inouye, Akaka
Kawainui Marsh Restoration, HI	Inouye
Charitan River, Rathbun Lake Watershed, IN	Harkin
Rathbun Lake, South Fork Restoration, IA	Grassley
Amite River Diversion Canal Bank Gapping, LA	Landrieu
Frazier/Whitehouse Oxbow Lake Weir, LA	Landrieu
Lake St. Joseph, Tensas Parish, LA	Landrieu
Hart-Miller Island, MD	Mikulski, Cardin
Broad Meadows Marsh, Quincy, MA	Kennedy, Kerry
Duck Creek Conservation Area, Stoddard County, MO	Bond
Assunpink Creek, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Delaware Bay Oyster Restoration, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Lincoln Park West, Ecosystem Restoration Study, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Lower Assunpink Creek, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Mordecai Island Coastal Wetland Restoration, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Pine Mount Creek, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Pond Creek Salt Marsh Restoration, Cape May County, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Rahway River, Rahway, NJ	Lautenberg, Menendez
Las Cruces Dam environmental Restoration, Dona Ana County, NM	Domenici, Bingaman
Pueblo of Santa Ana Aquatic Restoration, NM	Domenici, Bingaman
Route 66 Environmental Restoration, Albuquerque, NM	Domenici, Bingaman
Smokes Creek, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Spring Creek, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Whitney Point Lake, NY	Schumer, Clinton
Joe Creek restoration, OK	Inhofe
Lake Champlain Lamprey Barriers, VT	Leahy
Village of Oyster, Northampton County, VA	Warner, Webb
Mapes Creek Restoration, WA	Murray, Cantwell

The Committee has included a rescission of $6,472,000 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, 2007	$396,565,000
Budget estimate, 2008	260,000,000
Committee recommendation	375,000,000

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

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
INVESTIGATIONS			
BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	.....	1,400	LINCOLN, PRYOR
SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	.....	400	LINCOLN, PRYOR
ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA	200	200	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM LAND STUDY, LA	200	200	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
MORGANZA TO THE GULF, LA	.....	4,000	LANDRIEU, VITTER
SPRING BAYOU, LA	.....	100	LANDRIEU
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	300	300	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, STORM WATER MGMT STUDY, T	.....	148	COCHRAN
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	400	1,400	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
CONSTRUCTION			
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	53,395	55,414	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR
GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	.....	10,000	LINCOLN, PRYOR
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	28,767	51,767	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN, LANDRIEU, BOND, LINCOLN, PRYOR, VITTER
ST FRANCIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AR & MO	.....	7,000	LINCOLN, PRYOR
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	1,800	1,800	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	23,800	23,800	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	.....	1,000	LANDRIEU
YAZOO BASIN—BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	.....	200	COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN—DELTA HEADWATERS PROJECT, MS	.....	20,000	COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN—MAIN STEM, MS	.....	25	COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN—REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	.....	1,500	COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN—UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	.....	13,000	COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN—YAZOO BACKWATER F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, M	.....	50	COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN—YAZOO BACKWATER, MS	.....	10,000	COCHRAN
ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	.....	4,000	BOND
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	.....	200	ALEXANDER, CORKER
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	59,977	64,951	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN, LANDRIEU
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	63	400	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR

INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	249	249	PRESIDENT
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	100	300	PRESIDENT
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	115	115	PRESIDENT
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	10,726	11,800	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN, LANDRIEU, BOND, LINCOLN, PRYOR,
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	4,725	10,000	PRESIDENT, BOND, LINCOLN, PRYOR
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	2,667	2,667	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, LINCOLN, PRYOR
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	900	1,000	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	170	170	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	93	93	PRESIDENT
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,291	2,700	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	11,019	12,500	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	17	400	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	41	41	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
BONNET CARRE, LA	2,367	3,000	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,037	1,237	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	45	80	PRESIDENT
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	125	125	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
OLD RIVER, LA	9,045	10,000	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	2,500	4,000	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	30	300	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	143	143	PRESIDENT
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	71	300	PRESIDENT
YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	5,995	6,000	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	196	196	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS	7,011	10,000	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS	1,558	1,500	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS	6,664	8,000	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	2,075	3,000	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS	7,476	11,000	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	818	1,000	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN, WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	191	191	PRESIDENT
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	613	613	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS	578	578	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	185	185	PRESIDENT
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	4,819	4,819	PRESIDENT, BOND
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	81	81	PRESIDENT
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	2,866	2,866	PRESIDENT, ALEXANDER, CORKER
MAPPING	1,496	1,496	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
ANTICIPATED REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	−11,000	
TOTAL	260,000	375,000	

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.

Memphis Metro, Storm Water Management Study, Tennessee and Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $148,000 to complete the reconnaissance phase and initiate feasibility studies.

Construction

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

Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisisna, Mississippi, Missouri and Tennessee.—Additional funds above the budget request could be used to continue Item 2, New Madrid levee closure and box culvert and mitigation land acquisition for New Madrid levee closure and box culvert; award contracts for Reid-Bedford-King, Item 424–L; Magna Vista-Brunswick, Item 468-L; Bayou Vidal-Elkridge, Item 421–R; Carrollton Levee Enlargement; continue Floodway assessments; Trotters, Mississippi relief wells; Wilson, Arkansas relief wells; Cairo, Illinois Grade Raise and complete LMRMRIS.

Yazoo Basin, Backwater Pumping Plant, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $10,000,000 to fully fund pump and motor contracts and initiate purchase of conservation easements. Funds are also provided for the center associated with the Theodore Roosevelt National Wildlife Refuge.

Yazoo Basin, Delta Headwaters Project, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 to continue construction of this project.

Yazoo Basin, Upper Yazoo Project, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $13,000,000 which could be used to fully fund a contract for Item 6B structures; fund a contract for one bridge relocation; fund a contract for Item 7 channel; continue design of Item 7 and Item 8 channel; purchase project and mitigation lands; and reforestation.

Maintenance

Mississippi River Levees, Arkasnas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and Tennessee.—Funds provided above the budget request are to provide gravel surfacing to selected locations along roads on top of levees in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Lou-

isiana to ensure all weather access for flood fights and for other backlog maintenance.

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, 2007	$1,973,347,000
Budget estimate, 2008	2,471,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,291,971,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriation of $3,000,000.

This appropriation funds operation, maintenance, and related activities at the water resources projects that the Corps operates and maintains. Work to be accomplished consists of dredging, repair, and operation of structures and other facilities, as authorized in the various River and Harbor, Flood Control, and Water Resources Development Acts. Related activities include aquatic plant control, monitoring of completed projects where appropriate, removal of sunken vessels, and the collection of domestic waterborne commerce statistics.

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

The O&M budget request appears to have been increased by nearly $500,000,000 above the fiscal year 2007 enacted amount. However this is very misleading. Shifting of projects from the CG account to the O&M account totals almost $300,000,000 of the $500,000,000 increase to O&M. That still leaves an increase of $200,000,000 for traditional O&M projects. The Committee is pleased that the administration has provided this increase to O&M for fiscal year 2008. This is the first real increase in many years. Unfortunately, the Committee notes that the Corps maintenance backlog is more than $1,000,000,000 and increases by about $100,000,000 annually as the inventory of projects ages.

The Committee has chosen to display the budget request as the discreet projects that are the tradition as opposed to the regional budget proposed by the administration. Also the Committee has chosen to migrate the projects that the administration proposed in O&M back to their traditional location in the CG account. This makes the actual budget request for O&M $2,175,189,000 rather than $2,471,000,000 as presented in the budget. A list of these migrated projects is displayed under the CG heading earlier in this report.

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

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	Committee recommendation	Requested by
ALABAMA			
ALABAMA—COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	500	500	PRESIDENT
ALABAMA—COOSA RIVER, AL	3,686	3,686	PRESIDENT, SHELBY, SESSIONS
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	20,948	20,948	PRESIDENT, SHELBY
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,102	5,102	PRESIDENT
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	5,564	5,564	PRESIDENT, SHELBY, SESSIONS
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	20,000	20,000	PRESIDENT, SHELBY
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	125	125	PRESIDENT
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	5,767	5,767	PRESIDENT, SHELBY
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	99	99	PRESIDENT
TENNESSEE—TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	1,967	2,000	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN, SHELBY
TENNESSEE—TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	21,848	26,848	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN, SHELBY
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	7,039	7,039	PRESIDENT
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, AL	35	35	PRESIDENT
ALASKA			
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	16,115	16,115	PRESIDENT, STEVENS
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	2,601	2,601	PRESIDENT, STEVENS
CORDOVA HARBOR, AK	500	500	PRESIDENT, STEVENS
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	800	800	PRESIDENT, STEVENS
HOMER HARBOR, AK	350	350	PRESIDENT, STEVENS
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	55	55	PRESIDENT, STEVENS
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, BAR POINT, AK	600	600	PRESIDENT, STEVENS
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	350	350	PRESIDENT, STEVENS
NOME HARBOR, AK	1,650	1,650	PRESIDENT, STEVENS
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	525	525	PRESIDENT, STEVENS
ARIZONA			
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,783	1,783	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	95	95	PRESIDENT
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,217	1,217	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	37	37	PRESIDENT
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	183	183	PRESIDENT

ARKANSAS			
BEAVER LAKE, AR	5,204	5,204	PRESIDENT
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	8,043	8,043	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	2,068	2,068	PRESIDENT
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	6,864	6,864	PRESIDENT, BOND, LINCOLN, PRYOR
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	7,006	7,006	PRESIDENT
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	9,333	9,333	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,545	1,545	PRESIDENT
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,653	1,653	PRESIDENT
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,078	1,078	PRESIDENT
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	6,945	6,945	PRESIDENT
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	438	438	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	228	228	PRESIDENT
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	26,144	29,144	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,360	2,360	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	4,179	4,179	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR
NIMROD LAKE, AR	2,484	2,484	PRESIDENT
NORFORK LAKE, AR	5,794	5,794	PRESIDENT
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	12	700	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	9,865	9,865	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, LINCOLN, PRYOR, VITTER
OZARK—JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,855	4,855	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	8	8	PRESIDENT
WHITE RIVER, AR	30	1,000	PRESIDENT, LINCOLN, PRYOR
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	.....	176	LINCOLN, PRYOR
CALIFORNIA			
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	2,462	2,462	PRESIDENT
BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	2,257	2,257	PRESIDENT
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	7,165	7,165	PRESIDENT
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	.....	500	FEINSTEIN, BOXER
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	6,893	6,893	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	453	453	PRESIDENT
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	2,415	2,415	PRESIDENT
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	5,600	5,600	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, BOXER
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,796	1,796	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,414	1,414	PRESIDENT
LOS ANGELES—LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	2,560	4,560	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, BOXER
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	4,582	4,582	PRESIDENT
MARINA DEL REY, CA	2,550	2,550	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	351	351	PRESIDENT
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	290	290	PRESIDENT
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,426	1,426	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
NAPA RIVER, CA	.....	500	FEINSTEIN
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,249	2,249	PRESIDENT
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,764	1,764	PRESIDENT
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	7,510	7,510	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,115	1,115	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	.....	500	FEINSTEIN
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	3,395	3,395	PRESIDENT
PINOLE SHOAL MANAGEMENT STUDY, CA	.....	500	FEINSTEIN
PORT HUENEME, CA	1,309	1,309	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	2,422	2,422	PRESIDENT
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	7,775	7,775	PRESIDENT
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	3,078	3,078	PRESIDENT
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,432	1,432	PRESIDENT
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	173	173	PRESIDENT
SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	2,471	2,471	PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	.....	1,000	FEINSTEIN
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,121	1,121	PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	2,805	2,805	PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,793	2,793	PRESIDENT
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	3,094	3,094	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN, BOXER
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	.....	1,000	FEINSTEIN
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,455	3,455	PRESIDENT
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,940	1,940	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,681	1,681	PRESIDENT
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	2,156	2,156	PRESIDENT
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	2,825	2,825	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	2,247	2,247	PRESIDENT
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	3,695	3,695	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
YUBA RIVER, CA	117	117	PRESIDENT

COLORADO			
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	283	283	PRESIDENT
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,013	1,679	PRESIDENT, ALLARD, SALAZAR
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	612	1,280	PRESIDENT, ALLARD, SALAZAR
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	165	165	PRESIDENT
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	5,723	5,723	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	713	713	PRESIDENT
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,158	1,824	PRESIDENT, ALLARD, SALAZAR
CONNECTICUT			
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	600	600	PRESIDENT
BRIDGEPORT HARBOR DREDGING, CT	.....	500	DODD, LIEBERMAN
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	858	858	PRESIDENT
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	391	391	PRESIDENT
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	991	991	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	90	90	PRESIDENT
LONG ISLAND SOUND DMMP, CT	2,800	2,800	PRESIDENT
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	684	684	PRESIDENT
NORTH COVE HARBOR, CT	.....	2,000	LIEBERMAN
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	490	490	PRESIDENT
NORWALK HARBOR DREDGING INITIATIVE, CT	.....	3,000	DODD, LIEBERMAN
PATCHOGUE RIVER, WESTBROOK, CT	.....	100	DODD, LIEBERMAN
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,000	1,000	PRESIDENT
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	649	649	PRESIDENT
THOMASTON DAM, CT	826	826	PRESIDENT
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	681	681	PRESIDENT
DELAWARE			
HARBOR OF REFUGE, LEWES, DE	.....	750	BIDEN, CARPER
INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, SUSSEX COUNTY, DE	.....	1,500	BIDEN, CARPER
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	11,295	13,295	PRESIDENT, MIKULSKI, BIDEN, CARPER, CARDIN
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	20	20	PRESIDENT
MISPILLION RIVER, DE	20	850	PRESIDENT, BIDEN, CARPER
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	20	20	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	131	131	PRESIDENT
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	2,683	3,683	PRESIDENT, BIDEN, CARPER
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	25	25	PRESIDENT

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL)	850	850	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	25	25	PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	20	20	PRESIDENT
FLORIDA			
AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC &	100	100	PRESIDENT
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	4,880	4,880	PRESIDENT, MARTINEZ
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	13,971	13,971	PRESIDENT
EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	.....	500	BILL NELSON
ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	930	930	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON
EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA, SBC RESERVATION PLAN, FL	300	300	PRESIDENT
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,800	1,800	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	300	300	PRESIDENT
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	150	1,000	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	325	4,000	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	4,750	4,750	PRESIDENT
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	7,553	7,553	PRESIDENT, SHELBY
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	2,400	2,400	PRESIDENT, MARTINEZ
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	75	75	PRESIDENT
MIAMI RIVER, FL	4,500	7,500	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,017	2,017	PRESIDENT
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,170	2,170	PRESIDENT, MARTINEZ
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	953	953	PRESIDENT
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	935	935	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	1,075	1,075	PRESIDENT
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,650	3,650	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	30	30	PRESIDENT
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	4,250	4,250	PRESIDENT, BILL NELSON, MARTINEZ
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, FL	300	300	PRESIDENT
GEORGIA			
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	5,452	5,452	PRESIDENT
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	4,045	2,000	PRESIDENT, SHELBY
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	257	1,000	PRESIDENT, CHAMBLISS, ISAKSON

BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	4,993	4,993	PRESIDENT
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,960	7,960	PRESIDENT
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	7,445	7,445	PRESIDENT
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	10,774	10,774	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, GA	50	50	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	48	48	PRESIDENT
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	10,201	10,201	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA	325	325	PRESIDENT
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	7,384	7,384	PRESIDENT
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	12,906	12,906	PRESIDENT
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	243	243	PRESIDENT
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	12,147	12,147	PRESIDENT
HAWAII			
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	218	218	PRESIDENT
HALEIWA HARBOR, OAHU, HI	.....	220	INOUYE
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	216	326	PRESIDENT, INOUYE
PORT ALLEN, BREAKWATER REPAIR, HI	.....	1,700	INOUYE
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	360	360	PRESIDENT, INOUYE
WAIANAE HARBOR, HI	.....	220	INOUYE
IDAHO			
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,614	1,614	PRESIDENT
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	4,073	4,073	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	82	82	PRESIDENT
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,741	1,741	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	456	456	PRESIDENT
ILLINOIS			
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	3,852	3,852	PRESIDENT
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,443	4,443	PRESIDENT
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	1,875	1,875	PRESIDENT
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	450	450	PRESIDENT
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL	.....	500	DURBIN
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	396	396	PRESIDENT
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	31,379	31,379	PRESIDENT
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,929	1,929	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	857	857	PRESIDENT
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	3,175	3,175	PRESIDENT
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	624	624	PRESIDENT

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,072	5,072	PRESIDENT, DURBIN
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	48,425	49,970	PRESIDENT, BOND, GRASSLEY
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	26,657	26,657	PRESIDENT, GRASSLEY
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	99	99	PRESIDENT
REND LAKE, IL	4,424	4,424	PRESIDENT
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	123	123	PRESIDENT
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	718	718	PRESIDENT
INDIANA			
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	945	945	PRESIDENT
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	3,680	3,680	PRESIDENT
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	830	830	PRESIDENT
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	916	916	PRESIDENT
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	760	760	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	300	300	PRESIDENT
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	2,022	2,022	PRESIDENT
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	970	970	PRESIDENT
MONROE LAKE, IN	971	971	PRESIDENT
PATOKA LAKE, IN	952	952	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	177	177	PRESIDENT
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	831	831	PRESIDENT
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	117	117	PRESIDENT
IOWA			
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	3,169	3,169	PRESIDENT, GRASSLEY
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	227	227	PRESIDENT
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	161	161	PRESIDENT
MISSOURI RIVER—RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO	4,615	6,000	PRESIDENT, BOND, GRASSLEY
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE	1,889	1,889	PRESIDENT
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	3,067	3,067	PRESIDENT, GRASSLEY
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,650	3,650	PRESIDENT, GRASSLEY
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,308	4,308	PRESIDENT, GRASSLEY

KANSAS			
CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,112	2,112	PRESIDENT
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,594	1,594	PRESIDENT
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	402	402	PRESIDENT
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	1,063	1,063	PRESIDENT
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	2,489	2,489	PRESIDENT
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	871	871	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	222	222	PRESIDENT
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	2,689	2,689	PRESIDENT
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,366	1,366	PRESIDENT
MARION LAKE, KS	1,671	1,671	PRESIDENT
MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,099	2,099	PRESIDENT
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,569	2,569	PRESIDENT
PEARSON—SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	1,047	1,047	PRESIDENT
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,252	2,252	PRESIDENT
POMONA LAKE, KS	2,174	2,174	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	39	39	PRESIDENT
TORONTO LAKE, KS	1,551	1,551	PRESIDENT
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,406	2,406	PRESIDENT
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,667	1,667	PRESIDENT, ROBERTS
KENTUCKY			
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	10,975	10,975	PRESIDENT
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,007	2,007	PRESIDENT
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,393	1,393	PRESIDENT
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,734	1,734	PRESIDENT
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,644	1,644	PRESIDENT
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	1,039	1,039	PRESIDENT
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,704	1,704	PRESIDENT
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	9	9	PRESIDENT
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	2,162	2,162	PRESIDENT
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,316	1,316	PRESIDENT
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	2,294	2,294	PRESIDENT
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,838	1,838	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	237	237	PRESIDENT
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	20	20	PRESIDENT
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,587	1,587	PRESIDENT
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	986	986	PRESIDENT
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	897	897	PRESIDENT
NOLIN LAKE, KY	2,229	2,229	PRESIDENT

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	38,861	38,861	PRESIDENT
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH	4,330	4,330	PRESIDENT
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	857	857	PRESIDENT
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,289	2,289	PRESIDENT
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, FALLS, OF OHIO, KY	16	16	PRESIDENT
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	955	955	PRESIDENT
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	8,804	9,804	PRESIDENT, MCCONNELL
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,028	1,028	PRESIDENT
LOUISIANA			
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	6,717	14,000	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, VITTER
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	.....	1,000	LANDRIEU
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	766	766	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
BAYOU LACOMBE, LA	.....	450	LANDRIEU
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	1,273	1,273	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	35	35	PRESIDENT
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	.....	750	LANDRIEU
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	60	270	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
BAYOU TECHE, LA	209	209	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
CADDO LAKE, LA	196	196	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	16,108	20,000	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, VITTER
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	5,570	5,570	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	21,851	21,851	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, VITTER
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	135	2,000	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, VITTER
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,025	1,025	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	10,431	12,431	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, VITTER
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	25	546	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU, VITTER
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	4	81	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,685	1,685	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	290	2,000	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	59,424	59,424	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	60	60	PRESIDENT
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,000	2,000	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
TANGIPAHOA RIVER, LA	.....	700	LANDRIEU

TCHEFUNCTE RIVER & BOGUE FALIA, LA	.....	400	LANDRIEU
WALLACE LAKE, LA	211	211	PRESIDENT, LANDRIEU
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	.....	1,500	LANDRIEU
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	.....	125	LANDRIEU
MAINE			
DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME	1,100	1,100	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	20	20	PRESIDENT
NARRAGUAGUS RIVER, ME	.....	1,000	SNOWE, COLLINS
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	760	760	PRESIDENT
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17	PRESIDENT
MARYLAND			
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	16,655	18,655	PRESIDENT, MIKULSKI, CARDIN
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)	335	335	PRESIDENT, MIKULSKI, CARDIN
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	168	168	PRESIDENT
GOOSE CREEK, MD	.....	120	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
HERRING BAY AND ROCKHOLD, MD	.....	700	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	.....	1,000	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	40	40	PRESIDENT
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,722	1,722	PRESIDENT
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	150	150	PRESIDENT
PARISH CREEK, MD	.....	60	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	380	380	PRESIDENT
RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD	140	140	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	89	89	PRESIDENT
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	.....	140	MIKULSKI, CARDIN
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	800	800	PRESIDENT, MIKULSKI, CARDIN
MASSACHUSETTS			
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	922	922	PRESIDENT
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	795	795	PRESIDENT
BOSTON HARBOR, MA	7,000	7,000	PRESIDENT, KENNEDY, KERRY
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	637	637	PRESIDENT
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	9,200	9,200	PRESIDENT
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	358	358	PRESIDENT
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	280	280	PRESIDENT
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	525	525	PRESIDENT
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	658	658	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	129	129	PRESIDENT

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	728	728	PRESIDENT
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	734	734	PRESIDENT
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	385	385	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	1,100	1,100	PRESIDENT
TULLY LAKE, MA	852	852	PRESIDENT
WEST HILL DAM, MA	767	767	PRESIDENT
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	691	691	PRESIDENT
MICHIGAN			
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI		159	LEVIN, STABENOW
AU SABLE, MI		214	LEVIN, STABENOW
BAY PORT HARBOR, MI		550	LEVIN, STABENOW
BOLLES HARBOR, MI		388	LEVIN, STABENOW
CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI		114	LEVIN, STABENOW
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	90	90	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	188	188	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
CLINTON RIVER, MI		330	LEVIN, STABENOW
CROOKED RIVER LOCK UPGRADES, MI		375	LEVIN, STABENOW
DETROIT RIVER, MI	5,523	5,523	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI		237	LEVIN, STABENOW
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	656	656	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI		1,500	LEVIN, STABENOW
GRAYS REEF PASSAGE, MI		125	LEVIN, STABENOW
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	497	497	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
INLAND ROUTE, MI		400	LEVIN, STABENOW
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	149	149	PRESIDENT
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	15	250	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
LELAND HARBOR, MI		190	LEVIN, STABENOW
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI		175	LEVIN, STABENOW
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI		311	LEVIN, STABENOW
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI		500	LEVIN, STABENOW
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	677	1,196	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	387	387	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI		300	LEVIN, STABENOW

MONROE HARBOR, MI	.....	500	LEVIN, STABENOW
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	566	566	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	.....	130	LEVIN, STABENOW
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	643	643	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	.....	163	LEVIN, STABENOW
PETOSKEY HARBOR, MI	.....	3,198	LEVIN, STABENOW
PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	.....	150	LEVIN, STABENOW
PORTAGE HARBOR, MI	.....	245	LEVIN, STABENOW
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	.....	320	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	184	184	PRESIDENT
ROUGE RIVER, MI	.....	900	LEVIN, STABENOW
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	2,148	2,148	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	.....	315	LEVIN, STABENOW
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	.....	337	LEVIN, STABENOW
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	.....	302	LEVIN, STABENOW
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,515	1,515	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	667	667	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	21,999	21,999	PRESIDENT, LEVIN, STABENOW
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,806	2,806	PRESIDENT
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	.....	319	LEVIN, STABENOW
MINNESOTA			
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	242	242	PRESIDENT
DULUTH—SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	3,794	3,794	PRESIDENT
HARRIET ISLAND LOWER HARBOR DREDGING, MN	.....	100	COLEMAN, KLOBUCHAR
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	129	129	PRESIDENT
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES, MN	105	105	PRESIDENT
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	713	713	PRESIDENT
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	194	194	PRESIDENT
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	53,025	53,025	PRESIDENT
ORWELL LAKE, MN	341	341	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	70	70	PRESIDENT
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	133	133	PRESIDENT
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,700	3,700	PRESIDENT, COLEMAN
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	223	223	PRESIDENT
TWO HARBORS, MN	368	368	PRESIDENT
MISSISSIPPI			
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	1,250	1,250	PRESIDENT
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	.....	63	COCHRAN

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	135	135	PRESIDENT
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	3,559	5,059	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	153	153	PRESIDENT
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	110	134	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,455	1,895	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	4,646	12,000	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN, LOTT
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	212	212	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	100	100	PRESIDENT
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	20	600	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, MS	25	25	PRESIDENT
YAZOO RIVER, MS	.....	140	COCHRAN
MISSOURI			
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	10	500	PRESIDENT, BOND
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,692	5,692	PRESIDENT, BOND
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	3,899	3,899	PRESIDENT, BOND
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	9,324	9,324	PRESIDENT, BOND
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, MO	62	62	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	799	799	PRESIDENT
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	1,065	1,065	PRESIDENT
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	1,036	1,036	PRESIDENT
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (LOWER RIVER)	25,813	25,813	PRESIDENT, BOND
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	783	783	PRESIDENT, BOND
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO (MILE 889)	.....	200	BOND
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,162	2,162	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	327	327	PRESIDENT
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,376	1,376	PRESIDENT
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MO	.....	275	BOND
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,776	3,776	PRESIDENT
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	6,326	6,326	PRESIDENT, BOND
UNION LAKE, MO	6	6	PRESIDENT
MONTANA			
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,862	4,862	PRESIDENT

INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	32	32	PRESIDENT
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	1,891	1,891	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	90	90	PRESIDENT
NEBRASKA			
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	5,625	5,625	PRESIDENT
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	2,173	2,173	PRESIDENT, HAGEL
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	117	117	PRESIDENT
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	387	387	PRESIDENT
PAPIO CREEK, NE	40	40	PRESIDENT
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	585	585	PRESIDENT
NEVADA			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	48	48	PRESIDENT
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	812	812	PRESIDENT
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	247	247	PRESIDENT
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	779	779	PRESIDENT
COCHECO RIVER, NH	.....	3,000	GREGG
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	667	667	PRESIDENT
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	749	749	PRESIDENT
HOPKINTON—EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,281	1,281	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	28	28	PRESIDENT
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	802	802	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	233	233	PRESIDENT
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	1,238	1,238	PRESIDENT
NEW JERSEY			
ABSECON INLET, NJ	.....	145	LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	54	1,000	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	250	650	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	5	5	PRESIDENT
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	20,005	20,005	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, SPECTER, MENENDEZ
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	870	2,375	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, SPECTER, MENENDEZ
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	120	123	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	200	200	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	50	2,110	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	3,410	3,410	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	575	575	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	1,312	1,312	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	3,150	3,150	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
SALEM RIVER, NJ	25	25	PRESIDENT
SHARK RIVER, NJ	300	300	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
SHOAL HARBOR AND COMPTON CREEK, NJ	175	175	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	150	150	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ
NEW MEXICO			
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	2,693	3,097	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
COCHITI LAKE, NM	4,493	7,815	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	3,533	7,556	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
GALISTEO DAM, NM	899	1,404	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	166	1,060	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	13,868	2,177	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
RIO GRANDE BOSQUE REHABILITATION, NM	.....	4,000	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,711	2,210	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	291	291	PRESIDENT
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	689	781	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM	2,270	2,670	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
NEW YORK			
ALMOND LAKE, NY	583	583	PRESIDENT
ARKPORT DAM, NY	320	320	PRESIDENT
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,368	1,368	PRESIDENT
BRONX RIVER, NY	.....	1,000	SCHUMER, CLINTON
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	2,045	2,045	PRESIDENT
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	300	300	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	480	480	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	671	671	PRESIDENT
EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	80	80	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	350	2,000	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	150	150	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	.....	350	SCHUMER, CLINTON

GREAT KILLS HARBOR, S.I., NY	.....	50	SCHUMER, CLINTON
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	150	150	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	80	80	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	3,190	3,190	PRESIDENT
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	1,155	1,155	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	809	809	PRESIDENT
JAMAICA BAY, NY	3,400	3,400	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
JONES INLET, NY	100	3,000	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	120	120	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	10	10	PRESIDENT
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	280	280	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
MORICHES INLET, NY	180	900	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY	3,985	3,985	PRESIDENT
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	7,960	7,960	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ, SCHUMER, CLINTON
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	4,580	4,580	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ, SCHUMER, CLINTON
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	6,145	6,145	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ, SCHUMER, CLINTON
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSIT	950	950	PRESIDENT, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ, SCHUMER, CLINTON
PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	100	100	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,516	1,516	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	10	10	PRESIDENT
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	210	1,000	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	1,149	1,149	PRESIDENT
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	496	496	PRESIDENT
WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	80	80	PRESIDENT, SCHUMER, CLINTON
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	676	676	PRESIDENT
NORTH CAROLINA			
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	4,900	7,000	PRESIDENT, DOLE, BURR
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,817	1,817	PRESIDENT
BOGUE INLET, NC	.....	900	DOLE, BURR
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	588	588	PRESIDENT
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	.....	600	DOLE, BURR
FALLS LAKE, NC	2,013	2,013	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	39	39	PRESIDENT
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	.....	1,000	DOLE, BURR
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	7,600	10,600	PRESIDENT, DOLE, BURR

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	65	600	PRESIDENT, DOLE, BURR
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	5,500	5,500	PRESIDENT, DOLE, BURR
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	500	500	PRESIDENT, DOLE, BURR
NEW TOPSAIL INLET, NC	.....	900	DOLE, BURR
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	675	675	PRESIDENT
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	650	650	PRESIDENT
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	900	900	PRESIDENT
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	3,050	3,050	PRESIDENT
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	11,200	11,200	PRESIDENT, DOLE, BURR
NORTH DAKOTA			
BOWMAN—HALEY LAKE, ND	140	140	PRESIDENT
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	9,261	10,411	PRESIDENT, DORGAN
HOMME LAKE, ND	176	176	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	91	91	PRESIDENT
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES, ND	35	35	PRESIDENT
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,289	1,289	PRESIDENT
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	185	185	PRESIDENT
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	342	342	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	120	120	PRESIDENT
SOURIS RIVER, ND	279	279	PRESIDENT
OHIO			
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	1,102	1,102	PRESIDENT
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	900	900	PRESIDENT, VOINOVICH
BERLIN LAKE, OH	3,340	3,340	PRESIDENT
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	2,010	2,010	PRESIDENT
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	2,439	2,439	PRESIDENT
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	8,310	8,310	PRESIDENT, VOINOVICH
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	840	840	PRESIDENT
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	1,414	1,414	PRESIDENT
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	2,244	2,244	PRESIDENT
DILLON LAKE, OH	5,840	5,840	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	338	338	PRESIDENT

LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,040	1,040	PRESIDENT
MASSILLON, OH	155	155	PRESIDENT
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	1,523	1,523	PRESIDENT
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,729	1,729	PRESIDENT
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	7,505	7,505	PRESIDENT
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	268	268	PRESIDENT
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	1,746	1,746	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	368	368	PRESIDENT
ROSEVILLE, OH	35	35	PRESIDENT
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,050	1,050	PRESIDENT
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	195	195	PRESIDENT
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,975	3,975	PRESIDENT, VOINOVICH
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	550	550	PRESIDENT
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	701	701	PRESIDENT
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	1,341	1,341	PRESIDENT
OKLAHOMA			
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	837	837	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
BIRCH LAKE, OK	602	602	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	2,168	2,168	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,604	1,604	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
COPAN LAKE, OK	1,118	1,118	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	5,095	5,095	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	6,536	6,536	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	796	796	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	254	254	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	855	855	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,292	1,292	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
HULAH LAKE, OK	996	996	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	238	238	PRESIDENT
KAW LAKE, OK	2,145	2,145	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	4,173	4,173	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	5,307	5,307	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,083	2,083	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	231	231	PRESIDENT
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	85	85	PRESIDENT
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,197	1,197	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	5,131	5,131	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
SARDIS LAKE, OK	1,056	1,056	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	868	868	PRESIDENT

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,743	1,743	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,700	3,700	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,371	1,371	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,783	3,783	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
WISTER LAKE, OK	760	760	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
OREGON			
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	901	901	PRESIDENT
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	400	400	PRESIDENT
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	15,176	15,176	PRESIDENT
CHETCO RIVER, OR	443	443	PRESIDENT, WYDEN, SMITH
COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	25,212	25,512	PRESIDENT, MURRAY, WYDEN, SMITH
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	12,050	14,820	PRESIDENT, MURRAY, WYDEN, SMITH
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	484	484	PRESIDENT
COOS BAY, OR	3,967	3,967	PRESIDENT, WYDEN, SMITH
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	275	275	PRESIDENT, WYDEN, SMITH
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	968	968	PRESIDENT
COUGAR LAKE, OR	1,324	1,324	PRESIDENT
DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,285	1,285	PRESIDENT
DORENA LAKE, OR	1,044	1,044	PRESIDENT
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	1,099	1,099	PRESIDENT
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	1,379	1,379	PRESIDENT
GREEN PETER—FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,646	1,646	PRESIDENT
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	816	816	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, OR	43	43	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	174	174	PRESIDENT
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,686	4,686	PRESIDENT
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,632	1,632	PRESIDENT
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,134	3,134	PRESIDENT
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	5,711	5,711	PRESIDENT
PORT ORFORD, OR	333	333	PRESIDENT, WYDEN, SMITH
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	150	150	PRESIDENT
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	462	462	PRESIDENT, WYDEN, SMITH
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	64	64	PRESIDENT

SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	520	520	PRESIDENT, WYDEN, SMITH
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	400	400	PRESIDENT
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	.....	2,000	WYDEN, SMITH
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	974	974	PRESIDENT, WYDEN, SMITH
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	80	258	PRESIDENT, WYDEN, SMITH
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	62	62	PRESIDENT
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	617	617	PRESIDENT
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,348	1,348	PRESIDENT, WYDEN, SMITH
YAQUINA RIVER, OR	.....	400	WYDEN, SMITH
PENNSYLVANIA			
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	7,039	7,039	PRESIDENT, CASEY
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	813	813	PRESIDENT
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	320	320	PRESIDENT
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	2,457	2,457	PRESIDENT
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	3,115	3,115	PRESIDENT
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,630	1,630	PRESIDENT
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	2,326	2,326	PRESIDENT
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,457	1,457	PRESIDENT
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	805	805	PRESIDENT
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,682	1,682	PRESIDENT
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	805	805	PRESIDENT
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	1,286	1,286	PRESIDENT
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	372	372	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	456	456	PRESIDENT
JOHNSTOWN, PA	1,247	1,247	PRESIDENT
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,377	1,377	PRESIDENT
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,166	1,166	PRESIDENT
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	2,408	2,408	PRESIDENT
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	17,170	17,170	PRESIDENT
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	24,723	24,723	PRESIDENT
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	520	520	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	85	85	PRESIDENT
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	792	792	PRESIDENT
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	786	786	PRESIDENT
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	4,420	4,420	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	63	63	PRESIDENT
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	150	1,500	PRESIDENT, SPECTER
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	3,002	3,002	PRESIDENT
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	572	572	PRESIDENT

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	87	87	PRESIDENT
TIOGA—HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,760	2,760	PRESIDENT
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	2,216	2,216	PRESIDENT
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	320	320	PRESIDENT
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	956	956	PRESIDENT
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	632	632	PRESIDENT
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	2,149	2,149	PRESIDENT
RHODE ISLAND			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	22	22	PRESIDENT
POINT JUDITH HARBOR OF REUGE, RI	.....	200	REED, WHITEHOUSE
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	400	400	PRESIDENT
WARWICK COVE, RI	.....	200	REED, WHITEHOUSE
SOUTH CAROLINA			
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	872	3,872	PRESIDENT, GRAHAM
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	9,342	9,342	PRESIDENT, GRAHAM
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,982	3,982	PRESIDENT, GRAHAM
FOLLY RIVER, SC	.....	500	GRAHAM
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	3,360	3,360	PRESIDENT, GRAHAM
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	60	60	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	593	593	PRESIDENT
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	7,996	7,996	PRESIDENT
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	.....	3,000	JOHNSON, THUNE
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	237	237	PRESIDENT
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	174	174	PRESIDENT
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	7,533	7,533	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	25	25	PRESIDENT
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	570	570	PRESIDENT
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	150	150	PRESIDENT
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	9,079	9,379	PRESIDENT, DORGAN
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	54	54	PRESIDENT

TENNESSEE			
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,431	5,431	PRESIDENT
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	7,095	7,095	PRESIDENT
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	1,140	1,140	PRESIDENT, ALEXANDER, CORKER
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	5,298	5,298	PRESIDENT
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	6,414	6,414	PRESIDENT, ALEXANDER, CORKER
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	35	35	PRESIDENT
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,240	4,240	PRESIDENT
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	8,156	8,156	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	2	2	PRESIDENT
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	22,264	22,264	PRESIDENT, SHELBY
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	251	251	PRESIDENT
TEXAS			
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	944	944	PRESIDENT
ARKANSAS—RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI	1,410	1,410	PRESIDENT
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	188	188	PRESIDENT
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	2,168	2,168	PRESIDENT
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	188	188	PRESIDENT
BELTON LAKE, TX	3,227	3,227	PRESIDENT
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,498	2,498	PRESIDENT
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	.....	1,000	CORNYN
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	6,272	6,272	PRESIDENT
CANYON LAKE, TX	3,219	3,219	PRESIDENT
CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX	569	569	PRESIDENT
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	10,597	10,597	PRESIDENT
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	7,415	7,415	PRESIDENT, INHOFE
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	1	1	PRESIDENT
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	3,251	3,251	PRESIDENT
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	5,735	5,735	PRESIDENT, CORNYN
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	20,567	20,567	PRESIDENT
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,336	2,336	PRESIDENT
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	3,047	3,047	PRESIDENT
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	24,161	25,000	PRESIDENT, HUTCHISON
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,336	1,336	PRESIDENT
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	14,442	17,221	PRESIDENT, HUTCHISON, CORNYN
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	713	713	PRESIDENT
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,748	1,748	PRESIDENT
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	785	785	PRESIDENT
LAKE KEMP, TX	617	617	PRESIDENT

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
LAVON LAKE, TX	2,595	2,595	PRESIDENT
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,780	3,780	PRESIDENT
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	8,713	8,713	PRESIDENT, HUTCHISON
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	2,266	2,266	PRESIDENT
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	2,007	2,007	PRESIDENT
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	871	871	PRESIDENT
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,049	1,049	PRESIDENT
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	2,347	2,347	PRESIDENT
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	1,421	1,421	PRESIDENT
SABINE—NECHES WATERWAY, TX	12,612	12,612	PRESIDENT
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,229	4,229	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	196	196	PRESIDENT
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	3,932	3,932	PRESIDENT
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,912	1,912	PRESIDENT
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,587	4,587	PRESIDENT
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	100	1,000	PRESIDENT, HUTCHISON, CORNYN
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	3,081	3,081	PRESIDENT
WACO LAKE, TX	2,669	2,669	PRESIDENT
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	2,358	2,358	PRESIDENT
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	6,493	6,493	PRESIDENT
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	3,610	3,610	PRESIDENT
UTAH			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	50	50	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	695	695	PRESIDENT
VERMONT			
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	988	988	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	55	55	PRESIDENT
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	80	80	PRESIDENT
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	1,229	1,229	PRESIDENT
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	951	951	PRESIDENT
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	965	965	PRESIDENT
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	695	695	PRESIDENT

VIRGINIA			
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	.....	750	WARNER, WEBB
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA	1,795	1,795	PRESIDENT
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA	561	1,619	PRESIDENT, WARNER, WEBB
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	650	650	PRESIDENT
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,019	2,019	PRESIDENT
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	897	897	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	243	243	PRESIDENT
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	4,320	4,320	PRESIDENT
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	11,102	11,102	PRESIDENT
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,730	1,730	PRESIDENT
LITTLE WICOMICO RIVER, VA	100	100	PRESIDENT
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	10,687	10,687	PRESIDENT, WARNER, WEBB
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS	210	210	PRESIDENT
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	435	435	PRESIDENT
ONANCOCK RIVER, VA	.....	1,400	WARNER, WEBB
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	4,875	4,875	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	860	860	PRESIDENT
RUDEE INLET, VA	1,023	1,023	PRESIDENT, WARNER, WEBB
TYLERS BEACH, VA	200	200	PRESIDENT
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	190	190	PRESIDENT
YORK RIVER, VA	50	50	PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON			
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	814	814	PRESIDENT
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	.....	500	MURRAY, CANTWELL
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	.....	500	MURRAY
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,637	1,637	PRESIDENT, MURRAY, CANTWELL
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	8,705	8,705	PRESIDENT
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	3,615	3,615	PRESIDENT
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,052	4,052	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WA	65	65	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	320	320	PRESIDENT
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	5,952	5,952	PRESIDENT, CANTWELL
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,467	1,467	PRESIDENT
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,944	3,944	PRESIDENT
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,202	3,202	PRESIDENT, CRAPO
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	1,539	1,539	PRESIDENT
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	278	278	PRESIDENT
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	3,830	3,830	PRESIDENT, MURRAY, CANTWELL

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
NEAH BAY, WA	33	33	PRESIDENT
PORT TOWNSEND, WA	275	275	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	447	447	PRESIDENT
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	910	910	PRESIDENT
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	66	66	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	515	515	PRESIDENT
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	55	55	PRESIDENT
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	182	182	PRESIDENT
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	64	64	PRESIDENT
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	.....	500	MURRAY, CANTWELL
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	146	146	PRESIDENT
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	3,978	3,978	PRESIDENT
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	34	34	PRESIDENT
WEST VIRGINIA			
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,236	1,236	PRESIDENT
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	2,592	2,592	PRESIDENT
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,987	1,987	PRESIDENT
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,799	1,799	PRESIDENT
ELKINS, WV	13	13	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	121	121	PRESIDENT
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	10,293	10,293	PRESIDENT
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	31,709	31,709	PRESIDENT
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,541	2,541	PRESIDENT
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,994	1,994	PRESIDENT
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,120	1,120	PRESIDENT
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,696	1,696	PRESIDENT
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,962	1,962	PRESIDENT
TYGART LAKE, WV	3,753	3,753	PRESIDENT
WISCONSIN			
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	789	789	PRESIDENT
FOX RIVER, WI	2,135	4,535	PRESIDENT, KOHL
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	2,845	4,970	PRESIDENT, KOHL

INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	42	42	PRESIDENT
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	8	8	PRESIDENT
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	1,519	1,519	PRESIDENT
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	108	108	PRESIDENT
STURGEON BAY, WI	20	20	PRESIDENT
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	487	487	PRESIDENT
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	.....	2,000	KOHL
WYOMING			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	16	16	PRESIDENT
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	332	332	PRESIDENT
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	88	88	PRESIDENT
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	2,083,432	2,237,653	
REMAINING ITEMS:			
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	690	690	PRESIDENT
ASSET MANAGEMENT/FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	4,000	4,000	PRESIDENT
BUDGET/MANAGEMENT SUPPORT FOR O&M BUSINESS LINES	5,365	5,365	PRESIDENT
CHIEF'S 12 ACTIONS	8,737	8,737	PRESIDENT
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,475	2,475	PRESIDENT
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	1,500	1,500	PRESIDENT
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	8,000	8,000	PRESIDENT
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,062	1,062	PRESIDENT
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL R	6,080	6,080	PRESIDENT
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,391	1,391	PRESIDENT
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	270	270	PRESIDENT
FACILITY PROTECTION	12,000	12,000	PRESIDENT
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODEL	900	900	PRESIDENT
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	725	725	PRESIDENT
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	3,708	3,708	PRESIDENT
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	1,780	1,780	PRESIDENT
MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,575	1,575	PRESIDENT
NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING	4,000	10,000	PRESIDENT, COCHRAN
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	10,000	10,000	PRESIDENT
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS (NEPP)	5,000	5,000	PRESIDENT
NATIONAL NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	3,296	3,296	PRESIDENT
NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR REALLOCATION	300	300	PRESIDENT
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT	300	300	PRESIDENT
PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION—REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	500	PRESIDENT
PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION—STRAIGHTENING OF CHANNELS	50	50	PRESIDENT

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Requested by
RECREATIONONESTOP(R1S) NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVATION	1,130	1,130	PRESIDENT
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,391	4,391	PRESIDENT, INOUYE, CARDIN, DOLE, BURR, WYDEN, SMITH, REED, WHITEHOUSE, SCHUMER
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHAB	608	608	PRESIDENT
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS)	653	653	PRESIDENT
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,271	4,271	PRESIDENT
SUBTOTAL FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED UNDER STATES	91,757	100,757	
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	−46,439	
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	2,175,189	2,291,971	

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama and Mississippi.—The Committee recommendation includes $26,848,000. Funds provided above the budget request are provided for the construction of mooring cells near Columbus, Mississippi for safety of tows tying up during high water levels.

Helena Harbor, Arkansas.—The Committee includes $438,000 for maintenance dredging of this harbor.

McClellan-Kerr, Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas and Oklahoma.—An additional $3,000,000 is provided above the budget request to begin Planning, Engineering and Design [PED] for the Arkansas/White Cutoff project and to complete repairs on the Jim Smith Lake Structure, south end.

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

Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, California.—An additional $2,000,000 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 $13,295,000 for this project. Additional funds provided above the budget request are for repairs to the Summit Bridge.

Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee to Anclote, Florida.—The Committee provides $1,000,000 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 $7,500,000 for continued operations and maintenance of the Miami River Channel. This project will provides the first maintenance dredging of the Miami River since its original authorization in 1930.

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

Port Allen Breakwater Repair, Hawaii.—The Committee includes $1,700,000 for the breakwater repair.

Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for maintenance of the Asian Carp Barriers.

Mississippi River Between Missouri River and Minneapolis (MVR Portion), Illinois.—The Committee recommendation includes $49,970,000. Additional funds are provided for backlogged maintenance.

Missouri River—Rulo to the Mouth, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri.—Additional funds provided above the budget request are for dike repairs.

Wolf Creek Dam, Lake Cumberland, Kentucky.—The Committee notes that Lake Cumberland has been drastically lowered for ongoing seepage/stability correction repairs to Wolf Creek Dam. Additional funds provided above the budget request are for pool lowering mitigation features.

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 $2,000,000 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 for dredging in the Harbor.

Michigan Harbors, Michigan.—The Committee notes that there are some 30 federally maintained harbors in Michigan. However, the Committee also notes that fewer than 10 are budgeted. The Committee has attempted to provide for some of the dredging needs of the State. However, recognizing that conditions on these harbors are constantly changing and that the Great Lakes are continuing to suffer from historic low water levels, the Committee is directing the Corps to propose a dredging program for fiscal year 2008 that would most effectively utilize the scarce funds available for these harbor projects. This plan should be presented within 30 days of enactment of this act as a reprogramming action for approval by the House and Senate Appropriation Committees.

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.

Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $12,000,000 for this project. Additional funds above the budget request are to perform maintenance dredging of the Bar Channel, the Pascagoula River and Bayou Casotte channels.

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

Cocheco River, New Hampshire.—The Committee provides $3,000,000 continue dredging of the Cocheco River project.

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.

Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model, New Mexico.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to develop an outline for an integrated management plan of the Rio Grande in New Mexico in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, North Carolina.—The Committee includes an additional $2,100,000 for dredging of the project.

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 $200,000 for mosquito control, $950,000 for the Corps to work in cooperation with the Friends of Lake Sakakawea to ensure the recreation sites around the lake can be utilized.

Columbia River at the Mouth, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee recommendation includes $14,820,000 for the project. Additional funds above the budget request are to initiate a design documentation report to serve as supporting information for plans and specifications for the major rehabilitation of the jetties and to repair a foredune at the North Jetty that breached during the winter storms of 2007.

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 $3,000,000 to protect cultural resource sites and provide funding to the State and tribes for approved restoration and stewardship plans and in compliance with the requirements of title VI, directs the Corps to contract with or reimburse the State of South Dakota and affected tribes to carry out these duties.

Oahe Dam, Lake Oahe, South Dakota and North Dakota.—The Committee has provided additional funds above the budget request to allow the Corps to modify public facilities so that they can be utilized with the extreme low water levels currently being experienced on the lake.

Houston Ship Channel, Texas.—The Committee includes an additional $2,779,000 for additional dredging and dredging related activities.

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

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway-DSC, Virginia.—The Committee has provided additional operation and maintenance funds for the project.

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

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

Fox River, Wisconsin.—Additional funds above the budget request are to reimburse Wisconsin, in accordance with the agreement, for the costs of repairs and rehabilitation of the transferred

locks and for the Corps of Engineers to undertake major repairs for the dams and associated infrastructure.

Chief's 12 Actions.—The Committee has provided the Administration's request for this item. The Committee believes that these funds can serve to make significant improvements to the way the Corps administers completed projects to account for changed conditions since construction.

National Coastal Mapping.—$10,000,000 is provided for this program. Additional funds provided above the budget request are for LIDAR bathymetry for use in regional sediment management and for Coastal Zone Mapping and Imaging LIDAR/LASER to be conducted with the University of Southern Mississippi.

Regional Sediment Management Demonstration Program.—The Committee has provided $4,391,000 for this program, $3,000,000 above the budget request. Within the funds provided, the Corps is directed to undertake studies for the southeast coast of Oahu, Hawaii; the State of North Carolina; South Jetty and Clatsop Spit, Oregon; South Coastal Rhode Island; and for Long Island, New York coastal planning.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 2007	.....
Budget estimate, 2008	$40,000,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriation of $1,561,000,000.

The Committee has included $50,000,000 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.

The Committee has provided an additional $10,000,000 in this account to continue the National Flood Inventory rather than authorize the work to be carried out in the General Investigations Account as proposed by the administration. The National Flood Inventory was initiated in this account through supplemental funding following Hurricane Katrina. It is an interagency effort to improve management of the Nation's flood and storm damage reduction infrastructure. To date, work has consisted of data collection and development of an assessment methodology specific to levees and floodwalls. The COE has also worked with the Federal Emergency Management agency on issues such as risk communication and revisions to the Corps' Rehabilitation and Inspection program. The recommended funds will be used to continue development of the inventory of both Federal and non-Federal projects, to initiate testing of a risk assessment methodology for levees and floodwalls, to begin preliminary identification of "high risk" levees and other for other associated items. The Committee directs that outyear funding should be budgeted in this account unless specific authorization is enacted for this study in a Water Resource Development Act.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2007	$159,273,000
Budget estimate, 2008	180,000,000
Committee recommendation	180,000,000

An appropriation of $180,000,000 is recommended for the regulatory program of the Corps of Engineers.

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

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

The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers has begun a pilot program aimed at streamlining decisions for certain complex, high impact permit applications which have national or large regional implications. Specifically, we understand this program is focusing on projects related to rail capacity expansion, highway construction and pipelines where knowledge and experience gained in one district can be shared with other districts facing similar challenges, thus promoting efficiencies, the development and sharing of "best practices," and use of virtual or dedicated teams to expedite broad-impact permit applications. Since the Committee continues to be concerned about the permit application backlog and delays in making permit decisions, it fully supports this effort and encourages the Corps to dedicate even more attention and expand its efforts to an even greater extent in developing and using this pilot program to minimize negative impacts of the backlog and resulting delays, especially where there are significant impacts to the nation's economy and environmental health. The Committee further supports the three emphasis areas selected for the pilot program as it believes them to be critical elements of a healthy, expanding economy which must be vigorously developed, but in an environmentally sound manner.

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

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

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2007	$138,672,000
Budget estimate, 2008	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 to prioritize sites that are nearing completion during fiscal year 2008.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$167,250,000
Budget estimate, 2008	177,000,000
Committee recommendation	175,000,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommendation is $175,000,000. The Committee rejects the proposal to include the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) within the GE account. The Committee continues to believe that the office should be funded in the Defense Appropriations Act due to the other Army related duties of the Assistant Secretary's office and directs that it be funded in the Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance—Army budget account in future budgets. However, the Committee recognizes that this office will likely be funded in this bill this year. The Committee believes that if the Secretary's office is going to be funded in this bill, it should be funded in a separate account. The Committee's recommendation includes funding for this office under a separate account.

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. The Corps is reminded that General Expense funds are appropriated solely for the executive management and oversight of the Civil Works Program under the direction of the Director of Civil Works.

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

Millions of dollars have been spent over the last several years on an initiative to contract out Government jobs in order to make the Government more efficient. However, in more than 70 percent of the cases Government employees win the competition for their jobs. The Committee fails to see any evidence of cost savings or 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 the fiscal year 2007 program is about $5,450,000,000. Using the same percentage, this translates to more than $196,000,000 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 recommendation did not provide $192,000,000 for the GE account, it did increase the account by $3,000,000 to $175,000,000. These additional funds are provided in recognition of the heavier workload of the Corps Headquarters offices resulting from recent budget increases unrelated to hurricane Katrina. The costs for overseeing the New Orleans area are temporary and are being addressed in current budgets. The additional funds are provided for the recent budget increases to the Corps' program and that the recognition by this Committee that effective oversight of the Corps' program was being endangered by the lean budgets of the last few years. The Committee believes that these additional funds should be used to hire an additional 15–20 positions and that these additional positions should continue to be budgeted for in future budget submissions.

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

Appropriations, 2007	.....
Budget estimate, 2008	.....
Committee recommendation	$4,500,000

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

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

The decisions of fiscal year 2005 through 2007 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 3 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.

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 com-

plicated the Army's accounting for such indirect and overhead expenses with no commensurate benefit to justify the change. The Committee does not agree that these costs should be funded in this bill and therefore has only provided funding for salaries and expenses as in previous years.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Section 101. The bill includes language concerning reprogramming guidelines.

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

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

Section 104. The bill includes language prohibiting any steps to dismantle the St. Georges Bridge in Delaware. (Biden, Carper)

Section 105. The bill includes language concerning report notifications.

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

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

Section 108. The bill includes language allowing the use of the revolving fund for construction of two buildings at the U.S. Army Engineer Research and Design Center. (Cochran)

Section 109. The bill includes language concerning cooperative agreements. (Domenici)

Section 110. The bill includes language concerning in-kind services for the Rio Grande Basin Watershed study. The provision allows for local sponsors of this project to be reimbursed for overpayment of the non-Federal share of the costs of the study. (Domenici)

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

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

Section 113. The bill includes language regarding the Rio De Flag, Arizona, project. The provision increases the cost ceiling on this ongoing project to allow progress on te project to continue uninterrupted. (Kyl)

Section 114. The bill includes language regarding Avian Predation in the Columbia River Fish Mitigation project. The provision increases the authorization of funding to allow continued work on aviation predation. (Murray)

Section 115. The bill includes language regarding the Santa Ana, California, project. The provision increases the cost ceiling for the project in order to allow incorporation of the replacement of an aging wastewater line to be incorporated as a project feature. The line is endangered by bank erosion caused by other features of the Santa Ana project. (Feinstein)

Section 116. The bill includes language regarding the Upper Guadalupe, California, project. The provision increases the cost ceiling on this ongoing project to allow progress on te project to continue uninterrupted. (Feinstein)

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

Section 118. The bill includes a modification to section 594 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. The modification provides authority for North Dakota to be eligible for this assistance. (Dorgan)

Section 119. The bill includes language regarding the Kahuku Storm Damage Reduction Project, Hawaii. This provision allows the Corps to initiate PED and to include interior drainage improvements as part of the project. (Inouye)

Section 120. The bill includes language regarding the Federal dredge fleet.

Section 121. The bill includes language regarding the Federal dredge fleet.

Section 122. The bill includes language regarding the Federal dredge fleet.

Section 123. The bill includes language concerning Missouri River mitigation. The provision authorizes provision of facilities at Intake Dam for endangered species recovery. (President, Baucus, Tester)

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

Section 125. The bill includes language repealing a sections of Public Law 109–103 pertaining to continuing contracts.

Section 126. The bill includes language concerning the Shore Line Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program. This provision extends the authorization and will allow the Corps to expend funds that have been previously appropriated to complete on going projects and continue monitoring of completed projects.

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

Section 128. The bill includes language regarding a replacement health care facility at Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota. (Dorgan)

Section 129. The bill includes language regarding reimbursements. This provision increases the limits allowed on certain reimbursements for work undertaken by local interests.

Section 130. The bill includes language regarding Johnson Creek, Texas. This amends the previous authorization for the flood control project. (Hutchison)

Section 131. The bill includes language regarding McAlpine Lock and Dam. The provision increases the cost ceiling on this ongoing project to allow progress on te project to continue uninterrupted. (President, McConnell)

Section 132. The bill includes a provision concerning reimbursement for expenses incurred by locals carrying out portions of authorized Federal flood and storm damage reduction projects. (Landrieu, Vitter)

Section 133. The bill includes language regarding crediting of non-Federal expenditures on the San Lorenzo River, California project. (Feinstein)

Section 134. The bill includes a provision regarding the Missouri and Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement Project. (Bond)

Section 135. The bill includes a provision concerning Nogales Wash, Arizona. The provision increases the cost ceiling on this ongoing project to allow progress on the project to continue uninterrupted. (Kyl)

Section 136. The bill includes a provision concerning Tucson Drainage Area, Arizona. The provision increases the cost ceiling on this ongoing project to allow progress on the project to continue uninterrupted. (Kyl)

Section 137. The bill includes a provision on the Coronado, California project. The provision allows the local project sponsor credit for work undertaken prior to a project cooperation agreement. (Feinstein)

Section 138. The bill includes a provision concerning the Rural Utah [EI], Utah project. The provision increases the cost ceiling on this ongoing project to allow progress on the project to continue uninterrupted. (Bennett)

Section 139. Te bill includes a provision for the Navajo Reservation, Arizona, Utah and New Mexico project. This provision modifies the project by allowing the non-Federal share to be in the form of in-kind services. (Domenici)

Section 140. The bill contains a provision concerning the Connecticut River Watershed Study, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts and Vermont. The provision allows The Nature Conservancy to serve as the non-Federal sponsor of the study. (Lieberman, Gregg)

Section 141. The bill contains a provision concerning the Asian carp barriers on the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Illinois. (President, Durbin, Obama, Levin. Stabenow)

Section 142. The bill contains a funding limitation on a project.

Section 143. The bill contains a provision concerning the visitor reservation services for Corps of Engineers recreation sites.

Section 144. The bill includes a provision concerning Marshall, Minnesota project. The provision increases the cost ceiling on this completed ongoing project allowing the Corps to do the final fiscal closeouts of the project. (Coleman, Klobuchar)

Section 145. The bill includes a provision concerning the St. John's-New Madrid Floodway, Missouri. The provision makes the St. John's-New Madrid project a part of the Mississippi River Levees project. (Bond)

Section 146. The bill contains a provision concerning the Southeast Louisiana, Louisiana project. The provision recognizes the Southeast Louisiana project as an integral part of the project to provide 100-year level of protection to certain areas of the New Orleans metropolitan area. (Landrieu)

Section 147. The bill contains a provision allowing funds provided in Public Law 110–28 to be utilized for the purposes for which they were appropriated.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2007	$34,020,000
Budget estimate, 2008	43,000,000
Committee recommendation	43,000,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2008 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act totals $43,000,000. An appropriation of $40,404,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction; $976,000 for fish, wildlife, and recreation, mitigation and conservation. The Committee recommendation provides $1,620,000 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 in fiscal year 2007.

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, 2007	$878,623,000
Budget estimate, 2008	816,197,000
Committee recommendation	950,106,000

[1] Includes Emergency Supplemental Appropriations of $18,000,000.

An appropriation of $950,106,000 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.

It has been nearly 10 years since the Committee addressed reprogramming guidance for Reclamation. The Committee believes that Reclamation is managing funds in the appropriate manner, but thinks that it would be prudent to reiterate the guidelines. The guidelines are as follows:

The Bureau is permitted to transfer, without prior congressional approval and without regard to percentage limitation, not more than $5,000,000 in any one case to provide adequate funds for settled contractor claims, increased contractor earnings due to accelerated rates of operations, and real estate deficiency judgments, provided that such reprogramming is necessary to discharge legal obligations of the Bureau of Reclamation.

As to each project within the Resources Management and Development category for which $2,000,000 or more is available at the beginning of the fiscal year, the Bureau is permitted to transfer to such project in that fiscal year no more than 15 percent of the amount available at the beginning of the fiscal year for such project, without prior congressional approval. As to each project within the Resources Management and Development category for which less than $2,000,000 is available at the beginning of the fiscal year, the Bureau is permitted to transfer to such project no more than $300,000 in that fiscal year without prior congressional approval.

The Bureau is further permitted to transfer funds within the Facility Operation, Maintenance and Rehabilitation category without prior congressional approval and without regard to percentage or dollar limitation. The Bureau may not transfer, without prior congressional approval, more than $500,000 from either the Facilities Operation, Maintenance and Rehabilitation category or the Resources Management and Development category to any project in the other category. The Bureau is prohibited from initiating any program, project or activity through an internal reprogramming action.

DISCLOSURE PROVISIONS

The Committee received more than 130 requests for projects, programs, studies or activities for the Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal year 2008. These were items that were in addition to the budget request as well as those included in the budget request. The Committee obviously was unable to accommodate all of these requests.

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

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

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

It should be noted that many line items only have President listed as the requestor. It should not be inferred that the affected members are not interested in these projects studies or activities. Rather this is due to Committee direction that the President's budget requests are assumed to be requested by the affected Members unless they notify the Committee to the contrary.

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

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		Requested by
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	
ARIZONA					
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	.....	8,700	.....	8,700	PRESIDENT
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER BASIN	26,961	218	27,811	218	PRESIDENT, KYL, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	3,312	.....	3,312	.....	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	385	.....	385	.....	PRESIDENT
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER REUSE PROJECT	200	.....	200	.....	PRESIDENT
SALT RIVER PROJECT	360	240	360	240	PRESIDENT
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT	310	.....	310	.....	PRESIDENT
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	915	.....	915	.....	PRESIDENT
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	4,445	.....	4,445	.....	PRESIDENT
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,652	21,257	1,652	21,257	PRESIDENT
YUMA EAST WETLANDS	.....	.....	1,500	.....	KYL
CALIFORNIA					
CACHUMA PROJECT	1,071	640	1,821	640	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	460	.....	460	.....	PRESIDENT
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PLANT	900	.....	900	.....	PRESIDENT
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECTS:					
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	1,903	7,725	1,903	7,725	PRESIDENT
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	4,723	100	4,723	100	PRESIDENT
DELTA DIVISION	11,818	5,830	11,818	5,830	PRESIDENT
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,551	2,903	1,551	2,903	PRESIDENT
FRIANT DIVISION	2,261	3,686	3,761	4,261	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	12,697	1,083	14,697	1,083	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT	.....	19,410	.....	19,410	PRESIDENT
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	6,522	1,506	6,522	1,506	PRESIDENT
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	891	29	891	29	PRESIDENT
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	327	.....	327	.....	PRESIDENT
SHASTA DIVISION	584	7,957	584	7,957	PRESIDENT
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	7,329	3,133	9,329	3,133	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	1,407	8,874	1,407	8,874	PRESIDENT
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	3,460	6,504	3,460	6,504	PRESIDENT

YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	562	.....	562	.....	PRESIDENT
IRVINE BASIN GROUND AND SURFACE WATER IMPROVEMENT	.....	.....	1,000	.....	FEINSTEIN
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS	.....	.....	2,300	.....	REID
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	600	.....	600	.....	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
LONG BEACH DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJ	250	.....	250	.....	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	1,500	.....	1,500	.....	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT, PHAS	1,500	.....	1,500	.....	PRESIDENT, FEINSTEIN
ORLAND PROJECT	15	702	15	702	PRESIDENT
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	300	.....	300	.....	PRESIDENT
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	3,450	.....	3,450	.....	PRESIDENT
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	700	.....	700	.....	PRESIDENT
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	200	.....	200	.....	PRESIDENT
SOLANO PROJECT	1,452	2,533	1,452	2,533	PRESIDENT
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	190	.....	237	.....	PRESIDENT
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT	402	56	402	56	PRESIDENT
COLORADO					
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP	57,750	250	63,000	250	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, ALLARD, SALAZAR, BINGAMAN
COLLBRAN PROJECT	172	1,321	172	1,321	PRESIDENT
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	370	11,319	370	11,319	PRESIDENT
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	304	.....	304	.....	PRESIDENT
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	57	151	57	151	PRESIDENT
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	172	8,897	172	8,897	PRESIDENT
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	144	1,014	144	1,014	PRESIDENT
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY	36	1,994	36	1,994	PRESIDENT
MANCOS PROJECT	51	101	51	101	PRESIDENT
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	62	2,501	62	2,501	PRESIDENT
PINE RIVER PROJECT	124	145	124	145	PRESIDENT
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT	272	4,715	272	4,715	PRESIDENT
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	108	132	108	132	PRESIDENT
UPPER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS	200	.....	200	.....	PRESIDENT
HAWAII					
HAWAII RECLAIMATION PROJECTS—LAHAINA	.....	.....	1,000	.....	INOUYE
IDAHO					
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	2,420	2,743	2,420	2,743	PRESIDENT
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	15,000	.....	15,000	.....	PRESIDENT
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	331	.....	331	.....	PRESIDENT

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		Requested by
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	
LEWISTON ORCHARDS PROJECTS	576	27	576	27	PRESIDENT
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,029	2,720	3,029	2,720	PRESIDENT
KANSAS					
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	72	.....	72	.....	PRESIDENT
WICHITA-CHENEY PROJECT	8	419	8	419	PRESIDENT
WICHTITA PROJECT—EQUUS BEDS DIVISION	.....	.....	1,000	.....	ROBERTS
MONTANA					
FORT PECK RESERVATION/DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	.....	.....	10,000	.....	BAUCUS, TESTER
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	.....	913	.....	913	PRESIDENT
HUNTLEY PROJECT	56	105	56	105	PRESIDENT
LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT	235	65	235	65	PRESIDENT
MILK RIVER PROJECT	471	1,255	471	1,255	PRESIDENT
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	23	.....	23	.....	PRESIDENT
ROCKY BOYS/NORTH CENTRAL MONTANA RURAL WATER SYSTEM	.....	.....	6,000	.....	BAUCUS, TESTER
SUN RIVER PROJECT	108	262	108	262	PRESIDENT
NEBRASKA					
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	29	111	29	111	PRESIDENT
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	8	.....	8	.....	PRESIDENT
NEVADA					
HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY	175	.....	175	.....	PRESIDENT
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	4,875	3,704	4,875	3,704	PRESIDENT
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	900	.....	2,750	.....	PRESIDENT, REID, ENSIGN
NORTH LAS VEGAS WATER REUSE	.....	.....	3,000	.....	REID
NEW MEXICO					
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	.....	.....	1,500	.....	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,231	660	3,181	660	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
CHIMAYO WATER PLAN	.....	.....	1,000	.....	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN

EASTERN NEW MEXICO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMS	38	.....	38	.....	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI
EASTERN NEW MEXICO WATER REUSE	.....	.....	500	.....	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
EASTERN NEW MEXICO RURAL WATER SUPPLY	.....	.....	500	.....	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	12,005	11,195	20,655	18,895	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY, NM, UT, CO	.....	.....	500	.....	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	84	.....	84	.....	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	.....	197	.....	197	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	833	3,683	833	3,683	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	133	.....	133	.....	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI
SANTA FE BUCKMAN DIVERSION, NM	.....	.....	500	.....	DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	140	.....	140	.....	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	23	10	23	10	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS	76	.....	76	.....	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI
NORTH DAKOTA					
DAKOTAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	204	.....	204	.....	PRESIDENT
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN—GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT	15,495	4,725	64,275	4,725	PRESIDENT, DORGAN
OKLAHOMA					
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	51	137	51	137	PRESIDENT
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	42	568	42	568	PRESIDENT
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	15	400	15	400	PRESIDENT
NORMAN PROJECT	16	387	16	387	PRESIDENT
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	26	1,467	26	1,467	PRESIDENT
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	18	357	18	357	PRESIDENT
OREGON					
BURNT, MALHEUR, OWYHEE, AND POWER RIVER BASIN WATER OPTIMAZATION FEASIBILITY STUDY	.....	.....	300	.....	WYDEN, SMITH
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	426	548	426	548	PRESIDENT
DESCHUTES PROJECT	264	172	264	172	PRESIDENT
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	521	289	521	289	PRESIDENT
KLAMATH PROJECT	23,605	1,395	23,605	1,395	PRESIDENT
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	232	.....	732	.....	PRESIDENT, WYDEN, SMITH
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	851	490	851	490	PRESIDENT
SAVAGE RAPIDS DAM REMOVAL	15,000	.....	15,000	.....	PRESIDENT
TUALATIN BASIN WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	.....	.....	250	.....	WYDEN, SMITH
TUALATIN PROJECT	125	243	125	243	PRESIDENT
TUALATIN PROJECT TITLE TRANSFER AND FACILITY ASSESMENT STUDY	.....	.....	400	.....	WYDEN, SMITH
UMATILLA PROJECT	957	2,689	957	2,689	PRESIDENT

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		Requested by
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	
SOUTH DAKOTA					
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	15,000	.....	28,000	.....	PRESIDENT, JOHNSON, HARKIN, GRASSLEY, COLEMAN KLOBUCHAR, THUNE
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	.....	15	.....	15	PRESIDENT
MNI WICONI PROJECT	19,474	9,526	30,909	9,526	PRESIDENT, JOHNSON, THUNE
PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER SYSTEM, SD	.....	.....	1,500	.....	JOHNSON, THUNE
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM	.....	74	.....	74	PRESIDENT
TEXAS					
BALMORHEA PROJECT	41	17	41	17	PRESIDENT
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	72	72	72	72	PRESIDENT
DALLAS-TRINITY WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY	.....	.....	500	.....	HUTCHISON
LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES	50	.....	3,500	.....	PRESIDENT, HUTCHISON
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	29	718	29	718	PRESIDENT
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	10	331	10	331	PRESIDENT
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	114	.....	114	.....	PRESIDENT
UTAH					
HYRUM PROJECT	120	33	120	33	PRESIDENT
MOON LAKE PROJECT	3	29	3	29	PRESIDENT
NEWTON PROJECT	54	25	54	25	PRESIDENT
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	76	.....	576	.....	PRESIDENT, BENNETT
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	160	92	160	92	PRESIDENT
PARK CITY FEASIBILLTY STUDY	.....	.....	500	.....	BENNETT
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	553	314	553	314	PRESIDENT
SCOFIELD PROJECT	56	37	56	37	PRESIDENT
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	114	.....	114	.....	PRESIDENT
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	204	16	204	16	PRESIDENT
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,546	421	1,546	421	PRESIDENT
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	48	69	48	69	PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON					
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	3,658	8,299	5,658	8,299	PRESIDENT, MURRAY, CANTWELL
MAKAH INDIAN COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY	.....	.....	300	.....	MURRAY
ODESSA SUBAREA SPECIAL STUDY	185	.....	1,185	.....	PRESIDENT, MURRAY, CANTWELL
STORAGE DAM FISH PASSAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY	400	.....	400	.....	PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON AREA PROJECTS	82	10	82	10	PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	138	.....	138	.....	PRESIDENT
YAKIMA PROJECT	1,155	6,789	1,155	6,789	PRESIDENT
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	8,470	.....	8,470	.....	PRESIDENT
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER STORAGE PROJECT	.....	.....	1,000	.....	MURRAY, CANTWELL
WYOMING					
KENDRICK PROJECT	108	3,839	108	3,839	PRESIDENT
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	323	1,816	323	1,816	PRESIDENT
SHOSHONE PROJECT	76	960	76	960	PRESIDENT
SUBTOTAL FOR PROJECTS	321,433	211,064	459,948	218,764	
REGIONAL PROGRAMS					
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I	.....	9,441	.....	9,441	PRESIDENT, KYL
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II	7,850	.....	8,350	.....	PRESIDENT, BENNETT
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECTION 5	2,110	3,884	2,110	3,884	PRESIDENT
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECTION 8	4,690	.....	4,690	.....	PRESIDENT
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	440	.....	440	.....	PRESIDENT
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM					
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,400	.....	1,400	PRESIDENT
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	.....	57,100	.....	57,100	PRESIDENT
SAFETY OF EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	.....	18,500	.....	18,500	PRESIDENT
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	436	.....	436	.....	PRESIDENT, INOUYE
EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	.....	1,442	.....	1,442	PRESIDENT
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	16,614	.....	16,614	.....	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BENNETT, SALAZAR, BINGAMAN, HATCH
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,637	.....	1,637	.....	PRESIDENT
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	855	.....	855	.....	PRESIDENT
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	.....	6,440	.....	6,440	PRESIDENT
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,496	.....	1,496	PRESIDENT
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	2,006	.....	2,006	.....	PRESIDENT
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	7,584	.....	7,584	.....	PRESIDENT
LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM	1,000	.....	1,000	.....	PRESIDENT
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	236	.....	236	.....	PRESIDENT

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation		Requested by
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	15,418	.....	15,418	.....	PRESIDENT
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	.....	675	.....	675	PRESIDENT
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	6,179	.....	6,179	.....	PRESIDENT
NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,597	.....	1,597	.....	PRESIDENT
OPERATIONS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	828	458	828	458	PRESIDENT
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN	4,130	36,836	4,130	36,836	PRESIDENT
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	786	240	786	240	PRESIDENT
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	1,088	155	1,088	155	PRESIDENT
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	2,073	.....	2,073	.....	PRESIDENT
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT (TITLE XXVII)	.....	.....	1,000	.....	DOMENICI
RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,076	.....	1,076	.....	PRESIDENT
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DESALINATION AND WATER PURIFICATION PROGRAM	2,275	2,100	5,400	2,100	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
SALT CEDAR AND RUSSIAN OLIVE CONTROL PROGRAM	.....	.....	600	.....	DOMENICI, BEN NELSON, BINGAMAN
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	9,003	.....	9,003	.....	PRESIDENT
SITE SECURITY	.....	35,500	.....	35,500	PRESIDENT
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	800	.....	3,800	.....	PRESIDENT, DOMENICI
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECHNICAL SUPPORT	90	.....	90	.....	PRESIDENT
WATER CONSERVATION FIELD SERVICES PROGRAM	6,232	.....	7,000	.....	PRESIDENT
WATER 2025	11,000	.....	14,000	.....	PRESIDENT, REID, DOMENICI, BINGAMAN
UNDER FINANCING	.....	.....	−22,158	−3,688	PRESIDENT
SUBTOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	429,466	386,731	559,363	390,743	
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	816,197	.....	950,106	.....	

Central Arizona Project, Colorado River Basin.—The Committee recommendation includes $600,000 for activities related to the Gila River Settlement in New Mexico and $500,000 to initiate environmental compliance for the San Carlos Irrigation Project.

Central Valley Project—Friant Division.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $1,000,000 for the Friant-Kern and Madera canals capacity improvements and an additional $500,000 for the Semi Tropic Phase II groundwater banking.

Miscellaneous Project Programs.—An additional $2,000,000 above the budget request is provided for anadromous fish screen projects.

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 $63,000,000 for construction of this project.

Hawaii Reclamation Projects, Lahaina.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 for this water reuse 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.—The committee provided an additional $200,000 to assess the rehabilitation of radial gates at Sumner Dam, New Mexico and $750,000 for implementation of water salvage in partnership with the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission under the Pecos River Settlement.

Middle Rio Grande Project, New Mexico.—The Committee recommendation includes $39,550,000 for the Middle Rio Grande project, $20,655,000 for Resources Management and $18,895,000 for Operations, Maintenance and Replacements. Within the $20,655,000 for Resources Management, the Committee includes $16,271,000 for the Collaborative Program; and $1,000,000 for the Silvery Minnow Sanctuary operations. Within the $18,895,000 for Operations, Maintenance and Replacements, the Committee includes $2,200,000 for further development of the Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model and ESA Water conservation planning; $500,000 for initial development of an integrated management plan in partnership with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and $2,000,000 to be transferred to the USGS for stream gage repair and development in New Mexico. The Committee encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to be transparent in its communication of the cost of administration of the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program and to rapidly implement project management improvements to address the issues and recommendations of the non-Federal partners to the Collaborative Program. The Committee also encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to work closely with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to develop a rehabilitation plan for the levee system in the Middle Rio Grande.

Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin, Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota.—An additional $48,780,000 has been provided for rural water projects. Of this amount, $24,390,000 shall be expended for the following projects: $10,000,000 for the Northwest Area Water Supply; $500,000 for the Lakota Water Supply; $3,000,000 for the South Central Regional Water District; $1,000,000 for the Walsh Rural

Water District; $1,000,000 for the South Benson County/North Central Rural Water System; $1,000,000 for the Traill Rural Water District; $500,000 for the Upham/All Seasons Rural Water System;$2,000,000 for the Williston Water Treatment Plant; $4,000,000 for the Southwest Pipeline; and $1,390,000 for Garrison Water Treatment.

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

Odessa Subarea Special Study, Washington.—The Committee has provided $1,185,000 for this 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, although Reclamation did conduct a demonstration run at one-tenth capacity for 90 days in 2007. The Committee, once again, directs the Bureau of Reclamation, within the funds provided for the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, title I, to dedicate sufficient funds to the Yuma Desalting Plant so that one-third operational capacity may be achieved by the end of calendar year 2007. 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, 2008. If the plant is not one-third operational by the end of calendar year 2007, 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 $7,500,000. Of the funds provided, $2,100,000 is provided to New Mexico State University to undertake operations and maintenance of the newly constructed National Inland Desalination Research Facility in Alamogordo, New Mexico, on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation; $1,900,000 is provided to New Mexico State University for research activities undertaken at or associated with the National Inland Desalination Research Facility; and $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, national laboratories, State agencies, local agencies, industry, educational institutions or other water research entities.

Title XVI, Water Reclamation and Reuse.—The Committee has provided $3,800,000 for this program. Within the funds provided, the Committee has included $3,000,000 for the WateReuse Foundation. These are available to support the Foundation's research priorities.

Water Conservation Field Service Program.—The Committee has provided $7,000,000 for the Water Conservation Field Services Program. Within the amounts provided, Reclamation is urged to continue urban water conservation projects identified through the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Innovative Conservation Program; industrial water efficiency surveys to assess opportunities to conserve water in industrial water use; and for weather based irrigation controller activities to pilot ways to speed distribution and acceptance of these landscape water efficiency devices.

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 $14,000,000 for this initiative proposed by the administration. The Committee has included additional funds above the budget request 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, funds are provided for the Desert Research Institute to address water quality and environmental issues in ways that will bring industry and regulators to mutually acceptable answers.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2007	$52,150,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 59,122,000
Committee recommendation	51,622,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $51,622,000 for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund. The Committee recommendation does not reflect the establishment of the San Joaquin River Restoration Fund as proposed by the administration as this

program is not yet authorized. Consequently the Budget request is reduced by $7,500,000.

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, 2007	$36,648,000
Budget estimate, 2008	31,750,000
Committee recommendation	40,750,000

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, 2007	$57,575,000
Budget estimate, 2008	58,811,000
Committee recommendation	58,811,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is $58,811,000. 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. (President)

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. (Domenici)

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. (Domenici)

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

Section 207. The bill includes language concerning expended funds from the Desert Terminus Lakes program for the Truckee River Settlement Act. (Reid)

Section 208. The bill includes language concerning expended funds from the Desert Terminus Lakes program for a number of purposes within Nevada. (Reid)

Section 209. The bill includes a provision extending the authorization of the Mni Wiconi project from 2008 until 2013. Without this provision work would have to stop during fiscal year 2008. (Johnson)

Section 210. The bill includes a provision concerning operations of the Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Facility. (Domenici)

Section 211. The bill includes a provision for a reporting requirement to the appropriate House and Senate authorizing committees concerning changed land use determinations. (Dorgan)

Section 212. The bill contains a provision that increases the appropriation ceiling for the Indian Irrigation projects in the Pick-Sloan—Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota and South Dakota. (Dorgan)

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT [LDRD]

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

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 2008, 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

Appropriations, 2007	$1,474,285,000
Budget estimate, 2008	1,236,199,000
Committee recommendation	1,715,551,000

The Committee recommendation is $1,715,551,000 for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, $479,352,000 above the President's request. The Committee notes that virtually every program except Hydrogen Research and Development [R&D] suffers a reduction from the fiscal year 2007 Operating Plan. Hardest hit are the energy efficiency programs. Vehicle Technologies, Building Technologies, and Industrial Technologies are down about $40,000,000, while Weatherization grants are down over $60,000,000. The Department plays a key role in developing new energy-efficient technologies. For every dollar invested in Energy Efficiency R&D, the U.S. economy receives about $20 in return through energy savings, new jobs, and new products. This Committee sees wisdom in such investments, and supports increases above the President's request in the efficiency programs. The Committee understands the Department has made awards for projects within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, but has not provided funding to carryout these awards. The Committee strongly urges the Department to fulfill it prior commitments, and to provide notification to the Committee on any awards that are not being funded and for what purpose.

Hydrogen Technology.—The Committee recommends $228,000,000, a total of $15,000,000 above the request. The Committee notes that fiscal year 2008 request completes the President's 5-year, $1,200,000,000 commitment to the Hydrogen Fuel Initiative. Along with the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy request, the President's budget also requests research and development funding for hydrogen projects in the budgets of the Office of Science ($59,500,000), the Office of Nuclear Energy ($22,600,000), and the Office of Fossil Energy ($12,450,000), as well as in the Department of Transportation ($1,425,000). In total, the fiscal year 2008 request amounts to $308,975,000 for hydrogen research and development, the largest for hydrogen in the 5-year period.

Since the passage of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, there has been insufficient attention paid to the guidance Congress gave the Department regarding the hydrogen program which had several purposes. It broadened the Secretary's authority to accelerate the research, development and demonstration process toward commercialization; made Government a more reliable partner in more ambitious public/private partnerships; and gave the program permanent authority beyond the 5-year span of the President's Hydrogen Fuel Initiative. The Committee is encouraged by the Department's efforts to establish a program facilitating the deployment of hydro-

gen and fuel cell technology and to cultivate a competitive market for such technologies as demonstrated by its recent request for information [DE–PS36–07GO37002]. The Committee believes that the Federal Government can be an early adopter of new technology and can play a role in its deployment. In order to facilitate Federal purchases it is essential to provide Federal procurement officials with proven validation of operational performance data and expected lifecycle costs of alternative energy technologies. The Department, using its extensive laboratory capabilities and in partnership with technology venders, could validate the operational and economic capabilities of specific technologies. This review is likely to provide procurement officials more confidence in deploying alternative, energy saving technologies. Within the additional funds provided, the Committee recommends an additional $5,000,000 to support the development of a technology validation strategy. The Department may establish a pilot program to demonstrate such a capability if it believes it will have a positive impact. The Committee authorizes the Department to recover all costs associated with the validation activities.

The Committee also notes that the Department requested 24 percent less funding for Technology Validation Program than the enacted fiscal year 2007 program. This runs counter to the intent of the Energy Policy Act, and endangers the success of worthwhile public investments already made. The validation program has ambitious and critical goals concerning durability, vehicle range, storage, attainable hydrogen fuel cost, data reporting, technology evolution, renewable hydrogen feedstock generation, codes and standards coordination and public outreach. Within the funding available to the Program, the Committee directs that $40,000,000 be allocated to Technology Validation efforts in fiscal year 2008.

The Committee appreciates that this program has achieved its objective and is beginning to phase out research on hydrogen production from natural gas starting in fiscal year 2008. The full benefits of a hydrogen economy will be realized when our Nation is able to generate hydrogen from renewable sources and nuclear energy rather than fossil fuels. The Committee supports continued research and development into solar-powered hydrogen generation research and development programs including both thermo-chemical and photolysis processes. The Committee commends the Department for this progress in these areas and urges the Department to provide additional funds to the Department's Hydrogen Production and Delivery program for its continuation.

Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D.—The Committee strongly endorses the commitment to decrease our reliance on foreign oil. The President's goal of reducing gasoline usage by 20 percent in the next 10 years, coupled with growth in the Biomass R&D budget, could significantly reduce this Nation's "oil addiction." Unfortunately, the President's request is $20,424,000 below the fiscal year 2007 Operating Plan, and well below this Committee's recommendation from last year. Therefore, the Committee recommends $244,000,000, an increase of $64,737,000 over the request. Of the increase, $32,897,000 is for the Integration of Biorefinery Technologies under the Utilization of Platform Outputs

R&D subprogram, and $5,000,000 is for the Products Development element within this subprogram.

Within the available funds, the Committee directs the Department to conduct a study on the feasibility of increasing consumption in the United States of ethanol-blended gasoline with levels of ethanol blends between 10–25 percent, including a study of production and infrastructure constraints on increasing the consumption. In addition, the Committee requests that Department provide periodic updates on the National Biofuels Action Plan and have a goal of providing the final plan to Congress no later than the submission of the fiscal year 2009 budget request.

Within the available funds, the Committee recommends the Department provide a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee on how it intends to develop the proposed reverse auction as proposed in the fiscal year 2008 budget request before establishing such a program. The report should include information on market data and pricing and proposals as to which incentives would be the most effective in facilitating the deployment of cellulosic biomass and the expected costs.

The Feedstock Infrastructure subprogram provides for work with the Department of Agriculture on biomass feedstock. Lowering feedstock costs and ensuring sustainable supplies of biomass are necessary to greatly increase the amount of Biofuels production in the United States. To meet this goal, the Department developed a Regional Feedstock Partnership and should continue to work with the Sun Grant Initiative as well as other laboratories, and universities to assess and improve biomass resource availability throughout five distinct regions. The Committee is encouraged by the Department commitment to developing a variety of biomass feedstock. The Committee expects the Department to evaluate all manner of regional feedstock materials that include sorghum, switch grass, rice straw, corn stover, as well as other feedstock material.

The Committee also notes that the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory is building on key competencies in the areas of catalysis and biotechnology, and conducts R&D with industry as part of the DOE/Office of Biomass core program. The core research program also is an important part of expanding research with Washington State University, in a new Bioproducts, Sciences, and Engineering Laboratory [BSEL] being constructed in Richland, Washington, by the State of Washington.

Solar Energy.—The Committee recommends $180,000,000, an increase of $31,696,000 over the President's request. The Committee is pleased with the administration's efforts to diversify our energy supply while minimizing the generation of greenhouse gases. The Solar Energy Technology Program has established a target of making solar power cost-competitive by 2015, 5 years sooner than targeted in fiscal year 2006 budget request. Under this scenario, solar would provide hundreds of thousands of new high-tech jobs throughout the United States and would reduce natural gas demand on the order of billions of cubic feet. Unfortunately, as is painfully clear from the Department's budget, the promise of solar energy stretches back 33 years, to the 1974 Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act, and the program has only lost ground to other nations ever since. Now, the United States must make

substantial investments if it is to reclaim technological leadership in this critical sector. Therefore, the Committee directs an increase of $8,000,000 for Photovoltaic Energy Systems, an increase of $2,696,000 for Solar Heating and Lighting Systems to support deployment of this technology, and an increase of $16,000,000 for Concentrating Solar Power. The increase in Concentrating Solar Power is to help reduce the cost of heliostat technology to improve the economic performance of power towers and to facilitate the deployment of demonstration facilities. The Committee recommends $4,000,000 to demonstrate thermo-chemical processes in producing hydrogen using high temperature solar facilities.

Wind Energy.—The recommendation is $57,500,000, a total of $17,431,000 above the request.

Geothermal Technology.—The recommendation for Geothermal Technology is $25,000,000, similar to the fiscal year 2006 level, and above the administration's request of $0. The Committee notes the Massachusetts Institute of Technology report on the Impact of Enhanced Geothermal Systems on the United States in the 21st century recommended a number of actions that could be taken to encourage development of renewable energy sources. Among the short-term recommendations in this report is a call for more detailed and site-specific assessment of geothermal energy resources in the United States, as well as demonstrations of reservoir stimulation technology at as many as five enhanced geothermal systems within or on the edges of existing geothermal fields. The Committee urges the Department to build upon the success of its geothermal program and move the program forward.

Hydropower.—The Committee provides $2,000,000 for continuation of the program.

Water Power Energy R&D.—The Committee recommends creating a new program, authorized in EPACT 2005, which explores technologies that could convert the kinetic energy from non-impounded water sources, such as waves, currents and tidal streams, into renewable energy. The Committee recommends $8,000,000 to initiate this R&D effort.

Vehicle Technologies.—The Committee provides $230,000,000 for vehicles technology. This is an increase of $53,862,000 over the request. The recommendation provides $100,000,000 for hybrid electric systems. The increase of $19,336,000 is for Energy Storage Research and Development to make improvements in plug-in hybrid technology. Other increases provide a total of $50,000,000 for Advanced Combustion Energy Research and Development, $45,000,000 for Materials Technology, $18,000,000 for Fuels Technology, and $17,000,000 for Technology Integration Innovative Concepts. The Committee urges the Department to continue to support the Advanced Reciprocating Engine Systems program.

The Committee fully funds the fiscal year 2008 request for FreedomCAR and Fuel Partnership, a $207,819,000 departmental effort of which $126,619,000 is requested under the Vehicle Technologies program.

The Committee urges the Department to integrate the transportation sector's fuel and energy needs with zero emission and renewable electricity generation to improve the Nation's energy and environmental security by providing a minimum of $10,000,000 from

the funds made available for Vehicles Technology in competitively awarded grants for developing, researching, testing and operating grid-enabled plug-in electric and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles and batteries and technology, and related power electronics that use zero emission generated electricity for recharging. The Committee wishes to reinforce and recommend further enhancing research, development and demonstration of advanced battery technology (in partnership with the private sector), for electric, hybrid-electric, and plug-in hybrid vehicles. The Committee is concerned that many advanced batteries are currently being sourced from outside the United States. The prohibitively high costs of many advanced battery technologies must be addressed, along with the remaining performance barriers.

The Committee includes $5,000,000 for Off-highway Engine R&D within the Advanced Combustion Engine R&D subprogram. Off-highway Engine R&D supports diesel engine research and development having a high potential for improving fuel efficiency and low emission engines. The Committee also supports the 21st Century Truck Partnership. This cooperative effort between commercial vehicle (truck and bus) industry and major Federal agencies is developing technologies that will make commercial vehicles more efficient, clean, and safe. The 21st Century Truck Partnership will use research and development funding to increase engine efficiency, improve hybrid powertrains, and reduce losses.

The Committee directs the Department to study methods of increasing the fuel efficiency of alternative fueled vehicles by optimizing alternative fueled vehicles to operate using E–85 fuel. Within this funding the Committee directs the Department to use at least $2,000,000 for E–85 infrastructure deployment.

Building Technologies.—The Committee provides $137,000,000, an increase of $50,544,000 above the request. The increase is distributed as follows: $7,300,000 for Residential Buildings Integration; $10,000,000 for Commercial Buildings Integration; $8,244,000 for Emerging Technologies; $18,639,000 for Technology Validation and Market Introduction; and $6,361,000 for Equipment Standards and Analysis. The increase supports 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.

The Committee specifically recommends $24,283,000 for the solid state lighting research and development portion of the Emerging Technologies budget, an increase of $5,000,000 to support advanced research. The Committee recognizes the potential to achieve significant energy savings in this area.

Industrial Technologies.—The Committee provides $57,000,000, an increase of $11,002,000 over the request. Of the increase, the Committee directs $6,000,000 to be applied to the specific industries budget subprogram to begin focusing on new process development that can provide energy savings, environmental and economic benefits. The Committee directs $2,002,000 to be applied to the

combustion budget for continued development and deployment on Super Boiler technology. The Committee recommends that from within available funds, $3,000,000 is provided to support research and development to increase the efficiency of computer chips and systems.

Federal Energy Management Program.—This program is intended to support the deployment of energy efficiency and renewable technology to U.S. Government buildings. Since 1985, the Program has assisted in the reduction of energy intensity in Federal buildings by nearly 30 percent. Considering today's energy challenges, it hardly seems the time to reduce funding for this Program. Therefore, the Committee recommends $23,000,000, a total of $6,209,000 above the request.

Facilities and Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends $6,982,000, the same as the budget request.

Weatherization.—The Committee provides $240,550,000, a total of $96,550,000 above the request. 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 Secretary is directed to make fiscal year 2008 Weatherization funding available from October 1, 2007, through March 31, 2009, for States that submit plans requesting allocations for all or part of this period.

The Committee also provides $55,000,000 to the State Energy Program Grants, $7,000,000 for Tribal Energy Activities, and $5,000,000 for Renewable Energy Production Incentive programs. The Committee eliminates funding for the Asia-Pacific Partnership [APP]. The Committee remains unclear about the goals and direction of APP.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $105,013,000, the same as the budget request.

Program Support.—The Committee recommends $13,481,000, consistent with the budget request.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes the following congressionally directed projects, within available funds, for the purposes of research, development, and demonstration of energy efficiency or renewable energy technologies or programs. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects.

COMMITTEE DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Auburn, NY, Auburn Regional Bioenergy Enterprise	$500,000	Schumer, Clinton
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Biofuels Research	300,000	Durbin
Chariton Valley R.C.&D., Chariton Valley Biomass for Rural Development	500,000	Harkin, Grassley
Chautauqua County, NY, Methane Gas Utilization Project from landfill at Ellery.	500,000	Schumer, Clinton
Department of Energy's Clean Energy Technology Export Program (CETE), to export U.S. clean energy technologies.	600,000	Byrd
Compact Membrane Systems, Inc., Wilmington, DE, Development of Applied Membrane Technology for Processing Ethanol from Biomass.	500,000	Biden, Carper
DBS Energy, Inc., Glastonbury CT, Connecticut Biofuels Technology Project in Suffield, CT.	1,000,000	Dodd

COMMITTEE DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, Inc., St. Simons Island, GA	2,000,000	Stabenow, Brown, Kohl, Inouye, Bayh, Levin, Klobuchar, McConnell, Bunning, Bond, Chambliss, Lugar
Costilla County, CO, and Costilla County Economic Development Council, Inc., Biodiesel Project.	275,000	Salazar
Council of Energy Resource Tribes, Denver, CO	500,000	Salazar
Dakota Gold Research Association, Sioux Falls, SD, Biomass	1,000,000	Johnson
U. of Florida, Gainesville, with the EARTH University Foundation, Biofuel Project.	1,000,000	Nelson, Bill
Eikos, Inc., Franklin, MA, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Conductive, Transparent Coatings for Solar Cells.	1,000,000	Kennedy, Kerry
Electro Energy, Inc., Danbury, CT, Development of bipolar wafer cell vehicle batteries.	500,000	Lieberman
Foster-Glocester Regional School District, RI, Ponaganset Alternative Energy Lab and Biomass Facilities Project.	1,000,000	Reed, Whitehouse
Hawaii Natural Energy Institute, Honolulu, HA, Hawaii-New Mexico Sustainable Energy Security Partnership.	2,000,000	Inouye
Koochiching County, Renewable Energy Clean Air Project (RECAP), Koochiching County, MN, Plasma Gasification Waste-to-Energy project.	400,000	Klobucher
Iowa Association of Municipal Utilities, Iowa Stored Energy Plant	1,500,000	Harkin
Iowa Central Community College, Iowa Renewable Fuels Testing Laboratory	1,000,000	Harkin, Grassley
Lilliputian Systems, Inc., Woburn, MA, Silicon Based Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Chip for Portable Consumer Electronics.	500,000	Kennedy, Kerry
Louisiana State University, Agriculture Center Biorefinery for Ethanol, Chemicals, Animal Feed and Biomaterials from Sugar Cane Bagasse.	1,000,000	Landrieu, Vitter
Michigan State University, Advanced Hybrid Vehicle Technology, Hybrid Electric Vehicle group.	400,000	Levin
Michigan Technological University, Fuel Cell Research at the Center for Nanostructured and Lightweight Materials.	500,000	Stabenow, Levin
National Center for Manufacturing Sciences, Ann Arbor, MI, Lightweight Automotive Materials for Increased Fuel Efficiency.	400,000	Levin
Nevada Institute for Renewable Energy Commercialization, Reno, NV	1,500,000	Reid
North Dakota State University, Center for Nanoscale Energy	6,000,000	Dorgan
Oregon Institute of Technology, Geothermal Power Generation Study	1,000,000	Wyden, Smith
Pacific International Center for High Technology Research, Honolulu, HI, Renewable Energy Development Venture.	1,250,000	Inouye
Pierce County, WA, Landfill Gas-to-Clean-Fuel Project, Biomass	3,550,000	Murray
Raceland Raw Sugar Corporation, Raceland, LA, Bio-Renewable Ethanol and Co-Generation Plant, Biomass.	1,500,000	Landrieu
Stamford, CT, Waste-to-Energy Project	500,000	Lieberman
South Dakota State University, SD, Sun Grant Initiative, Regional Biomass Feedstock Development Partnerships, Biomass.	3,500,000	Johnson
Snohomish County, WA, Biodiesel Project	100,000	Murray, Cantwell
Trenton, NJ, Trenton Fuel Works Biofuels Plant Re-Construction, Biomass	1,500,000	Lautenberg, Menendez
U. of Hawaii, College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, Development of High Yield Tropical Feedstocks, Biomass.	500,000	Inouye
U. of Nebraska, Kearney, CIBS Solar Cell Development, Solar	950,000	Ben Nelson, Hagel
U. of Nebraska, Lincoln, Bioenergy Demonstration Project: Value-Added Products from Renewable Fuels.	2,000,000	Ben Nelson, Hagel
U. of Nevada, Las Vegas, Light Emitting Diode Display Engineering	600,000	Reid
U. of Nevada, Las Vegas, Solar Cell Nanotechnology	750,000	Reid
U. of North Dakota, Grand Forks, Center for Biomass Utilization	2,000,000	Dorgan
U. of Northern Iowa, National Agriculture-Based Industrial Lubricants (NABL), Biomass.	1,000,000	Harkin, Grassley
U. of Rhode Island, Research and Technology Development for genetic improvement of Switchgrass, Biomass.	1,500,000	Reed
University of Akron, OH, Carbon Based Fuel Cell	1,000,000	Brown
Vermont Biomass Energy Resources Center, Biomass	1,000,000	Leahy
Vermont Public Power Supply Authority, Renewable Energy from Animal Biomass.	500,000	Sanders

COMMITTEE DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Vermont Sustainable Jobs Fund, Montpelier, VT, Central Vermont Recovered Biomass Facility, Biomass.	500,000	Leahy
Vermont Sustainable Jobs Fund, Montpelier, VT, Vermont Biofuels Initiative, Biomass.	1,000,000	Leahy
West Virginia University, Lightweight Composite Material for Heavy Duty Vehicles.	500,000	Byrd
West Virginia University, Transportable Emissions Testing Laboratory (TESL), for alternative vehicles emissions testing.	1,000,000	Byrd
City of Chula Vista, CA, Alternative Fuels Pilot Project	750,000	Boxer
Affordable, Energy Efficient, Self Help Housing, Mississippi	300,000	Cochran
Alternate Fuel Cell Membranes for Energy Independence at USM, Mississippi	1,000,000	Cochran
Alternate Fuel for Cement Processing at Auburn University, Alabama	1,500,000	Shelby
Center for Advanced Vehicular Systems (CAVS) at MSU, Mississippi	4,000,000	Cochran
Center for Producer-Owned Energy, Minnesota	1,000,000	Coleman
Cloud County Community College Wind Turbine, Kansas	1,000,000	Brownback
Cooling, Heating, and Power (CHP) at MSU, Mississippi	2,000,000	Cochran
Kansas City Area Transportation Authority, Demonstration of Plug-in Vehicles, Kansas.	1,000,000	Brownback
Great Plains Wind Power Test Facility at Texas Tech University, Texas	2,000,000	Hutchison
Kentucky Rural Energy Consortium at the University of Louisville, Kentucky	2,000,000	McConnell
MidSouth/Southeast Bioenergy Consortium, Georgia	2,000,000	Chambliss, Isakson
Nanostructured Materials for Energy at NC State, North Carolina	1,000,000	Dole
Renewable Energy for Rural Economic Development Program, Utah	1,000,000	Bennett
Sandia National Lab Concentrating Solar, New Mexico	3,000,000	Domenici
Sustainable Buildings Project at the University of Louisville, Kentucky	400,000	McConnell
Sustainable Energy Research Center at MSU, Mississippi	11,000,000	Cochran
Ocean Power Technologies, Reedsport, OR, Wave Energy Research and Demo Center, Reedsport, Oregon.	2,000,000	Smith, Wyden

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

Appropriations, 2007	$137,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	114,937,000
Committee recommendation	168,437,000

The Committee recommendation is $168,437,000, a total of $53,500,000 above the request. The increase brings the High Temperature Superconductivity [HTS] R&D subaccount up to $40,242,000. As no technology has greater potential to resolve the transmission and distribution dilemma than HTS wire and cables and attendant HTS equipment can potentially provide, this funding level will permit continued strategic research at universities and National Laboratories; develop second generation (2G) wire; and will continue superconductivity industry partnerships which design, fabricate, test and demonstrate prototype products for the Nation's aging electric power grid. Additionally, $25,305,000 is provided for Visualization and Controls subaccount, the same as the request, from which the Committee encourages the Department to continue its efforts at the Electricity Infrastructure Operations Center at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. The Operations and Analysis subaccount recommendation is $19,500,000, $7,944,000 above the request. The Committee encourages continuation of the electricity transmission, distribution, and energy assurance activities including the Modern Grid Initiative, and, in particular, the Phase 2 Development Field Tests for the Allegheny Power Initiative.

Renewable Energy Deployment.—In order to facilitate further deployment of renewable energy resources, the Committee has provided additional funding to support the development of large scale energy storage capabilities to mitigate the effects of the intermittent nature of wind and solar power. Developing low-cost, reliable technologies will have a positive impact on renewable energy deployment. The Committee expects the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to work together developing transmission and distribution technologies to enable a smart, reliable grid; developing technical and regulatory standards for interconnecting our Nation's renewable and distributed energy portfolio; and enabling demand response. To the extent possible, the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability will be the primary Federal interface with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the States for the Department of Energy.

The Committee is interested to understand the commercial potential of the distributed generation market, including deployment of fuel cells, combined heat and power systems or other technologies that will increase the efficiency of existing generating (electric and thermal) sources. The Committee encourages the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability to identify the possible energy savings that may be achieved from increased efficiency and from transmission line losses as a result of locating generating facilities closer to the users. The Committee hopes this study will provide a clearer potential of the best commercial opportunities that can be realized immediately and the possibilities of technologies in the future for both industrial and residential systems.

The Committee recommends $21,803,000 for energy storage activities, and increase of $15,000,000. The Committee also provides $30,700,000 for Distributed systems integration, an increase of $5,000,000 in order to support the study on distributed generation and to enable this office to play a greater role in the deployment of renewable energy onto the transmission grid.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes the following congressionally directed projects, within available funds for the purposes of research, development, and demonstration of electricity delivery and energy reliability technologies or programs. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects.

COMMITTEE DIRECTED OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Gonzaga University, Spokane, WA, Electricity Utility Transmission and Distribution Line Engineering Program.	$800,000	Murray, Cantwell
Navajo Tribal Utility Authority, Fort Defiance, AZ, Navajo Electrification Demonstration Program.	2,000,000	Bingaman, Domenici
Bismarck State College, Center of Excellence	5,200,000	Dorgan
Florida State University, FL, Electric Power Infrastructure Security Research & Development.	1,000,000	Bill Nelson, Martinez
Rolls-Royce Fuel Cell Systems (US), Inc., Stark State College of Tech., Fuel Cell Prototyping Center, Canton, OH, solid oxide fuel cell.	500,000	Brown, Voinovich
Energy Surety Research Center at New Mexico Tech University, New Mexico	2,000,000	Domenici

COMMITTEE DIRECTED OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY PROJECTS—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Alabama Power Project, Integrated Distribution Management System, Alabama ..	2,000,000	Shelby

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Appropriations, 2007	$618,190,000
Budget estimate, 2008	801,703,000
Committee recommendation	720,558,000

The Committee recommendation for the Office of Nuclear Energy is $720,558,000.

Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.—The Committee recognizes the administration, through the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, is seeking to reduce the amount of nuclear waste that will need to be placed in a permanent repository or repositories. The goal of providing a comprehensive solution to the nuclear fuel cycle is understandable in light global growth of nuclear power. The policy of reinitiating the recycling of spent nuclear fuel in the United States is a significant issue and one that has international implications. While the Committee has members who support the administration's efforts on GNEP there are also members who have questions regarding the cost, pace, science, technology, and nonproliferation implications underpinning the GNEP initiative. The Committee believes the administration must come forward with greater scientific, technical, and policy information that examines more alternatives in the fuel cycle and recycling process. The administration is directed to limit the fiscal year 2008 work scope to research and development and technology demonstrations at existing facilities. No funds may be used beyond conceptual design of new facilities or the sodium cooled fast burner reactor.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy research and development includes a total of $470,600,000. This is $97,145,000 below the budget request of $567,745,000.

University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support.—For the second year, the Committee rejects the administration's proposal to include funding within the research and development accounts and provides $15,000,000 for this program. The Committee has decided to break this funding out of the research and development accounts, and therefore, doesn't expect the Department to duplicate these efforts.

Nuclear Power 2010.—The Committee has included $135,000,000 to support the development of license applications for new nuclear power plant designs under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's combined Construction and Operating License process, an increase of $21,000,000.

Nuclear Hydrogen Initiative.—The Committee provides $22,600,000 for nuclear hydrogen research and development, as requested. The Committee recommends the Department work to accelerate the experiments for thermochemical and high-temperature

electrolysis production methods and move to a hydrogen production pilot scale demonstration to test the system under extreme temperatures.

Generation IV.—The Committee provides $55,000,000 for the Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative. Of the total funding provided, $45,000,000 is for the Very High Temperature Reactor at Idaho National Laboratory. $7,000,000 is provided for continued research and development of gas cooled reactors. The Department is urged to coordinate research between the GenIV and AFCI programs was conducting this research, but diverted funding to GNEP activities.

Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative.—The Committee recommends $243,000,000 for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative. The Committee notes that the Department seems to have decided on a recycling pathway that consists of the UREX+ separations technology and sodium cooled advanced burner reactors. Many feel the decision to down-select to these technologies was made too soon. The Committee directs the Department to support a broader technology research and development program that better defines the technical requirements, validates the proliferation resistance and demonstrates the commercial feasibility of various recycling technologies. In addition, the Committee does not support the integration of the NNSA's mixed oxide fuel facility into the GNEP. This technology is intended to support a key nonproliferation objective of destroying weapons grade plutonium. The Committee does not support additional delays that may result in attempt to redesign the plant to handle spent nuclear fuel. As such, the Committee expects the Department, on August 1, 2007, to proceed with the construction of the facilities that will support the MOX program in South Carolina.

Of the funds provided, $50,000,000 is provided for separations technology development. DOE is directed to examine a broader array of technologies than UREX+, including pyroprocessing, and other technologies to determine the most cost-effective and proliferation resistant technology. $50,000,000 is provided for advanced fuels technology, including investments in testing facilities to support fuel irradiation experiments. Reactor and separations designs will be dependent on the type of fuel to be used, so fuels are on the critical path—and they pose substantial complexities. DOE is directed to examine different approaches for fuels that could be used for recycling, including, oxide, triso, metal, and nitride fuels; fuels with the plutonium and minor actinides together or separate; inert matrix fuels; and fuels that do or do not leave some of the fission products in the recycling fuel. $8,000,000 is provided for transmutation science. $50,000,000 is provided for systems analysis. DOE is urged to analyze a broad range of scenarios, including both once-through and recycling scenarios that include more than and UREX+. $25,000,000 is provided for reactor technology. DOE is directed to work with our international partners to examine other advanced burner reactor technology, including molten-salt, lead-cooled, and gas-cooled thermal fast-reactors, as well as sodium cooled reactors. DOE should focus on whether technical barriers can be overcome and costs reduced enough so that these reactors might make sense for commercial deployment. $5,000,000

is provided for the budget request related to small reactors that are passively safe and proliferation resistant. As the Committee recommends no funding to support the advanced fuel cycle facility for either technology development or demonstration, the Committee instead recommends $40,000,000 to be provided to make needed upgrades to existing hot cells at the NNSA and Department of Energy facilities. Of this funding, the Committee provides $10,000,000 to Oak Ridge National Laboratory, $7,000,000 to Idaho National Laboratory and $23,000,000 to Los Alamos National Laboratory to make badly needed investments to the existing infrastructure to support nuclear fuel production and testing. The Committee also recognizes the strong technical capabilities of the existing laboratory staff, and encourages the Department to make additional investment in upgrading existing nuclear facilities in future budget submissions. The Committee recommendation includes the following congressionally directed projects, within available funds. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects. $3,000,000 is provided to Technologies Ventures Corporation for technology transfer activities (Domenici).

RADIOLOGICAL FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The Committee provides $53,021,000, the same as the budget request, for the Radiological Facilities Management program.

IDAHO FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends $120,713,000, an increase of $16,000,000 to support nuclear research and development at the Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee has included an increase of $16,000,000 for research and development as well as planning design, modernization, and construction of safety posture improvements at the Advanced Test Reactor.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee provides $76,244,000 in Program Direction.

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.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee provides $35,104,000 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.

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(INCLUDING DEFERRAL AND RECISSION)

The Committee recommends the deferral of $149,000,000 in the Clean Coal Technology funding until fiscal year 2009. 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 Committee recommends that the Department transfer $166,000,000 from the Clean Coal Technology account and apply $88,000,000 in funding to the FutureGen project, $73,000,000 in funding to the Clean Coal Power Initiative for the current competitive solicitation, and $5,000,000 in funding to the Fossil Energy Research and Development program.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2007	$592,621,000
Budget estimate, 2008	566,801,000
Committee recommendation	808,113,000

The Committee recommendation for Fossil Energy Research and Development is $808,113,000 an increase of $215,492,000 above the request.

The Committee is concerned with the reduction in the fossil energy research and development activities proposed as part of this budget. In 2005, the Congress passed and the President signed the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This legislation provided 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 and other coal technologies. 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.

Clean Coal Power Initiative.—The Committee recommends $88,000,000. The Committee is frustrated by the remarkably low level of funding provided to this initiative which demonstrates advanced coal technologies including carbon sequestration, emission control and other co-production opportunities. The budget only provided $15,000,000 in new funding in addition to the $58,000,000 transferred from the Clean Coal Technology account. The Committee is aware that the Department has announced a new solicitation for the Clean Coal Power Initiative for the capture of carbon dioxide for sequestration or other beneficial uses. However, the Committee strongly urges the Department to select projects after September 30, 2008, so that sufficient funding will be available to award projects that will result in significant technological impact. Funds previously awarded for the WMPI project selected under DOE solicitation DE–PS26–02NT41428 shall remain available for obligation to the project provided that a cooperative agreement is awarded not later than September 30, 2008.

FutureGen.—The Committee understands and recognizes the potential value of the FutureGen project. However, the Committee is concerned about maintaining adequate funding for the core fossil energy research, development, and demonstration programs. The Committee has emphatically stated its intent, and has warned that this R&D project must not be funded at the expense of the balance of the core coal R&D program. Yet the administration has continued to ignore congressional intent and has eliminated or decreased funding for other core coal programs. Therefore, the Committee provides $88,000,000 for the FutureGen project. This is $20,000,000 less than the budget request, but $34,000,000 more than was provided in fiscal year 2007.

Fuels and Power Systems.—The Committee recommends $374,025,000 for fuels and power systems, an increase of $128,423,000. The recommendation includes $34,000,000 for Innovations for Existing Plants. Because carbon capture from existing plants is a substantial ongoing challenge to the existing fleet, the Innovations for Existing Plants program is directed to consider carbon capture as a future focus of this program. Included in Innovations for Existing Plants is $12,000,000 for Federal laboratories, in collaboration with research institutions, to conduct research and development on the critical link between water and fossil energy extraction and utilization and how different regions of the country can employ water efficiency technology. The Committee recommends $55,000,000 for the Advanced Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle activities and $25,000,000 for Advanced Turbines. The Committee recommends $132,000,000 for Carbon Sequestration activities. The Committee believes that carbon capture and sequestration must be accelerated while also advancing other important related coal research and development activities. The Committee urges the Department to continue to support the carbon sequestration demonstration projects authorized in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, including section 413 of Public Law 109–58. Additional funds are needed for the Regional Partnerships to expand to field and large-scale injection in various geologic formations. The Committee encourages the Department to develop and validate a science-based, site-specific risk assessment framework based on appropriate field observations from pilot injections and analog sites, including both short-term and long-term risks; this framework should serve as a common resource for assessing large-scale demonstrations and storage efforts. The Committee recommends $10,000,000 within the available funds to support this report. Within available funds for Carbon Sequestration, the Committee encourages the program to study CO_2 accelerated growth algae technology to recycle carbon and produce fuels. The Committee recommends $30,000,000 for Fuels to support both fuels from coal liquids and hydrogen. Within available funds for Fuels, the Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to initiate an integrated coal and biomass research activity to address carbon emissions and technology barrier issues. The Committee recommends $65,025,000 for Fuel Cell Research. Within available funds for Fuel Cell Research, $5,000,000 is available for the manufacturing initiative for coal-based systems. The Committee recommends $33,000,000 for Advanced Research. Within available funds for Ad-

vanced Research, the Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for computational energy sciences.

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

Oil Technology.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000. Within the available funds, the Committee provides $1,500,000 to continue support for the Risk Based Management System, a nationwide database for oil and gas regulations and technology developments. The Committee recommends the continuation of the stripper well program.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $149,962,000 for Program Direction.

Other Programs.—The Committee recommends $16,570,000 for fossil energy environmental restoration. The increase of $7,000,000 is to carryout research authorized in section 964 of EPACT 2005 that supports research in advanced coal mining recovery and to minimize the environmental impacts associated with underground mining. The Committee recommendation is $656,000 for the special recruitment program. The Committee recommendation for plant and capital equipment is $13,000,000. The Committee recommendation for cooperative research and development is $8,000,000.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes the following congressionally directed projects, within available funds for the purposes of research, development, and demonstration of fossil energy related technologies or programs. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects.

COMMITTEE DIRECTED FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, Colorado Center for Sustainable Energy at the Colorado School of Mines.	$1,000,000	Salazar, Allard
North Dakota Energy and Environment Research Center, Grand Forks, ND, Fossil Fuel Cooperative Research & Development.	4,000,000	Dorgan
Ramgen, Bellevue, WA, CO2 compression initiative utilizing shockwave/ramjet compression technology.	1,200,000	Murray
Sparks, NV, City of Sparks Methane Reclamation project	1,000,000	Reid
US/China Energy and Environmental Center, Clean Coal Technologies, Tulene University, Louisiana.	1,200,000	Landrieu
North Dakota Energy and Environment Research Center, Grand Forks, ND, National Center for Hydrogen Technology.	3,000,000	Dorgan
West Virginia University, Advanced coal technology (liquefaction) in China	350,000	Byrd
Center for Zero Emissions Technology, Montana State University, Clean Coal Technologies.	6,000,000	Baucus, Tester
Interdisciplinary Clean Energy Program at the University of Utah, Utah	3,500,000	Bennett
Shallow Carbon Sequestration Pilot Demonstration, Missouri	2,500,000	Bond
Gulf of Mexico Hydrates Research Consortium at the University of Mississippi, MS.	1,000,000	Cochran
Membrane Technology for Produced Water at Lea County, New Mexico	1,500,000	Domenici
Carbon Sequestration Monitoring Activities, Wyoming	1,650,000	Enzi
Penn State University, Solid Oxide Fuel Cells, Pennsylvania	4,000,000	Specter
Arctic Energy Office, Alaska	7,000,000	Stevens

COMMITTEE DIRECTED FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Center for Advanced Separation Technologies, Virginia	1,000,000	Warner, Webb

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

Appropriations, 2007	$21,326,000
Budget estimate, 2008	17,301,000
Committee recommendation	21,301,000

The Committee recommends $21,301,000 for fiscal year 2008. $2,000,000 of the increase provided is for the operation of the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves. Within available funds and consistent with the budget request, $3,000,000 is provided to support the Rocky Mountain Oil Technology Centers and $3,810,000 is recommended to support NPR–3 to continue and maintain production.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes the following congressionally directed projects, within available funds. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects. $2,000,000 is provided to Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico to support research for inbasin scale environmental impacts for oil shale production (Domenici, Bingaman).

ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND

Appropriations, 2007	.....
Budget estimate, 2008	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

The State of California maintains that they are due $9,710,000 under the Elk Hills program from 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, 2007	$164,441,000
Budget estimate, 2008	331,609,000
Committee recommendation	163,472,000

The Committee supports maintaining the existing storage program but does not support the expansion program request at this time. Current cost estimates and schedule for an expansion are $10,000,000,000 for new facilities and $55,000,000,000 for the cost of the oil fill, which would not be complete until 2027. The Committee does not believe that it makes sense to spend Federal funds to take oil off the market when prices are at record levels when such funds can be used for more pressing needs. The Committee recommends $163,472,000 for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Within available funds for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, $10,000,000 is provided for the Secretary to conduct an updated inventory of the oil and natural gas resources of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico OCS planning area using the latest non-drilling seismic technologies. The committee has also included section 313 regarding land acquisition related to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

Appropriations, 2007	$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	5,325,000
Committee recommendation	12,825,000

The Committee recommends $12,825,000, an increase of $7,500,000 above the budget request. The Department will use the additional funds to meet costs associated with increased storage contracts.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2007	$90,653,000
Budget estimate, 2008	105,095,000
Committee recommendation	105,095,000

The Committee recommends $105,095,000 for the Energy Information Administration.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2007	$349,687,000
Budget estimate, 2008	180,937,000
Committee recommendation	195,437,000

For the Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup program, the Committee recommends $195,437,000, a net increase of $14,500,000 above the President's request (this increase reflects an offset of $10,000,000 to prior year funds located at the Consolidated Business Center for which the program has no identified need). The Committee realizes that the Department's effort to complete cleanup in the future will be challenged by the failure to request sufficient funding. The Committee reminds the Department that it is not enough to simply fund projects that have the greatest perceived reduction to public risk; the Department committed to the public that it would meet regulatory agreements too. The Committee expects future funding requests to include sufficient funding to meet that commitment.

Control Levels.—In fiscal year 2006, the Environmental Management Program's budget was restructured to better display site information, which paralleled its management of the program. However, Congress increased the number of congressional reprogramming control points from approximately 25 line items in fiscal year 2005 to nearly 100 in fiscal year 2006. This Committee understands and continues to support the need for site managers to have the flexibility to meet the changing requirements at the sites and recommends the following reprogramming control points for fiscal year 2008:

—West Valley Demonstration Project;
—Gaseous Diffusion Plants;
—Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning;
—-Small Sites;
—All construction line items.

Internal Reprogramming Authority.—In fiscal year 2008, Environmental Management may transfer up to $2,000,000, one time, between accounts listed below to reduce health and safety risks, gain cost savings, or complete projects, as long as a program or

project is not increased or decreased by more than $2,000,000 in total during the fiscal year. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or to change funding levels for programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the act or report. The Committee on Appropriations in the House 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:

—West Valley Demonstration Project
—Gaseous Diffusion Plants;
—Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning;
—Small Sites;
—Transfers between construction line item(s) and operating projects within the same site, as applicable.

West Valley Demonstration Project.—The Committee includes $78,895,000 for West Valley, $24,500,000 above the budget request. The Committee notes that this budget request is significantly lower than that enacted fiscal year 2006 or the program's own preferred funding level displayed in their fiscal year 2007 Operating Plan submitted to Congress in March 2007. The fiscal year 2008 reduction is puzzling considering the amount of waste, decontamination and decommissioning, and remediation of contaminated groundwater that still must be accomplished. The Committee therefore provides an additional $18,000,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of excess ancillary facilities, per the State agreement, as well as $6,500,000 for additional low-level waste shipments for disposal from the ongoing decontamination and decommissioning.

Gaseous Diffusion Plants.—The Committee recommends $38,120,000 for operation of gaseous diffusion plant uranium conversion and stabilization activities, the same as the President's request.

Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning Project.—The Committee recommends $10,342,000, the same as the budget request.

Small Sites.—The Committee includes $78,080,000 for fiscal year 2008. These funds are distributed as follows: Argonne National Laboratory, $2,437,000; Brookhaven National Laboratory, $23,699,000; Idaho National Laboratory, $5,400,000; California Site Support, $160,000; Inhalation Toxicology, $427,000; Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, $5,900,000; Energy Technology Engineering Center, $13,000,000; Los Alamos National Laboratory, $1,905,000; Consolidated Business Center's Completed Sites Administration and Suppport, $1,200,000; and Moab, $23,952,000. The Committee is concerned with the lack of progress and funding in the request for Moab. The removal of the tailings pile must be accelerated to cut costs. The Committee expects to see increased funding in fiscal year 2009.

The Committee is aware of the suspension of the Department's deactivation and decommissioning activities at the Energy Technology and Engineering Site, Santa Susanna Field Laboratory, in Simi Valley, California, while the Department evaluates stakeholder concerns and input regarding the deactivation and decom-

missioning activities at the site. The Department has placed all operations in a safe and stable configuration during this pause that allows time to complete the evaluation, but will continue to perform environmental monitoring activities. The Department claims it is committed to cleaning up the Energy Technology and Engineering Site in accordance with applicable Federal and State regulations. The Committee is very concerned with this situation and will be monitoring the Department's actions during the "pause" in cleanup.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriations, 2007	$556,606,000
Budget estimate, 2008	573,509,000
Committee recommendation	573,509,000

Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund.—The Committee provides $573,509,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee also recommends $250,406,000, an increase of $20,000,000, to keep the decontamination and decommissioning of the East Tennessee Technology Park's K–25 process building on schedule for completion by fiscal year 2010. This building is on the critical path for the regulatory-driven completion of the cleanup of East Tennessee Technology Park by fiscal year 2012.

Uranium/Thorium Reimbursement.—The Committee recommends no funding for this activity, $20,000,000 below the request.

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2007	$3,797,294,000
Budget estimate, 2008	4,397,876,000
Committee recommendation	4,496,759,000

The Committee recommends $4,496,759,000 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.

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 2009 budget submission.

Advanced Materials Testing.—Many of the stockpile stewardship, Office of Science, and nuclear energy R&D programs face scientific challenges posed by ultra high temperature and pressure and high radiation environments. As such, the Committee urges the Department to begin to develop a research and development roadmap that considers the questions of what types of facilities are needed to perform experiments on materials under extreme temperature and

pressure. This facility should be shared between the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration and likewise should contribute to the benefit of both programs.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

For High Energy Physics, the Committee recommends $789,238,000. 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 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 $60,000,000 to support 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. 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. 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.

Joint Dark Energy Mission.—The Committee has consistently urged the Department to move forward toward launch of the Joint Dark Energy Mission [JDEM]. Unfortunately, in spite of the Committee's support and the Department's own scientific facilities planning process, this has not happened. The Department's fiscal year 2008 request for JDEM will cripple the Department's capacity to move forward either in partnership with NASA or as a single agency mission in 2008. Unfortunately, this budget reduction may also discourage international collaborations interested in a near term launch—collaborations which could significantly reduce the United States' costs. The Committee reasserts its strong support of JDEM, directs DOE to down select from among the three JDEM competitors immediately following the decision of the NRC committee, and provides $7,000,000 above the combined requests for JDEM, SNAP and other Dark Energy research programs to fund the competition and to aggressively ramp up activities focused on a launch in 2014.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee provides $471,319,000 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.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

For Biological and Environmental Research [BER], the Committee provides $605,320,000. BER uses competitive and peer-reviewed research at national laboratories, universities, and private institutions to further the Nation's competitiveness in the scientific arena.

Low Dose Research.—The Committee supports the Department's ongoing research efforts to understand the relationship between low dose radiation exposure and the impact to human health. After eight years of research, the Department is now compiling the data for independent scientific review. Following this review, the Committee encourages the Department to share its finding with other agencies and Congress as it may support review of our existing regulatory thresholds.

Medical Applications and Measurement Science.—Of the funds provided, $34,000,000 is for Medical Applications and Medical Science. The increase of $20,000,000 is for nuclear medicine research and should be distributed through a grant program. The Committee is disappointed that for the third year in a row the Department has eliminated from its budget funding for nuclear medicine research.

The Committee recommends that funding by used to support new isotope development R&D and increased availability of research isotopes for critical nuclear medicine applications. The Committee also notes that diagnostics are currently in development between the University of New Mexico and Los Alamos utilizing the unique capabilities of Los Alamos at the IPF at LANSCE and the radiopharmaceutical expertise of UNM at the Center for Isotopes in Medicine.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes the following congressionally directed projects, within available funds. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects. $400,000 is provided to the University of Rochester in New York to support biosensor and fuel cell research (Schumer, Clinton); $2,000,000 is provided to the Neurosciences Institute in Morgantown, West Virginia, to support molecular genetics research (Byrd); $1,000,000 is provided to the Inland Northwest Research Alliance in Idaho Falls, Idaho, to support water research (Murray, Cantwell); $500,000 is provided to the Nevada Cancer Institute in Las Vegas to support research of cellular antigens and nuclei acids (Reid); $2,500,000 is provided to the University of North Dakota in Grand Forks to support antibodies research (Dorgan); $2,000,000 is provided to the University of California, San Diego to support seismic research (Feinstein); $500,000 is provided to the University of Massachusetts at Boston to support marine systems research (Kennedy, Kerry); $3,000,000 is provided to the University of Vermont in Burlington to support research in agricultural, environmental, and biological sciences (Leahy); $1,000,000 is provided to the University of Vermont in Burlington to conduct research of MRI science (Leahy); $250,000 is provided to the Center for Nanomedicine at the University of Maryland in Baltimore to support research into new nanoconstructs (Mikulski, Cardin); $2,000,000 is provided to the

University of Nebraska Medical Center in Omaha to conduct nanoscale imaging of proteins (Ben Nelson, Hagel); $1,500,000 is provided to WIPP in Carlsbad, New Mexico, to support neutrino research (Domenici, Bingaman); $12,000,000 is provided the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, New Mexico, for the Mind Institute ongoing research into brain related research including supporting research of military personnel suffering from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, depression and traumatic brain injuries (Domenici, Bingaman); $1,500,000 is provided to New Mexico Tech University in Socorro, New Mexico, for Applied Energy Science Design (Domenici); $2,000,000 is provided to Jackson State University in Jackson, Mississippi, for Bioengineering Research Training (Cochran); $600,000 is provided to the University of Mississippi Medical Center in Jackson, Mississippi, to fund research in the areas of increasing efficiency by reducing the amount of contrast media needed for certain procedures (Cochran); $6,000,000 is provided to the University of California, Los Angeles for the Institute for Molecular Medicine radiation research (Stevens); $1,200,000 is provided to Northwest Missouri State University in Maryville, Missouri, for the Nanoscience Education Project (Bond); $1,000,000 is provided to The University of Louisville Regional NMR Facility in Louisville, Kentucky, to support ongoing research in fundamental processes of electron transport systems and the structural biology of proteins (McConnell); $1,000,000 is provided to Ultra-dense Supercomputing memory storage in Colorado for further research in this field (Allard); $1,000,000 is provided to Northern Hemisphere Pierre Auger Observatory in Colorado for the northern hemisphere location of a particle detection observatory (Allard); $1,000,000 is provided to University of Oklahoma in Norman, Oklahoma, for the Large Scale Application of Single-Walled Carbon Nanotubes (Inhofe); $1,000,000 is provided to the University of Maine in Orono, Maine, for research in Integrated Forest Products Refinery technology (Snowe, Collins); $1,000,000 is provided to Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for the Institute for Regenerative Medicine (Burr, Dole); $1,100,000 is provided to the South Dakota Catalyst Group for Alternative Energy to support research that will synthesize, characterize and scale up production of catalysts important for energy alternatives to fossil fuels (Thune); $1,500,000 is provided to Louisiana Tech University in Ruston, Louisiana, for research in nanotechnology (Vitter, Landrieu); $300,000 is provided to Dominican University in River Forest, Illinois for research related to the role of transglutaminases in Alzheimer's and Huntington's diseases (Durbin); $300,000 is provided to the University of Chicago to research multi-modality, image-based markers for assessing breast density and structure to determine risk of breast cancer (Durbin).

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommends $1,512,257,000 for Basic Energy Sciences, an increase of $13,760,000 from the budget request. The Committee fully funds facilities within this account including the four Nanoscale Science Research Centers and provides $15,992,000 for the Manuel Lujan, Jr., Neutron Scattering Center. The Com-

mittee provides $17,000,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research [EPSCoR].

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee provides $334,898 for Advanced Scientific Computing Research. The increase of $7,700,000 is for the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility to maintain budget and cost schedule. The Committee has also included language in the NNSA Advanced Simulation and Computing program to encourage the Office of Science and the NNSA to work together to establish a high performance computing capability within the Department by joining the capabilities of both program support advanced computing architecture, improvements in cyber security and to support the development of advanced software and algorithms to increase the speed and efficiency of existing and future systems. The Committee does not support the Department transferring $19,000,000 to the Department of Defense to play a minor role in that effort. Instead, the Committee has shifted $13,000,000 from the Office of Science to the NNSA Advanced Computing and Simulation program to reestablish the Department leadership role in high performance computing.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

For Fusion Energy Sciences, the Committee recommends $427,850,000. 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.

High Energy Density Plasma Laboratory Program.—The Committee is pleased that the Department has developed a multidisciplinary research program, which this Committee has been an advocate for the past several years. The Committee believes this program will provide greater interaction between the Office of Science researchers and the NNSA scientists and provide greater access to user facilities such as the Z machine, NIF and Omega. While these activities have their primary responsibility in the weapons program, these facilities can offer scientists new capabilities to support their experiments. The Committee encourages the Department to increase their investment in this modest program to ensure it future success. The Committee supports the budget request of $12,281,000 for the Office of Science. The Committee notes a similar amount has been included in the NNSA program.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee provides $88,956,000 to support infrastructure activities, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee continues to be supportive of the Physical Sciences Facility at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. The Physical Sciences Facility is supported by the Office of Science, the National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA], and the Department of Homeland Security. The Committee is aware of the MOU that was signed by the three agencies in November 2006 but it is unable to understand why the fiscal year 2008 budget request does not support this interagency agreement. This Committee provides the re-

quested amount of $35,000,000 from the Office of Science. The Committee is aware that a portion of this project is to be developed by a third party and that the financing proposal has not yet been approved by OMB. To prevent further delay of this project the Committee provides an additional $10,000,000 to proceed with the design of the buildings expected to be financed by the third party. All funding provided in fiscal year 2008 and all funds provided in previous bills for this project shall not be held in reserve.

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 $184,934,000 for the Office of Science Program Direction, the same as the budget request.

SCIENCE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

These initiatives support the missions of the Department's Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists program. The Committee provides $11,000,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2007	$99,206,000
Budget estimate, 2008	202,454,000
Committee recommendation	204,054,000

The Committee recommendation for the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management include $202,454,000 from fees collected by the Secretary which are deposited into the fund established by Public Law 97–425 as amended and $242,046,000 provided from the defense appropriation. An additional $1,600,000 is provided for a total of $446,100,000.

The Committee directs the Department to exercise great discretion to ensure that any work 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 provides $1,600,000 for the cooperative agreement between the Department of Energy and Inyo County, California. (Feinstein)

INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2007	$7,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	8,390,000
Committee recommendation	8,390,000

The Committee recommendation to support the Office of Loan Guarantees is $8,390,000, as requested. The Committee has provided full funding to enable to the Department to hire experienced staff with a background in project finance or have experience with existing U.S. Government agencies such as the Overseas Private

Investment Corporation or the Export-Import Bank. These entities have effectively utilized loan guarantees to encourage foreign countries to invest in U.S. technology, including the recent sale of nuclear reactor technology to China. The Committee strongly believes the administration should support a domestic initiative of greater proportion here in this country to diversity our energy portfolio. The Committee has included language regarding the terms and conditions of the loan guarantees provided under section 1702(b)(2) of the Energy Policy Act. The Committee does note that in an April 20, 2007 letter, the Government Accountability Office concluded the following: "EPACT section 1702(b)(2) confers upon DOE independent authority to make loan guarantees, notwithstanding the FCRA requirements." The Committee agrees with this determination and doesn't believe Congress is required to provide statutory authorization in an appropriations bill to comply with the Fair Credit Reform Act. However, the Committee is taking this prudent step to avoid complications in the future over legal interpretations intended to frustrate the effectiveness of this program.

The Committee expects the Department to move expeditiously to complete the rulemaking process and make awards on the first solicitation once the regulations have been finalized. The Committee, however, is concerned that the draft rules propose to limit the Federal guarantee to 90 percent of the debt portion, which is inconsistent with the statute, which allows for the Government to guarantee up to 100 percent of the debt portion. The Committee urges the administration to make the correction in order to optimize the effectiveness of the loan guarantee program to support the deployment of a diversified portfolio of energy saving applications and clean generation sources.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 2007	$276,832,000
Budget estimate, 2008	310,366,000
Committee recommendation	308,596,000

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2007	−$123,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	−161,818,000
Committee recommendation	−161,818,000

The Committee recommends $308,596,000 for Departmental Administration, a net appropriation of $146,778,000. The Departmental Administration account funds eleven Department-wide management organizations support administrative functions such as human resources, accounting, budgeting, workforce diversity and project management activities.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2007	$41,819,000
Budget estimate, 2008	47,732,000
Committee recommendation	47,732,000

For the Office of Inspector General, the Committee recommends $47,732,000 consistent with the budget request. The Office of In-

spector 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, 2007	$6,275,583,000
Budget estimate, 2008	6,511,312,000
Committee recommendation	6,489,024,000

Reliable Replacement Warhead.—The Committee is divided on the Reliable Replacement Warhead [RRW] program, but unified in its desire to review and discuss our national strategic defense policy and the role of nuclear weapons in the post-cold war and post-September 11th world. The President requested $88,000,000 for the RRW program and the bill will provide funding of $66,000,000. This is the amount required to complete phase 2a, design definition and cost studies, of the RRW research and planning outline. Following the completion of phase 2a, Congress will have to authorize any continuation of the RRW program.

The information developed from phase 2a will be helpful in assessing the role RRW might play in the reliability, safety, and nonproliferation areas of the nuclear weapon arsenal, but the information alone will not be enough upon which to base a decision on its construction or deployment. Congress should have a more vigorous analysis and debate of our national strategic defense policy prior to deciding whether to continue or terminate RRW development.

Specifically, we need to decide the type and size of our future inventory of nuclear weapons. We have thousands of warheads. Under treaties we have committed to substantial reductions and eventual elimination of nuclear warheads. We must decide the methodology of meeting those obligations and over what time. In the meantime, we also have to determine how we maintain the warheads we decide we must keep. Do we continue the Stockpile Stewardship Program, which has been used for many years to maintain our nuclear deterrence, or do we develop the RRW program to replace the current nuclear warheads with new ones?

These are important questions that must be answered before we decide whether to continue with or terminate the RRW program. Some of these answers will be influenced by how long the current nuclear warheads can be maintained in the Stockpile Stewardship Program without degradation. New evidence suggests that the life of those warheads is decades longer than previously estimated. The future funding requirements for a new RRW program will also have to be weighed against and compared to the costs of the Life Extension Program within the Stockpile Stewardship Program.

We should also consider what impact the RRW program would have on international nonproliferation efforts. The United States is engaged around the world on trying to halt the spread of nuclear weapon capability and we must consider the role of RRW in those efforts. These are among the most important issues policy makers

will face in the months and years ahead. The question of whether the RRW program should be continued must be based on accurate information and thorough debate.

The Committee favors the development of a bipartisan commission created by the Congress to evaluate and make recommendations on the role of nuclear weapons in our future strategic posture. That commission should engage the administration, the Congress and the best minds in the public and private sector to evaluate the future role of nuclear weapons as a part of our defense and strategic policies. That Commission report can form the basis of information and advice from which the President and the Congress can make decisions about the future of RRW and other weapons programs.

Complex 2030.—The Committee rejects the Department's premature deployment of the NNSA Complex 2030 consolidation effort. This plan was based on the adoption and deployment of the Reliable Replacement Warhead systems. The Government Accountability Office found this proposal to be lacking critical details about the size and military mission of the RRW system, which of course would dictate the size and makeup of the future stockpile including the necessity for a new pit manufacturing capability. The Committee has previously canceled the Modern Pit Facility, because the National Nuclear Security Administration, the Nuclear Weapons Council and the Department of Defense were unable to make a compelling case for a significantly larger pit manufacturing need. The Committee has not provided any funding for the Consolidated Pit Center for the very same reason. For as much thought as the Department has given to supporting Complex 2030 and its deployment, the Committee is concerned about sustaining the science capability at the laboratories and ensuring a balanced program that continues to make critical investment in improving the scientific mission. For example, the NNSA has established a preeminent capability in super computing to simulate warhead reliability without underground testing. However, the Department has no plans to advance the field of high performance computing, but instead proposes to reduce computing capacity within the laboratory system. This, however, doesn't mean that the NNSA doesn't have plans to purchase additional platforms in the future, but it is unclear what is driving these decisions. The Committee is frustrated by the lack of planning to ensure that the laboratory mission is not compromised. The Committee directs the Department to provide a comprehensive computing proposal that involves the input from the weapons laboratories that includes a long term strategy to maintain the necessary simulation capabilities within the complex and to drive innovation and competition for technology and performance. The Committee is also frustrated with the lack of scientific development vision for the labs. The NNSA has focused on its transformational plan, based on the RRW systems, but appears to have given little thought to the scientific path forward. The Committee directs the Department, drawing on the resources within NNSA and the Office of Science, to provide to the Committee a research and development plan that addresses unresolved physics and materials questions that will support national security mission as well as contributed to improving our energy independence, non-

proliferation mission and to support biomedical applications. This plan should explore technology options that can be deployed and provide an added capability to our R&D program to update the scientific capabilities at each of the laboratories.

Consolidation.—The Committee does believe the consolidation for disposal of the various amounts of special nuclear material, including highly enriched uranium; plutonium and excess pits should be aggressively pursued. The Committee is concerned that rising security costs continue to erode mission critical funding. The Committee encourages the administration to careful evaluate the future mission need for all special nuclear material. Any and all material that no longer has a specific mission need should be consolidated and destroyed, preferably into other forms that can be reused in other applications such as light water reactor fuel if possible. The Committee also supports utilizing existing facilities to recycle or destroy excess material at the H Canyon at the Savannah River Site. The facility, which is the last of its kind, can play a key role in down-blending a significant and varied amount of highly enriched uranium and various forms of plutonium and uranium. The cost of running this facility to support the consolidation campaign appears to be much more cost effective than attempting to develop a new capability. The Committee continues to encourage the Department to maintain its campaign to remove plutonium from the Livermore National Laboratory as soon as possible and urges the Department to give greater consideration to expanding the amount of plutonium that can be added to the 34 tons of weapons grade material that will be turned in to mixed oxide fuel for use in civilian reactors for electric generation.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

The Committee recommendation provides $1,409,521,000 for the Directed Stockpile Activities, a reduction of $37,715,000. These activities support the activities needed to provide critical surveillance, engineering, research and development, maintenance, and dismantlement of the stockpile.

Life Extension Programs.—The Committee recommends $238,686,000, as requested. The Committee is concerned about the growing costs associated with the Life Extension Program for the W–76. The Committee is aware of the fact that the NNSA is facing a challenge posed by attempting to reengineer cold war capabilities. However, the Committee expects that Department to establish a better program assessment and reporting requirements to better manage this program.

Stockpile Systems.—The Committee recommends $346,717,000 for the Stockpile Systems account as requested.

Reliable Replacement Warhead.—The Committee recommends $66,000,000 and directs the Department to conduct the appropriate feasibility studies allowed under phase 2a. The Committee commends the NNSA and laboratories for their work in the design competition for the RRW program. The design teams made security, reliability and manufacturability the foundation of both designs and both teams should be commended for their effort. The Committee expects the NNSA to conduct a timely and thorough feasibility review of the weapon system in order to provide Con-

gress with the necessary information to make an informed decision as to whether or not it will authorize the National Nuclear Security Administration to proceed with the next phase of development. It will be incumbent upon NNSA to provide specific details as to how many RRW weapons will be manufactured, how the Department of Defense intends to integrate the system into the stockpile and how many weapons from the existing deterrent can be retired. No funds may be used for initial research of a RRW2.

Weapons Dismantlement.—The Committee provides the requested level of $52,500,000 as requested. The Committee commends the Department for their recent efforts to increase the number of dismantlement and fulfill the terms of the Washington-Moscow Treaty, which calls for the reduction of the active stockpile to the lowest level in over three decades.

Stockpile Services.—The Committee recommends $705,868,000 for these activities, a reduction of $14,946,000. The Committee expects the Department to focus on providing adequate funding support to protect the ongoing research and development, engineering and production support to maintain the existing life extension program, and not to undertake significant transformational activities proposed as part of Complex 2030 or to accommodate the proposed RRW workload. The Committee recommends $284,979,000 for the Production support program as requested. The Committee provides no funding for the responsive infrastructure activity. The Committee recommends $205,576,000 for the Management, Technology and Production activity. The Committee provides full funding of the production of limited life components for the existing stockpile. Key limited life components, such as neutron generators, contain radiological sources that cannot be manufactured by private vendors. The Committee directs the NNSA to continue to provide full support for the continued production of neutron generators to support the existing stockpile. The Committee also supports the Department's efforts to deploy new core surveillance diagnostic capabilities developed in the Engineering Campaign.

CAMPAIGNS

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

The Committee recommends $1,933,193,000, an increase of $66,973,000 above the budget request. Within the funds provided, for the various campaigns, the Committee supports the budget request for the university research program in robotics [URPR] for the development of advanced robotic technologies for strategic national applications

Science Campaign.—The Committee recommends $273,075,000 as requested to support the science campaign. This is the same as the budget request.

Engineering Campaign.—The Committee recommends $172,749,000, an increase of $20,000,000 for the engineering campaign. This account provides critical engineering support to the

stockpile and can provide solutions to deploy state-of-the-art use control technologies. There remains a significant amount that still must be understood regarding limited life components. The Committee expects the NNSA to develop a better predictive capability to better understand why systems fail and what must be done to increase reliability and component lifetimes. The Committee recognizes the continued threat posed by international terrorist organizations that seek to acquire and detonate nuclear weapons within the stockpile of the United States and those possessed by other nations. The Committee recommends that the NNSA accelerate efforts within the Enhanced Surety subactivity of the engineering campaign to increase the safety, security and improved surveillance of nuclear weapons in the existing stockpile by developing modern surety technologies, and to take advantage of every opportunity to implement these technologies in any weapon program. Furthermore, the Committee recommends that the NNSA work with other nations to explore opportunities to share these technologies, within the bounds of existing laws and treaties so that nuclear weapons can be better secured against international terrorist threats. The Committee recommends $44,803,000, an increase of $20,000,000 above the request, to enhance these important activities. The Committee also requests the NNSA to report back by July 1, 2008 on progress made both in the inclusion of modern surety technologies in the RRW studies and the plan for making surety technologies available for other nations. The Committee expects the Department to complete the buildout of the MESA facility. The Committee also directs the NNSA to initiate the refurbishment of the Ion Beam Lab by reprogramming uncosted Microsystems and Engineering Science Applications and Exterior Communication Infrastructure Modernization contingency funds. This program is on the critical path and the replacement of these existing facilities will be offset against the increasing costly maintenance and repair activities.

Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign.—The Committee recommends $459,146,000 for the ICF campaign activities including $10,139,000 for the final year of construction of the National Ignition Facility as requested. The baseline ignition approach on NIF is x-ray or indirect drive. This approach was chosen after detailed review of its maturity and value to the weapons program. Significant challenges remain for the baseline approach as independent reviews have concluded. In addition there are severe budgetary constraints on the overall Stockpile Stewardship Program. The Department is therefore directed to allocate all of its resources for the first ignition demonstration with indirect drive and to defer other approaches such as direct drive until after achievement of x-ray driven ignition or after experiments have shown that the baseline approach will not succeed. The funds budgeted for direct drive should be used to increase the operating capacity of all other ICF funded facilities within the complex.

Facility Operations and Target Production.—The Committee recommends $132,970,000 for the facility operations and target production. This funding increase reflects the Committee's desire to consolidate funding for the Z machine operations and experimentation into NNSA Science and ICF campaign accounts. The Z facility at Sandia National Laboratories is a model NNSA shared na-

tional user facility. The request for Z experiments continues to grow. Scientists at the NNSA weapons laboratories are focused on the mission needs of the Stockpile Stewardship Program, and the new initiative in high energy density laboratory plasmas will increase the interest from scientists in the fundamental research fields of high-energy-density science, planetary science, and laboratory astrophysics. NNSA has invested $120,000,000 in the Z facility and a petawatt-class laser. Despite this investment, the budget request fails to provide sufficient funding to reestablish experimental capabilities (precision, performance, and shot rate) required to support the many users of the facility. This funding shortfall will severely restrict the ability to conduct high-priority weapons science, ICF, and basic science research using the refurbished Z facility. The Committee concurs with the President's budget request for Z using $12,800,000 in the Science Campaign, $10,440,000 in the ICF Pulsed Power and $1,200,000 in the ICF National Ignition Campaign activities. The Committee has provided $58,357,000 in the Facility Operations and Target Production category of the ICF Campaign in order to fully reestablish experimental capabilities on the refurbished Z facility. The Committee shifts $28,887,000 from the RTBF Campaign budgeted for Z to the ICF Facility Operations and Target Production category. Within the available funds, $13,000,000 has been added to ensure full operations and target production on Z and $5,000,000 to support a new approach known as a Linear Transformer Driver or LTD to create high current pulsed power devices has recently been demonstrated at Sandia. The funding shall be used to refine the baseline design including all of the critical elements of rep-rated high yield fusion facility and begin component improvements and demonstrations as appropriate. The Committee expects that the Department will provide adequate funding for the full utilization of Z machine in the out-year budgets.

Joint Program in High Energy Density Laboratory Plasmas.—The Committee appreciates the Department's effort to establish the High Energy Density Laboratory Plasmas joint program. The Committee is encouraged the Department is taking the proper steps to coordinate research between the Office of Science and NNSA, and to expand it to other agencies as well. The Department has provided $24,637,000 divided equally between Fusion Energy Sciences and NNSA. The Committee recommends the entire NNSA contribution of $12,356,000 be provided in the High Energy Density Laboratory Plasma line. The Committee has shifted funds from experimental support activities.

NIF Assembly and Installation.—The Committee provides $136,912,000 for NIF assembly and installation.

Advanced Simulation and Computing.—The Committee recommends $610,738,000 for the activities with the Advanced Simulation and Computing program. This is an increase of $25,000,000 above the President's request. The Committee has provided an additional $12,000,000 for infrastructure improvements such as power, storage and visualization across the complex. The Committee has also reallocated funding targeted to subsidize the Department of Defense research program and applied it to support a joint NNSA and Office of Science high performance computing ef-

fort; $19,000,000 is reprioritized to support this initiative. The Committee expects the Department to complete work on this computing system before proceeding with other platform acquisitions. The National Nuclear Security Administration and the Office of Science both have major High Performance Computing [HPC] programs. These programs have provided national leadership in the development of HPC technologies and their application to stockpile stewardship and scientific discovery. To address emerging issues in the Nation's security, economic competitiveness and scientific leadership, advances in HPC need to be accelerated beyond what each office can accomplish individually.

The Committee expects the Department to continue to diversify it computing potential and bring together national laboratories, computer industries and universities to develop critical technologies for future supercomputing platforms. Important areas for research and development include advanced supercomputer architectures, new algorithms and system software to enable efficient use of emerging architectures, advanced interconnection network technologies and advanced memory subsystems technologies that keep pace with advances in microprocessors. The Department is directed to establish a joint program office lead by the NNSA Administrator and the Under Secretary for Science. This office will have the primary responsibility to ensure the sustained availability of a well balanced, and hence productive and highly scalable, computing platforms for the DOE and the Nation and will serve the missions of NNSA, the Office of Science and emerging economic competitiveness initiatives. Within this responsibility, the institute will develop and maintaining a long-range HPC roadmap and create the strategy and guidelines for competitive acquisition of supercomputer platforms for the DOE including pre-competitive HPC R&D. These supercomputers protect national security information and thus have demanding cyber security requirements. The Department is expected to support research and development efforts to ensure these systems are protected from cyber attack. The Department of Energy has requested $19,000,000 to be provided to the Department of Defense to subsidize the creation of its own high performance computing program. Since the Department of Energy plays such a minor role in this effort, the Committee recommends no funding be provided to the Department of Defense from either the Office of Science or the NNSA and instead use the funds to revitalize the Department's own R&D capability. The Committee is aware of several competitive ideas for increased computing capacity from several different technology providers. The Committee encourages the NNSA to ensure the three laboratories have sufficient computing capacity to support each of the laboratory missions well into the future.

The Committee supports the administration's request to provide $52,100,000 for the Roadrunner at Petaflop scale.

Pit Manufacturing.—The Committee recommends $256,316,000 to support the Pit Manufacturing mission, down $24,914,000. The Committee does not endorse the consolidated plutonium center and has not provided any funding for this activity. The NNSA, Nuclear Weapons Council and the Defense Department have failed to clearly articulate its vision for the stockpile and the explain how it will

utilize the proposed tools in the Complex 2030 plan to reduce the overall number of warheads as well as individual weapons systems.

Readiness Campaign.—The Committee recommends $161,169,000, as requested. The Committee understands that $12,400,000 in uncosted obligations remain available from the completed Tritium Extraction Facility (98D125000). The Committee has rescinded these available funds for use in other priorities in the weapons program. This still leaves sufficient funding for close-out activities.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

The Committee provides $1,659,248,000. This funding is used to support the operations and maintenance of the NNSA laboratories, productions facility, equipment purchases and personnel.

Operations of Facilities.—The Committee recommends $1,126,409,000 for this account. This funding level reflects a reduction of $32,896,000. Within this amount the Committee shifted $28,887,000 to the ICF Campaign in order to consolidate funding for operations of the Z machine. The Committee also recommends a reduction of $4,009,000 from the Institution Site Support activities. This cut is expected to be spread equally among all sites.

Program Readiness.—The Committee provides the requested amount of $71,466,000.

Material Recycle and Recovery.—The Committee notes this activity continues to have uncosted obligations. As such funding has been reduced by $5,000,000 to $64,962,000.

Containers.—The Committee recommends $19,184,000.

Storage.—The Committee recommendation included $25,133,000, a reduction of $10,000,000. According to the GAO, this activity also contains uncosted balances.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $352,094,000, an increase of $45,000,000. The Committee has provided this funding increase to make key investments in laboratory infrastructure and security needs.

Project 08–D–801, High Pressure Fire Loop, Pantex, Texas.—The Committee recommends $7,000,000, the same as the request.

—*08–D–802, High Explosives Pressing Facility, Pantex, Texas*.—The Committee recommends $25,300,000, the same as the request.

—*08–D–804, TA–55 Reinvestment Project, Los Alamos, New Mexico*.—The Committee recommends $6,000,000, the same as the request.

—*08–D–805, Classified Vaults, Los Alamos, New Mexico*.—The Committee recommends an additional $45,000,000 to demonstrate proposed super vault type rooms at Los Alamos to consolidate 142 existing vaults into 10 vaults. Consolidation of classified data will deploy advanced security technology to defeat both internal and external threats.

—*07–D–140 Project Engineering and Design, Various Locations*.—The Committee recommends $2,500,000, the same as the request.

—*07–D–220 Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility Upgrade Project, LANL, New Mexico*.—The Committee recommends $26,672,000, the same as the request.

—*06–D–140 Project Engineering and Design, Various Locations*.—The recommendation for this activity is $23,862,000, the same as the budget request.

—*06–D–420 NTS Replace Fire Stations 1&2, Nevada Test Site, Nevada*.—The Committee recommends $6,719,000, the same as the request.

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

—*04–D–125, Chemistry and Metallurgy Facility Replacement Project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico*.—The Committee recommends $95,586,000 for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Facility Replacement Project. The current authorization basis for the existing CMR lasts only through 2010, as it does not provide adequate worker safety or containment precautions. However, deep spending cuts implemented by the NNSA in the 2007 Spend Plan and a significant cut to the 2008 budget request will likely result in delays that will require the laboratory to continue operations in the existing CMR facility. Any further reductions below the $95,586,000 request, which is $65,000,000 below the proposed spend plan from the 2007 request, would stop all work on the Nuclear Facility and long lead equipment purchases and would result in the layoff of key design personnel. Attempting to reconstitute a new team at a later day would likely result in a new round of delays and cost increases. The NNSA's indecision regarding future facilities will also result in added costs, delays and keep workers in unsafe working conditions at least 2 years beyond the existing 2010 deadline. The Committee has not provided funding to initiate work on the new multibillion consolidated plutonium because the Defense Department has been unable to articulate a coherent policy and pit requirement for the stockpile.

—*04–D–128 TA–18 Criticality Experiments Facility [CEF], Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, New Mexico*.—The Committee recommends $29,455,000, the same as the request.

—*01–D–124 HEU Materials Facility, Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee*.—The Committee recommends $77,000,000, the same as the request.

Test Capabilities Revitalization Phase II.—The Committee is very concerned about the lack of funding for the Test Capabilities Revitalization Phase II located at Sandia National Laboratory. The NNSA has previously indicated its desire to upgrade this testing facility, but has failed to provide any funding in the fiscal year 2008 budget request. The Committee is concerned that this facility, which represents a single point failure in the complex and cannot be operated for much longer in this State. The Committee directs the Department to provide a report to the Appropriations Committee identifying the options for the recovery of this facility and the expected cost and timetable.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION

The Committee recommends $262,743,000 for Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization activities, a decrease of $31,000,000.

This program was developed to reduce the backlog of deferred maintenance of aging infrastructure facilities throughout the complex. The old facilities continue to be a drain on resources and should be demolished or disposed of as quickly as possible. The Committee recommends $200,023,000 to support the FIRP program and $62,720,000 to support construction activities as requested.

SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Committee recommendation for the Secure Transportation Asset program is $215,646,000 as requested. This organization provides an invaluable service that is responsible for the safe and secure transport of our nuclear weapons, weapons components and special nuclear material.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS INCIDENT RESPONSE

The Committee recommends full funding for the nuclear weapons incident response program. The Committee provides $161,748,000 as requested.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT AND OPERATIONS

The Committee recommends $17,518,000 as requested for long term stewardship responsibilities.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation for the Safeguards and Security program is $893,057,000, an increase of $12,000,000. The Committee is frustrated with the continued climb in funding for this activity and the constantly increasing demands for additional resources. Currently, the Department and laboratories spend over $1 billion on physical security costs. The ever increasing costs lies in the application of the Design Basis Threat, which is linked to manpower needs. The Committee continues to be concerned that the Department does not have a realistic threat assessment in which to accurately assign risk and allocate scarce resources. This view is based on the continued escalation of security costs around the complex that seem to have no ceiling. Therefore, the Committee recommends the National Academy of Sciences analyze how the Design Basis Threat is currently formulated along with the funding requests to meet these requirements and then build a comprehensive "probabilistic risk assessment" tool for comparison purposes and provide a report back to the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee expects the NAS to perform this evaluation for both the physical and cyber environments and to inform the Committee if the Department has identified the proper balance between the two activities.

Operations.—The Committee recommends $733,318,000, an increase of $12,000,000 to be used to complete the cyber security upgrades of the red network at Los Alamos. This funding will provide the interconnectivity and hardening to facilitate this complete transformation of the site and allow the diskless classified workstation program to come rapidly to full implementation. Operating costs for classified computing and media will drop to provide

annual savings that can continue to support world-class cyber security.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $57,496,000, as requested to support the following projects:

—*08–D–701 Nuclear Materials S&S Upgrade Project Los Alamos National Laboratory*.—The Committee provides $49,496,000 as requested.

—*05–D–170 Project Engineering and Design, Various Locations*.—The Committee recommends $8,000,000 as requested.

Cyber Security.—The Committee encourages this office to redouble its efforts to increase the level of cyber protection of national security data and help facilitate the deployment of new technology and red networks throughout the complex in order to better control classified data. Despite the constant and evolving cyber threat, the Committee is surprised that the rate of growth in cyber security has failed to keep pace with physical security demands. The Committee hopes the National Academy Study will shed some light on our best opportunity to defeat this growing danger.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes the following congressionally directed projects, within available funds. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects. The Committee provides $8,000,000 for North Dakota State University (Fargo) to support computing capability (Dorgan); $600,000 is provided to the Atomic Testing Museum in Las Vegas, Nevada, for operations and maintenance (Reid); $19,650,000 is provided to the Nevada Test Site for operations and infrastructure improvements (Reid); $1,000,000 is provided to Arrowhead Center at New Mexico State University to promote prosperity and public welfare in New Mexico through economic development (Domenici, Bingaman); $750,000 is provided to the National Museum of Nuclear Science and History in Albuquerque, New Mexico, for the museum site (Domenici); $3,500,000 is provided to the University of Texas in Austin, Texas, to complete the construction of the Petawatt Laser (Hutchison); $3,500,000 is provided to the Sandia Institute for Advanced Computing Algorithms, New Mexico, for high performance computing and advanced algorithm development (Domenici); $350,000 is provided to the University of Nevada-Las Vegas for in-situ nanomechanics (Reid).

Unused Carryover Balances.—The Government Accountability Office has conducted a review of the NNSA budget and found that $67,000,000 in unobligated carryover balances are available for reuse. The Committee has shifted these funds to support vital activities with the weapons accounts.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriations, 2007	$1,818,339,000
Budget estimate, 2008	1,672,646,000
Committee recommendation	1,872,646,000

NONPROLIFERATION AND VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends $322,252,000 for Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development activities, an increase of $57,000,000. The Committee is disappointed that the Depart-

ment of Energy has reduced the funding for this activity over the past 2 years, despite out year budget estimates that show additional needs. The Committee recognizes this program provides a critical tool to prevent against technical surprise from other nations. The Committee recognizes it is the capabilities developed by this program that enable the Federal Government to monitor, detect and verify clandestine efforts by other countries to hide or disguise their nuclear capability. This program also plays a critical role in the development of technologies that secure civilian nuclear technology and to provide international monitoring of enrichment, reprocessing and reactor operations. The Committee also believes innovations in detection equipment can provide port and rail cargo better screening facilities and provide the NNSA with greater capability to screen more cargo in a timely fashion, including the deployment of mobile portal detection systems. Of the funding provided, $17,000,000 is for Project 06–D–180, National Security Laboratory at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. In providing this funding the Committee accelerates half of the NNSA's fiscal year 2009 funding share for this facility. Acceleration of completion of this facility is driven by the Department of Energy's environmental cleanup of the Hanford 300 Area. The NNSA is urged to meet its commitments to this replacement facility and continue to work closely with the Office of Science and the Department of Homeland Security.

NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

For Nonproliferation and International Security, the Committee recommends $210,870,000, an increase of $86,000,000. These activities provide critical oversight capabilities to ensure compliance with international treaties and agreements to reduce and eliminate nuclear material that poses a proliferation threat. Within available funds, the Committee recommends $1,500,000 to New England Research in White River Junction, Vermont, for the Caucasus Seismic Network (Leahy).

International Fuel Bank.—The Committee recommends an additional $50,000,000 to provide the U.S. contribution toward the establishment of an International Nuclear Fuel Bank under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency, [IAEA]. The fuel bank would accept contributions from many nations and private contributors to operate a civilian nuclear fuel reserve for countries that agree to forgo the development of a domestic enrichment capability. This international reserve will protect countries from potential economic and political disruptions in the nuclear fuel supply. Before the U.S. contribution is made to establish this international reserve, the Department will negotiate the terms and conditions for participation and use of the fuel bank and certify to Congress that the conditions are acceptable. Sixty days following the congressional notification, and assuming no legislative action is taken to prevent the Department from proceeding, the Department is directed to make the appropriated contribution.

Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention.—The Committee recommends $28,000,000 for the Global Initiatives for Proliferation and Prevention. This is an increase of $8,000,000 to support international science collaboration. The Committee believes that the ef-

forts to engage both Iraqi and Libyan scientific institutions are unlikely to bear significant results and the Committee authorizes the NNSA to use these funds and others to develop stronger research ties with China.

Global Regimes.—The Committee recommends $10,126,000 for the Global Regimes program, an increase of $8,000,000. This additional funding shall be used by the Department to conduct an international ministerial-level conference on nuclear nonproliferation goals and objectives. The Committee encourages the administration to press for new multilateral options to address the spread of fissile material, equipment and technology, particularly with respect to international supplier rules, strengthened IAEA safeguards and physical protection requirements, bilateral and multilateral cooperation to support implementation UNSCAR 1540 and the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, and multilateral cooperative agreements on civilian nuclear technology.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS PROTECTION AND COOPERATION

The Committee recommends $391,771,000, an increase of $20,000,000. The fiscal year 2007 global war on terror supplemental enacted on May 25, 2007 provided additional funding to support efforts to secure special nuclear material. The Committee will closely follow the Department's efforts as it works off the amount of un-obligated balances as a result of the supplemental appropriation.

ELIMINATION OF WEAPONS-GRADE PLUTONIUM PRODUCTION

The Committee recommends $152,593,000, a decrease of $29,000,000. This nominal reduction is enabled by the fact that the Department has succeeded in raising this amount of funding from other countries such as United Kingdom, Canada, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Republic of Finland and New Zealand. The Committee provided the Department with the statutory authority in 2005 to apply international contributions to the program and continues to encourage the Department to find offsetting contributions that allows the Department to provide funding to other priorities.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The Committee recommends $609,534,000 as requested to support the Fissile Materials Disposition program. The Committee provides full funding to the Plutonium Disposition Program and expects the Department to proceed expeditiously with construction of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility a Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility. The Committee would note that the Department has also completed certification of the surplus pit shipping containers and are beginning to fabricate them. During the delay in the start of construction due to the 2007 joint resolution, the Department has undertaken a thorough review of all the options available in disposing of excess weapons-grade plutonium. Despite the increasing projects costs associated with the MOX facility, the Department has found the MOX path still offers the lowest cost and quickest path to disposal. The Committee expects the Department to focus on delivering this project at cost and on time.

Russian Program.—The Committee continues to wait for an final agreement with the Russian Government as to terms and conditions Russian intends to fulfill the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreements and dispose of 34 tons of excess Russian plutonium. The Committee is frustrated with the delay. The Committee is aware of the fact that more than $250,000,000 has been appropriated earmarked for Russia if they commit to a disposition pathway. The Committee directs the Department to rescind $57,000,000 in previously appropriated funds for the Russian program and apply it to the construction activities of the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility. This will increase that account from $333,849,000 to $390,849,000 for construction of the MOX facility on the currently validated baseline and schedule. The Committee is not backing away from the United States obligation to provide assistance to this program and will support future budget requests for the Russian program once the Russian Government commits to a specific disposal pathway that includes a cost-sharing arrangement and on a timetable consistent with the United States effort. Further, the plutonium discharged from the portion of the reactors used weapons plutonium must be less than the weapons plutonium loaded into these reactors, and any material eventually reprocessed from these operations should be mixed in such a way that any plutonium recovered is not weapons-grade. The Committee emphasizes the importance of reaching agreement with Russia quickly on a monitoring regime, so that disposition in those facilities that already exist can begin; it should not be difficult to reach agreement on measures that will confirm that weapon-grade plutonium is being dispositioned. The Committee is disappointed that the Department does not yet appear to have focused on (a) the measures needed to ensure that high levels of security are maintained throughout the disposition process in Russia, and (b) working with Russia to ensure that the disposition pathway chosen is expandable to handle much larger quantities of plutonium, should the two sides agree to disposition of much larger quantities (which the Committee believes would significantly enhance the national security value of this effort). In both cases, the needed measures will be more effective and less expensive if designed in from the outset. The Committee's future support for the Russian effort will be affected by the progress made in these two areas.

GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

The Committee provides $185,626,000 for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, an increase of $66,000,000 over the request. The program serves the important role of securing and reducing vulnerable nuclear and radiological materials located at civilian sites around the world. The program is central to our efforts to prevent the use of such materials in weapons of mass destruction and acts of terrorism.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2007	$781,800,000
Budget estimate, 2008	808,219,000
Committee recommendation	808,219,000

Through the Naval Reactors program, the National Nuclear Security Administration is working to provide the U.S. Navy with nuclear propulsion plants that are capable of responding to the challenges of 21st century security concerns. The Committee recommends $808,219,000 for the Naval Reactors program.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 2007	$340,291,000
Budget estimate, 2008	394,656,000
Committee recommendation	394,656,000

The Committee recommends $394,656,000 for the Office of the Administrator, the same as the President's request.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2007	$5,731,839,000
Budget estimate, 2008	5,363,905,000
Committee recommendation	5,690,380,000

For Defense Environmental Cleanup, the Committee provides $5,690,380,000, an increase of $326,475,000 above the President's request. This total includes $10,000,000 for Hazardous Waste Worker Training. The Committee recognizes the program's focus on project management and encourages the program to continue its disciplined approach to managing its projects under the Department's Project Management Order (DOE Order 413). Using this process, 73 percent (in terms of dollar value) of all near-term project baselines have been validated, and 96 percent of those baselines are operating within an acceptable performance range (plus or minus 10 percent). However, the program is only requesting sufficient funding to provide a 50 percent confidence that the objectives (cost, scope, and schedule) of its projects will remain unchanged. The Department's effort to complete clean up in the future will be challenged by the failure to request sufficient funding. More importantly, it is not enough to simply fund projects that have the greatest perceived reduction to public risk; the Department committed to the public that it would meet regulatory agreements too. The Committee expects future funding requests to include sufficient funding to meet that commitment.

Recently, the Office of Envirenmental Management's Leadership determined that a number of activities that were directed by the Congress in the past have merit, benefiting the cleanup program as well as the taxpayer. Activities such as the historic preservation activities related to the Manhattan Project sites, the Self-Reliance Foundation/Hispanic Communications Network, the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory, and the Western Environmental Technology Office have now been incorporated into the fabric of the EM Cleanup program. The Committee recognizes that this determination came too late to be included in the fiscal year 2008 request, but will be supported within available funds. The Committee expects these meritorious activities to be supported in fiscal year 2009 and future budgets.

Control Levels.—In fiscal year 2006, the Environmental Management Program's budget was restructured to better display site information, which paralleled its management of the program. However, Congress increased the number of congressional reprogramming control points from approximately 25 line items in fiscal year 2005 to nearly 100 in fiscal year 2006. This Committee understands and continues to support the need for site managers to have the flexibility to meet the changing requirements at the sites and recommends the following reprogramming control points for fiscal year 2008:

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

Internal Reprogramming Authority.—In fiscal year 2008, Environmental Management may transfer up to $5,000,000, one time, between accounts listed below to reduce health and safety risks, gain cost savings, or complete projects, as long as a program or project is not increased or decreased by more than $5,000,000 in total during the fiscal year. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or to change funding levels for programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the act or report. The Committee on Appropriations in the House 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:

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

Closure Sites.—The Committee includes $55,937,000, an increase of $13,500,000 above the request, to assure disposal of the Fernald Byproducts Waste. Miamisburg receives $30,308,000, Consolidated Business Center receives $11,834,000, and Ashtabula receives $295,000, all as requested.

Hanford Site.—The Committee includes $950,376,000, a total of $73,296,000 above the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of $23,000,000 for solid waste activities, $19,400,000 for soil remediation in the Central Plateau (U Plant & BC Cribs), Plutonium-Uranium Extraction Facility remedial investigation/feasibility study to meet Tri-Party Agreement milestones, $23,000,000 for the River Corridor Closure project to meet near-term milestones and continue the deactivation of critical facilities to meet mid-term compliance milestones, and the transfer and combination of $471,000 from the Office of River Protection to the Hanford Office for Community and Regulatory Support. The Committee also recognizes that the program has determined the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response [HAMMER] facility has merit to the needs of the cleanup program and is included in the Hanford budget. The program should separately provide funding for this activity in its fiscal year 2009 request.

Office of River Protection.—The Committee is frustrated that the Department of Energy continues to request inadequate funds for Tank Farm Activities. The safe operation of the tank farms, retrieval of waste and the closure of the tank farms is an increasingly important activity as the underground storage tanks are past their planned life expectancy. Additionally, DOE has selected a supplemental treatment technology as part of its overall treatment plan for low-activity waste but has requested no funds for the demonstration project for the past 2 years. The delay of the Waste Treatment Plant highlights the need to test, evaluate, and ultimately deploy alternatives for treatment of liquid tank waste instead of relying solely on one solution. To support a robust program the Committee provides an additional $53,000,000 for the Tank Farm Activities. Funding at this level will keep an experienced, well-trained workforce on the job, achieving real cleanup results. The Committee also transfers $471,000 from the Office of River Protection to the Hanford Office to consolidate the Community and Regulatory Support function in one place. The total for the Tank Farm Activities is $325,972,000. The Committee includes $690,000,000 for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant [WTP], bringing the site total to $1,015,972,000. A significant factor in establishing an annual funding level of $690,000,000 for this project was to moderate the Federal budget impact of significant year-to-year swings in actual construction costs by allowing for carryover of excess funds in years with lower costs to years where costs rise above the appropriation. Continued support for this funding level will provide both solutions to identified problems with the project as well as ramp up in construction.

Idaho Cleanup Project.—The Committee recommends $532,926,000, an increase of $28,900,000. The increase supports shipping legacy mixed low-level waste offsite for disposal at the Nevada Test Site; plant and equipment upgrades that will permit Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Plant to operate at capacity to meet Settlement Agreement milestones; and completion of the remote handled-transuranic waste shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant by the end of fiscal year 2008 to meet its operational

requirements (to emplace remote-handled waste prior to emplacing contact-handled waste in disposal rooms).

NNSA Sites.—The Committee recommendation is $361,663,000, a total of $90,533,000 above the request. The Committee recommends $222,000,000 for cleanup at Los Alamos National Laboratory, $82,533,000 above the request, of which $5,000,000 is to support environmental impact studies and environmental remediation to support land transfer activities from the Los Alamos National Laboratory to Los Alamos County. The increase is necessary to prevent the site from missing agreed upon cleanup milestones in fiscal year 2008, and will also enable the laboratory to undertake the necessary predatory work necessary to remain on schedule for fiscal year 2009. The Committee also provides $8,000,000 above the request of $81,106,000 for characterization and certification of remaining transuranic waste stored at Nevada for disposal at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. The Committees also includes $8,680,000 for Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, $1,511,000 for the NNSA Service Center, $27,585,000 for the Separations Process Research Unit, $12,411,000 for Pantex, and $370,000 for California Site Support, all as requested.

Oak Ridge Reservation.—The recommendation is $179,284,000, the same as the budget request.

Savannah River Site.—The Committee includes $1,200,090,000. Within the recommendation, the Committee provides $311,811,000 for the nuclear materials stabilization and disposition activity, the same as the budget request.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant [WIPP].—The recommendation is $250,739,000, an increase of $31,000,000 above the requested amount. The increase provides for equipment to maintain operational reliability, assurance of transuranic waste receipts at an average rate of 21 contact- and 5 remote-handled shipments per week, procurement of TRUPACT III shipping casks for large containers, and finally, monitoring and plugging of wells. The remaining funds are for Carlsbad educational support, infrastructure improvements resulting from of operations at WIPP and for construction of the WIPP digital records center, activities the Program found meritorious enough to support in fiscal year 2007.

Program Direction.—The Committee includes $309,760,000, consistent with the requested amount.

Program Support.—The Committee includes $41,946,000.

Safeguards and Security.—The Committee recommends $273,581,000, an increase of $200,000, which is for WIPP.

Technology Development and Deployment.—The Committee provides $55,106,000, which provides for additional research and development for High Level Waste retrieval, pretreatment and immobilization, and decontamination and decommissioning activities designed to reduce long-term costs.

The Committee recommendation includes the following congressionally directed projects, within available funds. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects. $3,000,000 is provided to the University of Nevada, Reno, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, for continued expansion of the James E. Rogers and Louis Weiner Jr. Large-Scale Structures Laboratory (Reid); $3,475,000 is

provided to the University of Nevada, Reno, Center for Materials Reliability (Reid); $1,500,000 is provided to Cellular Bioengineering, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii, to continue development of polymeric hydrogels for radiation decontamination (Inouye); $1,500,000 is provided to Cerematec Incorporated in Salt Lake City, Utah, for Remediation of Low-Level Nuclear Waste Utilizing Ceramic Ionic Transport Membranes (Bennett, Hatch); $1,000,000 is provided to Savannah River National Lab in South Carolina for Integrated Collaborative Prototyping Environment (Graham).

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

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2007	$636,271,000
Budget estimate, 2008	763,974,000
Committee recommendation	765,464,000

The Committee recommends $765,464,000 for Other Defense Activities.

HEALTH, SAFETY AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $429,348,000, including $100,043,000 for Program Direction. The Committee does not recommend a reduction of $990,000 of prior-year balances, as these funds were not received by the program due to the year long continuing resolution in fiscal year 2007.

The Office of Health, Safety and Security is the Department's central organization responsible for health, safety, environment, and security; providing corporate-level leadership and strategic vision to coordinate and integrate these programs. This Office provides the Department with effective and consistent policy, assistance, enforcement, and independent oversight activities. The integrated approach and functional alignment of responsibility alleviates overlap in reporting and provides consistency in policy and guidance while increasing the effectiveness of communication and accountability for worker health, safety and security.

The Committee directs the Office of Health, Safety and Security to allocate $16,500,000 from within available funds for the former worker medical screening programs. The Office of Health, Safety and Security is directed to initiate an early lung cancer screening program using helical low dose CT scanning for former workers at Fernald facility in Harrison, Ohio, and the Mound facility in Miamisburg, Ohio, who are at elevated risk of lung cancer. Additionally, the Office of Health, Safety and Security is to extend early lung cancer screening at the three gaseous diffusion plants in Portsmouth, Ohio, Paducah, Kentucky, and Oak Ridge (K–25), Tennessee, for those who have not previously been screened but are now eligible according to established eligibility protocols. Given that lung cancer screening program carried out at the three gaseous diffusion plants since 2000 has identified the majority of lung cancers at early stages where surgical intervention has been demonstrated to be successful, and studies indicate this has led to an

increase in survival rates, it is appropriate to extend lung screening to at-risk workers at the Fernald and Mound facilities.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends $159,063,000, the same as the request. This funding is in addition to $35,401,000 appropriated under the Energy Supply and Conservation appropriation of the Department. Funds are used to monitor closed cleanup sites and manage DOE property as well as manage the pension and benefit responsibilities of former DOE contractors employed by the closed sites.

Congressionally Directed Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes the following congressionally directed projects, within available funds. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects. $500,000 is provided to the Rocky Flats Cold War Museum in Colorado to recognize the work that went on at Rocky Flats and those who contributed to the history (Allard).

FUNDING FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES AT IDAHO

The recommendation is $75,949,000, the same as the request. This provides for Safeguards and Security of the entire Idaho National Laboratory, protecting both the Nuclear Energy and Environmental Management cleanup employees.

DEFENSE RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

For Defense Related Administrative Support, the Committee recommends $99,000,000, 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 $4,607,000 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 for any adjudicative proceedings that the Secretary may delegate.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2007	$346,500,000
Budget estimate, 2008	292,046,000
Committee recommendation	242,046,000

The Committee recommendation for the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management is $242,046,000. This total is $50,000,000 below the request.

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 2008.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2007	$5,602,000
Budget estimate, 2008	6,463,000
Committee recommendation	6,463,000

For the Southeastern Power Administration, the Committee recommends $6,463,000 the same as the budget request. The Committee provides $62,215,000 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, 2007	$29,998,000
Budget estimate, 2008	30,442,000
Committee recommendation	30,442,000

For the Southwestern Power Administration, the Committee recommends $30,442,000 the same as the budget request. The Committee provides $45,000,000 for purchase power and wheeling.

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

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

Appropriations, 2007	$232,326,000
Budget estimate, 2008	201,030,000
Committee recommendation	231,030,000

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

Commission. Western also operates and maintains a system of transmission lines nearly 17,000 miles long, providing electricity to 15 Central and Western States over a service area of 1.3 million square miles.

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

The Committee recommends $231,030,000 for the Western Area Power Administration. The total program level for Western in fiscal year 2008 is $755,911,000 which includes $62,915,000 for construction and rehabilitation, $53,271,000 for system power operation and maintenance, $475,254,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and $157,304,000 for program direction. The Committee recommendation includes $7,167,000 for the Utah Mitigation and Conservation Fund.

Offsetting collections total $312,639,000; with the use of $3,937,000 of offsetting collections from the Colorado River Dam Fund (as authorized in Public Law 98–381), this requires a net appropriation of $231,030,000.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriations, 2007	$2,665,000
Budget estimate, 2008	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, 2007	$221,902,000
Budget estimate, 2008	255,425,000
Committee recommendation	255,425,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2007	−$221,902,000
Budget estimate, 2008	−255,425,000
Committee recommendation	−255,425,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY					
Hydrogen Technology	193,551	213,000	228,000	+34,449	+15,000
Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D	199,687	179,263	244,000	+44,313	+64,737
Solar energy	159,372	148,304	180,000	+20,628	+31,696
Wind energy	49,319	40,069	57,500	+8,181	+17,431
Geothermal technology	5,000		25,000	+20,000	+25,000
Hydropower			2,000	+2,000	+2,000
Ocean Tech			8,000	+8,000	+8,000
Vehicle technologies	188,024	176,138	230,000	+41,976	+53,862
Building technologies	104,329	86,456	137,000	+32,671	+50,544
Industrial technologies	56,563	45,998	57,000	+437	+11,002
Federal Energy Management Program:					
Departmental energy management program					
Federal energy management program	19,480	16,791	23,000	+3,520	+6,209
Subtotal, Federal Energy Management Program	19,480	16,791	23,000	+3,520	+6,209
Facilities and infrastructure:					
National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)	24,035	6,982	6,982	−17,053	
Research Support Buildings					
NREL Solar equipment recapitalization					
NREL South-table Mountain infrastructure					
NREL energy systems integration facility					
Strategic investment facilities					
Construction:					
07–EE–01 Integrated biorefinery research facility, NREL, Golden, CO	20,000			−20,000	
06–EE–01 Research support facility Project–1 NREL, Golden, CO	63,000			−63,000	
02–E–001 Science and technology facility, NREL					
Total, Construction	83,000			−83,000	
Total, Facilities and infrastructure	107,035	6,982	6,982	−100,053	

Program Support	10,930	13,281	13,481	+2,551	+200
Program Direction	99,264	105,013	105,013	+5,749	.....
Total, Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation RDD&D	1,192,554	1,031,295	1,316,976	+124,422	+285,681
Federal energy assistance:					
Weatherization assistance	200,000	139,450	236,000	+36,000	+96,550
Training and technical assistance	4,550	4,550	4,550	.....	.....
Subtotal, Weatherization	204,550	144,000	240,550	+36,000	+96,550
Other:					
State energy program	49,457	45,501	55,000	+5,543	+9,499
State energy activities	9,348	.....	.....	−9,348	.....
Gateway deployment	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
International renewable energy program	9,473	.....	.....	−9,473	.....
Tribal energy activities	3,957	2,957	7,000	+3,043	+4,043
Renewable energy production incentive	4,946	4,946	5,000	+54	+54
Asia pacific	.....	7,500	.....	.....	−7,500
Congressionally directed technology deployments	.....	.....	91,025	+91,025	+91,025
Subtotal, Other	77,181	60,904	158,025	+80,844	+97,121
Total, Federal energy assistance	281,731	204,904	398,575	+116,844	+193,671
TOTAL, ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	1,474,285	1,236,199	1,715,551	+241,266	+479,352
ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY					
High temperature superconductivity R&D	47,000	28,186	40,242	−6,758	+12,056
Transmission reliability R&D	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Electricity distribution transformation R&D	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Energy storage R&D	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Gridwise	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Gridworks	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Visiualization and controls	25,054	25,305	25,305	+251	.....
Energy storage and power electonics	2,900	6,803	21,803	+18,903	+15,000
Distributed systems integration	24,189	25,700	30,700	+6,511	+5,000
Congressionally directed technology deployments	.....	.....	13,500	+13,500	+13,500
TOTAL, Research and development	99,143	85,994	131,550	+32,407	+45,556
Electricity restructuring	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Operations and analysis	20,500	11,556	19,500	−1,000	+7,944
Program direction	17,357	17,387	17,387	+30	.....
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY	137,000	114,937	168,437	+31,437	+53,500
NUCLEAR ENERGY					
Research and development:					
University reactor infrastructure and education assist	16,547	.....	15,000	−1,547	+15,000
Nuclear power 2010	80,291	114,000	135,000	+54,709	+21,000
Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative	35,586	36,145	55,000	+19,414	+18,855
Nuclear hydrogen initiative	19,265	22,600	22,600	+3,335	.....
Advanced fuel cycle initiative	167,484	395,000	243,000	+75,516	−152,000
Total, Research and development	319,173	567,745	470,600	+151,427	−97,145
Infrastructure:					
Radiological facilities management:					
Space and defense infrastructure	30,650	35,110	35,110	+4,460	.....
Medical isotopes infrastructure	15,634	14,964	14,964	−670	.....
Enrichment facility and uranium management	491	.....	.....	−491	.....
Research reactor infrastructure	.....	2,947	2,947	+2,947	.....
Oak Ridge nuclear infrastructure	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Radiological facilities management	46,775	53,021	53,021	+6,246	.....
Idaho facilities management:					
INL Operations and infrastructure	107,693	104,713	120,713	+13,020	+16,000
INL infrastructure:					
Construction:					
06–E–200 Project engineering and design (PED), INL, ID	6,030	.....	.....	−6,030	.....
06–E–201 Gas test loop in the ATR, INL, ID	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Idaho facilities management	113,723	104,713	120,713	+6,990	+16,000

Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	75,919	.....	75,949	+30	+75,949
Total, Infrastructure	236,417	157,734	249,683	+13,266	+91,949
Program direction	62,600	76,224	76,224	+13,624	.....
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy	618,190	801,703	795,507	+177,317	−6,196
Funding from other defense activities	−122,634	.....	−75,949	+46,685	−75,949
Funding from Naval Reactors	−13,365	.....	.....	+13,365	.....
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	482,191	801,703	719,558	+237,367	−82,145
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH					
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)	7,848	.....	.....	−7,848	.....
Program direction	19,993	.....	.....	−19,993	.....
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	27,841	.....	.....	−27,841	.....
OFFICE OF LEGACY MANAGEMENT					
Legacy management	33,187	35,104	35,104	+1,917	.....
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION	2,154,504	2,187,943	2,639,650	+485,146	+451,707
CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY					
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2005	257,000	.....	.....	−257,000	.....
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2007	−257,000	.....	.....	+257,000	.....
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2008	.....	257,000	257,000	+257,000	.....
Rescission, uncommitted balances	.....	−149,000	−149,000	−149,000	.....
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D (CCPI)	.....	−58,000	−73,000	−73,000	−15,000
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D (FutureGen)	.....	−108,000	−88,000	−88,000	+20,000
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D(Fuels & Power Systems)	.....	.....	−5,000	−5,000	−5,000
Total, Clean Coal Technology	.....	−58,000	−58,000	−58,000	.....
FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT					
Clean coal power initiative	60,433	73,000	88,000	+27,567	+15,000
FutureGen	54,000	108,000	88,000	+34,000	−20,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Fuels and Power Systems:					
Innovations for existing plants	16,015	.....	34,000	+17,985	+34,000
Advanced integrated gasification combined cycle	56,952	50,000	55,000	−1,952	+5,000
Advanced turbines	20,000	22,000	25,000	+5,000	+3,000
Carbon sequestration	100,000	79,077	132,000	+32,000	+52,923
Fuels	22,127	10,000	30,000	+7,873	+20,000
Fuel cells	63,352	62,025	65,025	+1,673	+3,000
Advanced research	32,868	22,500	33,000	+132	+10,500
U.S./China Energy and environmental center	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Fuels and power systems	311,314	245,602	374,025	+62,711	+128,423
Subtotal, Coal	425,747	426,602	550,025	+124,278	+123,423
Natural Gas Technologies	12,000	.....	20,000	+8,000	+20,000
Petroleum-Oil Technologies	2,700	.....	10,000	+7,300	+10,000
Program direction	129,803	129,973	149,962	+20,159	+19,989
Plant and Capital Equipment	12,000	.....	13,000	+1,000	+13,000
Fossil energy environmental restoration	9,715	9,570	16,570	+6,855	+7,000
Import/export authorization	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Advanced metallurgical research	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Special recruitment programs	656	656	656	.....	.....
Cooperative research and development	.....	.....	8,000	+8,000	+8,000
Congressionally directed technology deployments	.....	.....	39,900	+39,900	+39,900
TOTAL, FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	592,621	566,801	808,113	+215,492	+241,312
NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES	21,316	17,301	21,301	−15	+4,000
ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUNDS	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE	164,441	331,609	163,472	−969	−168,137
NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE	5,000	5,325	12,825	+7,825	+7,500
ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION	90,653	105,095	105,095	+14,442	.....

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP					
West Valley Demonstration Project	78,591	54,395	78,895	+304	+24,500
Gaseous Diffusion Plants	66,860	38,120	38,120	−28,740	.....
Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion, 02–U–101	52,179	.....	.....	−52,179	.....
Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility (WA)	34,843	10,342	10,342	−24,501	.....
Small Sites	117,214	78,080	78,080	−39,134	.....
Legacy management	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Use of Prior year balances	.....	.....	−10,000	−10,000	−10,000
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	349,687	180,937	195,437	−154,250	+14,500
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND					
Decontamination and decommissioning	536,806	553,509	573,509	+36,703	+20,000
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	19,800	20,000	.....	−19,800	−20,000
SUBTOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT D&D FUND	556,606	573,509	573,509	+16,903	.....
Uranium sales and barter (scorekeeping adjustment)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, UED&D FUND/URANIUM INVENTORY CLEANUP	556,606	573,509	573,509	+16,903	.....
SCIENCE					
High energy physics:					
Proton accelerator-based physics	374,733	389,672	389,672	+14,939	.....
Electron accelerator-based physics	104,127	79,763	79,763	−24,364	.....
Non-accelerator physics	59,865	72,430	79,430	+19,565	+7,000
Theoretical physics	56,407	56,909	56,909	+502	.....
Advanced technology R&D	156,654	183,464	183,464	+26,810	.....
Total, High energy physics	751,786	782,238	789,238	+37,452	+7,000
Nuclear physics	410,646	453,619	453,619	+42,973	.....
Construction:					
07–SC–02 Electron beam ion source Brookhaven National Laboratory, NY	5,000	4,200	4,200	−800	.....
06–SC–01 Project engineering and design (PED) 12 GeV continuous electron beam accelerator facility upgrade, Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator facility (was project 07–SC–001), Newport News, VA	7,000	13,500	13,500	+6,500	.....
06–SC–02 Project engineering and design (PED), Electron beam ion source, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY	120	.....	.....	−120	.....
Total, Nuclear physics	422,766	471,319	471,319	+48,553	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Biological and environmental research:					
Biological research	349,097	393,773	467,196	+118,099	+73,423
Climate change research	134,398	138,124	138,124	+3,726	.....
Total, Biological and environmental research	483,495	531,897	605,320	+121,825	+73,423
Basic energy sciences:					
Research:					
Materials sciences and engineering research	898,481	1,093,219	1,106,979	+208,498	+13,760
Chemical sciences, geosciences and energy biosciences	226,740	283,956	283,956	+57,216	.....
Subtotal, Research	1,125,221	1,377,175	1,390,935	+265,714	+13,760
Construction:					
08–SC–01 Advanced light source (ALS) user support building, LBNL, CA	.....	17,200	17,200	+17,200	.....
08–SC–10 Project engineering and design (PED) Photon ultrafast laser science and engineering (PULSE) building renovation, SLAC, CA	.....	950	950	+950	.....
08–SC–11 Photon ultrafast laser science and engineering (PULSE) building renovation, SLAC, CA	.....	6,450	6,450	+6,450	.....
07–SC–06 Project engineering and design (PED) National Synchrotron light source II (NSLS–II)	3,000	45,000	45,000	+42,000	.....
07–SC–12 Project engineering and design (PED) Advanced light source user building, LBNL	1,500	.....	.....	−1,500	.....
05–R–320 LINAC coherent light source (LCLS)	101,000	51,356	51,356	−49,644	.....
05–R–321 Center for functional nanomaterials (BNL)	18,864	366	366	−18,498	.....
04–R–313 The molecular foundry (LBNL)	257	.....	.....	−257	.....
03–SC–002 Project engineering & design (PED) SLAC	161	.....	.....	−161	.....
03–R–313 Center for Integrated Nanotechnology	247	.....	.....	−247	.....
99–E–334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	125,029	121,322	121,322	−3,707	.....
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,250,250	1,498,497	1,512,257	+262,007	+13,760
Advanced scientific computing research	283,415	340,198	334,898	+51,483	−5,300
Fusion energy sciences program	318,950	427,850	427,850	+108,900	.....

Science laboratories infrastructure:					
Laboratories facilities support:					
Infrastructure support	1,520	1,520	1,520	.....	.....
General plant projects	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Construction:					
07–SC–05 Physical science facilities, PNNL	10,000	.....	.....	−10,000	.....
07–SC–04 Science laboratories infrastructure project engineering and design (PED)	8,908	.....	.....	−8,908	.....
04–SC–001 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
03–SC–001 Science laboratories infrastructure MEL–001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	10,131	63,529	73,529	+63,398	+10,000
Subtotal, Construction	29,039	63,529	73,529	+44,490	+10,000
Subtotal, Laboratories facilities support	30,559	65,049	75,049	+44,490	+10,000
Oak Ridge landlord	5,079	5,079	5,079	.....	.....
Excess facilities disposal	6,348	8,828	8,828	+2,480	.....
Total, Science laboratories infrastructure	41,986	78,956	88,956	+46,970	+10,000
Safeguards and security	75,830	76,592	76,592	+762	.....
Workforce development for teachers and scientists	7,952	11,000	11,000	+3,048	.....
Science program direction:					
Field offices	95,716	104,193	104,193	+8,477	.....
Headquarters	70,753	80,741	80,741	+9,988	.....
Total, Science program direction	166,469	184,934	184,934	+18,465	.....
Subtotal, Science	3,802,899	4,403,481	4,502,364	+699,465	+98,883
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−5,605	−5,605	−5,605	.....	.....
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,797,294	4,397,876	4,496,759	+699,465	+98,883
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL					
Repository program	33,566	127,780	129,380	+95,814	+1,600
Program direction	65,640	74,674	74,674	+9,034	.....
Integrated spent fuel recycling	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	99,206	202,454	204,054	+104,848	+1,600
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH					
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)					
Program direction					
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH					
Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program administrative operations		8,390	8,390	+8,390	
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION					
Administrative operations:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Office of the Secretary	5,429	5,787	5,787	+358	
Board of Contract Appeals	147			−147	
Chief Financial Officer	38,044	40,260	40,260	+2,216	
Management	54,161	63,939	63,939	+9,778	
Human capital management	22,107	28,161	28,161	+6,054	
Chief Information Officer	39,172	47,502	47,502	+8,330	
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,813	4,762	4,762	−51	
Economic impact and diversity	5,477	5,649	5,649	+172	
General Counsel	23,202	30,076	30,076	+6,874	
Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation					
Policy and international affairs	15,054	18,948	18,948	+3,894	
Public affairs	4,493	3,860	3,860	−633	
Loan guarantee office	7,000			−7,000	
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	219,099	248,944	248,944	+29,845	
Program support:					
Minority economic impact	677	834	834	+157	
Policy analysis and system studies	389	625	625	+236	
Environmental policy studies	558	531	531	−27	

Climate change technology program (prog. supp)	501	1,066	1,066	+565	.....
Cybersecurity and secure communications	43,075	35,184	35,184	−7,891	.....
Corporate management information program	22,825	28,421	28,421	+5,596	.....
Subtotal, Program support	68,025	66,661	66,661	−1,364	.....
Competitive sourcing initiative (A–76)	2,464	1,770	.....	−2,464	−1,770
Total, Administrative operations	289,588	317,375	315,605	+26,017	−1,770
Cost of work for others	74,243	91,991	91,991	+17,748	.....
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	363,831	409,366	407,596	+43,765	−1,770
Funding from other defense activities	−86,999	−99,000	−99,000	−12,001	.....
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	276,832	310,366	308,596	+31,764	−1,770
Miscellaneous revenues	−123,000	−161,818	−161,818	−38,818	.....
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	153,832	148,548	146,778	−7,054	−1,770
Office of Inspector General	41,819	47,732	47,732	+5,913	.....
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES					
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES					
Life extension program:					
B61 Life extension program	58,302	63,115	63,115	+4,813	.....
W76 Life extension program	193,566	175,571	175,571	−17,995	.....
W80 Life extension program	12,491	.....	.....	−12,491	.....
Subtotal, Life extension program	264,359	238,686	238,686	−25,673	.....
Stockpile systems:					
B61 Stockpile systems	67,879	75,091	75,091	+7,212	.....
W62 Stockpile systems	2,075	2,153	2,153	+78	.....
W76 Stockpile systems	62,481	69,238	69,238	+6,757	.....
W78 Stockpile systems	38,667	38,991	38,991	+324	.....
W80 Stockpile systems	36,558	32,372	32,372	−4,186	.....
B83 Stockpile systems	24,412	25,012	25,012	+600	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
W84 Stockpile systems	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
W87 Stockpile systems	63,098	57,147	57,147	−5,951	.....
W88 Stockpile systems	41,024	46,713	46,713	+5,689	.....
Subtotal, Stockpile systems	336,194	346,717	346,717	+10,523	.....
Reliable replacement warhead	35,846	88,769	66,000	+30,154	−22,769
Weapons dismantlement and disposition	75,000	52,250	52,250	−22,750	.....
Stockpile services:					
Production support	258,722	284,979	284,979	+26,257	.....
Research and development support	68,245	33,329	33,329	−34,916	.....
Research and development certification and safety	194,998	181,984	181,984	−13,014	.....
Management, technology, and production	166,928	205,576	205,576	+38,648	.....
Responsive infrastructure	25,430	14,946	.....	−25,430	−14,946
Subtotal, Stockpile services	714,323	720,814	705,868	−8,455	−14,946
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,425,722	1,447,236	1,409,521	−16,201	−37,715
Campaigns:					
Science campaign:					
Primary assessment technologies	54,844	63,527	63,527	+8,683	.....
Test readiness	14,644	.....	.....	−14,644	.....
Dynamic materials properties	84,238	98,014	98,014	+13,776	.....
Advanced radiography	36,387	30,995	30,995	−5,392	.....
Secondary assessment technologies	80,345	80,539	80,539	+194	.....
Subtotal, Science campaigns	270,458	273,075	273,075	+2,617	.....
Engineering campaign:					
Enhanced surety	26,666	24,803	44,803	+18,137	+20,000
Weapons system engineering assessment technology	21,102	19,691	19,691	−1,411	.....
Nuclear survivability	15,962	8,813	8,813	−7,149	.....
Enhanced surveillance	87,533	80,614	80,614	−6,919	.....

Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), other project costs	4,603	7,630	7,630	+3,027	.....
Construction: 01–D–108 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM	6,920	11,198	11,198	+4,278	.....
Subtotal, MESA	11,523	18,828	18,828	+7,305	.....
Subtotal, Engineering campaign	162,786	152,749	172,749	+9,963	+20,000
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign:					
Ignition	78,827	97,537	97,537	+18,710	.....
Support of stockpile programs	5,872	.....	.....	−5,872	.....
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	45,959	67,935	58,792	+12,833	−9,143
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	9,584	10,440	10,440	+856	.....
University grants/other ICF support	12,186	.....	.....	−12,186	.....
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	.....	3,213	12,356	+12,356	+9,143
Facility operations and target production	53,796	86,083	132,970	+79,174	+46,887
Inertial fusion technology	26,412	.....	.....	−26,412	.....
NIF demonstration program	143,438	136,912	136,912	−6,526	.....
High-energy petawatt laser development	2,213	.....	.....	−2,213	.....
Subtotal	378,287	402,120	449,007	+70,720	+46,887
Construction: 96–D–111 National ignition facility, LLNL	111,419	10,139	10,139	−101,280	.....
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	489,706	412,259	459,146	−30,560	+46,887
Advanced simulation and computing	611,973	585,738	610,738	−1,235	+25,000
Pit manufacturing and certification:					
W88 pit manufacturing	152,709	155,838	155,838	+3,129	.....
W88 pit certification	55,536	45,999	45,999	−9,537	.....
Pit manufacturing capability	34,147	54,479	54,479	+20,332	.....
Pit campaign support activities at NTS	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Consolidated plutonium center: other project cost	.....	24,914	.....	.....	−24,914
Subtotal, Pit manufacturing and certification	242,392	281,230	256,316	+13,924	−24,914
Readiness campaign:					
Stockpile readiness	21,964	18,924	18,924	−3,040	.....
High explosives and weapon operations	19,256	9,835	9,835	−9,421	.....
Non-nuclear readiness	31,139	25,592	25,592	−5,547	.....
Advanced design and production technologies	51,609	33,587	33,587	−18,022	.....
Tritium readiness	77,745	73,231	73,231	−4,514	

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Construction: 98–D–125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	77,745	73,231	73,231	−4,514	.....
Subtotal, Readiness campaign	201,713	161,169	161,169	−40,544	.....
Total, Campaigns	1,979,028	1,866,220	1,933,193	−45,835	+66,973
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF):					
Operations of facilities	1,150,141	1,159,305	1,126,409	−23,732	−32,896
Program readiness	75,167	71,466	71,466	−3,701	.....
Material recycle and recovery	69,982	69,962	64,962	−5,020	−5,000
Containers	20,130	19,184	19,184	−946	.....
Storage	35,285	35,133	25,133	−10,152	−10,000
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,350,705	1,355,050	1,307,154	−43,551	−47,896
Construction:					
08–D–801 High pressure fire loop (HPFL) Pantex, TX	.....	7,000	7,000	+7,000	.....
08–D–802 High explosive pressing facility Pantex Plant, Amerillo, TX	.....	25,300	25,300	+25,300	.....
08–D–804 TA–55 Reinvestment project Los Almos National Laboratory (LANL)	.....	6,000	6,000	+6,000	.....
08–D–805 Classified Vault Los Almos National Laboratory (LANL)	.....	.....	45,000	+45,000	+45,000
07–D–140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	.....	2,500	2,500	+2,500	.....
07–D–220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	.....	26,672	26,672	+26,672	.....
06–D–140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	16,577	23,862	23,862	+7,285	.....
06–D–402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV	13,919	6,719	6,719	−7,200	.....
06–D–403 Tritium facility modernization Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA	7,926	.....	.....	−7,926	.....
06–D–404 Building remediation, restoration, and upgrade, Nevada Test Site, NV	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
05–D–140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	9,615	7,000	7,000	−2,615	.....
05–D–401 Building 12–64 production bays upgrades, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
05–D–402 Berylium capability (BEC) project, Y–12 National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN	7,494	.....	.....	−7,494	.....
04–D–103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	3,478	.....	.....	−3,478	.....
04–D–125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	53,422	95,586	95,586	+42,164	.....

04–D–128 TA–18 mission relocation project, Los Alamos Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	24,197	29,455	29,455	+5,258	.....
03–D–103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	14,161	.....	.....	−14,161	.....
01–D–103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	1,565	.....	.....	−1,565	.....
01–D–124 HEU materials facility, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	110,182	77,000	77,000	−33,182	.....
Subtotal, Construction	262,536	307,094	352,094	+89,558	+45,000
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,613,241	1,662,144	1,659,248	+46,007	−2,896
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	123,750	231,023	200,023	+76,273	−31,000
Construction:					
08–D–601 Mercury highway, Nevada Test Site, NV	.....	7,800	7,800	+7,800	.....
08–D–602 Portable water system upgrades Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	.....	22,500	22,500	+22,500	.....
07–D–253 TA 1 heating systems modernization (HSM) Sandia National Laboratory	14,500	13,000	13,000	−1,500	.....
06–D–160 Project engioneering and design (PED), various locations	2,700	.....	.....	−2,700	.....
06–D–601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	6,429	2,500	2,500	−3,929	.....
06–D–602 Gas main and distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,145	1,900	1,900	−1,245	.....
06–D–603 Steam plant life extension project (SLEP), Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN	17,811	15,020	15,020	−2,791	.....
05–D–160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program project engineering design (PED), various locations	1,048	.....	.....	−1,048	.....
05–D–601 Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y–12, National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
05–D–602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
05–D–603 New master substation (NMSU), SNL	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	45,633	62,720	62,720	+17,087	.....
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	169,383	293,743	262,743	+93,360	−31,000
Secure transportation asset:					
Operations and equipment	134,777	130,845	130,845	−3,932	.....
Program direction	74,760	84,801	84,801	+10,041	.....
Total, Secure transportation asset	209,537	215,646	215,646	+6,109	.....
Nuclear weapons incident response	133,514	161,748	161,748	+28,234	.....
Environmental projects and operations: Long term stewardship	.....	17,518	17,518	+17,518	.....
Safeguards and security:					
Defense nuclear security	656,653	721,318	733,318	+76,665	+12,000
Cybersecurity	104,505	102,243	102,243	−2,262	.....
Construction:					
08–D–701 Nuclear materials S&S upgrade project Los Almos National Laboratory	.....	49,496	49,496	+49,496	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
05–D–170 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	.....	8,000	8,000	+8,000	.....
Material security and consolidation project, Idaho National Lab, ID	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	.....	57,496	57,496	+57,496	.....
Subtotal, Defense nuclear security	761,158	881,057	893,057	+131,899	+12,000
Subtotal, Safeguards and security	761,158	881,057	893,057	+131,899	+12,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities	6,291,583	6,545,312	6,552,674	+261,091	+7,362
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−33,000	−34,000	−34,000	−1,000	.....
Transfer to Office of the Administrator	17,000	.....	.....	−17,000	.....
Congressionally directed technology deployments	.....	.....	37,350	+37,350	+37,350
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....	−67,000	−67,000	−67,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	6,275,583	6,511,312	6,489,024	+213,441	−22,288
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION					
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	262,467	265,252	305,252	+42,785	+40,000
Construction:					
07–SC–05 Physical Science Facility, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA	4,220	.....	17,000	+12,780	+17,000
06–D–180 06–01 Project engineering and design [PED] National Security Laboratory, PNNL	3,700	.....	.....	−3,700	.....
Subtotal, Nonproliferation & verification R&D	270,387	265,252	322,252	+51,865	+57,000
Nonproliferation and international security	128,911	124,870	210,870	+81,959	+86,000
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	472,730	371,771	391,771	−80,959	+20,000
Global initiatives for proliferation prevention	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
HEU transparency implementation	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	225,754	181,593	152,593	−73,161	−29,000

Fissile materials disposition:					
U.S. surplus materials disposition	159,273	148,842	148,842	−10,431	.....
Russian surplus materials disposition	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
U.S. uranium disposition	.....	66,843	66,843	+66,843	.....
Construction:					
99–D–141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	48,289	60,000	60,000	+11,711	.....
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	262,500	333,849	390,849	+128,349	+57,000
Subtotal, Construction	310,789	393,849	450,849	+140,060	+57,000
Total, Fissile materials disposition	470,062	609,534	666,534	+196,472	+57,000
Global threat reduction initiative	115,495	119,626	185,626	+70,131	+66,000
International nuclear fuel bank	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,683,339	1,672,646	1,929,646	+246,307	+257,000
Use of prior year balances—Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program	.....	.....	−57,000	−57,000	−57,000
Use of prior year balances—Fissile Materials Disposition MOX construction line	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances for Emergency Supplemental for fiscal year 1999 (H.R. 4328, Public Law 105–277)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Supplemental Appropriations—Public Law 110–28 (emergency).	135,000	.....	.....	−135,000	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,818,339	1,672,646	1,872,646	+54,307	+200,000
NAVAL REACTORS					
Naval reactors development	734,283	765,519	765,519	+31,236	.....
Transfer to Nuclear Energy	13,365	.....	.....	−13,365	.....
Construction:					
08–D–901 Shipping and receiving and warehouse complex (SRWC), BAPL	.....	9,000	9,000	+9,000	.....
08–D–190 Project engineering and design Expended Core Facility M–290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID	.....	550	550	+550	.....
07–D–190 Materials research technology complex (MRTC)	1,485	450	450	−1,035	.....
06–D–901 Central office building II	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Transfer to Nuclear Energy	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
05–N–900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY	1,287	.....	.....	−1,287	.....
Subtotal, Construction	2,772	10,000	10,000	+7,228	.....
Total, Naval reactors development	750,420	775,519	775,519	+25,099	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Program direction	31,380	32,700	32,700	+1,320	
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	781,800	808,219	808,219	+26,419	
Office of the Adminstrator:					
Office of the Administrator	340,291	394,656	394,656	+54,365	
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation					
All other Office of the Administrator					
HBCU contribution from NNSA					
Use of prior year balances					
ES & H transfer					
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	340,291	394,656	394,656	+54,365	
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	9,216,013	9,386,833	9,564,545	+348,532	+177,712
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP					
Closure Sites	468,063	42,437	55,937	−412,126	+13,500
Hanford Site:					
2012 Completion projects	425,204	413,038	443,463	+18,259	+30,425
2035 Completion projects	410,112	464,042	506,913	+96,801	+42,871
Total, Hanford Site	835,316	877,080	950,376	+115,060	+73,296
Office of River Protection:					
Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant	690,000	690,000	690,000		
Tank Farm activities	277,127	273,443	325,972	+48,845	+52,529
Total, Office of River Protection	967,127	963,443	1,015,972	+48,845	+52,529
Idaho National Laboratory: Operating expenses	495,904	391,226	420,126	−75,778	+28,900

Construction:					
06–D–401, Sodium bearing waste treatment project, ID	31,000	112,800	112,800	+81,800	.....
04–D–414, Sodium bearing waste treatment facility, PED ID	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	526,904	504,026	532,926	+6,022	+28,900
NNSA	306,509	271,130	361,663	+55,154	+90,533
Oak Ridge Reservation	203,862	179,284	179,284	−24,578	.....
Savannah River site:					
2012 Completion projects: Oerating expenses	244,626	.....	.....	−244,626	.....
Construction:					
04–D–423 Container surveillance capability in 235F	.....	31,000	31,000	+31,000	.....
04–D–414 Project Engineering and Design, 105–K	2,935	.....	.....	−2,935	.....
Subtotal, 2012 accelerated completions	247,561	31,000	31,000	−216,561	.....
2035 Completion projects:					
Operating expenses	300,524	495,071	495,071	+194,547	.....
Construction: 08–D–414 Project engineering and design Plutonium Vitrification Facility, VL	.....	15,000	9,000	+9,000	−6,000
Subtotal, 2035 accelerated completions	300,524	510,071	504,071	+203,547	−6,000
Tank Farm Activities: Radioactive liquid tank waste stabil & disposition	513,809	524,018	524,018	+10,209	.....
Construction:					
05–D–405, Salt waste processing facility	.....	131,000	131,000	+131,000	.....
04–D–408, Glass waste storage building #2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
03–D–414, Salt waste processing facility PED SR	51,500	10,001	10,001	−41,499	.....
Subtotal, Tank farm activities	565,309	665,019	665,019	+99,710	.....
Nuclear material Stabilization and Disposition	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Savannah River site	1,113,394	1,206,090	1,200,090	+86,696	−6,000
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant: Operating expenses	228,818	219,739	250,739	+21,921	+31,000
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	228,818	219,739	250,739	+21,921	+31,000
Program direction	294,516	309,760	309,760	+15,244	.....
Program support	38,031	33,146	41,946	+3,915	+8,800
Safeguards and Security	275,920	273,381	273,581	−2,339	+200
Technology development	21,389	21,389	55,106	+33,717	+33,717

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	452,000	463,000	463,000	+ 11,000	
Material consolidation					
Legacy Management					
Canyons and Pu Vitrification office					
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP	5,731,849	5,363,905	5,690,380	− 41,469	+ 326,475
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES					
Health, safety and security:					
Health, safety and security		329,305	329,305	+ 329,305	
Program direction		100,043	100,043	+ 100,043	
Total, Health, safety and security		429,348	429,348	+ 429,348	
Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance:					
Nuclear safeguards and security	196,546			− 196,546	
Security investigations	40,531			− 40,531	
rogram direction	76,818			− 76,818	
Use of prior year balances		− 990			+ 990
Subtotal, Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance	313,895	− 990		− 313,895	+ 990
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	60,304			− 60,304	
Program direction—EH	20,076			− 20,076	
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	80,380			− 80,380	
Office of Legacy Management:					
Legacy management	19,733	148,063	148,563	+ 128,830	+ 500
Program direction	11,202	11,000	11,000	− 202	
Subtotal, Office of Legacy Management	30,935	159,063	159,563	+ 128,628	+ 500

Nuclear energy:					
Infrastructure:					
Idaho facilities management	15,923	.....	.....	−15,923	
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	75,949	75,949	75,949	.....	.....
Subtotal, Infrastruture	91,872	75,949	75,949	−15,923	.....
Program direction	30,844	.....	.....	−30,844	.....
Subtotal, Nuclear energy	122,716	75,949	75,949	−46,767	.....
Defense related administrative support	86,999	99,000	99,000	+12,001	.....
Office of Hearings and Appeals	4,349	4,607	4,607	+258	.....
Subtotal, Other Defense Activities	639,274	766,977	768,467	+129,193	+1,490
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−3,003	−3,003	−3,003	.....	.....
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	636,271	763,974	765,464	+129,193	+1,490
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL					
Defense nuclear waste disposal	346,500	292,046	242,046	−104,454	−50,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	15,930,633	15,806,758	16,262,435	+331,802	+455,677
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS					
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance:					
Purchase power and wheeling	47,198	62,215	62,215	+15,017	.....
Program direction	5,602	6,463	6,463	+861	.....
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	52,800	68,678	68,678	+15,878	.....
Less alternative financing (PPW)	−14,485	−13,802	−13,802	+683	.....
Offsetting collections	−32,713	−48,413	−48,413	−15,700	.....
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	5,602	6,463	6,463	+861	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Revised enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Revised enacted	Budget estimate
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance:					
Operating expenses	5,604	11,978	11,978	+6,374	.....
Purchase power and wheeling	12,400	45,000	45,000	+32,600	.....
Program direction	20,782	22,214	22,214	+1,432	.....
Construction	3,612	4,300	4,300	+688	.....
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	42,398	83,492	83,492	+41,094	.....
Less alternative financing (for program direction)	.....	−877	−877	−877	.....
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	.....	−6,304	−6,304	−6,304	.....
Less alternative financing (PPW)	−9,400	−10,000	−10,000	−600	.....
Less alternative financing (Const.)	.....	−869	−869	−869	.....
Offsetting collections	−3,000	−35,000	−35,000	−32,000	.....
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	29,998	30,442	30,442	+444	.....
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance:					
Construction and rehabilitation	60,205	62,915	62,915	+2,710	.....
Operation and maintenance	45,734	53,271	53,271	+7,537	.....
Purchase power and wheeling	427,931	425,254	475,254	+47,323	+50,000
Program direction	147,748	157,304	157,304	+9,556	.....
Utah mitigation and conservation	6,633	7,167	7,167	+534	.....
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	688,251	705,911	705,911	+17,660	.....
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	−2,058	−11,971	−5,000	−2,942	+6,971
Less alternative financing (for Const.)	−17,177	−47,915	−30,690	−13,513	+17,225
Less alternative financing (for Program direction)	−5,054	−15,804	−10,000	−4,946	+5,804
Less alternative financing (for PPW)	−148,931	−166,552	−166,552	−17,621	.....
Offsetting collections (Public Law 108–477 and Public Law 109–103)	−279,000	−258,702	−308,702	−29,702	−50,000

Offsetting collections (Public Law 98–381)	−3,705	−3,937	−3,937	−232	.....
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	232,326	201,030	231,030	−1,296	+30,000
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND					
Operation and maintenance	2,665	2,500	2,500	−165	.....
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	270,591	240,435	270,435	−156	+30,000
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION					
Federal energy regulatory commission	221,902	255,425	255,425	+33,523	.....
FERC revenues	−221,902	−255,425	−255,425	−33,523	.....
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	24,228,203	24,762,713	25,898,485	+1,670,282	+1,135,772
(Total amount appropriated)	(24,093,203)	(24,911,713)	(26,057,485)	(+1,964,282)	(+1,145,772)
(Emergency appropriations)	(135,000)	.....	.....	(−135,000)	.....
(Rescissions)	.....	(−149,000)	(−159,000)	(−159,000)	(−10,000)

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 2008 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 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 311. The Committee has included a provision related to the Use Permit at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

Section 312. The Committee has included a provision related to Bonneville Power Administration.

Section 313. The Committee has included a provision related to the Strategic Petroleum Preserve.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2007	$64,858,000
Budget estimate, 2008	65,000,000
Committee recommendation	75,000,000

Established in 1965, the Appalachian Regional Commission is an economic development agency composed of 13 Appalachian States and a Federal co-chair appointed by the President. For fiscal year 2008, the Committee recommends the budget request of $75,000,000 for the ARC, of which $5,597,000 is for salaries and expenses and $64,087,000 is for area development and $5,316,000 is for local development districts.

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

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

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

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$21,914,000
Budget estimate, 2008	22,499,000
Committee recommendation	22,499,000

For fiscal year 2008, the Committee recommends $22,499,000, the same as the President's request, for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. This Board is responsible for evaluating the im-

plementation 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, 2007	$11,888,000
Budget estimate, 2008	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	12,000,000

For the Delta Regional Authority, the Committee recommends $12,000,000. The Delta Regional Authority was established to assist the eight State Mississippi Delta Region in obtaining basic infrastructure, transportation, skills training, and opportunities for economic development. The Government Accountability Office recently reported that the DRA has a commendable record in the percentage of funds spent in rural America, and the Committee recognizes the DRA's role in bettering this underserved area of the Nation.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2007	$49,509,000
Budget estimate, 2008	1,800,000
Committee recommendation	31,800,000

The Denali Commission is a Federal-State partnership responsible for promoting infrastructure development, job training, and other economic development services in rural areas throughout Alaska. For fiscal year 2008, the Committee recommends $31,800,000.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$816,639,000
Budget estimate, 2008	908,409,000
Committee recommendation	910,559,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2007	$659,328,000
Budget estimate, 2008	−757,720,000
Committee recommendation	−757,720,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2007	$157,311,000
Budget estimate, 2008	150,689,000
Committee recommendation	152,839,000

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for fiscal year 2008 is $910,559,000, an increase of $2,150,000 over the budget request. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $757,720,000 resulting in a net appropriation of $152,839,000.

The Committee provides an additional $2,150,000 to support enhancing foreign regulators' programs to enhance security over radioactive sources. The Commission should continue to coordinate

its efforts with those at the Department of State and the Department of Energy.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2007	$8,285,000
Budget estimate, 2008	8,144,000
Committee recommendation	8,744,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2007	$7,410,000
Budget estimate, 2008	−7,330,000
House allowance	−7,330,000
Committee recommendation	−7,870,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2007	$875,000
Budget estimate, 2008	814,000
Committee recommendation	874,000

The Committee recommends $8,744,000, an increase of $600,000 over the budget request. The additional funds will provide the Office of Inspector General with the necessary resources to provide effective oversight of the agency's new licensing activities while fulfilling its statutory responsibilities under the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, and the Federal Information Security Management Act of 1992. The Committee also recommends that the current no year authority of the Office of Inspector General be retained. The Office of Inspector General, as an administrative entity, is fully integrated into the administrative processes at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to include its accounting, pay, and travel system, as well as other infrastructure support systems. In addition, the proposed two year funding authority could limit the continuity of the Inspector General's oversight.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2007	$3,591,000
Budget estimate, 2008	3,621,000
Committee recommendation	3,621,000

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 2008, the Committee recommends $3,621,000.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Appropriation, 2007	.....
Budget estimate, 2008	$2,322,000
Committee recommendation	2,322,000

The Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects was established as an independent agency in the Executive Branch on December 13, 2006, pursuant to the

Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act of 2004. The Committee recommends $2,322,000, the same as the budget request.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2007	.....
Budget estimate, 2008	$15,100,000
Committee recommendation	.....

OFFSET FROM TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 2007	.....
Budget estimate, 2008	−$15,100,000
Committee recommendation	.....

The Committee recommendation does not include the administration's proposal to establish a congressionally funded Office of the Inspector General to oversee the Tennessee Valley Authority. In recent years, the TVA has funded the requests of the TVA–IG office out of power revenues and receipts. This process has worked well, and the Committee sees no compelling reason to change that mechanism for funding the TVA–IG.

GENERAL PROVISION, INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

The following general provision is recommended by the Committee.

Section 401. The Committee has included a provision related to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The following list of general provisions are recommended by the Committee.

Section 501. The provision prohibits the use of any funds provided in this bill from being used to influence congressional action.

Section 502. The provision addresses transfer authority under this act.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The Committee recommends funding for the following programs or activities which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 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;

Health, Safety and Security;

Non-Defense Environmental Management;

Office of Science;

Department of Administration;

National Nuclear Security Administration: Weapons Activities; Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation; Naval Reactors; Office of the Administrator;

Defense Environmental Management, Defense Site Acceleration Completion;

Other Defense Activities;

Defense Nuclear Waste Fund;

Office of Security and Performance Assurance;

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;

Power Marketing Administrations: Southeastern, Southwestern, Western Area; and

Energy Information Administration.

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on June 28, 2007, the Committee ordered reported en bloc: an original bill (S. 1745) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, science, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and authorized the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to offer the text of the Senate bill as a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House companion measure; an original bill (S. 1751) making appro-

priations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, and authorized the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to offer the text of the Senate bill as a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House companion measure; and H.R. 2764, making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; with each bill subject to amendment and subject to the budget allocations, by a recorded vote of 28–1, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Byrd	Mr. Brownback
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Johnson	
Ms. Landrieu	
Mr. Reed	
Mr. Lautenberg	
Mr. Nelson	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Stevens	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Craig	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. Allard	
Mr. Alexander	

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which

would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the Committee."

In compliance with this rule, changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italic; and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

TITLE 16—CONSERVATION

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 12A—TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

* * * * * * *

§ 831a. Membership, operation, and duties of the Board of Directors

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) Compensation

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(2) Adjustments in stipends

The amount of the [stipend under paragraph (1)(A)(i)] *stipends under paragraph (1)(A)* shall be adjusted by the same percentage, at the same time and manner, and subject to the same limitations as are applicable to adjustments under section 5318 of title 5.

* * * * * * *

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 oth-

erwise 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.

* * * * * * *

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.

* * * * * * *

RECLAMATION PROJECTS AUTHORIZATION AND ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1992, PUBLIC LAW 102–575

* * * * * * *

TITLE XXXV—THREE AFFILIATED TRIBES AND STANDING ROCK SIOUX TRIBE EQUITABLE COMPENSATION PROGRAM, NORTH DAKOTA

SEC. 3501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the 'Three Affiliated Tribes and Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act'.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 3507. STANDING ROCK SIOUX INDIAN RESERVATION.

(a) * * *

(b) SPECIFIC.—There is authorized to be appropriated, in addition to any other amounts authorized by this title, or any other law, to the Secretary of the Interior [$4,660,000] *$12,660,000* for use by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out irrigation projects for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1992, PUBLIC LAW 102–580

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS

SEC. 219. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(71) CORONADO, CALIFORNIA.—$10,000,000 is authorized for wastewater infrastructure, Coronado, California.]

(71) CORONADO, CALIFORNIA.—

(A) $10,000,000 is authorized for wastewater infrastructure, Coronado, California.

(B) The Federal Share may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs incurred by the non-Federal sponsor for work performed by the non-Federal sponsor before or after the execution of a project cooperation agreement, if the Secretary determines that such work is integral to the project.

(C) The Secretary is authorized to credit towards the non-Federal share of project costs the costs incurred by the non-Federal sponsor for work performed by the non-Federal sponsor before or after the execution of a project cooperation agreement, if the Secretary determines that such work is integral to the project.

* * * * * * *

YAVAPAI-PRESCOTT INDIAN TRIBE WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1994, PUBLIC LAW 103–434

* * * * * * *

TITLE VIII—MNI WICONI RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT

* * * * * * *

SEC. 813. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 10 of the Act (102 Stat. 2571) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) PLANNING, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION.—There are authorized to be appropriated $263,241,000 for the planning, design, and construction of the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System, the Rosebud Sioux Rural Water Supply System, the Lower Brule Sioux Rural Water Supply System, the West River Rural Water Supply System, and the Lyman-Jones Rural Water Supply System described in sections 3, 3A, 3B, and 4. Such funds are authorized to be appropriated only through the end of the year [2003] *2013*. The funds authorized to be appropriated by the first sentence of this section, less any amounts previously obligated for the Systems, may be increased or decreased by such amounts as may be justified

by reason of ordinary fluctuations in development costs incurred after October 1, 1992, as indicated by engineering costs indices applicable for the type of construction involved.

* * * * * * *

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.

* * * * * * *

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. 520. NAVAJO RESERVATION, ARIZONA, NEW MEXICO, AND UTAH.

(a) * * *

(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of activities carried out under this section shall be 75 percent. Funds made available under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) may be used by the Navajo Nation in meeting the non-Federal share of the cost of the activities. *The local match for the funds appropriated for flood plain delineation on the Navajo reservation in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah may be provided as in-kind services.*

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 594. OHIO.] ***SEC. 594. OHIO AND NORTH DAKOTA.***

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in **[**Ohio.**]** *Ohio and North Dakota.*

(b) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under this section maybe in the form of design and construction assistance for

waterrelatedenvironmental infrastructure and resource protection anddevelopment projects in [Ohio,] *Ohio and North Dakota,* including projects for—

* * * * * * *

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorizedto be appropriated to carry out this section [$240,000,000.] *$240,000,000 for Ohio and $100,000,000 for North Dakota.*

* * * * * * *

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004, PUBLIC LAW 108–137

* * * * * * *

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS-CIVIL

* * * * * * *

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS-CIVIL

* * * * * * *

SEC. 117. Section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 383; 117 Stat. 142) is amended—

* * * * * * *

(4) in subsection (h), by striking "2001—" and all that follows and inserting "2001 $25,000,000 for each of Idaho, Montana, [New Mexico, and rural Utah] *and New Mexico and $50,000,000 for Rural Utah*, to remain available until expended.".

* * * * * * *

TITLE II

* * * * * * *

GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 209. ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM. (a) Using funds previously appropriated, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, for purposes of improving the efficiency and expediting the efforts of the Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program Workgroup, is directed to establish an executive committee of seven members consisting of—

[(1) one member from the Bureau of Reclamation;

[(2) one member from the Fish and Wildlife Service; and

[(3) one member at large representing each of the following seven entities (selected at the discretion of the entity in consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service) currently participating as signatories to the existing Memorandum of Understanding:

[(A) other Federal agencies;

[(B) State agencies;

[(C) municipalities;

[(D) universities and environmental groups;

[(E) agricultural communities;

[(F) Middle Rio Grande Pueblos (Sandia, Isleta, San Felipe, Cochiti, Santa Ana, and Santo Domingo); and

[(G) Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District.

[(b) Formation of this Committee shall not occur later than 45 days after enactment of this Act.

[(c) Fiscal year 2004 appropriations shall not be obligated or expended prior to approval of a detailed spending plan by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

[(d) The above section shall come into effect within 180 days of enactment of this Act, unless the Bureau of Reclamation, in consultation with the above listed parties, has provided an alternative workgroup structure which has been approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.]

SEC. 210. TULAROSA BASIN NATIONAL DESALINATION RESEARCH FACILITY. (a) DESALINATION DEMONSTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT.—Pursuant to section 4(a) of Public Law 104–298; 110 Stat. 3622 (October 11, 1996), the Secretary may hereafter conduct or contract for the design, construction, [testing and operation] *and testing* of the Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Facility.

(b) The Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Facility is hereafter exempt from all provisions of section 7 of Public Law 104–298; 110 Stat. 3622 (October 11, 1996). The Federal share of the cost of the Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Facility may be up to 100 percent, including the cost of design, construction, operation, maintenance, repair and rehabilitation.

(c) The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with New Mexico State University for the operations, maintenance, and the administration of research activities undertaken at the Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Facility. Operation and maintenance shall occur at full Federal cost and title to the facility shall remain in the United States.

* * * * * * *

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005, PUBLIC LAW 108–335

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 345. The project for the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier, Illinois, initiated under section 1135 of Public Law 99–662, is authorized at a total cost of $9,100,000 with a Federal cost of $6,825,000 and a non-Federal cost of $2,275,000.]

SEC. 345. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the Barrier II project of the project for the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier, Illinois, initiated pursuant to section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a).

* * * * * * *

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005, PUBLIC LAW 109–58

* * * * * * *

TITLE IX—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

* * * * * * *

SEC. 999H. FUNDING.

(a) OIL AND GAS LEASE INCOME.—[For each of fiscal years]

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2017, from any Federal royalties, rents, and bonuses derived from Federal onshore and offshore oil and gas leases issued under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) and the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) which are deposited in the Treasury, and after distribution of any such funds as described in subsection (c), $50,000,000 shall be deposited into the Ultra-Deepwater and Unconventional Natural Gas and Other Petroleum Research Fund (in this section referred to as the "Fund"). [For purposes of this]

(2) STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE.—For fiscal year 2008 the Secretary of Energy shall direct not more than $25,000,000 from Federal royalties, rents, and bonuses described in paragraph (1) shall be used to carry out land acquisition activities for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve required under section 301(e)(1).

(3) DEFINITION OF ROYALTIES.—In this section, the term "royalties" excludes proceeds from the sale of royalty production taken in kind and royalty production that is transferred under section 27(a)(3) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1353(a)(3)).

* * * * * * *

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

* * * * * * *

* * * * * * *

[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) and the collaborative program long-term plan. In carrying out a study, survey, or assessment under this subsection, the Secretary of the Army shall consult with Federal, State, tribal and local governmental entities, as well as entities participating in the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program referred to in section 205 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2008. The Secretary of the Army may also provide planning and administrative assistance to the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program, which shall not be subject to cost sharing requirements with non-Federal interests.*

* * * * * * *

[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).]

* * * * * * *

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006, PUBLIC LAW 109–234

* * * * * * *

TITLE II

FURTHER HURRICANE DISASTER RELIEF AND RECOVERY

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

* * * * * * *

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction" for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricane Katrina and other hurricanes of the 2005 season, $549,400,000, to remain available until expended, of which up to $20,200,000 may be used to reduce the risk of storm damage to the greater New Orleans metropolitan area, at full Federal expense, by restoring the surrounding wetlands through measures to begin to reverse wetland losses in areas affected by navigation, oil and gas, and other channels and through modification of the Caernarvon Freshwater Diversion structure or

its operations; at least $495,300,000 shall be used consistent with the cost-sharing provisions under which the projects were originally constructed to raise levee heights where necessary and otherwise enhance the existing Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity project and the existing West Bank and Vicinity project to provide the levels of protection necessary to achieve the certification required for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program under the base flood elevations current at the time of this [construction: *Provided,*] *: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, in implementing projects and measures in the New Orleans metropolitan area required to achieve certification for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program as directed in Public Law 109–234 shall include all authorized features of the Southeast Louisiana Flood Control project and related internal pumping requirements as integral elements of the comprehensive protection system for the area and shall complete all authorized work for the Southeast Louisiana project concurrently and integrally with other area projects: Provided further,* That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006: *Provided further,* That $1,500,000 shall be for the North Padre Island, Texas project: *Provided further,* That $30,400,000 is available for flood control work in the Sacramento, California, Area: *Provided further*, That $2,000,000 shall be provided at full Federal expense for the Hawaii Water Systems Technical Assistance Program.

* * * * * * *

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 2008: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Mandatory	.....	.....	1	[1] 1
Discretionary	32,273	32,273	33,229	[1] 33,083
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2008	.....	.....	.....	[2] 19,905
2009	.....	.....	.....	9,152
2010	.....	.....	.....	2,747
2011	.....	.....	.....	203
2012 and future years	.....	.....	.....	98
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2008	NA	111	NA	19

[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 2007 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2007 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2007 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
Investigations	162,916	90,000	172,147	+9,231	+82,147
Rescission	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Emergency appropriations	8,165	.....	.....	−8,165	.....
Total, Investigations	171,081	90,000	172,147	+1,066	+82,147
Construction	2,336,368	1,523,000	2,059,474	−276,894	+536,474
Rescission	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Emergency appropriations	36,500	.....	.....	−36,500	.....
Total, Construction	2,372,868	1,523,000	2,059,474	−313,394	+536,474
Mississippi River and tributaries	396,565	260,000	375,000	−21,565	+115,000
Operations and Maintenance	1,973,347	2,471,000	2,291,971	+318,624	−179,029
Emergency appropriations	3,000	.....	.....	−3,000	.....
Total, Operations and Maintenance	1,976,347	2,471,000	2,291,971	+315,624	−179,029
Regulatory program	159,273	180,000	180,000	+20,727	.....
FUSRAP	138,672	130,000	140,000	+1,328	+10,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	.....	40,000	50,000	+50,000	+10,000
Emergency appropriations	1,561,000	.....	.....	−1,561,000	.....
Total, Flood control and coastal emergencies	1,561,000	40,000	50,000	−1,511,000	+10,000
Expenses	167,250	177,000	175,000	+7,750	−2,000
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	3,979	.....	4,500	+521	+4,500

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2007 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2007 appropriation	Budget estimate
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	6,947,035	4,871,000	5,448,092	−1,498,943	+577,092
Appropriations	(5,338,370)	(4,871,000)	(5,448,092)	(+109,722)	(+577,092)
Emergency appropriations	(1,608,665)	.....	.....	(−1,608,665)	.....
Rescissions	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	31,351	40,404	40,404	+9,053	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	937	976	976	+39	.....
Subtotal	32,288	41,380	41,380	+9,092	.....
Program oversight and administration	1,732	1,620	1,620	−112	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	34,020	43,000	43,000	+8,980	.....
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	878,623	816,197	950,106	+71,483	+133,909
Emergency appropriations	18,000	.....	.....	−18,000	.....
Total, Water and related resources	896,623	816,197	950,106	+53,483	+133,909
Central Valley project restoration fund	52,150	59,122	51,622	−528	−7,500
California Bay-Delta restoration	36,648	31,750	40,750	+4,102	+9,000
Policy and administration	57,575	58,811	58,811	+1,236	.....
Legislative proposal SJRRF	.....	−7,500	.....	.....	+7,500
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	1,042,996	958,380	1,101,289	+58,293	+142,909
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	1,077,016	1,001,380	1,144,289	+67,273	+142,909

Appropriations	(1,059,016)	(1,001,380)	(1,144,289)	(+85,273)	(+142,909)
Emergency Appropriations	(18,000)	.....	.....	(−18,000)	.....
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Programs					
Energy efficiency and renewable energy	1,474,285	1,236,199	1,715,551	+241,266	+479,352
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	137,000	114,937	168,437	+31,437	+53,500
Nuclear energy	482,191	801,703	720,558	+238,367	−81,145
(Reallocation from Energy supply and conservation)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Reallocation from Nuclear nonproliferation)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Office of Legacy Management	33,187	35,104	35,104	+1,917	.....
Clean coal technology:					
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2005	257,000	.....	.....	−257,000	.....
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2007	−257,000	.....	.....	+257,000	.....
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2008	.....	257,000	257,000	+257,000	.....
Deferral of unobligated balances, fiscal year 2009	.....	.....	−149,000	−149,000	−149,000
Rescission, uncommitted balances	.....	−149,000	.....	.....	+149,000
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D	.....	−166,000	−166,000	−166,000	.....
Total, Clean coal technology	.....	−58,000	−58,000	−58,000	.....
Fossil Energy Research and Development	592,621	400,801	642,113	+49,492	+241,312
Transfer from Clean Coal Technology	.....	166,000	166,000	+166,000	.....
Subtotal, Fossil Energy Research and Development	592,621	566,801	808,113	+215,492	+241,312
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	21,316	17,301	21,301	−15	+4,000
Strategic petroleum reserve	164,441	331,609	163,472	−969	−168,137
Northeast home heating oil reserve	5,000	5,325	12,825	+7,825	+7,500
Energy Information Administration	90,653	105,095	105,095	+14,442	.....
Non-defense environmental clean up	349,687	180,937	195,437	−154,250	+14,500
(Reallocation from Energy supply and conservation)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	556,606	573,509	573,509	+16,903	.....
Science	3,797,294	4,397,876	4,496,759	+699,465	+98,883
Nuclear Waste Disposal	99,206	202,454	204,054	+104,848	+1,600
Environment, safety and health (Reallocation from Energy supply and conservation)	27,841	.....	.....	−27,841	.....
Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program	.....	8,390	8,390	+8,390	.....
Departmental administration	276,832	310,366	308,596	+31,764	−1,770

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2007 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2007 appropriation	Budget estimate
Miscellaneous revenues	−123,000	−161,818	−161,818	−38,818	.....
Net appropriation	153,832	148,548	146,778	−7,054	−1,770
Office of the Inspector General	41,819	47,732	47,732	+5,913	.....
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	6,275,583	6,511,312	6,489,024	+213,441	−22,288
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,683,339	1,672,646	1,872,646	+189,307	+200,000
(Reallocation to Nuclear energy)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Emergency appropriations	135,000	.....	.....	−135,000	.....
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,818,339	1,672,646	1,872,646	+54,307	+200,000
Naval reactors	781,800	808,219	808,219	+26,419	.....
Office of the Administrator	340,291	394,656	394,656	+54,365	.....
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	9,216,013	9,386,833	9,564,545	+348,532	+177,712
Defense environmental cleanup	5,731,839	5,363,905	5,690,380	−41,459	+326,475
Other defense activities	636,271	763,974	765,464	+129,193	+1,490
Defense nuclear waste disposal	346,500	292,046	242,046	−104,454	−50,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	15,930,623	15,806,758	16,262,435	+331,812	+455,677
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	38,315	54,876	54,876	+16,561	.....
Offsetting collection	−32,713	−48,413	−48,413	−15,700	.....
Subtotal, O&M, Southeastern Power Administration	5,602	6,463	6,463	+861	.....

Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	32,998	65,442	65,442	+32,444	.....
Offsetting collection	−3,000	−35,000	−35,000	−32,000	.....
Subtotal, O&M, Southwestern Power Administration	29,998	30,442	30,442	+444	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	515,031	463,669	493,669	−21,362	+30,000
Offsetting collection	−279,000	−258,702	−262,639	+16,361	−3,937
Offsettting collection Colorado River Dam Fund	−3,705	−3,937	.....	+3,705	+3,937
Subtotal, O&M, Western Area Power Administration	232,326	201,030	231,030	−1,296	+30,000
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,665	2,500	2,500	−165	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	270,591	240,435	270,435	−156	+30,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	221,902	255,425	255,425	+33,523	.....
Revenues applied	−221,902	−255,425	−255,425	−33,523	.....
Total, title III, Department of Energy	24,228,193	24,762,713	25,897,985	+1,669,792	+1,135,272
Appropriations	(24,093,193)	(24,654,713)	(25,789,985)	(+1,696,792)	(+1,135,272)
Emergency appropriations	(135,000)	.....	.....	(−135,000)	.....
Rescissions	.....	(−149,000)	.....	.....	(+149,000)
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	64,858	65,000	75,000	+10,142	+10,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	21,914	22,499	22,499	+585	.....
Delta Regional Authority	11,888	6,000	12,000	+112	+6,000
Denali Commission	49,509	1,800	31,800	−17,709	+30,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	816,639	908,409	910,559	+93,920	+2,150
Revenues	−659,328	−757,720	−757,720	−98,392	.....
Subtotal	157,311	150,689	152,839	−4,472	+2,150
Office of Inspector General	8,285	8,144	8,744	+459	+600
Revenues	−7,410	−7,330	−7,870	−460	−540
Subtotal	875	814	874	−1	+60

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2007 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2007 appropriation	Budget estimate
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	158,186	151,503	153,713	−4,473	+2,210
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,591	3,621	3,621	+30	.....
Tennessee Valley Authority: Office of Inspector General	.....	15,000	.....	.....	−15,000
Offset	.....	−15,000	.....	.....	+15,000
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects	.....	2,322	2,322	+2,322	.....
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	309,946	252,745	300,955	−8,991	+48,210
Grand total	32,562,190	30,887,838	32,791,321	+229,131	+1,903,483
Appropriations	(30,800,525)	(31,036,838)	(32,791,321)	(+1,990,796)	(+1,754,483)
Emergency appropriations	(1,761,665)	.....	.....	(−1,761,665)	.....
Rescission	.....	(−149,000)	.....	.....	(+149,000)