AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Calendar No. 514

107TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | SENATE | REPORT 107–220

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 2003

JULY 24, 2002.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2784]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 2784) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2003

Budget estimates considered by Senate	$25,797,357,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	26,785,991,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Above the budget estimate, 2003	988,634,000
Over enacted bill, 2002	1,126,032,000

80–912 PDF

CONTENTS

TITLE I

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Page
General investigations 10
Construction, general 24
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries 40
Operation and maintenance, general 42
Regulatory program 63
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program 64
General expenses 64

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:
Central Utah project completion account 67
Bureau of Reclamation: Water and related resources 67
Central Valley project restoration fund 76
California bay-delta restoration 76
Policy and administration 77

TITLE III

Department of Energy:
Energy Supply 79
Renewable energy resources 79
Nuclear energy programs 83
Environment, safety, and health 86
Energy support activities 86
Energy supply infrastructure 86
Environmental management (nondefense) 87
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation 88
Nuclear waste fund 88
Science 89
High energy physics 90
Nuclear physics 90
Biological and environmental research 90
Basic energy sciences 91
Fusion energy sciences 92
Departmental administration 92
Miscellaneous revenues 92
Inspector General 92
Atomic energy defense activities:
National Nuclear Security Administration:
Weapon activities 93
Defense nuclear nonproliferation 102
Naval reactors 106
Office of the Administrator 106
Other defense related activities:
Defense environmental restoration and waste management 107
Defense facilities closure projects 114
Defense environmental management privatization 114
Other defense activities 114
Defense nuclear waste disposal 118
Power marketing administrations:
Operations and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration 120

Page

Department of Energy—Continued
Power marketing administrations—Continued
Operations and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration 120
Construction, rehabilitation, operations and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration 120
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 121
General provisions 132

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:
Appalachian Regional Commission 134
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 134
Delta Regional Authority 135
Denali Commission 135
Nuclear Regulatory Commission 136
Office of Inspector General 137
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board 137

TITLE V

General provisions 138
Compliance with paragraph 7, rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate 139
Compliance with paragraph 7(c), rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate 139
Compliance with paragraph 12, rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate 140
Budgetary impact statement 141

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2003 beginning October 1, 2002, and ending September 30, 2003, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, Delta Regional Authority, Denali Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 2003 budget estimates for the bill total $25,510,881,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $26,299,915,000. This is $788,634,000 above the budget estimates and $1,129,556,000 over the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

The bill, as recommended, is in compliance with the subcommittee allocation agreed to by the Committee and entered into the Congressional Record on June 28, 2002.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $15,775,217,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Weapon activities	$6,108,959,000
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,115,630,000
Naval reactors	706,790,000
Other defense activities	537,664,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	5,406,532,000
Defense facilities closure projects	1,125,314,000
Defense environmental privatization	158,399,000

ENERGY SUPPLY

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $815,306,000 for energy research programs including:

Renewable energy resources	$448,062,000
Nuclear energy	323,608,000

NONDEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

An appropriation of $176,000,000 is recommended for nondefense environmental management activities of the Department of Energy.

SCIENCE

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $3,329,456,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$729,980,000
Nuclear physics	387,370,000
Basic energy sciences	1,044,600,000
Biological and environmental R&D	531,215,000
Fusion energy sciences	259,310,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $909,584,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission	$74,400,000
Delta Regional Authority	15,000,000
Denali Commission	50,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	192,000,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	578,184,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Corps of Engineers:	
General Investigations	$148,304,000
Construction, General	1,745,102,000
Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries	337,937,000
Operation and Maintenance, General	1,956,182,000
Regulatory Program	144,252,000
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	140,298,000
General Expenses	155,651,000
Central Utah Project Completion Account	36,228,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
Water and Related resources	919,921,000
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund	48,904,000
Policy and Administration	54,870,000

The Committee has recommended appropriations totaling approximately $5,640,330,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

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

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

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

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

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

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held four sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2003 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

Although it is the policy of the subcommittee to receive oral and written testimony from representatives of all of the major Department and Agencies within its jurisdiction, the Army Corps of Engineers provided written testimony only. The administration fired Mike Parker, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, early in the week in which the Army Corps of Engineers hearing was scheduled to take place. Given the confusion and controversy surrounding Mr. Parker's dismissal, the subcommittee elected to accept written testimony in lieu of an oral statement from a lower level appointee in an acting capacity.

In addition, the subcommittee received numerous statements and letters from Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life throughout the United States. Information, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 2003 therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of 29 to 0 the Committee on July 24, 2002, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

ACCRUAL FUNDING OF RETIREMENT COSTS AND POST-RETIREMENT HEALTH BENEFITS

The President's Budget included a legislative proposal under the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs to charge to individual agencies, starting in fiscal year 2003, the fully accrued costs related to retirement benefits of Civil Service Retirement System employees and retiree health benefits for all civilian employees. The Budget also requested an additional dollar amount in each affected discretionary account to cover these accrued costs.

The authorizing committee has not acted on this legislation, therefore the Senate Appropriations Committee has reduced the dollar amounts of the President's request shown in the "Comparative Statement of New Budget Authority Request and Amounts Recommended in the Bill", as well as in other tables in this report, to exclude the accrual funding proposal.

The Committee further notes that administration proposals requiring legislative action by the authorizing committees of Congress are customarily submitted in the budget as separate schedules apart from the regular appropriations requests. Should such a proposal be enacted, a budget amendment formally modifying the President's appropriation request for discretionary funding is subsequently transmitted to the Congress.

The Senate Appropriations Committee joins with the House Appropriations Committee in raising concern that this practice, which has always worked effectively for both Congress and past administrations, was not followed for the accrual funding proposal. In this case, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) decided to include accrual amounts in the original discretionary appropriations language request. These amounts are based on legislation that has yet to be considered and approved by the appropriate committees of Congress. This led to numerous misunderstandings both inside and outside of Congress of what was the "true" President's budget request. The Committee believes that, in the future, OMB should follow long-established procedures with respect to discretionary spending proposals that require legislative action.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The Committee remains concerned about the level of the budget requests for the water resources programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The budget request for fiscal year 2003 is about $600,000,000 less when comparably compared to the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2002. The budget request is extraordinarily unbalanced. Four projects account for 30 percent of the proposed Construction, General budget with the remainder of the projects severely underfunded. The proposed General Investigations budget, which provides funding for studies of water resources needs, is decimated. Only studies in their final year were adequately funded, the remainder were severely underfunded. The proposed Operations and Maintenance budget appears to show an increase, however, when accounting for inflation and a proposed funding transfer that is unlikely to be enacted, the final total is less than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2002. The budget proposed for the Mississippi River and Tributaries project, is equally inadequate.

If the proposed budget request were enacted, the Corps would be forced to terminate on-going construction contracts costing the government some $200,000,000 in termination fees. One of the many examples from the proposed budget involves the Southeast Louisiana project. The budget request proposed $20,083,000 for this project, yet approximately $20,000,000 in additional funding is required in fiscal year 2003 just to keep from terminating work started in fiscal year 2002. If approximately $41,000,000 were appropriated, contract terminations could be avoided, however, no new construction work could be started, and tens of thousands of peoples lives would be at risk from flooding for an additional year.

As has been the practice for the last several years, the budget proposal contained no new discretionary study or construction "starts". The budget proposal stated that this was done in order to only fund the backlog of on-going work (estimated at $21,000,000,000 in the budget proposal) and that within 10 years, this backlog would be reduced to zero. Followed to conclusion, that would mean that within 10 years the Corps would only be an operation and maintenance agency to oversee past constructed work. Since there are no other nationwide agencies that address water resource problems and needs, one can only assume that all water resource problems will be solved in the next 10 years or that the Federal Government intends to no longer fund water resource development.

The Committee does not share the views in the budget proposal and remains concerned about the huge and increasing backlog of infrastructure development, maintenance, and repair over which the Corps has jurisdiction. The proposed budget causes the backlog of unconstructed projects to increase from $40,000,000,000 to $44,000,000,000 and ignores an accelerating critical maintenance backlog which increases from $702,000,000 to $884,000,000. This maintenance backlog will soon become entirely unmanageable under the weight of an aging and crumbling inventory. Proposing no new study or discretionary construction starts, underfunding ongoing projects, and providing minimal O&M funding for completed projects leads the Committee to believe that the budget preparation may have been influenced by very narrow interest groups as opposed to providing for a robust national water resources development program. The situation that the proposed budget poses to the Nation's economy and quality of life leave the Committee no option but to step forward in support of these vital projects.

The Committee recommendation for the Corps of Engineers totals $4,647,953,000. This is $474,999,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 2003, and is $22,857,000 above the appropriation for the current year.

BUILDING AND SITE SECURITY

Given the events of September 11, 2001, there has been a recognition for the need of improved security at the nation's infrastructure. The Committee is aware of the increased costs all Federal agencies are beginning to realize. Therefore, the Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to utilize technology that is presently available in both the private and public sector as it evaluates its future infrastructure security needs.

BUDGET CONSTRAINTS

The budget allocation for non-Defense discretionary programs contained in the Energy and Water Development bill for fiscal year 2003 are constrained below what is necessary for a robust, balanced national water resources program. Faced with these budget realities, the Committee has had to make tough decisions and choices in the development of the Corps of Engineers' budget request for fiscal year 2003. However, while the budget resources for non-Defense discretionary programs have remained flat or have declined in real terms, the number of requests of the Committee continue to increase. This year the Committee received more than 1,200 requests for funding for water projects within the Corps' Civil Works program. Many supported the funding level in the budget request, but a majority of the requests made of the Committee sought increases over the budgeted amounts or items not contained in the President's budget for fiscal year 2003.

BASIS OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

In development of the fiscal year 2003 funding recommendation for the Corps of Engineers, the Committee is not able to include any new construction starts, and has recommended only a limited number of new study starts in an effort to restore balance to the

water resource program of the Corps, and to address high priority requests made to the Committee. The limited resources available have been focused on on-going projects where the Corps has contractual commitments. While the Committee has not been able to fund all projects at the optimum level, it has endeavored to provide sufficient funding on each project to mitigate delays and increased costs, to the greatest extent possible, across the entire Corps' Civil Works program. Finally, the Committee received numerous requests to include project authorizations in the energy and water development appropriations bill. In an effort to support and honor congressional authorizing committees jurisdiction, the Committee has not included new project authorizations

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2002	$154,350,000
Budget estimate, 2003	102,483,000
Committee recommendation	148,304,000

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

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
ALABAMA				
ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL	300		300	
BALDWIN COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, AL	100		100	
BALDWIN COUNTY WATERSHEDS, AL	100		100	
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	50		50	
BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL	150		150	
CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL	50		50	
DOG RIVER, AL	150		150	
TUSCALOOSA COUNTY, AL	50		50	
VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	250		250	
ALASKA				
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK		200		350
ALASKA REGION PORTS, AK			100	
ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK	50		50	
ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK	50		100	
ANIAK HARBOR, AK	50		100	
BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	200		200	
CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	50		50	
COFFMAN COVE, AK			100	
DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK	150		500	
EKLUTNA WATERSHEAD, AK			100	
FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK		25		25
FIRE ISLAND CAUSEWAY, AK			100	
HAINES HARBOR, AK		115		400
HOMER HARBOR, AK			200	
KAKTOVIK BEACH EROSION, AK			100	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
KENAI RIVER BLUFF EROSION STUDY, AK			185	
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK	50		50	
KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	50		50	
LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK	115		115	
MATANUSKA EROSION STUDY, AK			100	
MCGRATH BANK STABLIZATION			100	
MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK	50		50	
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	50		50	
QUINHAGAK HARBOR, AK			200	
SAINT GEORGE NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, AK	75		500	
SAND POINT HARBOR, AK		50		50
SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK	50		50	
SITKA HARBOR, AK	50		100	
SKAGWAY HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK	45		45	
SKAGWAY RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, AK	50		50	
UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK	50		50	
UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	144		400	
VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK		150		250
WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK	50		50	
AMERICA SOMOA				
TUTUILA HARBOR, AS	100		100	
ARIZONA				
AGUA FRIA RIVER, AZ	100		100	
NAVAJO NATION, AZ, NM AND UT	100		100	
PIMA COUNTY, AZ	200		500	
RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	150		150	
RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ		150		880
RIO SALADO OESTE, SALT RIVER, AZ	150		150	
SANTA CRUZ RIVER, GRANT RD TO FT LOWELL RD, AZ	50		50	
SANTA CRUZ RIVER, PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS, AZ	200		575	
TRES RIOS, AZ		350		1,500
TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ		100		200
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT, AZ	200		400	
ARKANSAS				
ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEES, AR		50		150
ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, AR AND OK	910		1,500	
HOT SPRINGS CREEK STUDY, AR			100	
MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR		100		100
NORTH LITTLE ROCK, DARK HOLLOW, AR		200		400
PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR		150		650
RED RIVER NAVIGATION, SW ARKANSAS, AR			583	
SOUTHWEST ARK, LITTLE RIVER BASIN, AR			200	
WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR AND MO	400		800	
WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOWS, AR	150		300	
CALIFORNIA				
ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA	250		250	
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA		1,275		2,600
ARANA GULCH WATERSHED, CA	50		50	
ARROYO SECO WATERSHED RESTORATION, CA	100		100	
BALLONA CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	100		150	
BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA		200		400
CALIFORNIA COSTAL SEDIMONT MASTER PLAN			100	
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	100		100	
COAST OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTH COAST REGION, LA COUNTY, CA			400	
COYOTE DAM, CA	50		150	
FOLSOM DAM, CA			100	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
GRAYSON AND MURDERER'S CREEKS, CA	200		200	
HUNTINGTON HARBOR DREDGING, CA			100	
LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	200		200	
LAKE ELSINORE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	100		100	
LLAGAS CREEK, CA		225		225
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	150		300	
LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, WOODLAND AND VICINITY		200		200
LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA		200		600
MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	200		200	
MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	25		25	
MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	170		250	
MATILIJA DAM, CA	150		150	
MIDDLE CREEK, CA		50		50
MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	200		200	
MUGU LAGOON, CA	100		100	
N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	200		200	
N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	100		100	
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	100		1,000	
NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	150		150	
NEWPORT BAY (LA–3 SITE DESIGNATION), CA			350	
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA		100		100
NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA	200		200	
OCEAN BEACH, CA	50		50	
ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	200		200	
ORANGE COUNTY SAMP, CA			200	
PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA		275		400
PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA	100		100	
PINE FLAT DAM, FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION		200		200
PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	100			
POSO CREEK, CA	100		100	
PRADO BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	50		50	
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SAMP, CA			1,000	
ROCK CREEK AND KEEFER SLOUGH, CA		25		25
RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	200		200	
SACRAMENTO—SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	100		100	
SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY	2,973		3,173	
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA	50		50	
SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA	100		398	
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SAMP, CA			500	
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA			500	
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	225		225	
SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA	100		100	
SAN JOAQUIN RB, W STANISLAUS, DEL PUERTO AND SALADO CREE	100		200	
SAN JOAQUIN RB, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, ORESTIMBA CREE		100		100
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	100		100	
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES AND MOKELUMNE RIVERS	100		100	
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA	100		100	
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	100		100	
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA	100		100	
SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA	100		100	
SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	240		240	
SANTA ANA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BIG BEAR LAKE, CA	100		100	
SANTA CLARA RIVER, CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	100		100	
SANTA CRUZ PORT, CA	50		50	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
SANTA ROSA CREEK WATERSHED, CA	260		260	
SANTA YNEZ RIVER, CA	50		50	
SOLANA BEACH, CA			500	
SONOMA CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	150		150	
STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	100		100	
SUTTER COUNTY, CA	677		677	
TAHOE BASIN, CA AND NV	690		1,500	
TIJUANA RIVER VALLEY, CA	200		200	
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	559		559	
UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	150		150	
VENTURA AND SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	100		100	
VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	150		150	
WESTMINSTER, COYOTE AND CARBON CANYON CREEK WATERSHEDS	50		50	
WESTMINSTER, EAST GARDEN GROVE, CA	200		200	
WHITE RIVER AND DEER CREEK, CA	100		100	
WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	50		50	
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA		250		250
COLORADO				
ADAMS COUNTY, CO			100	
ARAPAHO COUNTY, CO			100	
CACHE-LAPOUDRE RIVER FLOODWAY IMPROVEMENT			100	
CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO	200		200	
FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO	330		330	
ZUNI AND SUN VALLEY REACHES, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER, CO		200		200
COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS				
ROTA HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI	25		25	
TINIAN HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI	50		50	
DELAWARE				
DELAWARE COAST, CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE		100		314
FLORIDA				
HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL	280		280	
LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	126		126	
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL		100		100
ST JOHNS COUNTY BEACHES, FL			100	
ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL		100		100
WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FL	271		271	
GEORGIA				
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	186		186	
ARABIA MOUNTAIN, GA	50		100	
AUGUSTA, GA	230		230	
DEEP AND CAMP CREEKS WATERSHED STUDY			100	
INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS	100		100	
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	150		150	
METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	50		50	
NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA AND SC		50		276
SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA	100		100	
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA		428		428
SAVANNAH HARBOR SEDIMENT CONTROL WORKS, GA AND SC	50		50	
SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA AND SC	120		120	
UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA	150		150	
HAWAII				
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	135		135	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI		50		50
KAHUKU, HI	100		100	
KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI	142		142	
KIHEI AREA EROSION, HI	50		100	
NAWILIWILI HARBOR MODIFICATION, KAUAI, HI	50		300	
WAIKIKI EROSION CONTROL, HI		48		250
WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI		50		50
IDAHO				
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	50		50	
LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, ID	145			145
ILLINOIS				
ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	147		147	
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	335		500	
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	1,051		1,500	
ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	365		600	
PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL		237		237
ROCK RIVER, IL AND WI	182		182	
UPPER MISS AND ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO AND WI	1,000		3,685	
UPPER MISS RVR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN AND WI	1,814		1,814	
UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	463		463	
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL		200		200
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL		130		130
INDIANA				
COLUMBUS WATERFRONT STUDY, IN			100	
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	248		500	
JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN AND KY		1,346		2,100
VINCENNES WATERFROUNT STUDY, IN			100	
IOWA				
DAVENPORT, IA		61		125
DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	51		400	
FORT DODGE, IA	87		100	
LOWER DES MOINES, IA AND MO	89		150	
KANSAS				
GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER BASIN STUDY			100	
MANHATTAN, KS			100	
TOPEKA, KS	125		125	
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO		250		434
UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS	125		125	
WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS	110		110	
KENTUCKY				
COVINGTON WATERFROUNT STUDY, KY			100	
GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY AND OH		1,302		1,302
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY	225		225	
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	187		187	
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	140		140	
OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	3,000		3,000	
LOUISIANA				
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	150		300	
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BAYOU MANCHAC, LA	100		200	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	100		540	
BARATARIA BASIN BARRIER SHORELINE RESTORATION, LA		100		200
BARATARIA BASIN MARSH CREATION AND RESTORATION, LA		100		200
BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA		110		300
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	150		480	
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	150		350	
CALCASIEU RIVER PASS SHIP CHANNEL ENLARGEMENT, LA			100	
GIWW ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	100		250	
HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA	125		300	
JEFFERSON PARISH, LA		25		25
LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA		125		400
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	585		1,500	
ORLEANS PARISH, LA		25		25
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, LA AND AR	37		37	
PLAQUEMINES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	100		300	
PORT OF IBERIA, LA	185		540	
ST BERNARD PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	150		325	
ST CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	100		275	
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH, LA	100		200	
WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA		100	200	
MARYLAND				
ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD AND DC	248		248	
BALTIMORE METRO, GWYNNS FALLS, MD		50		250
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE EROSION, MD, VA AND DE	350		350	
EASTERN SHORE, MD	350		1,070	
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S, MD	100		100	
MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN, MD	350		350	
SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD		249		249
MASSACHUSETTS				
BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA AND RI	140		140	
BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA	362		362	
COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA	80		80	
MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MA		322		322
SOMERSET AND SEARSBURG DAMS, DEERFIELD RIVER, MA AND VT.	62		62	
MICHIGAN				
DETROIT RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI			100	
DETROIT RIVER MASTER PLAN, MI			100	
DETROIT RIVER SEAWALLS, MI			100	
GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION			174	
GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	375		750	
JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES STRATEGIC PLAN			500	
LANSING, MI			100	
ROUGE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI			100	
MUSKEGON LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING			100	
ST CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST CLAIR, MI			124	
WHITE LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI			100	
MINNESOTA				
MINNESOTA DAM SAFETY, MN	222		222	
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD AND MANITOBA, C	1,078		2,078	
UPPER MISS RIVER WATERSHED MGMT, LAKE ITASCA TO L/D 2	400		400	
MISSISSIPPI				
PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS	363		363	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
MISSOURI				
CHESTERFIELD, MO		385		550
KANSAS CITYS, MO AND KS	400		575	
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 AND R460–471, MO	100		331	
RIVER DES PERES, MO		130		130
SPRINGFIELD, MO	140		400	
ST. LOUIS AREA MISSISSIPPI RIVERFRONT, MO AND IL	185		185	
ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO AND IL		73		73
ST. LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO		150		150
SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO		100		200
WEARS CREEK, JEFFERSON CITY, MO	57		57	
MONTANA				
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	300		300	
NEBRASKA				
LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	139		139	
SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NE		130		130
WESTERN SARPY AND CLEAR CREEK, NE		180		180
NEVADA				
LAS VEGAS WASH, NORTH LAS VEGAS, NV	100		500	
LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	100		400	
TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV		650		1,000
WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	25		25	
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
CONNECTICUT RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NH AND VT	25		25	
MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN, NH	350		500	
PORTSMITH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER TURNING BASIN			100	
NEW JERSEY				
BARNEGAT BAY, NJ				200
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, NJ, NY, DE AND PA	100		325	
GREAT EGG INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ		300		300
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ			100	
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	206		300	
LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	30		30	
MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ		200		400
NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLE	100		100	
NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT	100		100	
PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ		270		270
PECKMAN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	50		50	
RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ	100		200	
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ	100		200	
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, KEYPORT, NJ	100		200	
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ	200		300	
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, PORT MONMOUTH, NJ		100		250
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ		100		100
SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	100		200	
SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ		100		200
STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ	100		200	
UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ		30		30
UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, NJ	300		300	
WOODBRIDGE RIVER BASIN, NJ	100		200	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
NEW MEXICO				
EAST MESA, LAS CRUCES, NM			100	
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	50		50	
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE BOSQUE, NM	100		400	
NAVAJO NATION, NM			100	
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO AND TX	300		300	
SANTA FE, NM	205		205	
SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, ALBUQUERQUE, N		250		450
NEW YORK				
AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY	50		50	
BOQUET RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY	50		50	
BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY	30		30	
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY			100	
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	258		258	
FREEPORT CREEK, VILLAGE OF FREEPORT, NY	100		100	
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, GOWANUS CANAL, NY AND NJ	360		500	
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, NY AND NJ	676		1,800	
HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY		50		50
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY	50		50	
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	200		200	
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	30		30	
LINDENHURST, NY	50		50	
NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	364		364	
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY	200		200	
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	250		250	
ONONDAGA COUNTY WATERSHED, NY			500	
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	300		300	
SAW MILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	50		50	
SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	50		50	
SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	200		200	
UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	146		146	
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON RESTORATION, NY	161		161	
NORTH CAROLINA				
BOGUE BANKS, NC	300		450	
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	200		300	
DARE COUNTY BEACHES, HATTERAS AND ORACOKE ISLANDS, NC	150		525	
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	100		100	
SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC	173		300	
OHIO				
ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH		160		480
BELPRE, OH				350
BUTLER COUNTY, OH	243		243	
OHIO RIVERFRONT STUDY, CINCINNATI, OH			200	
COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	100		100	
HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH	205		205	
HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH	225		225	
MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH AND PA	40		750	
MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH	225		225	
POLK RUN CREEK, OH			100	
OKLAHOMA				
MIAMI AND VICINITY, OK	380		380	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
MOUNTAIN FORK WATERSHEAD STUDY, OK			100	
OOLOGAH LAKE WATERSHED, OK AND KS	310		450	
RED RIVER WATERWAY, OK, TX AND AR	50		50	
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK	100		100	
SPAVINAW CREEK, OK			100	
WASHITA RIVER BASIN, OK			100	
WISTER LAKE WATERSHED, OK	50		200	
OREGON				
AMAZON CREEK, OR	100		100	
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA	300		300	
TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR	266		266	
WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR AND WA	390		800	
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	100		100	
WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR	249		249	
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	150		150	
PENNSYLVANIA				
BLOOMSBURG, PA	204		204	
CHRISTINA RIVER WATERSHED, PA, DE AND MD	100		300	
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, WISSAHICKON, PA	100		100	
SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN ESTAURINE, PA			250	
UPPER OHIO RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM STUDY, PA			400	
PUERTO RICO				
RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR		147		147
RHODE ISLAND				
QUONSET DAVISVILLE PORT, RI	25			
RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	25		25	
SOUTH CAROLINA				
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	475		625	
BROAD RIVER BASIN, SC	103		250	
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	135		135	
PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC		100		100
REEDY RIVER, SC	50		50	
SANTEE DELTA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, SC	50		50	
WACCAMAW RIVER, SC	25		25	
SOUTH DAKOTA				
JAMES RIVER, SD			1,000	
NIOBRARA RIVER AND MISSOURI RIVER, SD	100		100	
WATERTOWN, SD			750	
TENNESSEE				
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER,TN		252		4,000
DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	240		240	
FRENCH BROAD WATERSHED, TN	205		264	
LICK BRANCH WATERSHED, TN			100	
WASHINGTON DEE CEE BASIN, TN			100	
TEXAS				
BOIS D'ARC CREEK, BONHAM, TX	100		100	
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	160		160	
CEDAR BAYOU, TX		310		310
COLONIAS-LWR RIO GRANDE BASIN ALONG TX AND MEXICO BORDER		100		100
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	410		410	
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	200		500	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
FREEPORT HURRICANE PROTECTION LEVEE, TX	100		100	
GIWW MODIFICATIONS, TX	225		225	
GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	225		225	
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX		275		275
GIWW, MATAGORDA BAY, TX		480		480
GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	228		228	
GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX		150		150
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	300		800	
HARRIS GULLY, TX			100	
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	600		2,000	
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL (PORT LAVACA), TX			150	
MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	50		50	
MUSTANG BAYOU, BRAZORIA COUNTY, TX	137		137	
NORTH BOSQUE RIVER, TX		50		50
NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	228		228	
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	87		87	
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX		250		250
RESACAS AT BROWNSVILLE, TX	200		200	
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	400		400	
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	250		250	
SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX		200		200
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TEXAS	137		137	
SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX	50		50	
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX		200		750
UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	433		1,200	
UTAH				
PARK CITY WATER SUPPLY PROJECT, UT			500	
PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	25		25	
VIRGINIA				
AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA		275		275
CLINCH RIVER WATER PROJECT			100	
ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA		471		471
FOURMILE RUN, VA	37		37	
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA		109		109
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (SECTION 216)	300		400	
LOWER RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER BASIN, VA	157		157	
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	37		237	
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	350		350	
POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	100		100	
WASHINGTON				
BELLINGHAM BAY, WA	50		50	
CENTRALIA, WA		500		1,500
CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	250		250	
COMMENCEMENT BAY AND HYLEBOS WATERWAY, PIERCE COUNTY	200		500	
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA		265		265
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	450		450	
PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	50		50	
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	250		900	
SKAGIT RIVER, WA	450		1,000	
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA		100		100
WHITE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, W	200		200	
WEST VIRGINIA				
ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV		697		697
LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV			100	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
NEW RIVER BASIN, WV, NC AND VA	235		235	
WISCONSIN				
BARABOO RIVER, WI	350		350	
FOX RIVER, WI	40		40	
FOX RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, WI			200	
WYOMING				
JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY		108		108
MISCELLANEOUS				
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	2,500		4,500	
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	100		100	
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	300		300	
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	7,500		9,000	
GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SECTION 401)			2,000	
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	400		400	
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	400		400	
NATIONAL SHORELINE	500		500	
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	4,850		5,250	
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	6,000		8,300	
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	300		300	
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	200		200	
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	22,000		25,000	
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	100		100	
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	500		500	
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	500		500	
TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	450		450	
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−21,430		−44,061	
ADJUSTMENT FOR ACTUAL RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	−517			
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	83,488	18,995	113,657	34,647

Hot Springs, AR.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study to identify and evaluate alternatives for flood damage prevention.

Red River Navigation, Southwest Arkansas, AR and LA.—The Committee recommendation includes $583,000 to complete the cost-shared navigation study. The Committee understands that navigation in the Shreveport, LA, to Index, AR reach is an extension of the existing J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, and as such, urges the Corps to perform an additional analysis using the same discount rate and local cost-sharing requirements as required for the existing waterway. This analysis should be displayed as a part of all study and project documents.

Southwest Arkansas Study, AR.—The Committee has provided $200,000 to initiate and complete an expanded reconnaissance study to address flooding, environmental restoration, water quality and other water resource needs in the Red River and Little Red River basins.

Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, AZ.—The Committee recommendation includes $880,000 for preconstruction engineering and design phase for Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, AZ.

American River Watershed, CA.—The Committee has provided $2,600,000 for continuing analyses on the American River Watershed Long-Term Study, which recommends authorization of the so-called Folsom Dam Mini-Raise. In the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, Congress directed the Corps of Engineers to study a potential increase in flood storage at the Folsom reservoir. The Corps has completed its review and has concluded that raising the existing dam by 7 feet would provide substantially increased flood control benefits, and is technically feasible, economically justified and environmentally preferable, to other flood control options for the Sacramento region. The Congress has methodically authorized and funded improvements in the Sacramento region to reduce flooding and these efforts should continue without further delay. The Mini-Raise is widely supported by virtually all of the congressional delegation as well as State and local officials and the environmental community. However, the project continues to have narrow but persistent opposition. The Committee believes it is time to provide Sacramento with much needed and deserved flood protection. It is the Committee's understanding that the Chief's report for this project is currently under review. The longer the review drags on, the longer tens of thousands of citizens in the Sacramento, California, region will remain in jeopardy from catastrophic flooding. The Committee directs that this review be expedited such that the project will be eligible for authorization in 2002. The Committee also strongly urges the congressional authorizing committees to authorize the Folsom Mini-Raise in the next Water Resources Development Act.

Coast of California, Los Angeles County, CA.—The Committee has provided $400,000 to continue data collection and surveys.

Huntington Harbor Dredging, CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study for ecosystem restoration of Huntington Harbor, CA.

Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to complete the feasibility study and to initiate preconstruction engineering and design activities for Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, CA.

Sacramento and San Joaquin Comprehensive Basin Study, CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,173,000 to complete the feasibility study and to initiate preconstruction engineering and design.

Tahoe Basin, CA & NV.—The Committee has included $1,500,000 to continue the comprehensive watershed study of the Lake Tahoe Basin Watershed.

Adams County, CO.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study for ecosystem restoration study for Adams County, CO.

New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam, GA & SC.—The Committee has provided $276,000 to complete the preconstruction engineering and design phase of the New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam, GA & SC.

Savannah Harbor Estuary Restoration Study, GA.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study for ecosystem restoration study for the Savannah Harbor Estuary Restoration Study, GA.

Waikiki Erosion Control, HI.—The Committee has provided $250,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Waikiki Erosion Control, HI, project.

Upper Mississippi & Illinois Navigation Study, IL, IA, MN, MO, & WI.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,685,000 to continue the system feasibility phase of this study to ensure timely completion in fiscal year 2004. The Committee understands that the Corps has submitted an Interim Report in compliance with direction in the fiscal year 2003 Senate Energy and Water Development bill.

Columbus Waterfront Development Project, Columbus, IN.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of the Columbus, IN waterfront area.

Vincennes Waterfront Development Project, Vincennes, IN.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of the Vincennes, IN waterfront area.

Covington Waterfront Development Project, Covington, KY.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of the Covington, KY waterfront area.

Muddy River, Boston, MA.—The Committee recommendation includes $322,000 to complete the preconstruction engineering and design phase of the flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration for the Muddy River in Boston and Brookline, MA.

Detroit River Environmental Dredging, MI.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study of dredging and disposal requirements of contaminated sediments in the Detroit River.

Detroit River Master Plan, Detroit, MI.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to continue the Detroit River Master Plan study.

Detroit River Seawalls, Detroit, MI.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for continued studies of the Detroit River Seawalls.

Rouge River Environmental Dredging, MI.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study on remediation of contaminated sediments in the Rouge River.

Red River of the North Basin, MN, ND, SD, & Manitoba, Canada.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,078,000 to continue feasibility studies and incorporate the Fargo Southside, ND, formerly being studied under the Continuing Authorities Program.

The Committee is aware that several stakeholder groups in the Red River Basin are coordinating water resource management efforts across State and international borders by forming the Red River Basin Commission (RRBC). The Committee recognizes this Commission, which includes local, provincial, State, and Federal interests, as a non-profit entity registered in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and the Canadian Province of Manitoba.

Missouri River Levee System, Units L455 & R 460–471, MO & KS.—The Committee has provided $331,000 to complete the feasibility study.

Portsmouth Harbor & Piscataqua River, Upper Turning Basin, NH & ME.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of navigation improvements at Portsmouth Harbor.

Hudson Raritan Estuary — Hackensack Meadowlands Ecosystem Restoration, NJ.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study.

Onondaga County Watershed Management Study, NY.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to initiate comprehensive watershed studies for the Onondaga County Watershed.

Ohio Riverfront Study, Cincinnati, OH.—The Committee has provided $200,000 to initiate a feasibility study.

James River, SD.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,000,000 to complete reconnaissance studies and to initiate feasibility studies for flood damage reduction in the James River basin.

Watertown, SD.—The Committee recommendation provides $750,000 for initiation of a general reevaluation report for a flood protection project at Watertown, SD.

Guadalupe and San Antonio River Basins, TX.—The Committee has provided $800,000 to continue basinwide environmental restoration studies and for basin hydrologic studies to update flood plain mapping in Goliad, Karnes, and Wilson Counties.

Harris Gully, Houston, TX.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for studies to determine the feasibility of alternative measures relating to flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and other allied purposes for Harris Gully, Houston, TX.

Matagorda Ship Channel (Port Lavaca), TX.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for studies of navigation improvements of the Matagorda Ship Channel.

Duwamish and Green River Basin, WA.—The Committee recommendation includes $265,000 to complete the preconstruction engineering and design phase for ecosystem restoration of the Duwamish and Green River Basin.

Coastal Field Data Collection.—Within the funds provided, the Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Southern California Beach Processes Study and $1,000,000 for Hurricane Evaluation Studies in the State of Hawaii and U.S. Territories.

Flood Plain Management Services.—Within the amount provided for the Flood Plain Management Services Program, the Committee urges the Corps to develop information and decision-support tools for hurricane preparedness in the State of Hawaii and U.S. Territories and to conduct a flood plain management study for Dexter, MO, and a flood plain management study for Cumberland County, TN.

Planning Assistance to States.—The Committee has provided $8,300,000 for the Planning Assistance to States Program. Within the funds provided, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to assist in the development of a watershed management assessment plan for Lamar County, Alabama, initiate studies for Cross Lake, LA, and a drought watershed management plan for Big Hole, MT.

The Committee acknowledges the serious impacts of coastal erosion due to continued climate change and other factors in the following communities in Alaska: Bethel, Dillingham, Shishmaref, Kakatovik, Kivalina, Unalakleet, and Newtok. The Committee directs the Corps to perform an analysis of the costs associated with continued erosion of these communities, potential costs associated with moving the affected communities to new locations (including collocation with existing communities), and to identify the expected

time line for a complete failure of the useable land associated with each community. An additional $2,000,000 above the President's request has been provided for this work, of which $1,000,000 is for Shishmaref, AK.

Due to rapid erosion occurring at Shishmaref, AK, the Committee directs the Corps to expedite all necessary environmental studies to document the impacts of this severe and continuing erosion.

Other Coordination Programs.—Within the funds provided, the Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for activities related to the Environmental Improvement Program for the Lake Tahoe Basin, CA & NV, $200,000 for the American Heritage Rivers Program, $500,000 for international waters studies, and $600,000 for the Tri-Service CADD/GIS Technology Center.

Research and Development.—Within the funds provided for the Corps of Engineers R&D Program, $2,000,000 is provided for innovative technology demonstrations for urban flooding and channel restoration. These demonstrations shall be conducted in close coordination and cooperation with the Urban Water Research Program of the Desert Research Institute of Nevada. $500,000 is provided to conduct investigations, assessment, and demonstrations on large-scale submerged aquatic vegetation restoration techniques and technologies. Appropriate demonstration activities should be considered within the Chesapeake Bay, MD.

The Committee is aware that WRDA 1999, Sec. 503 authorized the test and demonstration of innovative technologies for environmentally sound management of contaminated sediments. The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to continue its work in this matter in cooperation with the University of New Hampshire.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2002	$1,715,951,000
Budget estimate, 2003	1,415,612,000
Committee recommendation	1,745,102,000

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

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

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA		
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	200	200
WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL AND GA (MAJOR REH	16,473	16,473
WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL AND GA (MAJOR REHAB)	2,852	2,852
ALASKA		
BETHEL BANK STABILIZATION, AK		3,000
BUCKLAND ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, AK		4,000
CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	3,120	3,120
DILLINGHAM BANK STABILIZATION		3,000
GALENA, AK		3,000
NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	4,500	4,500
ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	5,880	5,880
SEWARD HARBOR, AK		3,500
WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	5,000	2,000
ARIZONA		
RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ	14,300	17,000
ARKANSAS		
FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, AR		500
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	3,360	3,360
MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	20,000	24,000
RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, AR, LA, TX		5,000
RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR, LA		7,500
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), C	4,900	4,900
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	22,280	22,280
CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	100	100
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	5,000	9,000
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	3,900	5,000
HARBOR/SOUTH BAYWATER RECYCLING, CA		7,000
IMPERIAL BEACH, SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, CA	200	600
KAWEAH RIVER, CA	10,151	11,000
LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA		10,300
LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	1,680	1,680
MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	5,900	5,900
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	500	500
MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	5,172	5,172
NAPA RIVER, CA	5,000	8,000
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	5,000	5,000
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	4,000	10,700
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	2,600	2,600
SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	250	400
SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	806	806
SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA		1,150
SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	2,751	2,751
SAN RAMON VALLEY RECYCLED WATER PROJECT, CA		500
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	29,700	32,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	100	100
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	2,000	7,000
STOCKTON METROPOLITIAN FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSEMENT, CA	1,000	
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	1,000	1,000
SURFSIDE-SUNSET-NEWPORT BEACH, CA	4,300	4,300
TULE RIVER, CA		1,500
UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	3,510	3,510
DELAWARE		
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES BEACH	500	1,200
DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	294	294

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
DELAWARE COAST, REHOBOTH BEACH TO DEWEY BEACH, DE	1,000	3,000
FLORIDA		
BREVARD COUNTY, FL		1,500
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,600	3,600
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	108,202	98,202
DADE COUNTY, FL		2,000
EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	19,526	19,526
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	4,028	4,028
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL AND GA (MAJOR R	1,742	1,742
KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	23,727	23,727
MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	13,100	13,100
PALM BEACH COUNTY (REIMBURSEMENT), FL		1,500
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	1,645	1,645
ST JOHNS COUNTY, FL		300
GEORGIA		
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	11,116	11,116
BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	3,374	3,374
HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	2,493	2,493
LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA AND SC	250	250
OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA (DEF CORR)	850	850
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	1,000	1,000
THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	3,500	3,500
HAWAII		
HAWAII WATER MANAGEMENT		2,000
IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	419	419
KAUMALAPAU HARBOR, HI		2,000
KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	4,303	4,303
MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	2,262	2,262
ILLINOIS		
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	2,037	2,037
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	19,000	21,000
COOK COUNTY, IL		400
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL		2,500
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	800	800
LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	10,000	10,000
LOVES PARK, IL	2,973	2,973
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	10,000	12,000
MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL AND MO	1,200	1,200
NUTWOOD LEVEE, IL		200
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL AND KY	77,000	68,000
UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO	12,200	15,000
INDIANA		
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE)		500
INDIANA HARBOR (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY), IN	6,800	6,800
INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	2,000	2,000
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	3,562	3,562
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	7,094	7,094
OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	732	732
IOWA		
DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA		1,400
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	1,366	2,250
LOCK AND DAM 12, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	5,404	5,404
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	17,500	18,600
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS AND MO	6,978	9,000
PERRY CREEK, IA	4,000	4,500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
KANSAS		
ARKANSAS CITY, KS	3,000	3,000
KENTUCKY		
DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	600	600
KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	27,400	31,000
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY AND IN	6,192	13,000
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	3,838	3,838
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	2,000	2,000
LOUISIANA		
ASCENSION PARISH (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE), LA		300
COMITE RIVER, LA	3,000	3,000
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE)		300
GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA		213
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	9,000	15,000
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	11,016	20,000
LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	4,900	7,000
LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	410	410
LIVINGSTON PARISH (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE), LA		300
MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET, LA		500
MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	200	200
NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	900	1,500
OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES		1,500
SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	20,083	55,000
WEST BANK AND VICINITY, NEW ORLEANS, LA	5,000	10,000
MARYLAND		
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	6,900	6,900
ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	200	200
BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD AND VA	10,590	10,590
CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTOR AND PROTECTION, MD		2,000
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD AND VA	2,000	3,000
CUMBERLAND, MD		5,000
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	10,600	10,600
MASSACHUSETTS		
CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	8,500	8,500
WEST HILL DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	2,800	2,800
MICHIGAN		
GENESEE COUNTY (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE), MI		200
NEGAUNEE, MI		575
SAULT STE MARIE LOCK REPLACEMENT, MI		3,000
TWELVE TOWNS DRAIN RETENTION FACILITY		300
MINNESOTA		
BRECKENRIDGE, MN		3,000
CROOKSTON, MN	3,202	3,202
LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	3,000	3,000
MILLE LACS REGIONAL WASTEWATER, MN		1,000
MISSISSIPPI		
DESOTO COUNTY, MS		4,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS		800
MISSISSIPPI (SECTION 592)		12,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,476	5,834
MISSOURI		
BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	200	200
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	6,676	11,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BOIS BRULE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, MO		200
MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	600	4,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	1,700	3,500
STE GENEVIEVE, MO	300	300
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO AND AR (DAM SAFETY)	10,000	12,000
MONTANA		
FORT PECK FISH HATCHERY, MT		8,000
RURAL MONTANA		3,500
NEBRASKA		
ANTELOPE CREEK, NE		2,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD	750	750
WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	3,536	3,536
NEVADA		
RURAL NEVADA, NV		13,000
TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	33,900	45,000
NEW JERSEY		
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET (ABSECON ISLAND)	500	1,000
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	82	82
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA AND DE	12,000	10,000
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	460	460
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	2,000	2,000
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	3,000	3,000
RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, MAHWAH, NJ AND SUFFERN, NY	500	500
RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	5,241	5,241
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	1,000	1,000
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	5,000	7,000
SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	4,434	4,434
TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	7,000	8,000
NEW MEXICO		
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	1,500	5,200
ALAMOGORDO, NM	5,400	5,400
CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM		8,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	800	800
RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE	800	800
NEW YORK		
ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT	450	450
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY	1,000	1,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	500	500
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	2,750	2,750
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ	120,000	110,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	700	700
STANLEY COUNTY WASTEWATER, NC		1,000
WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET, NC	1,200	1,200
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	24,650	41,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION	1,000	2,500
DEVILS LAKE, ND		5,000
GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	6,500	6,500
GRAFTON, PARK RIVER, ND		1,000
GRAND FORKS, ND—EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	30,000	40,000
HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	2,272	2,272
SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	2,417	2,417

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
OHIO		
HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	.....	2,000
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	3,270	4,000
MILL CREEK, OH	1,100	4,500
WEST COLUMBUS, OH	2,000	3,000
OKLAHOMA		
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	3,000	3,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	4,600	4,600
OREGON		
BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR AND WA (MAJOR REHAB)	8,913	8,913
COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR AND WA	.....	5,000
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR AND WA	5,800	5,800
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	1,000	1,000
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR AND WA	100	100
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA	2,000	.....
WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	6,000	8,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA	1,161	1,161
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	36,017	42,000
PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	580	1,080
SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	4,103	4,103
SCHUYLKILL RIVER PARK, PA	.....	1,000
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	9,439	9,439
PUERTO RICO		
ARECIBO RIVER, PR	5,000	5,000
PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	5,500	5,500
RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	500	500
RIO GRANDE DE MANATI, PR	4,981	4,981
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	8,778	8,778
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	1,457	1,457
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING AND WIDENING)	4,539	6,500
HARTWELL LK,CLEMSON UPPER AND LOWER DIVERSION, SC (DAM S	5,791	5,791
MYRTLE BEACH STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, SC	.....	400
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	3,964	3,964
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	1,700	9,500
MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, SD	750	750
PIERRE, SD	1,426	6,000
TENNESSEE		
BLACK FOX, OAKLANDS AND MURFREE SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN	.....	2,300
TEXAS		
BOSQUE AND LEON RIVERS, TX	.....	1,000
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	3,798	3,798
CLEAR CREEK, TX	1,200	1,200
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TX	.....	9,744
EL PASO, TX	1,000	1,000
HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	19,487	36,000
JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	3,636	3,636
NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	7,000	7,000
NORTH PADRE ISLAND, PACKERY CHANNEL, TX	.....	4,000
RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX	.....	2,000
SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	3,219	3,219

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	9,000	9,000
UTAH		
UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	500	500
VERMONT		
VERMONT DAMS REMEDIATION, VT		500
VIRGINIA		
AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	3,401	3,401
EMBREY DAM, VA		2,500
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (MAJOR REHAB)	6,600	6,600
LYNCHBURG (COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW), VA		500
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	477	
RICHMOND (COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW), VA		500
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	850	850
SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VA		1,400
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	120	120
WASHINGTON		
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR AND ID	98,000	87,000
GRAYS HARBOR, WA	50	50
HOWARD HANSON DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA	5,776	7,500
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	4,600	4,600
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	281	281
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	1,200	2,500
SHOALWATER BAY SHORELINE EROSION, WA		1,000
THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1–14), WA AND OR (MAJOR REH	3,000	3,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	8,500	13,100
LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	10,400	16,900
LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB)	11,934	11,934
LOWER MUD RIVER, WV		750
MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	10,978	58,500
ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV AND OH	1,500	1,500
WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	200	200
WISCONSIN		
LAFARGE LAKE, WI	4,361	4,361
MISCELLANEOUS		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	10,000	20,000
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	3,000	5,000
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	1,500	1,500
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	5,000	10,000
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM	9,000	9,000
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC 14)	7,000	9,000
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	20,000	20,000
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	30,000	45,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE	45	45
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE	185	185
NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)	500	2,000
NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	7,000	9,100
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	16,000	23,000
SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATIO	8,000	8,000
SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	5,000	5,000
SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECT (SECTION 208)	1,000	1,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−103,454	−228,360
ADJUSTMENT FOR ACTUAL RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	−2,388	
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL	1,415,612	1,745,102

Bethel Emergency Bank Stabilization Project, Bethel, Alaska.—The Committee is aware that extenuating circumstances and the dire situation with regard to the Bethel Emergency Bank Stabilization project. Therefore, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to take all steps necessary to address the rapidly deteriorating seawall in order to prevent its imminent collapse.

Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, AR.—The Committee recommendation includes $24,000,000. The Committee understands that this is far less than the Corps capability for this important navigation project that contributes to the Nation's economic security, but in a constrained budget environment, is an increase over the budget amount.

Red River Below Denison Dam, AR, LA, OK & TX.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to continue the levee rehabilitation and bank stabilization project in Arkansas.

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, AR, LA, OK & TX.—The Committee recommendation includes $7,500,000 to continue the project.

Harbor/South Bay Water Recycling, CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $7,000,000 to continue construction of the project.

Los Angeles Harbor Main Channel Deepening, CA.—The Committee has provided $10,300,000 to continue construction of the channel deepening project.

Petaluma River, CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,700,000 for completion of this project.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,150,000 for continuation of the General Reevaluation Reports on the Avon Turning Basin and for the minimal deepening of the San Francisco Bay to the Port of Stockton.

South Sacramento County Streams, CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $7,000,000. The Committee understands that this is far less than the Corps capability for this project that will provide flood protection for more than 100,000 people and 41,000 structures, but in a constrained budget environment, it is a significant increase over the budget amount.

Central and Southern Florida, FL.—The Committee recommendation includes $98,202,000 to continue Everglades Restoration projects. This is a $10,000,000 reduction from the budget request. This should in no way be considered any diminution of interest or support for these vitally important ecosystem restoration projects by the Committee. Rather, this cut is due to recent questions raised concerning implementation of the restoration project. The Committee is concerned that the project may be too heavily weighted in favor of commercial development of water supplies rather than the restoration of historic water flow characteristics and water quality needed to save the Everglades. The Committee believes that the Corps should respond to these concerns and provide written notification to the Committee that addresses these concerns.

Hawaii Water Management, HI.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for continued construction of the Hawaii Water Management Project.

Kaumalapau Harbor, HI.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for continued construction of the harbor project.

Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Mitigation, IA, NE, KS, and MO.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,100,000 above the budget amount for habitat acquisition. Additional funding should be focused on acquisition of lands at the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers near St. Louis, MO.

Des Plaines River, IL (Phase I).—The Committee recommendation includes $2,500,000 to continue construction of the project.

Olmsted Locks and Dam, Ohio River, IL & KY.—The Committee recommendation includes $68,000,000 to continue construction of the replacement navigation structure. This is a $9,000,000 reduction from the budget request, but should in no way be considered any diminution of interest in this critically important portion of the Nation's inland waterway system by the Committee. Rather it reflects the extraordinarily unbalanced nature of the budget request and the Committee's attempt to restore some balance to this account. None of the funds provided for the Olmsted Locks and Dam Project are to be used to reimburse the Claims and Judgement Fund.

Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, KY.—The Committee recommendation includes $31,000,000. The Committee understands that this is considerably less than the Corps capability for this important navigation project that contributes to the Nation's economic security, but in a constrained budget environment, it is an increase over the budget request.

McAlpine Lock and Dam, IN & KY.—The Committee recommendation includes $13,000,000. The Committee understands that this is considerably less than the Corps capability for this important navigation project that contributes to the Nation's economic security, but in a constrained budget environment, it is an increase over the budget request.

Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000. The Committee understands that this is considerably less than the Corps capability for this important navigation project, but in a constrained budget environment, it is an increase over the budget request.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes $20,000,000 to continue construction of necessary navigation channel refinements, land purchases and development for mitigation of project impacts, and construction of project recreation and appurtenant features.

Ouachita River Levees, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 to continue construction of the project.

Southeast Louisiana, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes $55,000,000. While this is a significant increase over the budget request, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection, MD, PA, and VA.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for continuation of the Taylor's Island Marsh Creation Project, and the Baltimore Harbor Middle Branch Wetland Creation Project.

Cumberland, MD.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 to continue this flood control project.

Sault Ste. Marie (Replacement Lock), MI.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 to continue construction of the replacement lock.

Breckenridge, MN.—$3,000,000 is included to continue construction of this vital flood control project.

Mississippi Environmental Infrastructure, MS.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000. Within the funds provided the Corps should continue on-going work at Pearlington, Hancock County, MS; Jefferson County, MS; Picayune, Pearl River County, MS; Gulfport, Harrison County, MS and is directed to give priority for initiation of assistance to Helena, Jackson County, MS; Town of Decatur, MS; and City of Newton, MS.

Fort Peck Fish Hatchery, MT.—The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 for continuation of construction.

Rural Montana, MT.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,500,000 to continue the Rural Montana Project. Within the funds provided, the Corps should give consideration to Grant Creek, Missoula County, and the cities of Belgrade, Helena, and Conrad.

Stanly County Wastewater, NC.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for continued construction of this project.

Wilmington Harbor, NC.—The Committee recommendation includes $41,000,000. The Committee understands that this is considerably less than the Corps capability for this important harbor project that contributes to the Nation's economic security, but in a constrained budget environment, it is an increase over the budget request.

Devils Lake, ND.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for construction of the Devils Lake outlet subject to certain conditions. The Committee also recognizes that the Corps has authority to use up to an additional $10,000,000 of previously appropriated funds for construction if the conditions mandated by Congress are met.

Grafton, Park River, ND.—The Committee recommendation has included $1,000,000 to continue construction of this flood control project.

Grand Forks, ND.—East Grand Forks, MN.—The Committee recommendation includes $40,000,000. While this is an increase over the budget request, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

Antelope Creek, NE.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 to continue construction of the project.

Delaware Main Channel Deepening, NJ, PA, & DE.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for construction of this project. However, the Committee has serious concerns about the project due to concerns raised in the General Accounting Office's review of the project's economic analysis. It is the Committee's understanding that the Corps is currently conducting an entirely new economic analysis to address the concerns that were raised in the GAO report and that this analysis will be subject to two independent peer reviews. The Committee believes this is a prudent action, however, until the project is shown to be technically sound, environmentally sustainable, and economically viable, the Committee directs that none of the funds provided should

be used to award construction contracts. Further, the Secretary is required to provide written notification to the Committee that these requirements have been met before funds can be used for this purpose.

Rural Nevada, NV.—The Committee recommendation includes $13,000,000 to continue the Rural Nevada project. Within the funds provided, the Corps is directed to give consideration to projects at Boulder City, Lyon County (Carson River Regional Water System), Gerlach, Incline Village, Round Hill, Mesquite, Moapa, Spanish Springs, Battle Mountain, Virgin Valley, Lawton-Verdi, and Esmeralda County.

Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, NV.—The Committee has provided $45,000,000 to continue construction of the project. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for reimbursement of work performed by the project non-Federal sponsor in accordance with Section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Holes Creek, West Carrollton, OH.—The Committee recommendation has included $2,000,000 to continue construction of the project.

Columbia River Channel Improvements, OR & WA.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for continuation of the project.

Lower Columbia River Ecosystem Restoration, OR & WA.—In keeping with the Committee's decision to not initiate any construction "new starts" in the fiscal year 2003 Committee recommendation, no funding has been provided.

Locks and Dams 2, 3 and 4, Monongahela River, PA.—The Committee recommendation includes $42,000,000. The Committee understands that this is considerably less than the Corps capability for this important navigation project that contributes to the Nation's economic security, but in a constrained budget environment, it is an increase over the budget request.

Presque Isle Peninsula, PA.—The Committee has provided $1,080,000 for the beach nourishment project at Presque Isle for both annual periodic nourishment and for construction of modifications to the North Pier to facilitate the stockpiling of sand.

Charleston Harbor (Deepening/Widening), SC.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,500,000 for continued construction of the project.

Myrtle Beach, SC.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for dune restoration work at Surfside Beach/Garden City authorized as a part of the Myrtle Beach Project but not constructed at the time of sand placement due to funding constraints.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, SD.—The Committee notes that Title VI of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, as amended, authorizes funding to pay administrative expenses, implementation of terrestrial wildlife plans, activities associated with land transferred or to be transferred, and annual expenses for operating recreational areas. 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 remaining funds as directed by Title VI to the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and Lower Brule Sioux Tribe.

Dallas Floodway Extension, Texas.—The Committee has provided $9,744,000 to continue the overall project, including the Cadillac Heights feature, generally in accordance with the Chief of Engineers Report dated December 7, 1999.

North Padre Island, Packery Channel, Texas.—The Committee is aware that design and environmental studies have been completed and construction initiated to ensure the project meets provisions of Section 556 of WRDA 99. To that end, the Committee has provided $4,000,000 to continue construction of the project.

Red River Basin Chloride Control Project, TX, OK, AR, & LA.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 to complete the reevaluation effort, initiate plans and specifications, and continue monitoring for the Wichita River Basin portion of the project. Further, the Committee urges budgeting for this critical project that improves Red River water quality in four States.

Sandbridge Beach, VA.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,400,000 to continue the project. The Committee is aware of questions concerning property ownership in the project area and directs that the funding provided shall not be used for construction contracts until these questions are resolved and the Committee notified of the resolution.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, WA, OR, and ID.—The Committee recommendation includes $87,000,000 to continue efforts associated with Columbia River Fish Mitigation. This is an $11,000,000 reduction from the budget request, but should in no way be considered any diminution of interest or support for these vitally important mitigation projects by the Committee. Rather it reflects the fiscal constraints with which the Committee is faced with. The Committee recommendation is $6,000,000 above fiscal year 2002 funding enacted for this project.

Within the funds provided, the Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for a reconnaissance level investigation of Columbia River flood control operations to determine what changes, if any, would benefit endangered species, particularly salmon. Evaluation beyond the reconnaissance phase is subject to agency review and congressional notification.

Mud Mountain Dam, WA.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000 to continue work on dam safety measures and the fish passage facility.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, WV, KY, & VA.—The Committee has provided $16,900,000 for continuation of the project. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for Buchanan County, VA; $500,000 for Dickenson County, VA; and $10,400,000 for Grundy, VA. Further, the Committee recommendation includes $800,000 for Kermit, Lower Mingo County, WV; $3,800,000 for McDowell County, WV; $700,000 for Upper Mingo County, WV; and $200,000 for Wayne County, WV.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Aquatic Plant Control Program, the Nation's only Federally authorized research program for technology that focuses on the management of non-indigenous aquatic species. The Committee is aware of the growing problem of invasive plant infestation around the country and supports the Corps' and industries

efforts to develop new management and control technologies. The Committee believes that success in management of these invasive species is dependent upon the research and development activities of this program. In an effort to maximize limited funding for eradication and harvesting, the Committee strongly recommends that these efforts be undertaken only where a local sponsor agrees to provide 50 percent of the cost of the work. Within the funds provided, $300,000 is for a cost shared effort with the State of South Carolina and $400,000 is for a cost shared effort with the State of Vermont.

Dam Safety and Seepage Stability Correction Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for the program. Within the funds provided, $5,000,000 is provided for the Corps to continue work on Waterbury Dam in Vermont.

Idaho Dam Safety, Idaho.—The Committee encourages the Corps to provide assistance, within the authorities available to it, to the State of Idaho as it evaluates the need for maintenance of these deteriorating structures as well as the need for increased security.

Ability to pay.—Section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, 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. While within the letter of the law, the Secretary's policies do not appear to be keeping the spirit of the law. The Secretary is directed to report to the Appropriations Committees within 90 days on a proposal intended to be published in the Federal Register to revise 33 CFR 241 eligibility criteria to allow a more reasonable and balanced application of the ability-to pay provision.

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM

The continuing project authorities listed below, allow the Corps great flexibility to respond to various, limited-scope, water resource problems facing communities throughout the Nation. This program has proven to be remarkably successful in providing a quick response to serious local problems. These problems range from flood control and navigation to bank stabilization and environmental restoration. The Committee has provided funds in excess of the budget request for virtually all of these accounts. As a general rule, once a project has received funds for the initial phases of any of these authorities, the project will continue to be funded as long as it

proves to be environmentally sound, technically feasible, and economically justified, as applicable. With this in mind, the Committee has chosen to limit explicit direction of these project authorities.

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

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (Section 206).—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for the Section 206 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes:

$250,000 for the Arroyo Mocho, Ecosystem Restoration, CA, for the preliminary restoration plan; $185,000 for the Sweetwater Ecosystem Restoration, CA, for the preliminary restoration plan; $100,000 for a preliminary restoration plan and planning and design analysis for the St. Joseph River, South Bend, IN; $400,000 for the Chariton River/Rathbun Lake Watershed, IA, to continue feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications; $114,000 for the Duck Creek-Fairmont Park Wetland Restoration, IA for planning and design analysis; $250,000 for developing the plans and specifications for the Squaw Creek, IL, Ecosystem Restoration project; $285,000 to complete feasibility studies for the Lake Killarney, LA, restoration; $150,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Mill Creek, Littleton Pond, MA, restoration; $161,000 for plans and specifications and construction of the Belle Isle Piers, MI restoration; $100,000 for feasibility studies for controlling Eurasian watermilfoil in Clearwater Lake, MI; $250,000 to conduct a feasibility study of alternatives to control Eurasian watermilfoil in Houghton Lake, MI; $40,000 for the Little Sugar Creek, NC, restoration; $200,000 to prepare a preliminary restoration plan for the West Cary Stream Restoration, NC; $100,000 for the preliminary restoration plan and planning and design analysis for the Mason's Point Dike, NJ; $380,000 for Bottomless Lakes, NM; $233,000 for Jemez River, NM; $1,600,000 to initiate planning, design, and implementation of various restoration projects for Tillamook Bay, OR; $50,000 for the preliminary restoration plan for Roaring Branch, VT; $240,000 to complete plans and specifications and to initiate construction for the Lake Poygan, WI restoration; $140,000 to complete feasibility studies and initiate plans and specifications for the Menomonee River Watershed, WI; and $100,000 to initiate the planning and design analysis for the Trinity Creek, Mequon, WI, restoration.

Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The Committee has provided $9,100,000 for the Section 107 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes:

$40,000 to complete the detailed project report for the Oyster Point Marina, CA, project; $300,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Short Cut Canal project in Terrebonne Parish, LA; $125,000 to complete feasibility studies for the Rouge River, MI, navigation project; $100,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Tri State Commerce Park navigation Project in Iuka, MS; and

$100,000 to initiate studies for the navigation project at Charlestown Breachway and Ninigret Pond, RI.

Tatilik Harbor, Alaska.—Given concerns over the safety and security of port and maritime harbors in the wake of terrorist attacks on the United States, the Committee recognizes the importance of ensuring there is an adequate response in the case of a major oil spill near the Valdez terminal facility in Valdez, Alaska. The Committee also recognizes that nearly 20 percent of the domestic oil supply of the United States flows via tanker from Valdez terminal to the Lower 48 States, and that a terrorist attack on the facility, or a natural or man-made disaster around the terminal could temporarily suspend the flow of Alaska oil to the Lower 48 market. Further the Committee acknowledges that Tatitlik, Alaska is strategically located and designated as the primary alternate response site to stage an oil spill clean up effort if the port of Valdez is inaccessible. To this end, the Committee authorizes and directs the Corps of Engineers to take whatever steps necessary with existing funds authorized and appropriated under section 107 to begin and finalize construction of a small boat harbor at Tatitlik, Alaska.

Navigation Mitigation Projects (Section 111).—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Section 111 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes:

$1,220,000 to initiate construction of the Saco River and Camp Ellis Beach, ME project to mitigate shoreline damages caused by the Federal navigation project.

Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135).—The Committee has provided $23,000,000 for the Section 1135 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes:

$130,000 for feasibility studies for restoration of Ditch 28, Mississippi County, AR; $25,000 for feasibility studies for modifications to Big Creek Spilllway, IA; $90,000 to complete the planning design analysis for the Honey Creek Wetlands project in IA; $25,000 for the Trail Creek, IN, for the planning and design analysis for a sea lamprey barrier; $30,000 for the Black Mallard Creek, MI, for the planning and design analysis for a sea lamprey barrier; $100,000 to complete the feasibility studies for the project at Hennepin Marsh, MI; $70,000 for the planning and design analysis for a sea lamprey barrier at Rapid River, Delta County, MI; $451,000 to complete the analysis and for construction of the Lemay Wetlands Restoration, MO; $740,000 to complete feasibility studies and plans and specifications for the Pine Mountain Creek, (Cohansey River), NJ; project; $150,000 to complete feasibility studies of the Middle Harbor Restoration at East Harbor State Park, Marblehead, OH; $450,000 for construction of the Boyd's Marsh restoration project in Portsmouth, RI; and $1,351,000 for construction of Phase I of Drakes Creek, Hendersonville, TN project and initiation of Phase II.

Emergency Streambank & Shoreline Protection Projects (Section 14).—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 for the Section 14 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes:

$185,000 for construction of the Baker Canal, East Baton Rouge, LA project; $100,000 for the planning and design analysis for the

Bell Isle South Shore, Detroit, MI project; $800,000 for completion of design and construction of the Detroit River Shoreline, Detroit, MI, project; $500,000 to initiate construction on the St. Cloud, MN project; $687,000 for I–40 Rio Puerco, NM; $167,000 Paseo del Norte, NM; $415,000 for Unamed Arroy, NM; and $600,000 for construction of the Cincinnati Waterworks, Hamilton County, OH project.

Flood Control Projects (Section 205).—The Committee has provided $45,000,000 for the Section 205 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes:

$100,000 for feasibility studies of flooding problems at Grubbs, AR; $200,000 for feasibility studies of flood protection measures for the Santa Venetia Flood Control Zone 7, CA; $4,500,000 to continue construction of the project for Van Bibber Creek at Arvada, CO; $100,000 to complete feasibility studies and initiate plans and specifications for Mosquito Creek at Council Bluffs, IA; $100,000 to initiate feasibility studies of flooding problems along the Cedar River in Waverly, IA; $1,000,000 to investigate flooding problems along Bayou Choupique in the vicinity of the Chitimacha Reservation in St. Mary Parish, LA; $1,000,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction for the Braithwaite Park, Plaquemines Parish, LA, project; $300,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction for the Dawson, MN, project; $100,000 to continue feasibility studies of flooding problems at Jordan, MN; $100,000 to initiate feasibility studies for Tchula Lake in Tchula, MS; $2,000,000 for continued construction of the Wahpeton, ND, flood control project. The Committee is aware of the close hydraulic connection between this project and the Breckenridge, NM, project and encourages the Corps to coordinate these projects closely; $1,600,000 for Little Puerco Wash, Gallup, NM; $3,000,000 to complete plans and specifications for the nonstructural flood damage reduction project for Little Duck Creek, Cincinnati and Fairfax, OH; $100,000 for plans and specifications for the Beaver Creek, Bristol TN and VA, project; and $100,000 for feasibility studies for a flood damage reduction project along Richland Creek, Nashville, TN.

Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material (Section 204).—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for the Section 204 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes $25,000 to initiate the feasibility phase for the Blackhawk Bottoms, Des Moines County, IA, project.

Shoreline Protection Projects (Section 103).—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Section 103 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes $100,000 to complete feasibility and initiate plans and specifications for the Luna Pier, MI, project and $250,000 to complete design and plans and specifications for the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Hampton, VA, project.

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

Appropriations, 2002	$345,992,000
Budget estimate, 2003	280,671,000
Committee recommendation	337,937,000

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

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA	420	420
BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	.....	1,633
SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	.....	900
DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA	780	780
SPRING BAYOU, LA	505	505
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	180	180
GERMANTOWN, TN	345	345
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN AND MS	25	.....
MILLINGTON AND VICINITY, TN	150	150
MORGANZA TO THE GULF, LA	2,880	2,880
WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	123	123
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	600	600
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	6,008	7,936
CONSTRUCTION		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	36,690	36,690
FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR	750	750
HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	660	660
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	42,360	49,885
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO	1,970	4,200
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	7,010	7,010
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	18,873	19,173
LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA	2,449	2,449
MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA AND MS	25	25
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	3,500	3,500
HORN LAKE CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES (INCL COW PEN CREEK), MS	300	300
YAZOO BASIN	(10,550)	(44,000)
BACKWATER PUMP, MS	250	11,000
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	200	1,200
DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	.....	19,500
MAIN STEM, MS	25	25
REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	25	25
TRIBUTARIES, MS	200	200
UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	9,850	12,050
ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	100	1,000
NONCONNAH CREEK, TN AND MS	605	1,605
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	100	100
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	125,942	171,347
MAINTENANCE		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	66,465	66,465
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	490	490

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	441	441
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	105	105
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	135	135
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	7,185	8,130
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO	10,580	11,180
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR AND LA	2,463	3,713
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	1,250	1,250
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	50	50
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	35	35
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,095	2,095
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	12,512	14,320
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	210	210
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	75	75
BONNET CARRE, LA	3,105	3,105
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	510	510
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	125	2,375
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	860	860
OLD RIVER, LA	11,520	11,520
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	3,145	3,145
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	340	340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	286	286
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	330	330
YAZOO BASIN	(26,910)	(37,470)
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	5,380	8,380
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	115	3,115
ENID LAKE, MS	4,920	5,660
GREENWOOD, MS	825	825
GRENADA LAKE, MS	5,700	6,120
MAIN STEM, MS	1,265	1,265
SARDIS LAKE, MS	5,905	8,905
TRIBUTARIES, MS	1,265	1,265
WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	450	450
YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	280	680
YAZOO CITY, MS	805	805
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	167	167
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	6,730	6,730
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	96	96
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	1,750	1,750
FACILITY PROTECTION	1,000	1,000
MAPPING	1,170	1,170
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE	162,135	179,548
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−13,085	−21,474
ADJUSTMENT FOR ACTUAL RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	−329	.....
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	280,671	337,937

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 national 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. In conjunction with efforts to optimize use of the additional funding provided, the Committee expects the Corps to make the necessary adjustments in lower priority activities and non-critical

work in order to maximize the public benefit within the Mississippi River and Tributaries program.

Construction

Bayou Meto Basin, AR.—The Committee has included $1,633,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design.

Channel Improvement, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, & TN.—The Committee recommendation includes $36,690,000 for continuation of construction of various bank stabilization and river training measures to ensure an efficient flood control channel as well as to provide a safe and reliable navigation alignment.

Mississippi River Levees, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, and TN.—The Committee has provided $49,885,000 for continued construction of the various elements of the Mississippi River Levee Project. Within the funds provided, $500,000 is provided to continue engineering and design of the Lower Mississippi River Museum and Interpretive Site.

Yazoo Basin, Demonstration Erosion Control, MS.—The Committee recommendation includes $19,500,000 to continue construction of the Demonstration Erosion Control Project, a joint effort of the Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service. The Committee expects the Corps to continue design work, acquire real estate, monitor results for all watersheds, and initiate continuing contracts as required for completion of the total program.

Yazoo Basin, Yazoo Backwater Pumping Plant, MS.—The Committee recommendation includes $11,000,000 to complete design, continue real estate activities and to initiate the pump supply contract.

Maintenance

Mississippi River Levees, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, and TN.—The Committee recommendation includes $8,130,000 and includes $945,000 to provide gravel surfacing to selected locations on levee roads in Mississippi.

St. Francis River and Tributaries, AR & MO.—An additional $600,000 has been provided above the budget request for maintenance items in Missouri.

Atchafalaya Basin, LA.—An additional $1,808,000 has been provided above the budget request for dewatering and major lock repairs to Berwick Lock.

Lower Red River, South Bank Levees, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,375,000 for completion of the Bayou Rapides Pumping Plant and to continue routine operation and maintenance activities of the project.

Yazoo Basin, (Bogue Phalia), Big Sunflower River, MS.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 above the budget request to continue channel maintenance items.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2002	$1,874,803,000
Budget estimate, 2003	1,913,760,000
Committee recommendation	1,956,182,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA-COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	500	500
ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER, AL	2,974	3,174
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	2,000	2,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	24,201	24,201
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	4,963	4,963
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	100	100
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM ''BILL'' DANNELLY LA	7,094	7,644
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	18,610	20,110
PERIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL		1,200
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	350	350
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	5,558	5,858
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	100	100
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL AND MS	23,083	26,800
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA	6,912	6,912
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	3,616	4,200
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	2,889	2,889
COOK INLET NAVIGATION CHANNEL, AK		1,000
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	459	684
HOMER HARBOR, AK	363	488
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	40	40
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, BAR POINT, AK	500	500
ST HERMAN (KODIAK) HARBOR, AK		750
NAKNEK RIVER, AK	215	215
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	232	232
NOME HARBOR, AK	410	410
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	543	543
ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	75	75
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,282	1,282
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	79	79
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,269	1,269
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	32	32
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	168	168
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	5,064	5,064
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	9,444	9,444
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,162	1,162
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	5,675	5,675
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,699	5,699
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,620	4,620
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	931	931
DIERKS LAKE, AR	959	959
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	861	861
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	5,445	5,445
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	23	340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	147	147
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	23,925	25,925
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,257	1,257
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	7,440	7,440
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,409	1,409
NORFORK LAKE, AR	4,368	4,368
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	21	610
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR AND LA	6,491	8,325

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,152	4,152
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	6	6
WHITE RIVER, AR	195	2,200
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	10	147
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	2,034	2,034
BODEGA BAY, CA	1,750	1,750
BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,796	1,796
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,622	3,622
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,334	3,334
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,338	4,338
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	308	308
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,751	1,751
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	3,426	4,926
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,130	1,130
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,227	1,227
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	170	170
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	320	320
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	4,424	7,584
MARINA DEL REY, CA	60	60
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	313	313
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	259	259
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,280	1,280
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	.....	1,125
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,006	2,006
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,651	1,651
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	120	120
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	11,204	11,204
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,240	1,240
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	.....	1,000
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,500	2,500
PORT HUENEME, CA	60	60
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,148	1,148
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	4,381	4,381
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,189	2,189
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,271	1,271
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	145	145
SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	150	150
SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, CA	60	60
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,181	1,181
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,072	2,072
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,920	1,920
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	2,122	2,872
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,395	3,395
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,800	1,800
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,415	1,415
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,992	1,992
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	2,815	4,000
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,770	1,770
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,590	2,590
YUBA RIVER, CA	63	63
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	315	315
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,225	1,725
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	894	1,394
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	136	136
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,148	2,148
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	242	242
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,309	1,809

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	364	364
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	506	506
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	284	284
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	906	906
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	35	35
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	447	447
NEW HAVEN HARBOR, CT	4,546	4,546
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	337	337
NORWALK HARBOR, CT		200
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,185	1,185
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	349	349
THOMASTON DAM, CT	565	565
TREATMENT OF MATERIAL FROM LONG ISLAND SOUND		250
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	506	506
DELAWARE		
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	12,853	12,853
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	45	45
MISPILLION RIVER, DE	275	275
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	310	310
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	50	50
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	4,966	4,966
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	7	7
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	1,110	1,110
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	33	33
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	50	50
FLORIDA		
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,960	3,960
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	9,347	9,347
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	3,030	3,030
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	200	200
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	322	2,500
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	4,040	4,040
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL AND GA	6,050	6,050
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	2,780	2,780
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	1,508	1,508
MIAMI RIVER, FL	5,550	5,550
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,695	2,695
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,018	2,018
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	1,000	1,000
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	2,350	2,350
PORT ST JOE HARBOR, FL	1,000	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	780	780
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,911	3,911
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	8,559	8,559
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	6,456	6,456
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	1,444	4,709
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	178	2,500
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,993	3,993
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	8,060	8,060
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	9,958	9,958
HARTWELL LAKE, GA AND SC	12,896	12,896
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	41	41
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA AND SC	13,553	13,553
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	7,548	7,548

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	12,540	12,540
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	134	134
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL	5,587	5,587
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	354	354
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	275	275
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	544	544
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,677	1,677
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	3,951	3,951
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	81	81
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,488	1,488
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	371	371
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL AND IN	3,190	3,190
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,856	4,856
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,616	2,616
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362	362
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	204	204
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL AND IN	25,154	25,154
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL AND IN	1,683	1,683
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	428	428
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,386	1,386
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	1,037	1,037
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,073	5,073
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	41,820	42,320
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	15,443	15,443
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	30	30
REND LAKE, IL	4,520	4,520
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	111	111
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	1,270	1,270
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	732	732
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	3,427	3,427
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	1,606	1,606
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	634	634
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	704	704
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	64	64
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	168	168
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	1,108	1,108
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	1,132	1,132
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	853	853
MONROE LAKE, IN	759	759
PATOKA LAKE, IN	727	727
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	55	55
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	649	649
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	130	130
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	3,097	3,097
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	78	78
MISSOURI RIVER-KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	147	147
MISSOURI RIVER-RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS AND MO	5,613	6,113
MISSOURI RIVER-SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA AND NE	3,075	3,075
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,189	2,189
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,609	4,409
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,088	4,088

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,934	2,300
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,491	1,991
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	460	460
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	552	552
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,204	1,204
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	752	752
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	48	48
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,144	1,144
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,521	1,521
MARION LAKE, KS	1,621	1,621
MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,034	2,034
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,997	1,997
PEARSON-SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	1,052	1,052
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,111	2,111
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,897	1,897
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	194	194
TORONTO LAKE, KS	424	424
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,106	2,106
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,846	1,846
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN	8,171	8,171
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,074	2,074
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	35	1,135
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,703	1,703
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,343	1,343
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	833	833
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,555	1,555
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	19	19
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,927	1,927
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,259	1,259
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,081	1,081
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,769	1,769
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	181	181
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	400	400
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,542	1,542
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	28	28
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	623	623
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	52	52
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,992	1,992
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN AND OH	30,969	30,969
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN AND OH	5,577	5,577
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	982	982
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	6	6
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,120	2,120
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	913	913
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	7,162	8,362
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,156	1,156
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	14,681	15,681
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA		2,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	794	794
BAYOU LACOMBE, LA		315
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	1,085	1,085
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	40	40
BAYOU SEGNETTE, LA		740
BAYOU TECHE, LA		2,000
CADDO LAKE, LA	166	166
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	15,852	15,852

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,443	1,443
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	19,129	19,500
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,223	3,223
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	772	772
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	7,297	12,224
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	20	441
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	5	105
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,280	1,280
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	80	80
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	57,482	57,482
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	13,061	13,061
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80	80
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,000	2,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	180	180
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	.....	280
MAINE		
BELFAST HARBOR, ME	1,305	1,505
CAMDEN HARBOR MAINTENANCE DREDGING	.....	470
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	16	16
NARRAGUAGUS RIVER, ME	.....	50
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,720	1,720
ROCKLAND HARBOR, ME	1,110	1,110
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	500	500
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	663	663
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	18,444	18,444
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	168	168
FISHING CREEK, MD	.....	492
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	930	1,330
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	34	34
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV	1,653	1,653
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	1,627	1,627
POCOMOKE RIVER, MD	619	619
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	323	323
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	91	91
TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD	180	180
TWICH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	.....	950
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	604	2,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
AUNT LYDIA'S COVE, CHATHAM, MA	418	418
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	533	533
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	498	498
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	431	431
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	7,659	7,659
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	260	260
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	174	174
CUTTYHUNK HARBOR, MA	174	174
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	313	313
GREEN HARBOR, MA	418	418
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	416	416
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	112	112
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	483	483
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	441	441
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	322	322
PLYMOUTH HARBOR, MA	1,000	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	1,197	1,197
SCITUATE HARBOR, MA	2,950	2,950
TULLY LAKE, MA	486	486

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
WEST HILL DAM, MA	657	657
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	406	406
MICHIGAN		
ALPENA HARBOR, MI	222	222
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	107	107
BAY PORT HARBOR, MI	299	299
BLACK RIVER HARBOR, MI	12	12
BLACK RIVER, PORT HURON, MI	14	500
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	128	128
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	124	124
CHEBOYGAN HARBOR, MI	12	12
CLINTON RIVER, MI	10	10
DETROIT RIVER, MI	3,192	3,192
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	177	177
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,250	1,250
GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	227	227
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	505	505
INLAND ROUTE, MI	33	33
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	154	154
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	450	450
LAC LA BELLE, MI	102	102
LELAND HARBOR, MI	174	174
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	704	704
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	462	462
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	95	95
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	247	247
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	50	50
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	193	193
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI AND WI	281	281
MONROE HARBOR, MI	792	792
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	387	387
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	156	156
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	1,745	1,745
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	25	25
PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	501	501
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	21	21
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	234	234
ROUGE RIVER, MI	933	933
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	2,351	2,351
SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	2,803	2,803
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	12	12
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	54	54
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	694	694
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	996	996
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	18,181	18,181
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,507	2,507
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	67	67
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN AND SD	274	274
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN AND WI	4,506	4,506
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	207	207
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	1,031	1,031
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	130	130
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	45,405	45,405
ORWELL LAKE, MN	481	481
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	72	72
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	126	126
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	4,513	4,513
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	306	306
TWO HARBORS, MN	167	167

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR	.....	1,500
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	8	113
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	170	170
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,002	3,402
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	7	7
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	25	106
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,618	1,618
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	3,401	5,001
PEARL RIVER, MS AND LA	288	288
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	5	5
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	15	613
WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS	.....	1,500
YAZOO RIVER, MS	15	105
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	21	240
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,959	5,959
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	1,860	1,860
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	10,253	10,253
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	1,043	1,043
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	935	935
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	980	980
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	13,878	14,378
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	16	290
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,168	2,168
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	6	6
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	296	296
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MO	.....	400
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,070	1,070
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	4,268	4,268
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	6,261	6,261
UNION LAKE, MO	10	10
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	7,354	7,354
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	40	40
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	1,505	1,505
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	100	100
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE AND SD	7,199	7,199
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	2,025	2,025
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	78	78
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO	500	500
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWO	45	45
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	669	669
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	925	925
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	39	39
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV AND CA	556	556
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	194	194
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	454	454
COCHECO RIVER, NH	50	500
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	490	490
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	496	496
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,074	1,074
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	11	11

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
LITTLE HARBOR, NH	200	200
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	577	577
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	273	273
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	575	575
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,750	1,750
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	425	425
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	20	20
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA AND DE	19,245	19,745
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,470	3,470
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	65	65
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,586	2,586
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	75	75
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	425	425
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	782	782
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	80	80
SHARK RIVER, NJ	590	590
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,949	3,449
COCHITI LAKE, NM	2,124	2,124
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	2,032	2,032
GALISTEO DAM, NM	510	510
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	175	175
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	497	1,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,400	1,400
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	112	112
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	369	369
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL, NM	55	55
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	457	457
ARKPORT DAM, NY	246	246
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,041	1,041
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	643	643
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	300	300
CAPE VINCENT HARBOR, NY	11	11
CATTARAUGUS CREEK HARBOR, NY	50	50
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	480	480
EAST RIVER, NY	80	80
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	2,100	2,100
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	501	501
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	175	175
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	80	80
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	80	80
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	80	80
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	80	80
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	2,245	2,245
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	3,170	3,170
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	639	639
IRONDEQUOIT BAY HARBOR, NY	10	10
JAMAICA BAY, NY	1,420	1,420
JONES INLET, NY	100	100
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	80	80
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	1,284	1,284
MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	80	80
MORICHES INLET, NY	600	600
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	2,040	2,040
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	3,835	3,835
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY AND NJ	5,300	5,300
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	750	750

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	3,720	3,720
OAK ORCHARD HARBOR, NY	15	15
OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	10	10
PLATTSBURGH HARBOR, NY	590	590
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	2,595	2,595
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	35	35
SAG HARBOR, NY	2,500	2,500
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	1,346	1,346
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	760	760
STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	20	20
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	595	595
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	705	705
WILSON HARBOR, NY	20	20
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	806	4,000
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,829	1,829
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	400	400
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	867	867
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	587	587
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,060	1,060
FALLS LAKE, NC	2,281	2,281
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	32	32
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	455	455
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,732	4,732
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	45	45
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	5,100	5,400
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	815	815
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	640	640
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	139	139
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	73	73
ROANOKE RIVER, NC	100	100
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	3,480	3,480
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	8,213	8,213
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN-HALEY LAKE, ND	177	177
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	11,939	12,239
HOMME LAKE, ND	281	281
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	15	15
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,354	1,354
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	395	395
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	68	68
SOURIS RIVER, ND	370	370
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	775	775
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,915	1,915
BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,857	1,857
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,234	1,234
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	773	773
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,520	3,520
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	585	585
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	711	711
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	932	932
DILLON LAKE, OH	576	576
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	1,090	1,090
HURON HARBOR, OH	860	860
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	233	233
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	3,400	3,400
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25	25
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	789	789

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,036	1,036
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	6,133	6,133
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	319	319
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	778	778
PORT CLINTON HARBOR, OH	1,275	1,275
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	150	150
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	90	90
ROCKY RIVER, OH	30	30
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30	30
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,010	1,010
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	175	175
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,525	3,525
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	240	240
TOUSSAINT RIVER, OH	520	520
VERMILION HARBOR, OH	205	205
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	461	461
WEST HARBOR, OH	30	30
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	992	992
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	451	451
BIRCH LAKE, OK	602	602
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,627	1,627
CANDY LAKE, OK	19	399
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,620	1,620
COPAN LAKE, OK	821	1,521
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	5,546	5,546
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	4,352	4,352
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	924	924
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	209	209
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	600	600
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,732	1,732
HULAH LAKE, OK	426	1,076
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	94	94
KAW LAKE, OK	1,931	1,931
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	4,647	4,647
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	3,923	3,923
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,360	2,360
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	59	59
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	34	34
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,187	1,187
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,648	4,648
SARDIS LAKE, OK	912	912
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	389	389
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,488	1,488
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,690	3,690
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,498	1,498
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	4,178	4,178
WISTER LAKE, OK	580	580
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	729	729
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	220	220
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	5,043	5,443
CHETCO RIVER, OR		390
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA AND PORTLA	14,770	17,770
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA	6,632	10,702
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	526	526
COOS BAY, OR	5,494	5,494
COQUILLE RIVER, OR		330
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	842	842
COUGAR LAKE, OR	732	732

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
DEPOT BAY, OR		3,200
DETROIT LAKE, OR	588	588
DORENA LAKE, OR	635	635
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	419	419
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	989	989
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,122	1,122
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	401	401
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	172	172
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	3,416	5,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,613	1,613
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,028	3,028
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	4,626	4,626
PORT ORFORD, OR	606	606
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	200	200
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR		450
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	71	71
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	466	466
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	5	325
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	134	134
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	15	315
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	963	963
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	344	344
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	67	67
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	714	714
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR		1,450
YAQUINA RIVER, DEPOT SLOUGH, OR		100
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	4,070	4,070
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	630	630
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	270	270
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,171	1,171
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,513	2,513
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	898	898
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,915	1,915
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,746	1,746
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	722	722
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,318	1,318
ERIE HARBOR, PA	60	60
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	775	775
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	782	4,282
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	341	341
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	170	170
JOHNSTOWN, PA	1,243	1,243
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,231	1,231
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	957	957
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	848	848
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	14,357	14,357
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH AND WV	18,589	18,589
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH AND WV	488	488
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	18	18
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	506	506
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	13	13
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,941	3,941
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	60	60
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	50	50
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,734	2,734
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	392	392
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	72	72
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,542	2,542
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	2,032	2,032
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	245	245

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	761	761
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	543	543
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD	1,895	1,895
RHODE ISLAND		
BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI	502	502
POINT JUDITH POND AND HARBOR OF REFUGE		120
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	6	6
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	2,330	2,330
PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	8,220	30,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	264	3,598
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	10,516	10,516
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,140	7,050
FOLLY RIVER		257
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	3,073	4,373
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	26	26
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC		2,222
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	69	69
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	816	816
TOWN CREEK, SC		396
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	9,137	9,137
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD		5,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	211	211
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	184	184
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	9,016	9,016
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	24	24
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD AND MN	504	504
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	500	500
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD AND ND	12,885	12,885
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	69	69
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	6,031	6,031
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,257	6,257
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	1,025	1,025
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	6,407	6,407
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	5,720	5,720
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	129	129
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	2,954	2,954
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,598	6,598
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	6	6
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	15,794	15,794
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	19	440
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	743	743
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI	1,373	1,373
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	606	606
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,574	1,574
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,389	2,389
BELTON LAKE, TX	2,707	2,707
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,011	2,011
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	2,143	2,143
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	3,126	3,126
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,498	2,498
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,669	5,669
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	6,132	6,732
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	5	5

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,682	2,682
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	7,298	7,298
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	4,887	4,887
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,612	1,612
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,602	2,602
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	20,829	20,829
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,250	1,250
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	8,254	13,300
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	498	498
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,248	1,248
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	823	823
LAKE KEMP, TX	150	150
LAVON LAKE, TX	2,609	2,609
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,134	3,134
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,748	1,748
MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	2,604	2,604
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,676	1,676
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,835	1,835
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	872	872
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,116	1,116
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,623	1,623
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	50	50
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	862	862
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	14,986	14,986
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,559	4,559
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	255	255
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,683	2,683
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,805	1,805
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	300	500
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	2,135	2,135
WACO LAKE, TX	2,270	2,270
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	999	999
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	5,205	5,205
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,742	2,742
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	81	81
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	364	364
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	705	780
BURLINGTON HARBOR BREAKWATER, VT	2,150	800
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	26	26
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT AND NY	95	95
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	576	576
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	647	722
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	687	762
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	538	613
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA	2,035	2,035
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA	1,159	1,159
CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	155	155
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	1,124	1,124
DAVIS CREEK, VA	350	350
DEEP CREEK, NEWPORT NEW, VA		1,300
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,612	1,612
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK AND NEWPORT NEWS HBR (DRIFT REMOVAL	1,200	1,200
HORN HARBOR, VA	270	270
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	111	111
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,801	4,800
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA AND NC	9,890	9,890

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,334	1,334
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	225	225
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	200	200
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	8,679	8,679
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	297	297
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	4,377	4,377
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	749	749
QUINBY CREEK, VA	400	400
RUDEE INLET, VA	1,030	1,030
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,150	1,150
WHITINGS CREEK, MIDDLESEX CO, VA	350	350
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	853	853
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA	.....	764
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,355	1,355
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	8,781	12,281
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,777	1,777
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,065	5,065
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	257	257
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	7,479	7,479
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,268	1,268
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,244	5,244
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,291	3,291
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	947	947
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	321	321
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	2,075	2,075
NEAH BAY, WA	.....	750
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	253	253
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	999	999
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	975	975
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	439	439
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	640	640
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	247	247
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	60	60
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	127	127
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA AND OR	2,264	2,514
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	492	492
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,167	1,167
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,149	1,149
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,555	1,555
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,832	1,832
ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	440	440
ELKINS, WV	16	16
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	131	131
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	7,544	13,394
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY AND OH	18,991	18,991
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY AND OH	3,260	3,260
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,431	1,431
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	905	905
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,603	1,603
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,777	1,777
TYGART LAKE, WV	5,546	5,546
WISCONSIN		
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	180	180
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	820	820
FOX RIVER, WI	1,372	1,372
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,924	2,424
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	31	31

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	1,315	1,315
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	75	75
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	278	278
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	789	789
OCONTO HARBOR, WI	13	13
PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI	261	261
PORT WING HARBOR, WI	6	6
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	56	56
SAXON HARBOR, WI	45	45
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	1,603	1,603
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	1,578	1,578
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	498	498
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	471	471
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,233	1,233
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	101	101
MISCELLANEOUS		
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	725	725
AUTOMATED BUDGET SYSTEM (WINABS)	285	285
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,750	2,750
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	1,545	1,545
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	8,000	8,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,180	1,180
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	6,755	6,755
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	1,545	1,545
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	300	300
FACILITY PROTECTION	64,000	35,000
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS	1,000	1,000
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	675	675
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION PROJECTS	4,120	4,120
MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,750	1,750
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	45	45
NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM	30	30
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	4,120	4,120
NATIONAL LEWIS AND CLARK COMMEMORATION COORDINATOR	310	310
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	815	815
PROTECTING, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS(SEC 3	50	50
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM (RMSP)	1,545	1,545
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	1,545	1,545
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675	675
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	500
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	725	725
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,745	4,745
HYDROPOWER MAINTENANCE	.....	−49,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−19,091	−47,778
ADJUSTMENT FOR ACTUAL RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	−240	.....
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,912,310	1,956,182

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

Maintenance backlogs continue to grow, with much of the backlog being essential maintenance dredging needed to keep the Na-

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

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

The budget request has proposed that no navigation project with less than one billion ton-miles of cargo be eligible for maintenance dredging. The Committee believes that this is in direct conflict with the way projects are analyzed. Project analysis is based upon Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies (1983), the Corps of Engineers Planning Guidance Notebook (2000), and other polices and procedures. For navigation studies, the analysis centers on transportation savings to the Nation considering the ultimate origins and destinations of commodities to be moved. Operation and maintenance costs are considered as a part of this analysis and are figured into the benefit to cost ratio utilized to make the investment decision. By applying an arbitrary ton-mile figure to determine O&M funding decisions, the budget request has essentially obviated the need for any of the previous studies undertaken to determine the investment decision.

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

Uncertainties in maintenance funding for lower use projects, seriously impact their abilities to compete and become higher use facilities. Without funding to provide a stable channel and authorized depths and widths, industries and shippers are reluctant to make the necessary investments in using these projects. The Committee believes that proposed elimination of maintenance funding for au-

thorized projects is not only a serious disservice to the public, but is demonstrates a profound lack of respect for the congressional oversight committees that have jurisdiction for authorization and deauthorization of such projects.

The Committee is not in favor of funding projects that are no longer economically viable or environmentally sustainable however, we believe that they should be proposed for deauthorization through the proper congressional oversight committees. Therefore, the Committee has restored funding to most of the low use waterways and port projects not included in the budget request and encourages the administration to budget accordingly.

Alabama Coosa River, AL.—The Committee has provided $200,000 above the budgeted amount for implementation of a systemwide geographic information system for the Alabama-Coosa River.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, AL & MS.—The Committee recommendation includes $26,800,000. Within the funds provided, $2,000,000 is provided for to maintain mitigation on State managed lands and $1,717,000 is provided to accomplish additional dredging of navigation channels.

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, AR.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 above the budget request to perform advance maintenance dredging to assure the authorized depth of 9 feet is maintained.

Ouachita/Black Rivers Navigation Project, AR & LA.—The Committee recommendation includes $8,325,000. Funds provided above the budget request are for yearly maintenance dredging, and backlog maintenance.

White River, AR.—The Committee has provided $2,200,000 for routine operation and maintenance activities and for minimum expected dredging and snagging requirements.

Humbolt Harbor, CA.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,500,000 to the administration's budget request of $3,426,000 for Humboldt Bay, California, for advanced maintenance dredging to remove the source of shoaling that has impeded navigational safety in the entry channel to the harbor. The shoaling has caused loss of life, property, oil spills and interruptions in the flow of commerce to and from Humboldt Bay.

Los Angeles County Drainage Area, CA.—Within the funds provided, $3,160,000 is for the Hansen Dam unit of the project. The funds are to be used for restoration of the swim/recreation lake facility, and initiation of a design for a playfield and campground site. The Committee urges the Corps to work with the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy concerning development and management of the natural areas within the Hansen Dam Recreation Area.

Cherry Creek, Chatfield, and Trinidad Lakes, CO.—An appropriations request of $1,500,000 over the budget for these three lakes has been provided. Frequent inundation of recreation areas are causing health and safety concerns requiring repair or replacement of the facilities. A total of $1,500,000 above the budget request has been provided for 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 cost of the operation and maintenance of these recreation facilities.

Treatment of Dredged Material from Long Island Sound.—$250,000 is provided to initiate a demonstration program for the use of innovative technologies for the treatment of dredged materials from Long Island Sound.

Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, DE & MD.—The Committee recommendation is $12,853,000. Funds are provided for routine operation and maintenance activities and for immediate reimbursement to the State of Delaware for normal operation and maintenance costs incurred by the State for the SR–1 Bridge, from station 58+00 to station 293+00, between October 1, 2002 and September 30, 2003. The reimbursable costs include electric lighting and associated late fees, power sweeping, drainage cleaning, snow removal, surface deicing, and periodic bridge inspections. The Corps shall initiate necessary repairs to the SR–1 bridge once repair recommendations from the bridge inspections are received.

Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, FL.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for maintenance activities along the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway.

Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, GA, FL, & AL.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,709,000 which includes annual dredging of the river channel, annual operations and maintenance of the George W. Andrews Lock, spot dredging of shoals continue slough mouth restorations, continue restoration efforts at Corley Slough, and routine operations and maintenance of the project.

Missouri River—Sioux City to Rulo, IA & NE.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 above the budget request to continue implementation of actions related to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service biological opinion.

Red Rock Dam, Lake Red Rock, IA.—The Committee has provided $800,000 above the budget request to complete repairs to the SE Des Moines Remedial Works Levee.

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, IL, IA, MN, MO, & WI.—The Committee has provided $500,000 above the budget request for ongoing major maintenance items and initiation of major maintenance activities at Lock and Dam 11.

Clinton Lake, KS.—An additional $366,000 has been provided above the budget request for Lewis and Clark Commemoration events.

Big Sandy Harbor, KY.—$1,135,000 has been provided by the Committee for annual dredging requirements.

Wolf Creek Dam, Lake Cumberland, KY.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,200,000 above the budget request for the Corps to make safety and other necessary improvements to the boat ramps at Old Fall Creek, Tate Access, Camp Attrahunt and Ramsey Point.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,224,000. Within the funds provided, $1,000,000 is provided for bank stabilization repairs, $408,000 is

provided for dredging entrances to oxbow lakes, with the remainder provided for routine operation and maintenance activities, annual dredging requirements, and backlog maintenance items.

Narraguagus River, Milbridge, ME.—The Committee has provided $50,000 for the Corps to complete necessary environmental documentation and plans and specifications for restoring the project to authorized widths and depths.

Black River, Port Huron, MI.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate maintenance dredging of the project.

Morehead City Harbor, NC.—$300,000 has been provided above the budget request to complete the Section 933 study concerning placement of maintenance material on the beaches of Bogue Banks.

Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, ND.—The Committee has provided $300,000 above the budget request for mosquito control and continued improvements to low water lake accessibility.

Cocheco River, NH.—$500,000 has been provided for needed maintenance dredging of the authorized project.

Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model, New Mexico.—The Committee is aware of the importance and need for the daily water operations model for the Upper Rio Grande Basin.

Cochiti Partnering Initiative, Cochiti Pueblo, New Mexico.—The Committee is aware of the joint efforts made by both the Corps of Engineers and the Cochiti pueblo in an attempt to resolve residual differences regarding the construction of the Cochiti dam and encourages both sides to continue to build further on this relationship.

Delaware River, Philadelphia to the Sea, NJ, PA, & DE.—The Committee has provided $500,000 above the budget request to continue restoration work at Pea Patch Island.

Copan Lake, OK.—The Committee is aware of the need to complete a study of the need to determine the feasibility of reallocating available storage at Copan Lake, OK to meet the future water supply needs for the city of Bartlesville, OK. Therefore the Committee has provided $1,521,000 for routine operations and maintenance and the reallocation study.

Bonneville Lock and Dam, OR & WA.—The Committee has provided $400,000 above the budget request for continue actions to implement the Federal Columbia River Power System Biological Opinion.

Columbia River at the Mouth, OR & WA.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,702,000. Funds provided are for routine operations and maintenance, increased dredging costs, jetty evaluation, studies of alternate dredged material disposal and a dredged material disposal demonstration project at Benson Beach.

John Day Lock and Dam, OR & WA.—The Committee has provided $1,584,000 above the budget request for significant safety repairs to the navigation lock, to continue the major rehabilitation evaluation report to address significant foundation problems, and to continue actions to implement the Federal Columbia River Power System Biological Opinion.

Francis E. Walter Dam, PA.—The Committee has provided $3,500,000 above the budget request to complete the relocation of the frequently inundated access road.

Point Judith Pond and Harbor of Refuge, RI.—The Committee recommendation includes $120,000 to survey the breakwaters and determine if repairs are warranted.

Providence River and Harbor, RI.—The Committee recommendation includes $30,000,000 to initiate dredging of the authorized project.

Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, SC.—The Committee has provided $7,050,000 for the Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, SC project. Within the funds provided, $3,750,000 is provided to make a lump sum payment to the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources to perform all future operation of the fish lift at St. Stephen, South Carolina.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, SD.—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 has provided $5,000,000 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.

Texas Water Allocation Assessment, TX.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the Texas Water Allocation Assessment for the Corps to work with the Texas regional planning groups in the evaluation of technologies and the exploration of water supply opportunities in the State including (where appropriate) water reuse, aquifer storage and recovery, and development of new multi-purpose facilities.

Burlington Harbor Breakwater, VT.—The Committee recommendation includes $800,000 to complete repairs to the south breakwater.

Connecticut River Basin Master Plans, VT.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 to complete master plans for Ball Mountain, North Springfield, Townshend, and Union Village Reservoirs in Vermont.

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, WA.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,281,000 for routine operation and maintenance, to complete the North Jetty rehabilitation contract, to continue entrance channel study, for maintenance of the South Jetty.

Facility Protection.—The Committee has provided $35,000,000. The Committee has been informed that this is the average annual cost for guards at critical facilities.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2002	$127,000,000
Budget estimate, 2003	144,252,000
Committee recommendation	144,252,000

An appropriation of $144,252,000 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, the Clean Water Act of 1977, and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972.

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

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2002	$140,000,000
Budget estimate, 2003	140,298,000
Committee recommendation	140,298,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $140,298,000 to continue activities related to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) in fiscal year 2003.

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 notes that portions of the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant in Middleton, Iowa, has recently been deemed eligible for inclusion into the FUSRAP program. The Committee encourages the Corps to reprogram available FUSRAP funds to initiate work on this site as soon as practicable and to budget for this site in future budget submissions.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2002	$153,000,000
Budget estimate, 2003	155,651,000
Committee recommendation	155,651,000

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.

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, informatino 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 and analyses amd 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 centralizes support for all Corps finance and accounting sites.

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.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $155,651,000.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 2002	
Recissions	−$25,000,000
Budget estimate, 2003	20,227,000
Committee recommendation	20,227,000

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 is aware of the successful testing of the Rapid Deployment Flood Wall at the Engineering Research and Development Center in Vicksburg, Mississippi. This technology has proven to be promising in the effort to fight floods, cost-effective, quick to deploy and successful in protecting property from flood damage, damages which total millions each year.

The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers intends to revise 33 CFR 203.82 and implement cost-sharing conditions for emergency response and recovery activities funded by the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (FCCE) account. Public Law 8499

provides the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with broad discretionary authority to respond to disasters, preserve human life, and protect critical infrastructure. Appropriations to the FCCE account allow the Corps to provide assistance to distressed areas before, during and after natural disasters—events that usually require rapid response and extract heavy tolls on community resources. Under such urgent and extreme circumstances, Federal cost-sharing should not impose delay and unreasonable financial burdens on state and local governments trying to rebuild their communities. The Committee expects the Secretary to administer the FCCE program in accordance with the terms and conditions of Public Law 84–99 in a fair, reasonable and balanced manner, and to inform the Appropriations Committees of any specific cost sharing required in law for the FCCE program and to modify 33 CFR 203.82 accordingly. Further, the Appropriations Committees shall be informed of any Corps of Engineers proposal intended to be published in the Federal Register.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Language included under Section 101 restates language contained in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60 which places a limit on credits and reimbursements allowable per project and annually.

The bill includes language in Section 102 which directs that none of the funds made available in fiscal year 2002 may be used to carry out any activity relating to closure or removal of the St. Georges Bridge across the Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland.

SEC. 103. The Committee has included language to make changes to Sec. 595(h)(1) of Public Law 106–53.

SEC. 104. The Committee has included language concerning private sector contracting percentages.

SEC. 105. The Committee has included language making technical corrections to the St. Paul Harbor, Alaska project.

SEC. 106. The Committee has included language making technical corrections to the Abiquiu Dam Emergency gate project.

SEC. 107. The Committee has included language concerning relocations credit for the Tropicana Flamingo project.

SEC. 108. The Committee has included language concerning rehabilitation of the dredge McFARLAND. The Committee believes that a determination for how the dredge is to be utilized following this rehabilitation should be deferred until after the GAO report requested in Public Law 107–66 has been received and has undergone a thorough review by the appropriate Committees.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2002	$36,228,000
Budget estimate, 2003	36,228,000
Committee recommendation	36,228,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2002 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act totals $36,228,000. An appropriation of $23,643,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction; $11,259,000 for fish, wildlife, and recreation, mitigation and conservation. The Committee recommendation provides $1,326,000 for program administration and oversight.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2002	$762,531,000
Budget estimate, 2003	726,147,000
Committee recommendation	816,147,000

An appropriation of $816,147,000 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 is aware the Bureau has undertaken an investigation into the extent to which alkali silica reactivity effects projects within the Bureau's domain. The Committee commends the Bureau for this initiative. The Committee requests that information from the investigations be provided to the relevant Senate

and House authorizing and appropriating Subcommittees within 6 months of enactment, along with recommendations for a course of action to prevent and mitigate ASR in the future's.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
ARIZONA				
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	.....	6,200	.....	6,200
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER BASIN	34,709	74	34,709	74
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I	731	10,240	731	10,240
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	3,450	.....	4,450	.....
FORT MCDOWELL SETTLEMENT ACT	500	.....	500	.....
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	422	.....	422	.....
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER REUSE PROJECT	250	.....	250	.....
SALT RIVER PROJECT	39	.....	39	.....
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	4,825	.....	4,825	.....
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	797	.....	797	.....
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	200	.....	500	.....
TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY	100	.....	100	.....
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,658	19,107	1,658	19,107
CALIFORNIA	.....			
CACHUMA AREA PROJECTS	778	557	778	557
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	417	.....	417	.....
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PLANT	1,000	.....	1,000	.....
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	2,043	9,658	2,043	9,658
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	7,707	44	7,707	44
DELTA DIVISION	11,095	5,323	18,845	5,323
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,230	3,855	1,230	3,855
FRIANT DIVISION	2,276	3,024	4,026	3,024
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	12,726	1,027	27,726	1,027
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT	.....	16,000	.....	16,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	4,921	1,780	5,821	1,780
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	519	.....	519	.....
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	249	.....	249	.....
SHASTA DIVISION	1,543	8,042	4,543	8,042
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	7,727	5,572	7,727	5,572
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	1,791	7,614	1,791	7,614
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	5,989	6,018	5,989	6,018
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	1,000	.....	1,000	.....
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	200	.....	3,000	.....
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	1,500	.....	1,800	.....
LONG BEACH DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	.....	.....	1,000	.....
MISSION BASIN BRACKISH GROUNDWATER DESALTING DEMO	.....	.....	300	.....
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	1,800	.....	2,500	.....
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT, PHAS	1,800	.....	1,800	.....
ORLAND PROJECT	39	430	39	430
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	1,000	.....	1,000	.....
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	6,000	.....	6,000	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	1,800	.....	1,800	.....
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	2,000	.....	2,000	.....
SOLANO PROJECT	1,248	1,513	1,248	1,513

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	842	.....	842	.....
COLORADO				
ANIMAS LAS PLATA PROJECT, CRSP SECTION 5 AND 8	33,000	.....	35,000	.....
COLLBRAN PROJECT	122	1,212	122	1,212
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	75	.....	75	.....
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	12	10,265	12	10,265
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT—HORSETOOTH DAM	.....	31,100	.....	31,100
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	41	118	41	118
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	.....	6,785	.....	6,985
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	224	612	224	612
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	582	1,552	582	1,552
MANCOS PROJECT	28	50	28	50
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	50	1,968	50	1,968
PINE RIVER PROJECT	58	65	58	65
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT	399	4,066	399	4,066
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	143	113	143	113
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	2,714	3,192	2,714	3,192
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	15,000	.....	15,500	.....
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT	100	.....	100	.....
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	578	.....	578	.....
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,282	2,194	3,282	2,194
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	200	.....	200	.....
KANSAS				
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	235	.....	235	.....
WICHITA PROJECT	.....	285	.....	285
MONTANA				
FORT PECK DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	.....	.....	7,000	.....
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	.....	300	.....	300
MILK RIVER PROJECT	320	826	320	826
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	475	.....	475	.....
ROCKY BOYS INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	4,600	.....	4,600	.....
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	.....	78	.....	78
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	71	.....	71	.....
NEVADA				
HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY	.....	.....	390	.....
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	6,215	2,339	6,215	2,339
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	1,000	.....	2,000	.....
SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	.....	.....	3,000	.....
NEW MEXICO				
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER AND RECLAMATION REUSE	.....	.....	400	.....
CARLSBAD PROJECT	1,644	1,126	1,644	1,126
EASTERN NEW MEXICO WATER SUPPLY	.....	.....	250	.....
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	7,200	8,263	19,200	18,763
NAVAJO GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	300	.....	300	.....
NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	300	.....	300	.....
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	.....	27	.....	500
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	1,054	2,953	1,054	2,953
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	243	.....	243	.....
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	196	.....	196	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	19	.....	19	.....
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	165	.....	165	.....
NORTH DAKOTA				
DAKOTAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	239	.....	239	.....
DAKOTAS TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	400	.....	400	.....
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT	20,662	4,577	24,000	4,577
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	.....	193	.....	193
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	.....	452	.....	452
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	.....	306	.....	306
NORMAN PROJECT	225	208	225	208
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	207	.....	507	.....
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	.....	742	.....	742
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	.....	293	.....	293
OREGON				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	301	546	301	546
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	500	.....	750	.....
DESCHUTES PROJECT	382	152	382	152
DESCHUTES PROJECT-WICKUP DAM	.....	12,300	.....	12,300
DESCHUTES PROJECT, TUMALO, BEND FEED CANAL	.....	.....	1,300	.....
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	308	275	308	275
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	150	.....	150	.....
KLAMATH PROJECT	13,644	623	19,377	623
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	333	.....	333	.....
ROUGE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, SAVAGE RAPIDS PUMPING PLANT	.....	.....	250	.....
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	454	169	454	169
TUALATIN PROJECT	238	125	238	125
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	25	.....	25	.....
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	50	.....	300	.....
UMATILLA PROJECT	408	2,363	408	2,363
WILLOW LAKE NATURAL TREATMENT SYSTEM	.....	.....	650	.....
SOUTH DAKOTA				
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	2,000	.....	7,000	.....
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	10,000	40	17,860	40
MNI WICONI PROJECT	23,292	8,228	30,772	8,228
PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	.....	.....	4,300	.....
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM	.....	27	.....	27
TEXAS				
BALMORHEA PROJECT	.....	71	.....	71
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	.....	109	.....	109
LEON CREEK QUARRY/MITCHELL LAKE WATER REUSE PROJECTA	.....	.....	500	.....
LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCE CONSERVATION	.....	.....	500	.....
NUECES RIVER	.....	392	.....	392
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	.....	307	.....	307
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	217	.....	217	.....
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT	120	24	120	24
MOON LAKE PROJECT	43	53	43	53
NAVAJO SANDSTONE AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY	100	.....	100	.....
NEWTON PROJECT	52	21	52	21
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	301	.....	301	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	350	44	350	44
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	677	493	677	493
SCOFIELD PROJECT	97	27	97	27
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	279	.....	279	.....
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	107	7	107	7
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,455	399	1,455	399
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	52	71	52	71
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	4,485	6,346	4,885	6,346
SALMON CREEK WATERSHED RESTORATION, WA	.....	.....	250	.....
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	518	.....	518	.....
YAKIMA PROJECT	598	6,156	598	6,156
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	11,900	.....	15,775	.....
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT	4	2,568	4	2,568
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	10	1,324	10	1,324
SHOSHONE PROJECT	10	1,232	10	1,232
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	37	.....	37	.....
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II: 1PROGRAM AND COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMEN	10,087	.....	10,087	.....
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5	7,178	2,302	7,178	2,302
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8, R&F&WL	3,970	22	3,970	22
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	150	.....	150	.....
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,275	.....	1,275
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	.....	21,910	.....	21,910
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	.....	14,315	.....	14,315
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	.....	50	.....	50
DEPARTMENTAL IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	2,600	.....	3,350	.....
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE	899	.....	5,399	.....
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	3,087	.....	3,087	.....
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	.....	334	.....	334
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	12,747	.....	12,747	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,706	.....	1,706	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,890	.....	1,890	.....
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	.....	5,597	.....	5,597
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,390	.....	1,390
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	2,195	.....	2,195	.....
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	9,689	.....	9,689	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	275	.....	275	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	12,421	.....	12,421	.....
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	.....	594	.....	594
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	850	.....	850	.....
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	8,500	.....	8,500	.....
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,185	.....	1,185	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	420	921	420	921
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN—OTHER PROJECTS	2,828	30,759	2,828	30,759
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	969	244	969	244
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	420	.....	420	.....
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	4,469	.....	4,469	.....
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT—TITLE XXVIII	2,800	.....	2,800	.....
RECREATION & FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	2,292	.....	2,292	.....
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:				
ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT DESALINATION PROGRAM	1,310	.....	1,310	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
APPLIED SCIENCE /TECHNOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT	3,490		3,490	
DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	100		4,000	
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION/ ENHANCEMEN	900		900	
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	350		350	
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,000		1,000	
SITE SECURITY		28,440		28,440
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION	326		326	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	1,942		1,942	
TITLE XVI, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	1,500		3,500	
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECHNICAL SUPPORT	67		67	
WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM	6,581		7,081	
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	3,117		3,117	
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	−37,942		−74,341	
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	381,164	344,983	459,991	356,156
LOAN PROGRAM				
CALIFORNIA				
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	1,239		1,239	
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION	401		401	
SAN SEVAINE CREEK WATER PROJECT	5,575		5,575	
VARIOUS				
LOAN ADMINISTRATION	280		280	
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM	7,495		7,495	

Colorado River Front Work and Levee System, AZ.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue design and Environmental compliance activities for water management reservoirs to be constructed along the All American Canal.

Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, CO.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 for the reevaluation report.

Central Valley Project, CA.—The Committee recommendation provides an additional $30,000,000 for this project for activities in support of the California Bay-Delta Restoration. These activities are more fully described under the heading for the California Bay-Delta Restoration.

CVP, Sacramento Division.—The Committee has provided $400,000 above the budget request to continue the Colusa Basin Integrated Resource Management Plan.

Lake Tahoe Regional Wetlands Development, California.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 to continue the environmental restoration projects in the vicinity of Lake Tahoe, California and Nevada.

The Bureau of Reclamation is authorized hereafter to negotiate and enter into financial assistance agreements with public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions for activities under the Lake Tahoe Regional Wetlands Development Program. Costs associated with such activities will be non-reimbursable.

Animas Las-Plata Project, Colorado.—The bill contains $35,000,000 for the Animas Las-Plata, Colorado Project. The Committee recognizes that with constrained resources it will be difficult to maintain the schedule established by the Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000.

Arrowrock Dam, Idaho.—The Committee expects continued and full compliance by the Bureau with Section 206 of Public Law 107–066, with regard to the Valve Rehabilitation Project at the Arrowrock Dam on the Arrowrock Division of the Boise Project in Idaho, for the full period of recovery of expenses prescribed in that Section.

Columbia and Snake River Salmon Recovery Project, ID, OR, and WA.—The Committee has provided $500,000 above the budget request for continued fishery habitat improvements in the John Day River Subbasin Project, OR.

Lucky Peak, Idaho.—The Committee is aware of the Bureau collecting from water users for NEPA compliance work associated with the Lucky Peak water service contract renewals. The Committee believes that, with respect to these water service contracts, the Bureau of Reclamation should incur these costs as part of its regular activities and shall report to the Committee within 180 days within enactment of this bill on how it intends to address this situation.

Halfway Wash, NV.—The Committee recommendation has provided $390,000 to studies of Halfway Wash in Mesquite, County, NV.

Middle Rio Grande Project, NM.—The Committee is aware of the pending biological opinion in effect on the Rio Grande. When combined with the drought conditions facing New Mexico, and municipalities, farmers and the silvery minnow all competing for the same scarce resource, water, a delicate balance must be maintained. The recommendation includes funding for the following activities: $5,100,000 for modifications to river habitat; $2,180,000 for silvery minnow population management; $1,100,000 for monitoring of stream effects on the silvery minnow; $130,000 to combat non-native species endangering the silvery minnow; $650,000 for Bureau of Reclamation's repayment obligations under the agreement; $950,000 for water quality studies and improvements; and $2,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation's purchase of water. In addition, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service on silvery minnow monitoring and habitat efforts. Finally, the Committee has included statutory language which requires the Bureau to submit a report on the status and results of fiscal year 2002 funding and, to submit to the Committee for approval, a detailed spending plan for fiscal year 2003 within 60 days of enactment.

Middle Rio Grande Levees, New Mexico.—The Committee is very concerned about the state of disrepair of the Middle Rio Grande levees due to the lack of sufficient and regular maintenance within the river bed, including both the levees and the low-flow channel. The Committee has included an additional $10,000,000 to address this problem and expects the Bureau to expedite its work in order to begin the repair of the project in order to address the life and safety issues. Additionally, the Committee expects that the Bureau

will take all steps necessary to maintain the project in a responsible manner such that additional levees will not be at risk. Finally the Commissioner is directed to submit an annual report to the Senate Appropriations Committee on the status of the levee repairs.

Pecos River Basin Water Supply Salvage Project, New Mexico.—The Committee is aware that the Bureau of Reclamation carries out the Pecos River Basin Water Supply Salvage project in collaboration with the State of New Mexico. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation, within funds appropriated for the Facility Maintenance and Rehabilitation, not to provide less than $500,000 for this eradication effort.

Bandon Cranberry Water Control District, Oregon.—The Committee is aware that over the last several years, the Bureau of Reclamation has been working with the Bandon Cranberry Water Control District on several proposals for water storage capacity and reservoir upgrades. The Committee encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to continue its work in an effort to determine the Federal interest in these projects and the needs of the water district.

Garrison Diversion Unit, ND.—The Committee recommendation includes $24,000,000. While this is an increase over the budget request, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

Klamath Project, OR.—The Committee recommendation includes $19,377,000. The additional funds are for continued construction of the A-Canal fish screen.

Mni Wiconi Project, SD.—The Committee has provided $30,772,000 for the Mni Wiconi Project. While this is an increase over the budget request, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimal level.

Columbia Basin Project, WA.—The Committee recommendation includes $400,000 above the president's request for design documents, plans and specifications for stream habitat restoration along Icicle Creek, WA.

Salmon Creek Watershed Restoration Feasibility Study, WA.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for feasibility studies to improve fisheries habitat in the Salmon Creek Watershed.

Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program.—The Committee recognizes the progress the WateReuse Foundation program has accomplished in providing important research into the science and technological aspects of water reclamation and public health. The Committee is further aware that the Foundation has continued to meet its cost share is requirement as directed. Accordingly, the Committee provides that within funds provided, the Bureau of Reclamation is to provide $2,000,000 to support the WateReuse Foundation in its research activities. A high priority of this research shall be related to aquifer storage and recovery.

Within funds provided for the Title XVI Program, the Bureau is directed to undertake feasibility studies of the potential for water reclamation and reuse in North Las Vegas, NV in cooperation with the Southern Nevada Water Authority.

Science and Technology, Desalination Research and Development Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for desalination research and development. Within the funds provided,

the Commissioner is directed to assess the potential use of advanced water treatment technologies as a resource to create net new water supplies and to evaluate project benefits, economic values and environmental effects. Further, the Commissioner should identify resource needs that can be met through these technologies and interparty transfers and to identify obstacles to be overcome (physical, financial, institutional, and regulatory). The assessment should include an assessment of life cycle cost effectiveness and validate new technology and practices.

Drought Emergency Assistance.—The Committee has provided $5,399,000. Within the funds provided, $3,500,000 is for a regional weather damage modification program and $1,000,000 is for assistance to the State of Montana, now in its fourth year of drought.

The Committee is concerned about the impact of the current drought on farmers, municipalities, and other water users. Unfortunately, being that this issue was unanticipated, the President's budget did not contain any significant funds to address drought. Therefore, the Committee expects that the Bureau will utilize its drought emergency assistance program which enables the Bureau to construct temporary facilities and provide assistance in the form of contingency planning for communities in an effort to minimize the impacts of drought.

From the funds appropriated for drought emergency assistance, the Committee urges the Bureau to provide full and fair consideration of the request for drought assistance from the State of Hawaii and fund, if meritorious.

Water Management and Conservation Program.—The Committee has provided $500,000 above the President's budget for urban water conservation programs within the service area of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program.—The Committee has provided $750,000 above the budget request for the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users Association Selenium Remediation Demonstration Project.

Nonreimbursability of Security Funding.—Funds made available in Public Law 107–117 for Water and Related Resources to respond to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States and sums appropriated under this heading for increased site security/counter-terrorism activity shall be nonreimbursible.

BUDGET LIMITATIONS AND REDUCTIONS

Constrained spending limits have made it difficult for the Committee to formulate a balanced Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 2003. In order to adhere to the subcommittee's allocations, address the critical ongoing activities, correct program imbalances contained in the President's fiscal year 2003 budget, and respond to the numerous requests of the Members, the Committee finds it necessary to recommend numerous adjustments to funding levels proposed in the budget. Finally, the Committee regrets that many worthwhile projects could not be recommended for funding because of the lack of authorization and the shortfall in resources.

The Committee received numerous requests to include project authorizations in the Energy and Water Development appropriations

bill. However, in an effort to support and honor the congressional authorizing committees' jurisdiction, the Committee has not included new project authorizations.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2002	$55,039,000
Budget estimate, 2003	48,904,000
Committee recommendation	48,904,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $48,904,000, the same as the budget request for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund.

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

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2002	.....
Budget estimate, 2003	$15,000,000
Committee recommendation	.....

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

The CALFED Program was established in May 1995, for the purpose of developing a comprehensive, long-term solution to the complex and inter-related problems in the San Francisco Bay-Delta area of California. The program's focus is on the health of the ecosystem and improving water management. In addition, this program addresses the issues of uncertain water supplies, aging levees, and threatened water quality.

The Committee is aware that legislation has been introduced in the House and Senate to reauthorize the comprehensive program. Absent this legislation, the Committee has recommended no funding under the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration Project. In order to support the efforts of the State of California to provide a safe, clean water supply and improve the environment, the Committee has provided funds for previously authorized studies under the Central Valley Project. These studies will support and further the goals of the overall CALFED Program until such time as the

California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration Project is reauthorized.

The Committee has provided an additional $30,000,000 over the budget request for the Central Valley Project. Additional funds to support the goals of CALFED are provided as follows:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL WATER ACCOUNT

Miscellaneous Project Programs.—$15,000,000 to acquire water and ground water storage.

PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Delta Division Oversight.—$2,500,000 to continue coordination, administration, planning, performance tracking and science activities in coordination with CALFED Program Implementation Plan.

STORAGE

Shasta Division.—$3,000,000 to continue evaluating the potential impacts of the proposed Shasta raise.

Delta Division.—$250,000 to continue evaluations of the Delta Wetlands project and other in-delta storage proposals. $2,000,000 for Reclamation to continue participating in planning activities associated with enlarging Los Vaqueros reservoir.

Friant Division.—$1,750,000 to continue developing a plan of study for a feasibility level investigation for storage in the Upper San Joaquin Watershed.

Sacramento River Division.—$500,000 to continue planning activities as agreed to in the Sites MOU.

CONVEYANCE

Delta Division.—$5,000,000 to construct the Tracy Test Fish Facility.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2002	$52,968,000
Budget estimate, 2003	54,870,000
Committee recommendation	54,870,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is $54,870,000. This is the same as the budget request.

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Section 201 of the bill includes language that States requirements for purchase or lease of water from the Middle Rio Grande or Carlsbad Projects, New Mexico.

Section 202 of the bill includes language concerning Drought Emergency Assistance.

Section 203 of the bill includes language concerning natural desert terminal lakes.

Section 204 of the bill includes language concerning private sector contracting percentages.

Section 205 of the bill includes language directing the Bureau to undertake studies for the North Central Montana Rural Water Supply project using prior appropriated funds.

Section 206 of the bill includes language to make changes to Section 8 of Public Law 104–298.

Section 207 of the bill includes language regarding the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson Reservoir in California.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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

CONTRACTOR TRAVEL

The Committee believes that earlier statutory restrictions on contractor travel established new appreciation by contractors for propriety and cost effectiveness in their travel expenditures. For fiscal year 2003, no statutory travel restrictions are included. Nevertheless, the Committee directs the Department to maintain contractor travel summaries adequate for periodic reviews of programmatic relevance and costs of contractor travel.

ENERGY SUPPLY

Appropriations, 2002	$666,726,000
Budget estimate, 2003	693,934,000
Committee recommendation	815,306,000

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2002	$396,000,000
Budget estimate, 2003	407,000,000
Committee recommendation	448,062,000

The Committee recommendation provides $448,062,000, for renewable energy resources.

The recommendation for Renewable Energy Resources reflects the Committee's strong belief that only a balanced portfolio of production and distribution technologies and strategies will fulfill our Nation's long-term needs and goals for both energy and the environment. For that reason, the Committee recommendation includes substantial investments in renewable energy resources above the Administration's request.

The Committee has modified the request for low emission energy technologies, including hydro, renewable, and nuclear, with the view toward post 2010 application of new technologies. As a result, with few exceptions, the Committee recommends basic research that will provide significant improvements over existing technologies.

Each year the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Conference Report contains a handful of "Congressionally-directed activities" (to use the Department's description). To date, the Renewable Energy Resources Office has funded fifteen of these Congressionally-mandated activities for fiscal year 2002. This is an unacceptable rate at this point in the fiscal year. These activities are not optional and are to be given the same priority as the rest of the fiscal year spending program. The Committee fully expects the

Department to address this situation before the Conference Committee completes action on the final funding bill.

Although the Renewable Energy Resources Office is currently undergoing a reorganization, it is not yet complete. It is both unwise and impractical to appropriate funds to accounts that may or may not exist at the start of the fiscal year. For that reason, the Committee recommendation appropriates funds generally in accordance with the Administration's fiscal year 2003 budget request. If the reorganization is complete when the Conference Committee convenes, the Committee will consider re-aligning the accounts.

Solar energy.—The Committee recommendation for solar energy programs is $95,000,000. This account is broken up into three subaccounts, each of which is described below.

Solar building technology research.—The Committee recommends $12,000,000 to fund solar building technology development, including enhanced support to the zero energy building program.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The Committee recommends $77,000,000 for photovoltaic energy systems. The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for continuation of the Million Solar Roofs program at current year levels and $2,500,000 for the Southeast and Southwest photovoltaic experiments stations. Additionally, the Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the Navajo electrification project.

Concentrating solar power.—The Committee recommends $6,000,000 for concentrating solar power. The Department is directed to begin implementation of a program to deploy 1000 MW of new solar capacity supplying the Southwestern United States by the year 2006.

Biomass/biofuels—energy systems.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000,000 for biomass/biofuels energy systems. The final Energy and Water Development Conference Report for fiscal year 2002 combined the power systems and transportation subaccounts to increase the programmatic flexibility available to the Department. Thus far, the Committee is encouraged with the results of this consolidation and has maintained the new program structure.

Not less than $27,000,000 shall be used for a competitive solicitation for Biomass Integrated Biorefinery Process Development which shall be funded from within the totals available under the biomass/biofuels energy account.

The Department has indicated a desire to end direct support to the Regional Biomass Energy Program (RBEP). The Committee believes that the RBEP has been a successful partnership with the five distinct regions it has served. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 and directs the Department to work with regional governors' organizations to make RBEP even more successful. The Committee recommendation also includes $2,500,000 for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, a successful consortium of 34 universities and 33 agribusinesses and trade associations.

Wind.—The Committee recommendation includes $50,000,000 for wind. The Committee expects the Department to utilize the additional funds to accelerate development and deployment of low wind speed turbines. The Wind Powering America initiative is to be con-

tinued at last year's funding level. The Committee continues to recognize the need for a set-aside for small wind programs.

Renewable energy production incentive.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the renewable energy production incentive.

Renewable program support.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,059,000 for technical analysis and assistance within renewable program support. The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 to continue the collaboration and integration of multi-program activities by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) to develop renewable energy resources and address the electric power needs of the Southwestern United States. NREL will provide expertise through a virtual laboratory or site office in Nevada that enables partnerships among universities, researchers, technology developers, and those interested in deployment.

Departmental Energy Management.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for departmental energy management.

International renewable programs.—The Committee strongly supports the U.S. international joint implementation program funded in this account and recommends $6,500,000 for that purpose. The Committee supports efforts to increase international market opportunities for the export and deployment of advanced clean energy technologies—end-use efficiency, fossil, renewable, and nuclear energy technologies. The Committee is pleased that the Administration has decided to expand its international renewable energy activities.

National Renewable Energy Laboratory.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,800,000, for capital equipment and general plant projects at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Of this amount, $1,000,000 is provided to reduce the maintenance backlog and $800,000 is for construction.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommends $37,000,000 for geothermal technology development, including continued funding (at current year levels) for GeoPowering the West. The Committee is concerned that the Department appears to be cutting funds for these important research efforts prematurely. The decision to cut funds for geothermal technology development flies in the face of the recommendations of the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) made in 1997. The PCAST report recommends an escalation of funding over a short period of time to $50,000,000–$60,000,000. The Committee has provided a substantial increase and expects the Department to use the additional funds, in part, to foster university research and public private partnerships.

Hydrogen research.—The Committee strongly supports research and development of hydrogen technology and recognizes it to be a highly promising and cost effective energy carrier. The Committee recommends $45,000,000.

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

Industrial consumption of hydrogen, especially by the petrochemical and fertilizer communities is large and growing. The rate of petro-chemical hydrogen consumption necessary for gasoline-

powered vehicles will accelerate as global reserves of sweet crude oil diminish. The dominant resource for hydrogen production today is natural gas whose reformation into hydrogen and carbon dioxide contributes significantly to atmospheric greenhouse gases. Moreover, natural gas reserves are insufficient to service simultaneously domestic heating and electricity requirements, industrial hydrogen consumption, and future demands by hydrogen powered vehicles and other fuel cell applications that would accompany the future "Hydrogen Economy." Accordingly, the Committee supports investment in exploration of feasible concepts for renewable production of hydrogen with no greenhouse gas emissions and no other waste products by adding $2,000,000 for an engineering study and evaluation of solar-powered thermo-chemical production of hydrogen from water.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommends $7,489,000 for hydropower.

Renewable Indian energy resources.—The Committee recommendation includes $9,307,000 for Indian renewable energy resource development. The Committee expects these funds to be administered as competitively awarded grants to federally-recognized tribes throughout the United States. Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for the Council of Renewable Energy Resource Tribes (CERT) to provide technical expertise and training of Native Americans in renewable energy resource development and electric generation facilities management.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The Committee recommendation includes $75,000,000 for electric energy systems and storage.

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

The Committee strongly supports the activities of the high temperature superconductor development program, which will revolutionize the way electric power is generated, transmitted and ultimately used by the consumer, and therefore urges the Department of Energy to submit as part of future budgets an independent funding request for HTS research and development, as it does for programs such as wind, solar and geothermal power.

The Committee recommendation includes $50,000,000 for high temperature superconductor research and development and $25,000,000 for distributed energy systems. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $9,000,000 for the effort jointly led by Oak Ridge National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory to develop high-performance, low-cost, second-generation, high-temperature superconducting wire.

Renewable program direction.—The Committee recommendation includes $16,907,000 for program direction within this account.

Use of prior year balances.—The recommendation includes the use of $15,000,000 of prior year funds to be carried over from fiscal year 2002 to offset the fiscal year 2003 funding requirements. The Department may not cut congressionally-directed activities to implement this offset.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2002	$226,773,000
Budget estimate, 2003	249,798,000
Committee recommendation	324,108,000

The Committee recommendation provides $324,108,000 for nuclear energy.

Nuclear energy presently contributes about 21 percent of our nation's electrical power and emits no atmospheric pollutants, although disposal of spent fuel remains a major technical and social challenge. While the Committee supports continued nuclear power research and development activities as part of a balanced approach to meeting our Nation's energy needs, industry and the Department are strongly encouraged to focus their research efforts on a broader array of disposal options, including reprocessing, transmutation, and dry cask storage, all of which reduce or eliminate the need for a geologic repository. The Committee recommendation includes enhanced funding for the advanced accelerator applications program as described below.

University reactor fuel assistance and support.—The Committee recommends $19,500,000 for university reactor fuel assistance and support. University nuclear engineering programs and university research reactors represent a fundamental and key capability in supporting our national policy goals in health care, materials science and energy technology.

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

The Committee notes the progress of the Department in carrying out congressional direction to establish and support regional university reactor consortia. Although progress is visible, the Committee remains concerned about the ability of the Nation to respond to the growing demand for trained experts in nuclear science and technology in the face of financial and other challenges affecting engineering programs and research reactor facilities at American universities. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of $3,000,000 over the request to fund additional consortia and strongly encourages the Department to request sufficient funding in future years to fund all meritorious proposals.

Nuclear energy plant optimization.—The Committee recommends a total of $5,000,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request. The Department is encouraged to continue this cost-shared research and development program to improve the reliability, availability, and productivity of existing nuclear power plants.

Nuclear Energy Research Initiative.—The Committee recommends a total of $29,000,000, an increase of $4,000,000 over the budget request. The Department's budget request would not allow for any new NERI projects in the coming year. The proposed increase is necessary to continue to grow the scope of the technology and the people for a growing nuclear industry.

Nuclear Energy Technologies.—The Committee recommends a total of $48,500,000. The Committee directs the Department to prepare a report by March 31, 2003, regarding how it intends to carry out the results of the Generation IV Roadmap.

To further the introduction of advanced reactors, especially those that are not conventional, it is important to establish a process by which research/demonstration reactors can be built and tested in a manner that will allow a regulatory process to focus on the safety of the technologies for which there is not a large regulatory history. It is thus recommended that $1,000,000 be allocated to a joint DOE and NRC development of a licensing process employing "risk information" that would be technology neutral for future licensing of advanced reactors that would lead to eventual certification.

The Committee supports the Department's efforts to establish the fuels resource and infrastructure ultimately essential to the realization of the President's vision for the future "Hydrogen Economy." Accordingly, the Committee provides an additional $3,000,000 for the purpose of accelerating the engineering evaluation of an integrated sulfur/iodine thermo-chemical water-splitting cycle for coupling with a high temperature nuclear reactor power source. Of the additional $3,000,000, the Committee directs that $1,000,000 be provided to the Research Foundation of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas for the purpose of establishing a public-private partnership to develop and evaluate innovative high temperature heat exchangers.

The Committee remains interested in the potential use and application of small modular reactors with attractive characteristics for remote communities that otherwise must rely on shipments of relatively expensive and environmentally undesirable fuels for their electric power. To be acceptable, such a reactor would have to be inherently safe, be relatively cost effective, contain intrinsic design features which would deter sabotage or diversion, require infrequent refuelings, and be largely factory constructed and deliverable to remote sites. The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 to begin design work for a plant to demonstrate the viability of such small modular reactors.

Radiological facilities management.—The Committee recommendation includes $92,699,000, $9,600,000 above the request, for radiological facilities management.

The Committee funding recommendation includes $600,000 in additional funding for the Cyclotron Isotope Research Center. Within available funds the Department is also directed to provide $7,000,000 for hot cell upgrades/establishment of the Bethel Valley Hot Cell Complex; and $5,000,000 for Pu238 production and Np237 storage. Construction projects are funded at the level of the administration's request.

Production of Medical Isotopes.—The Committee commends the Department for issuing a request for proposal to dispose of U233 in building 3019 at the Oak Ridge Reservation and to process that material to produce medical isotopes. The Committee's long support of this effort is a matter of record, and the Committee again emphasizes the importance of this project for the treatment of cancer. Initial human trials utilizing thorium-229, which can be derived from the uranium-233 stored in Building 3019, have yielded tre-

mendously encouraging results which indicate this radio-isotope may be able to effectively treat leukemia and other cancers. The Committee also recognizes that an essential part of this project is the disposition of the U233 at the Oak Ridge Reservation. The Committee, cognizant that 1,800 people in the United States die every month of leukemia, is frustrated that the Department is now 2 years behind schedule on this project and has proposed a schedule that includes unusually long pauses between phases (such as the proposed 6 months between completion of phase I and initiation of phase II). The Committee recommendation makes available $5,000,000 for this project in fiscal year 2003. The Department is directed to fully fund the disposition of U233 and the processing of the material to produce medical isotopes in future years and proceed with this project as swiftly as possible.

Fast flux test facility.—The Committee has provided the budget request of $36,100,000 for the FFTF. The Committee expects the Department to move forward quickly on the permanent deactivation of this facility.

Advanced fuel cycles program.—The Committee recommendation includes $77,870,000 for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Program of which $18,000,000 is allocated to EBR–II Spent Fuel Treatment.

This program subsumes the Advanced Accelerator Applications program and its activities and will focus on the development of advanced fuel cycles, including recycle or reprocessing of spent fuel, and transmutation technologies. The Committee intends the Department to use national laboratory, university and industrial expertise to perform research in advanced nuclear materials recycle technologies, proliferation-resistant nuclear fuels, and transmutation systems, including both reactor- and accelerator-based approaches. The program goals shall include enabling better utilization of uranium resources and minimizing the amount and toxicity of final waste products. The program shall begin pre-conceptual design of an advanced recycle facility for performing research on scalable recycle technologies that are proliferation resistant, economical, and minimize environmental impact. The program shall use international collaborations to provide cost effective use of research funding and expand both university collaborations and domestic industry participation.

The University of Nevada Las Vegas shall continue research activities in the area of transmutation science and testing of spallation target technology established under the Advanced Accelerator Applications program. Funding of $4,500,000 is provided for these efforts. The program shall undertake evaluation and may initiate design and development of a fuels and materials testing station using the LANSCE accelerator facility.

Finally, the program shall be coordinated with other programs such as Generation IV and Nuclear Power 2010, but shall maintain separate program and financial management. Within the increased funding levels, the Department is directed to continue the advanced accelerator applications program, including funding for the UNLV program at current year levels and the Idaho Accelerator Program at $3,500,000. Additionally, the Department is directed to restore the nuclear energy program funding to current year levels at Argonne National Lab and ANL-West.

Left unchecked, the administration's budget cut would dismantle the last remaining nuclear development team in the United States. Such an action is completely inconsistent with the Administration's Nuclear Power 2010 goals. The Committee is pleased that the Department has agreed that the Nuclear Energy Program is an appropriate home for this robust research and development effort.

University Consortium for Transmutation Research.—As discussed above, the right mix of treatment and transmutation technologies must be found to reduce the amount of highly-toxic spent nuclear fuel and waste slated to be buried in a geologic repository, and to avoid the need for more repositories. High-energy accelerators could be central to a future strategy to transmute spent nuclear fuel into less toxic, shorter-lived materials.

Innovative transmutation technologies promise to be the most cost-effective and proliferation-resistant means of reducing nuclear waste toxicity. Accelerator-based research on transmutation of radioactive waste would also supply facilities for medical diagnostics and therapy and become a national source of large-scale isotope production for radio-pharmaceuticals.

The Department of Energy is urged to establish a consortium of U.S. universities to develop accelerator-based technologies for transmutation of radioactive waste. The consortium should include, at a minimum, the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, University of New Mexico, New Mexico State University, Washington State University, Idaho State University, the University of Texas, Texas A&M University, and the University of California at Santa Barbara, Berkeley and Davis.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation includes $23,439,000 for program direction, the amount of the request.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

Appropriations, 2002	$30,500,000
Budget estimate, 2003	29,211,000
Committee recommendation	19,211,000

The Committee recommendation includes $19,211,000 for non-defense environment, safety, and health which includes $13,871,000 for program direction.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2002	$7,770,000
Budget estimate, 2003	7,925,000
Committee recommendation	6,925,000

Technical information management.—The Committee recommendation for the technical information management program is $1,400,000.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $5,525,000.

ENERGY SUPPLY INFRASTRUCTURE

Appropriations, 2002	.....
Budget estimate, 2003	.....
Committee recommendation	$17,000,000

The Committee recommendation provides $17,000,000 for energy supply infrastructure.

The energy supply infrastructure program provides assistance, technical support, and project funding to specific energy projects. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the Upper Lynn Canal power supply project, $5,000,000 to the Swan Lake-Lake Tyee segment of the Southeastern Alaska Intertie System, and $2,000,000 to the Tok to Glenallen transmission project.

The Committee recommendation also includes $5,000,000 for the National Center on Energy Management and Building Technologies.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

(NONDEFENSE)

Appropriations, 2002	$236,372,000
Budget estimate, 2003	166,000,000
Committee recommendation	176,000,000

The Committee recommendation provides $176,000,000 for non-defense environmental management.

The non-defense environmental management program is responsible for managing and addressing the environmental legacy resulting from nuclear energy and civilian energy research programs, primarily the Office of Science within the Department of Energy. Research and development activities of DOE and predecessor agencies generated waste and other contaminants which pose unique problems, including unprecedented volumes of contaminated soils, water and facilities. The funding requested and provided here supports the Department's goal of cleaning up as many of its contaminated sites as possible by 2006 in a safe and cost-effective manner.

Site Closure.—The Committee directs the Department to continue to monitor the groundwater at the Weldon Springs, Missouri, site and to immediately utilize whatever funds may be necessary to completely remediate the site if the results from the on-going monitoring or other studies indicate additional treatment is required.

Site completion.—The Committee recommendation provides $67,272,000 for site completion. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $15,000,000 for the Brookhaven National Laboratory; and $1,000,000 in additional funding for the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

Post 2006 completion.—The Committee recommendation provides $123,887,000. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $3,134,000 for remediation of the Atlas mill tailings site at Moab, Utah; and an additional $3,000,000 for the Energy Technology Engineering Center in California.

West Valley.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $5,000,000 for the West Valley Demonstration Project. The Committee is concerned that the Department and State of New York have not yet entered into an agreement regarding the scope of the clean-up at the site.

Excess Facilities.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,841,000 for the transfer of excess facilities at the Brookhaven

National Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Oak Ridge from other DOE organizations.

URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION

Appropriations, 2002	$418,425,000
Budget estimate, 2003	382,154,000
Committee recommendation	471,154,000

Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning.—The Committee recommendation provides $334,523,000 for the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.

The Committee provides a total of $134,048,000, an increase of an additional $34,000,000 for clean-up at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant to ensure compliance with applicable State and Federal obligations. The Committee directs the Department to fund the Kentucky Consortium for Energy and Environment from within available funds.

The Committee recommendation also includes $65,000,000 in additional funding for the East Tennessee Technology Park.

Other Uranium Activities.—The Committee recommends $136,631,000. The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 in support of preliminary environmental planning, siting studies, and related activities for the Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride (DUF–6) projects at that gaseous diffusion plants at Paducah, Kentucky, and Portsmouth, Ohio, consistent with the direction (ignored for many years by the Department but reiterated legislatively by Congress this year) of Section 1 of Public Law 105–204 (112 Stat. 681) as amended.

The Committee recommendation includes uranium program activity funding of $16,381,000 for East Tennessee Technology Park, $19,737,000 for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, and $89,714,000 for the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriations, 2002	$95,000,000
Budget estimate, 2003	209,702,000
Committee recommendation	56,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes $336,000,000 for nuclear waste disposal. Of that amount, $56,000,000 is derived from the nuclear waste fund, and $280,000,000 shall be available from the "Defense nuclear waste disposal" account.

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

The Committee directs that $2,500,000 from within the amount provided to Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal for Yucca Mountain Site Characterization be provided to the Research Foundation of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas for the purpose of continuing and expanding its efforts in ground water characterization and research into the transport and fate of radionuclides in the vicinity of the proposed Yucca Mountain repository.

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2002	$3,233,100,000
Budget estimate, 2003	3,279,456,000
Committee recommendation	3,329,456,000

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

The Department of Energy is the leading source of Federal investment for R&D facilities and fundamental research in the physical sciences. Yet investment in the Department's R&D has declined in constant dollars from $11,200,000,000 in 1980 to $7,700,000,000 in 2001. As a percentage of GDP, total Federal investment in the physical sciences and engineering has been cut roughly in half since 1970.

Shrinking investment in the physical sciences and engineering poses serious risks to DOE's ability to perform its mission. It also threatens the nation's science and technology enterprise. DOE faces a shortage of nearly 40 percent in its technical workforce over the next 5 years. To meet it needs, it must compete for a shrinking pool of skilled workers with industry, many of whose leaders also report serious shortages of scientists and engineers.

American educational institutions are failing to attract sufficient numbers of U.S. students, especially women and minorities, into undergraduate and graduate programs in the physical sciences and engineering. For these skills we now are more heavily dependent on foreign nations than ever before. The H1–B visa has become a main element of U.S. technology policy.

As fewer foreign students choose to pursue their education in the United States and too few U.S. students enter these fields, our vulnerability grows. NSF reports that between 1996 and 1999, the number of Ph.D.s in science and engineering awarded to foreign students declined by 15 percent. Only 5 percent of U.S. students now earn bachelors degrees in natural science or engineering. Since 1986 the total number of bachelors degrees in engineering is down 15 percent. Between 1994 and 2000, the number of Ph.D.s awarded in physics in the United States declined by 22 percent.

These trends must be reversed. Many DOE user facilities do not operate at their designed capacity. As a result, opportunities and momentum are lost as researchers and students encounter barriers to the pursuit of inquiry of national importance, including promising research opportunities at the boundaries of the life sciences, physical sciences, engineering and computer sciences. Future U.S. global leadership and technological leadership will rely upon today's investment in research in all the sciences and engineering.

The Committee strongly supports and encourages increased investment in the research and education initiatives of the DOE Office of Science.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2002	$716,100,000
Budget estimate, 2003	724,990,000
Committee recommendation	729,980,000

The Committee recommendation includes $729,980,000 for high energy physics. The Committee has included an additional $5,000,000 for the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. The Committee recognizes that the High Energy Physics Advisory Panel has recommended that the Next Linear Collider (NLC) at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center should proceed into design and construction.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2002	$360,510,000
Budget estimate, 2003	382,370,000
Committee recommendation	387,370,000

The Committee recommends $387,370,000 for nuclear physics. The Committee recommends that the additional funds be used to enhance operation of the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) at Brookhaven National Laboratory and the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility at the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility in Virginia.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2002	$527,405,000
Budget estimate, 2003	504,215,000
Committee recommendation	531,215,000

The Committee recommendation includes $531,215,000 for biological and environmental research. The recommendation includes an additional $10,000,000 above the requested level for the Genomes to Life program and $25,000,000 in total funding for the low dose effects program. The recommendation also continues the free air carbon dioxide experiments at the current year level and $3,000,000 in additional funding for the EMSL computer.

The Committee strongly encourages the Department to budget for additional resources for the Genomes to Life Program in fiscal year 2004. This program shows tremendous potential and deserves enhanced support.

Environmental Remediation.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional amount of $6,000,000 for a program to evaluate improved technologies for removal of arsenic from municipal water supplies, with a focus on minimization of operating costs and reducing energy requirements. This program shall include peer-reviewed research projects as well as cost-shared demonstration projects conducted with municipal water systems. Demonstration programs shall focus on technologies applicable in the arid southwestern United States. The program shall be administered through contracts with the American Water Works Association Research Foundation, which shall utilize capabilities of WERC, A Consortium for Environmental Education and Technology Development, for evaluations of cost effectiveness of alternative treatment methodologies.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 2002	$1,003,705,000
Budget estimate, 2003	1,019,600,000
Committee recommendation	1,044,600,000

The Committee recommendation includes $1,044,600,000. For purposes of reprogramming in fiscal year 2002, the Department may allocate funding among all operating accounts within basic energy sciences upon written notice to the appropriate Congressional Committees.

The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000 for the Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research and $4,500,000 in additional funding to complete preliminary engineering and design (PED) and move to construction at the Center for Integrated Nanotechnology. Within available funds the Committee recommendation includes full funding for the operation of the National Synchrotron Light Source, the Spallation Neutron Source, and the Nanoscale Science Centers Initiative, including $24,000,000 for design and construction of the Center for Nanophase Materials Sciences and Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Construction projects are all funded at the level of the administration's request.

The Committee is pleased with the progress of the Department's Nanoscience Initiative. The Committee understands the Department has recently announced its intention to fund a Nanocenter at Brookhaven National Laboratory. The Committee has included $1,000,000 to begin preliminary engineering and design in fiscal year 2003 for the Nanocenter at Brookhaven (Project 02–SC–2). The Committee strongly supports the nanoscale science research centers.

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

Advanced Scientific Computing Research.—The Committee recommendation provides $169,625,000 for advanced scientific computing research.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation provides $48,127,000 for safeguards and security.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation provides $134,837,000 for science program direction.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES FACILITIES SUPPORT

The Committee recommends $42,735,000, the amount of the request, for science energy laboratories facilities support. The program supports infrastructure activities at the five national labs under the direction of the Office of Science.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 2002	$248,495,000
Budget estimate, 2003	257,310,000
Committee recommendation	259,310,000

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is $259,310,000, an amount that is $2,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee is aware of significantly increased neutron yields from compressed fuel elements heated by an extremely short pulse, high power laser beam. Such advances promise significant acceleration of the schedule for achieving ignition of compressed fusion pellets. Accordingly, the Committee adds $2,000,000 to Fusion Energy Sciences for the purpose of evaluating this so-called "fast ignition" concept. The Department is directed to report back to the Committee no later than August 1, 2003 with the results of this evaluation along with any recommendations the Department would make regarding the schedule and milestones of the High Energy Density Physics Program.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 2002	$210,853,000
Budget estimate, 2003	299,220,000
Committee recommendation	235,000,000

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2002	$137,810,000
Budget estimate, 2003	137,524,000
Committee recommendation	137,524,000

The Department recommends $235,000,000 for departmental administration, a net appropriation of $97,476,000.

The Committee has been underwhelmed by the timeliness and level of detail in the Department's responses to the Committee's requests for the additional budget information required to evaluate the administration's requests to Congress. The Department needs to focus on providing timely, detailed, and transparent budget information to Congress when making requests for appropriations.

International affairs.—The Committee strongly urges the Department of Energy, the Department of Commerce, U.S. AID, and other Federal agencies associated with the Clean Energy Technology Exports Program to finalize and implement the strategic plan and establish the advisory board. The strategic plan is a critical component of a broad range of international and domestic policy interests, including those promoting economic development, energy, trade, employment, environmental, and climate change policies.

INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2002	$32,430,000
Budget estimate, 2003	37,671,000
Committee recommendation	37,671,000

The Committee has provided $37,671,000 for the Office of the Inspector General.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

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

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

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

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2002	$5,429,238,000
Budget estimate, 2003	5,867,000,000
Committee recommendation	6,108,959,000

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

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

An appropriation of $1,234,467,000 is recommended for the directed stockpile work of the NNSA.

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

Stockpile research and development.—The Committee recommends $467,149,000, the same as the budget request. Stockpile R&D provides for assessment, certification, surveillance and maintenance research and development for systems comprising our enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. The additional $118,149,000 above the current year is meant to support acceleration in stockpile life extension research and development activities for the W80 and W76 systems, necessary additional sub-critical experiments at the

Nevada Test Site for pit certification, and a vigorous program in advanced concepts research and development.

Stockpile maintenance.—The Committee recommends $401,157,000 to provide for stockpile maintenance and production and exchange of limited life components in the enduring stockpile, as well as major refurbishment activities to extend the stockpile life of the W87, W76, W80, and B61 weapons systems.

Stockpile evaluation.—The Committee recommends $197,184,000 to support new material laboratory tests, new material flight tests, stockpile laboratory tests, stockpile flight tests, quality evaluations, special testing, and surveillance of weapons systems to support assessment of the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile, all of which contributes to the Annual Certification to the President.

Dismantlement/disposal.—The Committee recommends $24,378,000. The program includes all activities associated with weapon retirement and disassembly. The slight decrease below current year reflects reduced activity involving the W–56 at Y–12 and contractor efficiencies at Pantex.

Production Support.—The Committee recommends $137,706,000.

CAMPAIGNS

An appropriation of $2,148,210,000 is recommended for the campaigns of the NNSA, an increase of $80,376,000 over the budget request.

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

Primary certification.—The Committee recommends $47,159,000 to support sub-critical experiments and other activities necessary to support the required delivery date for a certified pit.

Dynamic materials properties.—The Committee recommends $90,594,000. The Committee commends the administration for its investment in the future through university grants, partnerships and cooperative agreements. Using $5,000,000 of the available funds, the Administration is directed to make full use of existing and developing capabilities for materials properties studies, including the subcritical experiments at the U1a facility, Joint Actinide Shock Physics Experimental Research facility and the Atlas facility at the Nevada Test Site, and the High Pressure Collaborative Access Team facility at the synchrotron light source at Argonne National Laboratory. The Committee understands that this materials work is essential to predicting the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons in the absence of nuclear weapons testing.

The Committee recommendation includes $8,110,000 for University Partnerships, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the request.

Advanced radiography.—The Committee recommends $82,925,000, an increase of $30,000,000 over the request. The recommendation includes $25,000,000 to continue research, develop-

ment, and conceptual design activities for an advanced hydrodynamics test facility, including further development and evaluation of proton radiography. It is the intent of the Committee to continue this important effort even though any decision on whether to proceed to construction is still several years away. The additional $5,000,000 is provided to fund other experiments that might be conducted in the Contained Firing Facility, the U1a tunnel complex, or other appropriate experimental facilities. The Committee also directs the Department to fully support the DHART facility, proton radiography, and radiation flow diagnostics.

Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins.—The Committee recommends $47,790,000 for radiation source development, radiation case dynamics studies, radiation transport and the effects of aging and refurbishment on secondary performance. From the funds available, the administration is encouraged to continue, and expand as appropriate, its investments in high energy density physics research through university grants, partnerships and cooperative agreements.

Enhanced surety.—The Committee recommends $32,000,000, an amount comparable to current year, to develop and demonstrate advanced initiation concepts and enhanced use denial concepts, and to enhance efforts to establish high precision, micro system technologies for enhanced surety of future weapon systems.

Weapons systems engineering certification.—The Committee recommends $27,007,000 to accelerate the acquisition of experimental data necessary to validate new models and simulation tools being developed in the Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign.

Nuclear survivability.—The Committee recommends $23,394,000 to develop and validate tools to simulate nuclear environments for survivability assessments and certification; restore the capability to provide nuclear-hardened microelectronics and microsystem components for the enduring stockpile; and accelerate the qualification and certification of the neutron generator and the arming, fusing and firing system for the refurbished W76.

ICF ignition and high yield.—The Committee recommends $487,293,000.

The Committee recommendation includes $214,045,000 for National Ignition Facility construction, Project 96–D–111, and $273,248,000 is for the ICF ignition and high yield program.

The National Ignition Facility (NIF) was originally justified as a way of attracting, training, and evaluating the next generation of nuclear weapons scientists, who would then help maintain the capabilities of our existing nuclear stockpile. The Department of Energy has long maintained that achieving ignition with this multibillion dollar facility was a top priority for the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program, because the scientific and engineering challenges of achieving ignition with the NIF could be used to induce first-rate scientists to contribute to the nuclear weapons program. It was the ignition objective that determined the original size, performance criteria, and cost of the multibillion dollar NIF construction project, and the ignition objective that has justified continued support by this Committee in spite of large cost overruns and long delays.

The Committee is therefore disturbed to see that the NNSA has now changed the title of its campaign from "Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield" to "High Energy Density Physics", in other words, from a focus on achieving the specific goal of ignition to a generalized physics research program. Ignition is now only one of several objectives for the NIF.

The Committee is likewise concerned that the NNSA will downgrade the NIF Project's long-standing "Functional Requirements and Primary Criteria" into a set of "eventual goals" and adopt new reduced performance criteria for acceptance testing of the NIF beams that are significantly below what is required to support ignition experiments.

The possibility of these various changes leaves the Committee with the overall impression that NNSA is not committed to the NIF Project and might down scope the project to the point where laser performance that is needed to evaluate ignition targets would never be realized. And that would raise the question of the appropriate size for the NIF, and its future funding level. This is an alarming prospect, given NIF's estimated project cost of more than $3,500,000,000, and the greater amounts that will eventually be required to operate and maintain the facility for various experiments.

At this late stage in the construction project, the Committee has every right to expect that the confidence in achieving the ignition objective should be increasing, not decreasing. The apparent retreat from ignition signified in this budget request raises anew the question of the appropriate size and role of the NIF Project within the overall Stewardship Program, and its future level of funding.

The Committee rejects this re-prioritization and down-scoping. Ignition is now and will remain the primary objective for the National Ignition Facility. The Committee fully expects the NIF to meet its original "Functional Requirements and Primary Criteria" and to perform at the levels required for ignition and directs the NNSA to maintain the original scope of the project. Additionally, the Committee rejects the proposed name change and expects the fiscal year 2004 request to revert to Inertial Confinement Fusion and High Yield.

The Committee is disappointed that the administration, while apparently committed to the construction of the multi-billion dollar National Ignition Facility (NIF), has not requested funds that are essential to the achievement of the ignition goal. Accordingly, the Committee adds $15,000,000 to the administration's request for the NIF Director to support the development of cryogenic targets and essential NIF diagnostics. The Committee, recognizing the "national" character of NIF, encourages the participation of appropriate entities of the national technical community in these activities.

Petawatt lasers.—Short pulse, petawatt class lasers will significantly increase the capabilities of the administration's high energy density facilities such as the Z-pinch pulsed power facility at Sandia National Laboratories, the Trident Laser at Los Alamos National Laboratory, the Omega Laser at the Laboratory for Laser Energetics of the University of Rochester, and the National Ignition Facility at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $13,000,000 to realize the benefits of such laser technology. Within this amount, $5,000,000 is provided to modify the beamlet laser at Sandia National Laboratories; $3,000,000 is provided to continue petawatt laser development at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; $2,000,000 is provided for technical community activities in developing critical short-pulse, high power laser technology, such as damage resistant gratings; and $3,000,000 is provided for petawatt laser development at the Laboratory for Laser Energetics (LLE) at the University of Rochester. This funding will allow the LLE to continue operations of the OMEGA laser at full capacity. The Department should provide a report before December 31, 2002, addressing the need for a new high energy OMEGA–EP (extended performance). The Committee is concerned that the existing facility will be unable to meet national science-based stockpile stewardship requirements in light of the current oversubscription of OMEGA.

The Committee also includes an additional $4,500,000 for university grants and other support. Within this amount, $2,000,000 is provided for short pulse, high power laser development at the University of Texas; and $2,500,000 is provided to continue short pulse, high power laser development and research at the University of Nevada, Reno.

Advanced simulation and computing.—The Committee recommends $704,335,000, an amount that is $20,527,000 below the budget request.

The Committee notes the intriguing development of the Japanese vector-based Earth Simulator Computer which is now several times faster than any current ASCI computer and 33 percent faster than the NNSA's newest platform, the Q machine. The NNSA has put forth a credible case for their decision to abandon custom-designed chips and vector architecture for the much cheaper commodity chip-based, massively parallel, scalar systems which are the foundation of ASCI.

However, the Committee is not convinced that the NNSA is aggressively pursuing alternative hardware architectures or software solutions that will result in better interconnection and more efficient use of the NNSA's substantial computer investment. The Committee requires more evidence that the current ASCI approach is the most cost-effective and efficient way of achieving the desired capability and capacity when needed.

While the Committee recognizes the central importance of the ASCI program to the success of stockpile stewardship, the Committee remains unconvinced that the NNSA's platform acquisition strategy is driven by identified requirements, rather than a well intentioned, but insufficiently justified, desire to aggressively acquire larger and faster computing assets on an accelerated time-scale. The NNSA procurements represent a very small percentage of the U.S. supercomputing market, and the Committee is not convinced that the NNSA's acquisition strategy is taking full advantage of the steady fall in the price per teraflop that characterizes this market.

The NNSA is directed to commission an independent National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report that includes the following elements. First, the report should include an assessment of the alter-

native computer architectures and the applicability of the requirements of the stockpile stewardship program.

In addition to the NNSA, the NAS should consult with the Department's Office of Science and the National Security Agency and include their perspectives as to the appropriate computer architectures necessary to meet the needs of the broader scientific community and other elements of the national security community.

Second, the report should identify the distinct requirements of the stockpile stewardship program and its relation to the ASCI acquisition strategy. The report should clearly describe the linkage between the development of software applications and the acquisition of hardware capability and capacity, with the needs of the stockpile life extension programs and the underlying science programs.

Finally, the report should include an evaluation of the cost tradeoffs between the dates on which specific computing resources are required and reduced future costs for computational power. This report is due to the appropriate congressional committees on May 1, 2002.

The Committee recommends the following amounts for ASCI construction projects:

Project 01–D–101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA.—The Committee recommends $13,305,000.

Project 00–D–103 Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA.—The Committee recommends $35,030,000.

Project 00–D–107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM.—The Committee recommends $7,000,000.

Pit manufacturing and certification.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $246,000,000 for the Pit Manufacturing and Certification Campaign, an increase of $51,516,000 over the budget request. This amount includes $242,000,000 to support the manufacturing and certification of a W88 pit as the September, 2001, project baseline indicated. The recommendation also includes the requested amount of $2,000,000 for pit manufacturing capability and $2,000,000 for the modern pit facility.

The Committee remains greatly concerned about the NNSA's refusal to request funds consistent with its own project plan submitted less than 1 year ago. Although the Committee acknowledges the NNSA is reporting substantial progress in the effort, the NNSA has not revised its September, 2001, project baseline to reflect a lower and presumably more accurate cost projection.

Instead, the Committee has been forced to reduce other items in the budget request to fully fund a program both the Congress and the NNSA have identified as one of the most important tests of the success of the Stockpile Stewardship and Management program. The Committee directs the NNSA to revise as appropriate the pit production and certification plan and submit the report to the relevant congressional committees before the end of the current fiscal year, and annually thereafter.

Stockpile readiness campaign.—The Committee recommends $61,027,000 for the stockpile readiness campaign. This program, initiated in fiscal year 2001, enables the Y–12 National Security Complex to replace or restore production capability and to modernize aging facilities. At present, the critical manufacturing capa-

bilities required for weapons refurbishments at Y–12 do not exist. The Committee agrees that "stockpile readiness campaign" is a more appropriate and indicative program title than "secondary readiness campaign".

High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness.—The Committee recommends $12,093,000 to establish production-scale high explosives manufacturing and qualification; to deploy and validate technologies and facilities for production re-qualification; and, to demonstrate and validate Enterprise Integration and Collaborative Manufacturing.

Non-nuclear readiness.—The Committee recommends $22,398,000 to deploy commercial products and processes for components supporting the B61, W80, and W76 stockpile life extension programs; to modify existing tritium loading and cleaning facilities to support stockpile life extension programs; and, to support neutron target loading and detonator production.

Tritium readiness.—The Committee recommendation includes $112,899,000 for the tritium readiness campaign, including the budget request of $70,165,000 for construction and $42,734,000 for operations, a reduction of $13,400,000 from the request. The NNSA has acknowledged that the Tritium Extraction Facility construction project has experienced serious cost-overruns and schedule delays. The NNSA has proposed initiating the use of commercial reactors for the irradiation of tritium producing rods in fiscal years 2004 and 2005. This schedule would have required the delivery of fuel in the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2003. However, the delays in the construction of the Tritium Extraction Facility and the resulting delays in start of facility operations will necessitate a delay in the commercial light water reactor tritium production program. As such the Committee recommends a reduction of $13,400,000 from the budget request.

Cooperative agreements.—The Committee recognizes that cooperative agreements with universities are important resources for developing essential technical data for stockpile stewardship. Additionally, such long-term relationships with universities allow considerable opportunity for promoting advanced studies and recruiting the future workforce in technical areas that are critical to the continuing stewardship enterprise. The Committee understands that the NNSA has established a new office to be responsible for administering university partnerships, cooperative agreements and/or other long-term university relationships. The Committee remains supportive of this activity and directs the administration to honor existing cooperative agreements as this new office implements its responsibilities.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

An appropriation of $1,849,812,000 is recommended for readiness in technical base and facilities. Readiness in technical base and facilities encompasses efforts to provide for the physical infrastructure and operational readiness required to conduct the directed stockpile work and campaign activities at the laboratories, the test site and the production plants.

Operations of facilities.—The Committee recommends $1,026,000,000 to maintain warm standby readiness for all RTBF

facilities with some allowance for inflation. Within available funds, $6,000,000 is provided for full single shift operations of Sandia National Laboratories' Z-pinch pulsed power facility, and $56,725,000 is provided for continuing operations of the Device Assembly Facility, the Joint Actinide Shock Physics Experimental Research facility, operations associated with the Atlas relocation project, U1a operations, general plant projects and other NTS support facilities.

For continued facility upgrades, refurbishments, operations and maintenance costs associated with and for the National Center for Combating Terrorism, an additional $27,000,000 is provided.

The Committee recommendation also includes an additional $10,000,000 for facility operations at Pantex and an additional $10,000,000 for operation of facilities at Y–12.

Technology transfer and industrial partnerships.—The Committee recognizes that partnerships with industry may enable the weapons complex to accomplish its mission more efficiently. Such partnership can provide access to new technologies, processes and expertise that improve NNSA's mission capabilities. One of the most successful technology transfer and commercialization efforts in the Department of Energy has occurred with the not-for-profit Technology Ventures Corporation around Sandia National Laboratories, resulting in over 30 start-up ventures and thousands of jobs created. The Committee has included an additional $3,000,000 and directs the NNSA to use this successful public/private partnership at the other interested NNSA laboratories and the Nevada Test Site.

Program readiness.—The Committee recommends $218,000,000, an increase of $9,911,000 above the budget request, to enhance readiness and maintain materials processing and component manufacturing readiness.

Within available funds $64,201,000 is provided for test site readiness including archiving, resumption planning, activities required for enhanced test readiness planning including test scenarios and cost/benefit trade offs. Funds are also provided for Testing Drillback Borehole management as well as experimental and direct stockpile activities included in DSW and campaigns which contribute to the test readiness posture.

Special projects.—The Committee recommendation includes $50,500,000 for special projects. Within available funds, $600,000 is provided as the Federal contribution to the Oral History of the Nevada Test Site; $6,900,000 is provided for the New Mexico Education Enrichment Foundation; $2,500,000 is provided for the National Museum of Nuclear Science and History relocation project; $500,000 for the design, fabrication, and installation of exhibits at the Atomic Testing History Institute; and $1,000,000 is provided for the UNLV Research Foundation, which is integrating the Nevada community reuse organization during fiscal year 2003, for operations in support of stockpile stewardship and homeland security activities at the Nevada Test Site. The Los Alamos County Schools Program is funded at the level of the President's request.

As a result of the events of September 11, 2001, which have placed increased demands, and a heightened availability requirement on the aircraft required for Aerial Measurements, Sensing and Monitoring, the Committee is concerned that asset deployed at

NNSA facilities at Nellis Air Force Base and Andrews Air Force Base may not be safely deployed due to dated avionics. In order to assure the safety and reliability of these assets under all conditions, the Committee recommends $4,000,000 to update aircraft navigational and other related avionics.

The Committee encourages the Administration to support a joint Air Force/NNSA research and development program in physical security systems and technologies at the Sandia National Laboratory.

The National Laboratories have long served as test beds for the development and deployment of advanced technologies. The Committee is impressed with laboratory work designed to protect critical U.S. transportation infrastructure and encourages the Department to continue research and deployment in this area. Within available funds, the Department is directed to conduct a field installation of the truck stopping device developed at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and to build a prototype of a portable, remotely controlled truck stopping device for positive control of trucks in critical areas. The Committee further directs the Department to continue research regarding suspension bridges and new techniques for scanning shipping containers.

Material recycle and recovery.—The Committee recommends $98,816,000, the amount of the budget request.

Nuclear weapons incident response.—The Committee recommends $96,000,000, to enhance the state of response readiness at various locations, particularly in light of the events of September 11, 2001. The Committee is very pleased with the performance of DOE's Emergency Response assets in the aftermath of September 11, 2001. These emergency response teams have done remarkable work with relatively meager resources. The Department is encouraged to maintain these programs in a robust posture and provides $5,000,000 in additional funding for this purpose.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $328,182,000, for construction projects under Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities.

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

Project 01–D–108 Microsystems and engineering science applications, SNL.—The Committee recommends $123,000,000, an increase of $48,100,000 above the budget request.

Project 03–D–102 LANL administration building (SM–43) replacement project, LANL.—The Committee recommendation includes $16,000,000, an increase of $16,000,000 above the Administration's request.

01–D–103 PED, Various locations, TA–18 relocation at LANL.—As a result of the NNSA's announced preferred option that this equipment and material be transferred to the Device Assembly Facility, the Committee recommends the NNSA suspend planning related to relocation of the facility at Los Alamos and instead utilize previously appropriated funds to support planning consistent with the eventual Record of Decision. The Committee recommends no funding.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommends $242,512,000, to support re-capitalization of existing operational facilities to halt their deterioration and restore the robust and enduring mission readiness that relies on them.

SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Committee recommends $152,989,000. Of the amount appropriated, $100,863,000 is provided for operations and equipment, and $52,126,000 is provided for program direction.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $509,954,000. The Committee recommendation includes $8,900,000 for construction of the nuclear material safeguard and security upgrade project at Los Alamos.

The Committee directs the NNSA to continue to improve its ability to build an integrated multiyear budgeting process and eliminate the separate line-item treatment of the security budget in a manner consistent with April 2002 Report of the Commission on Science and Security ("Hamre Commission").

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriations, 2002	$803,586,000
Budget estimate, 2003	1,113,630,000
Committee recommendation	1,115,630,000

The Committee recommendation provides $1,115,630,000 for defense nuclear nonproliferation.

The fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act provided $861,419,000 for nuclear nonproliferation activities. Since that time, Congress has appropriated an additional $326,000,000 for defense nuclear nonproliferation in supplemental appropriations bills. Unfortunately, a substantial portion of the total appropriated funding for fiscal year 2002 remains unspent and unobligated.

These programs of are critical interest to this Committee and to Congress as a whole. However, the Committee is concerned that the rate of expenditure for nonproliferation programs lags substantially behind that of the rest of the National Nuclear Security Administration. Carry-over rates of 40 percent are not uncommon. Although the Committee recognizes the difficulty in implementing nonproliferation activities in Russia, the Committee strongly urges the Department to improve on this level of performance. However, the Committee does not expect the Department to carry out these programs with any less rigorous oversight in ensuring efficient and cost-effective implementation. The securing and safeguarding of fissile nuclear material abroad is a critical component of our Nation's terrorism prevention effort.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation activities of the NNSA are directed to reducing the serious global danger of the proliferation weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The NNSA utilizes the highly specialized scientific, technical, analytical, and operational capabilities of the NNSA and its national laboratories as well as other De-

partment of Energy laboratories to implement its nonproliferation programs. Its mission is to prevent the spread of WMD materials, technology and expertise; detect the proliferation of WMD worldwide; reverse the proliferation of nuclear weapons capabilities; dispose of surplus materials in accordance with terms set forth in agreements between the United States and Russia; and store surplus fissile materials in a safe and secure manner pending disposition. The Committee continues to strongly support these important national security programs.

Nonproliferation and verification research and development.—The Committee recommends $293,407,000.

The recommended level continues the important remote sensing and verification technology research, development and deployment, and continues to invest in the development of essential technologies for responding to the growing threat of chemical and biological terrorism.

The Nonproliferation and Verification, Research and Development program is essential for stable long-term research and the development of unique science and technology competencies needed for the increasing demands of arms control, nonproliferation, domestic nuclear safeguards and security, energy security, and emergency management.

Within available funds, the Committee has provided $15,000,000 to support on-going activities at the Remote Sensing Test and Evaluation Center including sensor test bet development, support for field testing, and deployment of sensors, applied technology activities, the HAZMAT Spill Center, the RSL, and the STL. Within available funds, the Committee recommendation also includes $500,000 for the Remote Sensing Test and Evaluation Center to conduct a site-wide survey of the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant (IAAP) in Middletown, Iowa, for radiological contamination. This study shall be done in conjunction with the Army Corps of Engineers and the State of Iowa. The Committee recommends $2,500,000 in support of the 3-year research effort by the Caucasus Seismic Information Network. The Committee recommendation includes $5,250,000 for the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology PASSCAL Instrument Center.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $10,000,000 in support of the nuclear and radiological national security program. The NNSA is directed to provide for the sustained development of advanced technologies needed to counter nuclear terrorism threats and should focus on improving capabilities through research and development in threat assessment and prediction, basic nuclear understanding, sensors and detection systems, consequence mitigation, forensics and attribution and render-safe technologies.

Nonproliferation and International Security.—The Committee recommends $92,668,000 for Nonproliferation and International Security.

The Department's Nonproliferation and International Security program supports the U.S. arms control and nonproliferation policies, and provides leadership and representation within the Department in the international arms control and nonproliferation community. The goal is to reduce the threat of nuclear proliferation by

integrating the Department's assets and efforts, including those of the national laboratories and contractors, to provide technical support to the U.S. Government's foreign policy and national security objectives. The Committee recommendation includes $8,100,000 for continuing the efforts for disposition of spent nuclear fuel in Kazakhstan.

The Committee commends the NNSA for engaging the wider US scientific community in contributions to the treaty monitoring program. The Committee will not continue direction that the NNSA compete a specific portion of the treaty monitoring program, but strongly encourages the laboratories to continue to incorporate more industry and academic involvement and to establish metrics that will allow the Committee to track progress in this effort.

Russian Transition Initiatives.—The Committee recommends $39,334,000 for Russian Transition Initiatives. The recommendation is meant to continue important activities that counter "brain drain" to potential proliferant states and terrorist organizations from the nuclear weapons complex laboratories and production plants of the former Soviet Union. The request includes $16,748,000 for the Nuclear Cities Initiative (NCI), and $22,586,000 for Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP).

International materials protection, control, and accounting.—The recommendation provides $233,077,000 for international material protection, control, and accounting (MPC&A) activities. The Committee continues to consider these activities extremely important to reducing the threat created by the breakup of the former Soviet Union.

The increased funding from fiscal year 2002 supplemental appropriations and the fiscal year 2003 recommendation will allow for additional material consolidation and control work, an expanded program of MPC&A at several Russian Navy sites, and expanded MPC&A efforts within defense-related and important civilian and regulatory sites in Russia. In addition, the Committee supports the NNSA pursuing opportunities to work with the Russian Strategic Rocket Forces in securing additional weapon sites. The Committee continues to believe that these activities are critical elements of the United States non-proliferation efforts.

Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to accelerate the blend-down of highly enriched uranium. The Administrator of the NNSA is directed to explore new approaches, in addition to the current 500 MT HEU blend-down program, that could increase the rate at which HEU is modified to render it incapable of weapons use in a manner consistent with section 3157 of S. 2514, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003.

Second Line of Defense.—From within available funds, an additional $10,000,000 is provided for expanded activities within NNSA's Second Line of Defense (SLD) program. This program is responsible for improving border and transportation security against the illicit movement of material used in weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The Committee supports expanded program work in major transit/transportation hubs and ports in countries other than Russia and the Newly Independent States.

HEU (Highly Enriched Uranium) Transparency Implementation.—The Committee recommendation includes $17,229,000, the amount of the budget request for the HEU Transparency Implementation program of the Department of Energy. This program is responsible for ensuring that the non-proliferation aspects of the February 1993 agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation are met. This Agreement covers the purchase over 20 years of low enriched uranium [LEU] derived from at least 500 metric tons of HEU removed from dismantled Russian nuclear weapons. Under the Agreement, conversion of the HEU components into LEU is performed in Russian facilities. The purpose of this program is to put into place those measures agreed to by both sides, that permit the United States to have confidence that the Russian side is abiding by the Agreement.

International nuclear safety.—The Committee recommends $14,576,000 to implement permanent improvements in Russian nuclear safety culture as well as improvements in the regulatory framework for Soviet-design reactor operations in nine former Soviet Union countries.

Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production.—The Committee recommendation includes $49,339,000 for the elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program. The Committee supports the administrations request to transfer the Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium program (EWGPP) from the Department of Defense to the NNSA. However the Committee is concerned with the inherent complexity, and the concomitant problems of cost increases and schedule slippage, when working in the Russian weapons complex closed cities. The Committee directs the department to provide a report by December 31, 2002, detailing the proposed program plan, including cost, schedule, and project milestones that can be used to track program progress.

Fissile materials disposition.—The Committee recommends $448,000,000, to maintain operations in the United States and in Russia according to the plan under the budget request.

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

The Committee recommendation includes $194,000,000 for U.S. surplus materials disposition, the same as the budget request.

The Committee urges the Department to continue the thorium-based fuel cycle program currently being conducted by the Russian Research Initiative in conjunction with their U.S. industrial partners.

Construction.—

Project 99–D–141 Pit Disassembly & Conversion Facility.—The Committee recommends $33,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 99–D–143 Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility.—The Committee recommends $93,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 01–D–407 Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Blend Down Project.—The Committee recommends $30,000,000, the same as the budget request.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2002	$688,045,000
Budget estimate, 2003	706,790,000
Committee recommendation	706,790,000

The Naval Reactors Program within the NNSA provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores having long fuel life, high reliability, improved performances, and simplified operating and maintenance requirements. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combat vessels varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships. The Committee recommendation is $706,790,000, the amount of the budget request.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 2002	$312,596,000
Budget estimate, 2003	335,929,000
Committee recommendation	335,929,000

The Committee has included $335,929,000 for the expenses of the Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).

The NNSA is taking the long-overdue steps necessary to re-engineer the entire nuclear weapons complex to reflect new national security realities. In the field, the Operations Offices are being converted to Service Centers and the 8 Site Offices are being given greater authority over the contractors. The NNSA has announced its first major Headquarters re-engineering to consolidate management and oversight.

When fully implemented, the layers of Federal Headquarters management will be reduced. The Committee recognizes that there will be increased cost for permanent change of station associated with re-deploying existing staff. The committee expects the NNSA to aggressively pursue these efforts without negatively impacting critical national security missions.

The National Nuclear Security Administration Act and subsequent Appropriations Acts have included requirements or direction to develop and implement a planning, programming, and budgeting system. The Committee directs the Department conduct an independent assessment of the NNSA's PPBS process and structure, including its comparability to that of the Department of Defense. The review should also determine whether the NNSA's PPBS is capable of being used as the central decision making process for resource allocation decisions and the extent to which it has been incorporated by NNSA M&O contractors.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

OTHER DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 2002	$5,234,576,000
Budget estimate, 2003	4,544,133,000
Committee recommendation	5,406,532,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,406,532,000 for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management programs for fiscal year 2003. This is $862,399,000 over the budget request.

The Department's environmental management program is responsible for identifying and reducing health and safety risks, and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out defense nuclear energy or weapons research and production activities which resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination. The environmental management program goals are to eliminate and manage the urgent risk in the system; emphasize health and safety for workers and the public; establish a system that increases managerial and financial control; and establish a stronger partnership between DOE and its stakeholders. The "Defense environmental restoration and waste management" appropriation is organized into two program accounts, site/project completion and post-2006 completion to reflect the emphasis on project completion and site closures.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT CLEAN-UP REFORM

The Department's top-to-bottom review of the Environmental Management Program concluded that cleaning up the legacy of the Cold War is costing billions more than it should and will take many years longer than anticipated to complete. The Department's position, correct in the view of the Committee, is that the status quo is unacceptable. The Department, during the last year, has embarked on a mission to quickly and markedly improve the program's performance in achieving clean-up and closure, and ensure that the primary goal is reducing risk to workers, the public, and the environment.

In the fiscal year 2003 budget submittal, the Department recommended the creation of an $800,000,000 clean-up reform account in an attempt to lure sites and States into re-negotiating binding agreements to accelerate clean-ups throughout the DOE complex. In a relatively flat budget request, this pot of money was created by cutting fiscal year 2003 funding levels at nearly every DOE clean-up site. The Department wanted the $800,000,000 to be completely unallocated by Congress as an incentive to bring States and sites to the bargaining table quickly rather than risk not receiving any of the funding. The general unfairness and inequity of such a tactic is not lost on the Committee.

This approach seems to have worked because the Department has entered into negotiations with the vast majority of the sites in

the complex. There was no shortage of States or sites willing to line up to accept additional funding now in exchange for, at best, a vague promise to complete work on their clean-up years ahead of schedule. The Committee remains skeptical that the addition of a relatively small increase in funds today at, for example, Hanford, will result in a savings of 35 years and $40,000,000,000–$50,000,000,000. The Department has utilized this "more money now, great savings later" strategy in a number of other areas, with limited success to date. However, the Committee is in full agreement that the current situation is untenable.

Of greater concern to the Committee is the fact that the budget tally for the re-negotiated agreements totals approximately $1,100,000,000, a figure that the Department has, since early in this year's budget process, treated as if it was the actual budget request. It is completely unacceptable for the Department to enter into binding legal agreements with States when it is clear there is no money in the budget request to fully fund the final agreements. This behavior is in no way mitigated by the submittal of a budget amendment weeks after the Committee had issued 302(b) allocations to each of the Subcommittees.

The result of such a cynical action is to force the Committee into making one of two equally unappealing choices: (1) Forego funding for critically important nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear weapons stockpile programs, including the pit manufacturing and certification program that is the cornerstone of science-based stockpile stewardship; or (2) allow the Department to renege on agreements with States, due to insufficient funding, mere months after entering into them.

The Committee reluctantly chooses the former approach if only because this administration has already proved far too eager to trample on the rights of the States if it serves its interests to do so. This administration has also shown no greater long-term commitment to fulfilling legally binding clean-up agreements with States than its immediate predecessors.

The Committee recommendation does not include a separate clean-up reform account. The Committee is unwilling to provide a completely unallocated $1,100,000,000 to the Department. Rather, the recommendation appropriates funds to each of the affected sites in accordance with the State agreements and in the existing clean-up appropriation accounts.

The fact that the (less than timely) $300,000,000 budget amendment arrived with less detail about the uses and sites for the dollars than was contained in the public affairs press releases trumpeting each new State agreement, provides the Committee with no confidence whatsoever that the Department is planning to fulfill each individual clean-up commitment. The complete lack of detailed information from the Department to Congress concerning the specific tasks to be performed with $1,100,000,000 of the taxpayers money is as shocking as it is arrogant.

Given the lack of adequate budget justification material for each of the sites, the Committee is compelled to withdraw the internal reprogramming authority that has traditionally been provided to the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management. Any proposed reprogramming shifts between accounts and sites of all Envi-

ronmental Management funds, both current and prior years, available to the Department during fiscal year 2003, must be submitted to the appropriate House and Senate Committees for approval.

In conclusion, the Committee reiterates its support for the Department's efforts to expedite the clean-up of the legacy of the Cold War in an efficient and effective manner. To the extent that the clean-up reform initiative has improved the legally binding agreements between the Department and the States, the Committee is pleased. However, once these agreements are in place, the Committee expects the annual budget submission from this and future administrations to fully fund the Federal portion of each of these agreements. If not, the balances will be made up from the Environmental Management Program Direction and Departmental Administration accounts.

The Committee expects the Department to continue to seek every opportunity to bring about more efficiencies and tough businesslike approaches to program execution. The Department should continue the critical review concerning the need and requirement for each individual support service contract, and duplicative and overlapping organizational arrangements and functions.

SITE AND PROJECT COMPLETION

An appropriation of $981,350,000 is recommended for site and project completion activities, including $973,106,000 for operation and maintenance, and $8,244,000 for construction.

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

For construction, the Committee recommendation includes all requested projects.

The Committee recommendation includes additional funding above the level of the administration's request for the following activities: $40,000,000 to accelerate cleanup at Savannah River Site in South Carolina; $5,000,000 for cleanup activities at Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory in Idaho; $141,000,000 for accelerated cleanup at the Hanford site in Washington; $8,000,000 to accelerate cleanup activities at Sandia National Lab in New Mexico; and $5,000,000 for accelerated cleanup at the Pantex site in Texas.

The Committee provides $1,000,000 to the State of Oregon to cover costs of its clean-up effort, including emergency drills, planning activities, technical review of DOE's waste management and clean-up plans, participation in the Hanford Advisory Board meetings and other meetings at Hanford.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $1,500,000 for the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory and recommends that the Department continue its relationship with the University of South Carolina's Center for Water Resources at current year levels.

The Committee understands the Department is prepared to transfer up to 2,000 acres for the use of Pueblo of San Ildefonso and approximately 100 acres to the County of Los Alamos. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $4,000,000 to expedite the remediation and conveyance of the land consistent with the direction of section 632 of Public Law 105–119.

POST-2006 COMPLETION

The Committee recommendation for post-2006 completion activities is $3,353,098,000, which includes $2,211,240,000 in operating expenses for post-2006 completion, $455,256,000 in operating expenses for the Office of River Protection, and $671,732,000 for ORP construction.

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

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

Post-2006 operation and maintenance.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funding above the level of the administration's request for the following activities: $229,000,000 for vitrification plant work at the Office of River Protection in Washington; $176,000,000 to accelerate cleanup and nuclear materials stabilization at Savannah River Site in South Carolina; $105,000,000 for cleanup activities at Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory in Idaho; $63,000,000 for accelerated cleanup of the River Corridor and tank waste management at the Hanford site in Washington; $54,000,000 to accelerate remediation, waste management, and nuclear materials stewardship activities at Los Alamos National Lab in New Mexico; $40,000,000 for accelerated cleanup at the Oak Ridge National Lab and Oak Ridge Reservation in Tennessee; $33,000,000 for accelerated cleanup at the Nevada Test Site in Nevada; $22,000,000 for accelerated cleanup at the Lawrence Livermore National Lab; and $2,000,000 for cleanup activities in Alaska.

The Department is expected to continue making PILT payments to counties that have the Hanford reservation within their boundaries at last year's level.

Within available funds, the Committee also directs the Department to fund the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program and the HAMMER programs at levels consistent with fiscal year 2001 levels.

The Department is directed to pay its Title V air permitting fees at the INEEL consistent with prior year levels.

Last year the Committee encouraged the Department to utilize alternative dispute resolution to resolve the Pit 9 issue currently in Federal court. The Committee is aware the district court has ordered the parties to enter into mediation. The Committee commends that initiative and encourages the pursuit of the action to avert continued costly and protracted litigation. The Committee expects the Department to participate directly in that mediation, not through the M&O contractor. If mediation is not successful, the Committee expects the Department to initiate and participate in arbitration to resolve this dispute.

Carlsbad Field Office.—The recommendation includes an additional $14,000,000 for Carlsbad to accelerate shipping and disposing of transuranic waste around the complex; an additional $5,000,000 to continue the U.S. Mexico Border Health Commission/Materials Corridor Partnership Initiative. The recommendation also includes an additional $3,500,000 which shall be made available to the Carlsbad community for educational support, infrastructure improvements, and related initiatives to address the impacts of accelerated operations.

In order to provide more timely information in a useable format to citizens, researchers, stakeholders and regulators, the Committee directs the Department to consolidate at Carlsbad all record archives relevant to the operations of WIPP and the TRU waste in the repository.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Committee recommendation includes $77,000,000 for science and technology, $15,000,000 below the administration's request. The Committee notes that the administration's request is a cut of nearly $164,000,000 from the current year.

The Science and Technology Program provides new or improved technologies and research results that reduce risks to workers, the public and the environment; reduce cleanup costs; and/or provide solutions to environmental problems that currently have no solutions. New and improved technologies have the potential to reduce environmental restoration and cleanup costs by an estimated several billion dollars.

The Committee is aware of the Department's plan to "re-focus" the Science and Technology Program and to discontinue all focus area activities, all technology applications activities, as well as other university and industry programs under this account. This recommendation is a result of the Department of Energy's recent Top-to-Bottom Review of the Environmental Management program.

The Committee disagrees with this decision and is skeptical that a robust Science and Technology program can be maintained given the $164,000,000 cut. Long-term investment in research and development is the single most important thing the Department can do to ensure that clean-ups are completed quickly and efficiently. The solutions to many of the technical problems facing clean-up sites throughout the DOE complex have not yet been invented. Sharp cuts to science and technology are not the answer and the Committee hopes the Department will reconsider for fiscal year 2004.

Within available funds, the Committee provides $7,000,000 for the Western Environmental Technology Office; $3,150,000 to con-

duct advanced conceptual design of the Subsurface Geosciences Laboratory; $6,000,000 for the Subsurface Science Research Institute (operated by the Inland Northwest Research Alliance and INEEL; $5,000,000 for the National Spent Nuclear Fuel Program; $6,000,000 for the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory; $3,000,000 to continue micro-sensing technology development and prototype development and prototype deployment for the Underground Test Area; and $4,350,000 for the University Research Programs in Robotics.

An additional $5,000,000 is provided to establish the Critical Infrastructure Testbed at INEEL to implement the recommendations of the Energy Infrastructure Assurance Task Force.

Within available funds, the Committee provides additional funding of $7,500,000 to INEEL for the research and development of technologies to address environmental challenges.

The Committee urges the Department to continue its previous commitment to seek alternative cost-effective technologies from outside the Department in cleaning up legacy waste. The Committee is aware that the international agreement with AEA Technology has been successful in accomplishing this vital task and urges the Department to expand use of this Agreement.

The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for basic science experiments requiring the specialized underground environment of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, including continuation of evaluation of the mass of the neutrino through study of double beta decay of xenon-136 as initiated in fiscal year 2002. The Committee recommends close coordination between the Office of Science and the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management to assure that basic science studies at WIPP do not interfere with the TRU waste responsibilities of WIPP. The Committee also notes with concern that funds provided to initiate this work in fiscal year 2002 were not released by the Department until well into that fiscal year, seriously jeopardizing progress, and directs that funds be promptly released in fiscal year 2003.

The Committee agrees with DOE testimony that proven innovative technology should be deployed in clean-up operations as quickly as possible. As in previous years, the Committee continues to support proving out the advanced vitrification technology, which holds the potential to significantly lower clean-up costs and future appropriation requirements. The advanced vitrification system also represents technology and innovation which have been invented, developed, and produced in the United States and should be a national security priority for government-funded nuclear waste management programs.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Department, from within available funds, to develop the vitrification-in-the-final-disposal-container AVS system in accordance with the work plan.

Finally, the Department is directed to renew its cooperative agreement with the University of Nevada-Las Vegas through its Research Foundation.

EXCESS FACILITIES

The Committee recommendation for excess facilities is $1,300,000, which is the same as the budget request. These funds

are provided to manage the transfer for the final disposition of excess contaminated physical facilities leading to significant risk and cost reductions. In fiscal year 2003 these funds are to be used for the transfer of excess facilities at the Pantex Plant, Savannah River Site, and the Y–12 Plant from other DOE organizations.

MULTI-SITE

The Committee recommendation includes $479,871,000 for multi-site activities.

This program account supports management and oversight for various crosscutting Environmental Management and Department initiatives, including the program's contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.

Within available funds, the Committee provides $14,000,000 for the National Energy Technology Laboratory to support the implementation of an integrated program for closing small DOE clean-up sites and to serve as the DOE field service center for the long-term stewardship of former DOE sites in the eastern United States. The Committee further directs that no action shall be taken to diminish the fiscal year 2002 Environmental Management employee levels at NETL in any was as the laboratory's workload transitions from the science and technology program.

The Department shall continue its support of WERC, the Consortium for Environmental Education and Technology Development, at current year levels consistent with its contractual obligations and shall extend the Tribal Colleges Initiative grant, involving Crownpoint Institute of Technology, Diné College, Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute, to develop high-quality environmental programs at tribal colleges.

Within available funds, the Committee provides additional funding of $7,500,000 to INEEL for the research and development of technologies to address environmental challenges.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation for safeguards and security is $228,260,000, the same as the budget request.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation for program direction totals $324,000,000, which is the same as the budget request.

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

The Assistant Secretary shall provide a report to the relevant House and Senate Appropriations Committees by November 1, 2002, detailing the reassignment of all the Senior Executive Service (SES) employees paid in fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002 from the Environmental Management program direction account. The report should name all reassigned Federal managers, their title and position at the beginning of the calendar year 2001, date of reassignment, title and position as of September 30, 2002, rationale for reassignment, and the unique capabilities or experience the individual brings to the reassignment position.

DEFENSE FACILITY CLOSURE PROJECTS

Appropriations, 2002	$1,092,878,000
Budget estimate, 2003	1,091,314,000
Committee recommendation	1,125,314,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,125,314,000 for the site closure program, an increase of $34,000,000 over the request.

The "Site closure" account includes funding for sites where the environmental management program has established a goal of completing the cleanup mission by the end of fiscal year 2006. After the cleanup mission is complete at a site, no further DOE mission is envisioned, except for limited long-term surveillance and maintenance. This account provides funding to cleanup the Rocky Flats, Fernald, Mound, Ashtabula, and Columbus sites.

The Committee recommendation includes additional funding above the administration's request to maintain the 2006 closure goal at the following sites in Ohio: $25,000,000 for Fernald; $4,000,000 for the Mound site; $5,000,000 for the Columbus Environmental Management Project.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

Appropriations, 2002	$153,537,000
Budget estimate, 2003	158,399,000
Committee recommendation	158,339,000

An appropriation of $158,339,000 is recommended for the environmental management privatization initiative.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2002	$544,044,000
Budget estimate, 2003	468,664,000
Committee recommendation	537,664,000

ENERGY SECURITY AND ASSURANCE

The Committee recommendation for energy security and assurance is $56,686,000. This program supports the national security of the United States by working to protect the Nation against severe energy supply disruptions by working with the private sector and the National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center (NISAC) to provide technical response support during an emergency. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for a pilot project in Washington, DC, to be carried out in conjunction with the local power provider and the Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments, to protect and harden electricity infrastructure in the Nation's Capital, an area uniquely susceptible to terrorist attack.

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $30,000,000 in support of the National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center. This funding will enable the continuation of work authorized in the USA Patriot Act to develop sophisticated models and

simulation capabilities for critical infrastructures. The additional resources are to be available for additional operations, construction of general plant projects and acquisition of equipment to support the center.

The Committee recommendation also includes $16,000,000 for the National Energy Technology Laboratory to assist the Office of Energy Assurance in support of research and development to monitor and protect the physical assets of the U.S. energy infrastructure, including power plants, pipelines, transmissions lines, gaseous and liquid fuel storage, and depots, processing plants, and refineries.

The Committee strongly urges the Department, when conducting critical infrastructure assessments, use entities with a proven global information technology infrastructure, and with experience in cyber security and energy information management.

INTELLIGENCE

The Committee recommendation totals $41,246,000 for intelligence.

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

SECURITY

The Committee recommendation for security and emergency operations is $185,515,000.

Nuclear Safeguards.—The Committee recommendation provides $91,102,000 for nuclear safeguards.

Security Investigations.—The Committee recommendation provides $45,870,000, the amount of the budget request.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation provides $48,543,000 for program direction.

Coordination with local communities.—The Committee recognizes the unique emergency response role carried out by local governments adjacent to Departmental facilities and directs the Department to use available resources to improve local government emergency response capabilities through better communications and stronger coordination of training and response activities.

INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Committee recommendation provides $22,430,000 for independent oversight and performance assurance, the amount of the budget request.

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

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

An appropriation of $45,955,000, the amount of the request, is provided for the counterintelligence activities of the Department of Energy.

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

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation provided $114,041,000 for Environmental, Safety and Health activities including $17,149,000 for program direction. The mission of the Office of Environmental, Safety and Health is to protect the health and safety of Department of Energy workers, the public, and the environment and is to be the Department's independent advocate for safety, health and the environment.

The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to continue the DOE worker records digitization project through the Research Foundation at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas.

The Committee continues to be concerned that the Department has failed to recognize the importance of automating records management processes and continues to encumber extraordinary costs by employing labor intensive procedures in support of these requirements. Though the Committee recommended a Department-wide standardization of processes to ensure data preservation and access, the Committee is not aware of a comprehensive coordinated effort being undertaken within the Department. The Committee is also aware that even within the Environment Safety & Health organization, parallel activities were undertaken to digitize worker records while another part of the organization sought the digitization of similar worker records to support the Employee Compensation Initiative. To the extent that there is a desire to digitize records in support of the ECI, the Committee strongly encourages the Department to utilize the existing program at UNLV.

The Committee is concerned that the Department is waivering in its commitment to medical screening and health studies of current and former workers. Many of these medical screenings are required by law. The Committee expects the Department to expend $60,000,000, a slight increase above the current year rather than the $7,000,000 cut proposed by the Administration, on health studies.

The Committee recommends $5,200,000, an increase of $4,150,000 above the request, for medical monitoring at the gaseous diffusion plants at Paducah, Kentucky, Portsmouth, Ohio, and Oak Ridge, Tennessee. This will fully fund, as required by law, the worker screening program for both current and former workers. The Committee strongly supports and requires the continued use of helical low-dose CAT scanning for early lung cancer detection in workers with elevated risks of lung cancer. Such tests may detect lung cancers at an early stage even when they are not visible with conventional x-rays. The program in place at the gaseous diffusion

plants is successfully identifying early lung cancers at a stage when they are treatable and can be expected to dramatically increase survival rates. The recommendation also includes $1,000,000 for health studies at the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant.

The Committee directs the Department to initiate a beryllium screening and outreach program for those workers employed at vendors in the Worcester, Massachusetts, area who supplied beryllium to the Atomic Energy Commission for use in the nuclear weapons program. The DOE is directed expedite the screening program by using one of the DOE's existing former worker medical screening program providers. The Committee recommends $250,000 for this program.

Energy Employees Compensation Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes $16,000,000, the amount of the request, for the Energy Employees Compensation Initiative. Title 36 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2001 (Public Law 106–398) established the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program to provide benefits to DOE contractor workers made ill as a result of exposures from nuclear weapons production. The Department is responsible for establishing procedures to assist workers in filing compensation claims.

The Committee understands that a proposed final rule implementing Part D of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program is currently under review within the Administration. Any final rule implementing Part D should prohibit contractor challenges, specify that a majority determination of the Physicians' Panel is sufficient, and rely on the independent judgment of a physicians' panel with respect to burden of proof and medical causation.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The Committee has provided an appropriation of $25,683,000 for these activities for fiscal year 2003. This is the same as the budget request.

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

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $50,587,000 for national security programs administrative support. This fund pays for departmental services that are provided in support of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

An appropriation of $2,933,000 is recommended for the Office of Hearings and Appeals. The Office of Hearings and Appeals conduct

all of the Department's adjudicative process and provides various administrative remedies as may be required. The goal is to promote successful and uninterrupted DOE operations through the deliberate, expeditious and equitable resolution of all claims of adverse impact emanating from the operations of the Department.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2002	$280,000,000
Budget estimate, 2003	315,000,000
Committee recommendation	280,000,000

The Committee recommends $280,000,000 for defense nuclear waste disposal.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

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

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

Purchase power and wheeling.—The Committee is recommending the elimination of the phase out by the end of fiscal year 2004 of the use of receipts by the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration for purchase power and wheeling.

This approach was originally proposed in the Administration's fiscal year 2001 budget request and endorsed in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 106–377). In recognition of the Western energy crisis during the previous year, the Committee did not adhere to the Public Law 106–377 limitations on purchase power and wheeling in fiscal year 2002, with the largest increase being for the Western Area Power Administration. The budget request for fiscal year 2003 proposed resuming the phase-out of purchase power and wheeling along the schedule contained in Public Law 106–377. However, the Committee finds that there is no compelling reason to continue the phase out of purchase power and wheeling, particularly since this activity is budget neutral.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2003 maintains purchase power and wheeling activities at the fiscal year 2002

level. The Committee will continue to establish ceilings on the use of receipts for purchase power and wheeling, and also establish the amount of offsetting collections.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

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

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

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

Borrowing Authority.—Bonneville Power Administration presently has available $3,750,000,000 in permanent borrowing authority, authorized by the Transmission System Act (Public Law 93–454). For fiscal year 2003, the Committee recommendation includes an estimate of use of $630,800,000 of authorized borrowing authority, the same as the budget request and $256,300,000 more than fiscal year 2002. This borrowing authority is available for capital investments in power systems (including fish and wildlife measures), transmission systems, and capital equipment. Bonneville forecasts that it will fully utilize its remaining borrowing authority during fiscal year 2004.

The Administration has submitted a legislative proposal to increase the current Bonneville borrowing authority by $700,000,000, for a new total borrowing authority of $4,450,000,000. The Committee recommendation does not include this additional borrowing authority at this time because the matter is presently committed to the House-Senate conference on energy legislation.

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

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

Bonneville to obligate borrowing authority in excess of such amounts.

The Committee recommendation includes $34,463,000 for purchase power and wheeling activities, the same as the current year and consistent with the terms described above.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2002	$4,891,000
Budget estimate, 2003	4,534,000
Committee recommendation	4,534,000

The Southeastern Power Administration markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers projects in 11 Southeastern States. There are 23 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092 megawatts. Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through transmission arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2002	$28,038,000
Budget estimate, 2003	27,378,000
Committee recommendation	27,378,000

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

The Committee recommendation includes $2,200,000 for purchase power and wheeling activities, the same as the current year and consistent with the terms described above.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2002	$171,938,000
Budget estimate, 2003	162,758,000
Committee recommendation	168,858,000

The Western Area Power Administration is responsible for marketing electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission which operate hydropower generating plants in 15 Central and Western States encompassing a 1.3-million-square-mile geographic area. Western is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of almost 17,000 miles of high-voltage trans-

mission lines with 258 substations. Western distributes power generated by 55 plants with a maximum operating capacity of 10,576 megawatts.

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

Of the total resources available to the Western Power Administration, $6,100,000 shall be transferred to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission.

The Committee recommendation includes $186,124,000 for purchase power and wheeling activities, the same as the current year and consistent with the terms described above.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

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

The Committee recommendation is $2,734,000, the same as the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2002	$184,155,000
Budget estimate, 2003	192,000,000
Committee recommendation	192,000,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2002	$184,155,000
Budget estimate, 2003	192,000,000
Committee recommendation	192,000,000

The Committee recommendation provides $192,000,000, the amount of the budget request, for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ENERGY SUPPLY		
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES		
Renewable energy technologies:		
Biomass/biofuels energy systems	86,005	100,000
Geothermal technology development	26,500	37,000
Hydrogen research	39,881	45,000
Hydropower	7,489	7,489
Solar energy	87,625	95,000
Wind energy systems	44,000	50,000
Total, Renewable energy technologies	291,500	334,489
Electric energy systems and storage	70,447	75,000
Renewable support and implementation:		
Departmental energy management	3,000	3,000
International renewable energy program	6,500	6,500
Renewable energy production incentive program	4,000	5,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	8,307	9,307
Renewable program support	2,059	6,059
Total, Renewable support and implementation	23,866	29,866
National renewable energy laboratory	4,200	6,000
Construction: 02–E–001 Project engineering and design, NREL Golden, CO	800	800
Total, National renewable energy laboratory	5,000	6,800
Program direction	16,187	16,907
Subtotal, Renewable Energy Resources	407,000	463,062
Use of prior year balances	.....	−15,000
TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES	407,000	448,062
NUCLEAR ENERGY		
Advanced radioisotope power system	.....	.....
Isotopes:		
Isotope support and production	.....	.....
Construction	.....	.....
99–E–201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	.....	.....
Subtotal, Isotope support and production	.....	.....
Offsetting collections	.....	.....
Total, Isotopes	.....	.....
University reactor fuel assistance and support	17,500	19,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Research and development:		
Nuclear energy plant optimization	.....	5,000
Nuclear energy research initiative	25,000	29,000
Nuclear energy technologies	46,500	48,500
Total, Research and development	71,500	82,500
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	36,100	36,100
Radiological facilities management:		
Radiological facilities	78,977	88,638
ANL–West operations	.....	.....
Test reactor area landlord	.....	.....
Subtotal	78,977	88,638
Construction:		
99–E–2–1 Isotope production facility (LANL)	1,721	1,721
99–E–200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Lab, ID	1,840	1,840
95–E–201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Lab, ID	500	500
Subtotal, Construction	4,061	4,061
Total, Radiological facilities management	83,038	92,699
Nuclear facilities management:		
EBR–II shutdown	.....	.....
Disposition of spent fuel and legacy materials	.....	.....
Disposition technology activities	.....	.....
Total, Nuclear facilities management	.....	.....
Advanced fuel cycle	18,221	77,870
Program direction	23,439	23,439
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy	249,798	332,108
Use of prior year balances	.....	−8,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	249,798	324,108
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH		
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)	10,340	5,340
Program direction	18,871	13,871
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	29,211	19,211
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES		
Technical information management program	1,400	1,400
Program direction	6,525	5,525
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	7,925	6,925
ENERGY SUPPLY INFRASTRUCTURE		
Energy Supply Infrastructure	.....	17,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY INFRASTRUCTURE	.....	17,000
Subtotal, Energy supply	693,934	815,306

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
General reduction	.....	.....
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	693,934	815,306
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT		
Site closure	.....	.....
Site/project completion	51,272	67,272
Post 2006 completion	112,887	123,887
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	.....	.....
Long-term stewardship	.....	.....
Excess facilities	1,841	1,841
Subtotal, Non-Defense Environmental Management	166,000	193,000
Use of prior year balances	.....	−17,000
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	166,000	176,000
URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION		
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund:		
Decontamination and decommissioning	234,523	333,523
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	1,000	1,000
Total, Uranium enrichment D&D fund	235,523	334,523
Other Uranium Activities:		
Maintenance and pre-existing liabilities	146,631	136,631
02–U–101 Depleted uranium hexafluoride conversion project, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH	.....	.....
96–U–201 DUF6 cylinder storage yard, Paducah, KY	.....	.....
Total, Other uranium activities	146,631	136,631
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....
TOTAL, URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION	382,154	471,154
SCIENCE		
High Energy Physics:		
Research & Technology	258,545	263,555
Facility operations	446,352	446,332
Construction: 98–G–304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	20,093	20,093
Total, High energy physics	724,990	729,980
Nuclear physics	382,370	387,370
Biological and environmental research	504,215	531,215
Construction: 01–E–300 Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics, ORNL	.....	.....
Total, Biological and environmental research	504,215	531,215
Basic energy sciences:		
Research:		
Materials sciences and engineering research	547,883	553,383
Chemical sciences, geosciences and energy biosciences	220,146	234,146
Engineering and geosciences	.....	.....
Energy biosciences	.....	.....
Subtotal, Research	768,029	787,529
Construction:		
03–SC–002 Project engineering & design (PED) SLAC.	6,000	6,000
03–R–312 Center for nanophase materials sciences, ORNL	24,000	24,000
03–R–313 Center for Integrated Nenotechnology	.....	4,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
02–SC–002 Project engineering and design (VL)	11,000	12,000
99–E–334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	210,571	210,571
Subtotal, Construction	251,571	257,071
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,019,600	1,044,600
Advanced scientific computing research	169,625	169,625
Energy research analyses	1,020	1,020
Science laboratories infrastructure:		
Infrastructure support	1,020	1,020
Oak Ridge landlord	5,079	5,079
Excess facilities disposal	5,055	5,055
Construction:		
03–SC–001 Science laboratories infrastructure project engineering and design (PED), various loc.	3,355	3,355
MEL–001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	28,226	28,226
02–SC–001 Multiprogram energy laboratories, project engineering design, various locations	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	31,581	31,581
Total, Science laboratories infrastructure	42,735	42,735
Fusion energy sciences program	257,310	259,310
Safeguards and security	48,127	48,127
Science workforce development	.....	.....
Science program direction:		
Field offices	70,163	65,000
Headquarters	58,224	64,377
Science education	5,460	5,460
Technical information management program	.....	.....
Energy research analyses	.....	.....
Total, Science program direction	133,847	134,837
Subtotal, Science	3,283,839	3,348,819
General reduction	.....	−14,980
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−4,383	−4,383
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,279,456	3,329,456
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL		
Repository program	146,713	.....
Program direction	62,989	56,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	209,702	56,000
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION		
Administrative operations:		
Salaries and expenses:		
Office of the Secretary	4,645	4,645
Board of contract appeals	743	743
Chief information officer	30,862	28,862
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,953	4,953
Economic impact and diversity	5,121	5,121
General counsel	22,813	21,813
International affairs	.....	.....
Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation	106,536	94,536
Policy office	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Policy and international affairs	16,840	14,840
Public affairs	4,531	4,531
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	197,044	180,044
Program support:		
Minority economic impact	1,400	1,400
Policy analysis and system studies	800	800
Energy security and assurance	2,000	2,000
Environmental policy studies	1,200	1,200
Engineering and construction management reviews	.....	.....
Cybersecurity and secure communications	32,027	32,027
Corporate management information program	20,420	8,420
Subtotal, Program support	57,847	45,847
Total, Administrative operations	254,891	225,891
Cost of work for others	69,916	69,916
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	324,807	295,807
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	.....	−10,000
Funding from other defense activities	−25,587	−50,587
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	299,220	235,000
Miscellaneous revenues	−137,524	−137,524
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	161,696	97,696
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL		
Office of Inspector General	37,671	37,671
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	37,671	37,671
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION		
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES		
Directed stockpile work:		
Stockpile research and development	467,149	467,149
Stockpile maintenance	401,157	401,157
Stockpile evaluation	197,184	197,184
Dismantlement/disposal	24,378	24,378
Production support	137,706	137,706
Field engineering, training and manuals	6,893	6,893
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,234,467	1,234,467
Campaigns:		
Science campaigns:		
Primary certification	47,159	47,159
Dynamic materials properties	87,594	90,594
Advanced radiography	52,925	82,925
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins	47,790	47,790
Subtotal, Science campaigns	235,468	268,468
Engineering campaigns:		
Enhanced surety	37,713	32,000
Weapons system engineering certification	27,007	27,007
Nuclear survivability	23,394	23,394

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Enhanced surveillance	77,155	77,155
Advanced design and production technologies	74,141	74,141
Subtotal, Engineering campaigns	239,410	233,697
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield.	237,748	273,248
Construction: 96–D–111 National ignition facility, LLNL	214,045	214,045
Subtotal, ILF Ignition	451,793	487,293
Advanced simulation and computing	669,527	649,000
Construction:		
01–D–101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	13,305	13,305
00–D–103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	35,030	35,030
00–D–105 Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	.....	.....
00–D–107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	7,000	7,000
Subtotal, Construction	55,335	55,335
Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing	724,862	704,335
Pit manufacturing and certification	194,484	246,000
Readiness campaigns:		
Stockpile readiness	61,027	61,027
High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness	12,093	12,093
Non-nuclear readiness	22,398	22,398
Materials readiness	.....	.....
Tritium readiness	56,134	42,734
Construction: 98–D–125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	70,165	70,165
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	126,299	112,899
Subtotal, Readiness campaigns	221,817	208,417
Total, Campaigns	2,067,834	2,148,210
Readiness in technical base and facilities:		
Operations of facilities	949,920	1,026,000
Program readiness	208,089	218,000
Special projects	37,744	50,500
Material recycle and recovery	98,816	98,816
Containers	17,721	17,721
Storage	14,593	14,593
Nuclear weapons incident response	91,000	96,000
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,417,883	1,521,630
Construction:		
03–D–101 Sandia underground reactor facility SURF, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	2,000	2,000
03–D–102 LANL Administration Building (LANL)	.....	16,000
03–D–103 Project engineering and design various locations	15,539	15,539
03–D–121 Gas transfer capacity expansion, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO	4,000	4,000
03–D–122 Prototype purification facility, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	20,800	20,800
03–D–123 Special nuclear materials requalification, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	3,000	3,000
02–D–103 Project engineering and design, various locations	27,245	27,245
02–D–105 Engineering technology complex upgrade, LLNL	10,000	10,000
02–D–107 Electrical power systems safety communications and bus upgrades, NV	7,500	7,500
01–D–103 Project engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	6,164	.....
01–D–107 Atlas relocation, Nevada test site	4,123	4,123
01–D–108 Microsystems and engineering sciences applications complex (MESA), SNL	75,000	123,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
01–D–124 HEU materials facility, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	25,000	25,000
01–D–126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	8,650	8,650
01–D–800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL	9,611	9,611
99–D–103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	4,011	4,011
99–D–104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction—Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,915	5,915
99–D–106 Model validation & system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	.....	.....
99–D–108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	.....	.....
99–D–125 Replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	.....	.....
99–D–127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	29,900	29,900
99–D–128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	407	407
98–D–123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	10,481	10,481
98–D–124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y–12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	.....	.....
97–D–123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	.....	.....
96–D–102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Construction	270,346	328,182
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities.	1,688,229	1,849,812
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	242,512	242,512
Secure transportation asset:		
Operations and equipment	100,863	100,863
Program direction	52,126	52,126
Total, Secure transportation asset	152,989	152,989
Safeguards and security	501,054	501,054
Construction: 99–D–132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	8,900	8,900
Total, Safeguards and security	509,954	509,954
Subtotal, Weapons activities	5,895,985	6,137,944
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....
General reduction	.....	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−28,985	−28,985
Subtotal, Weapons activities	5,867,000	6,108,959
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	.....	.....
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	5,867,000	6,108,959
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	5,055,873	.....
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	283,407	293,407
Construction:		
00–D–192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LAN	.....	.....
Total, Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	283,407	293,407
Nonproliferation and international security	92,668	92,668
Nonproliferation programs with Russia:		
International materials protection, control, and cooperation	233,077	233,077
Russian transition initiative	39,334	39,334
HEU transparency implementation	17,229	17,229
International nuclear safety	14,576	14,576
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	49,339	49,339

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Fissile materials disposition:		
U.S. surplus materials disposition	194,000	194,000
Russian surplus materials disposition	98,000	98,000
Construction:		
01–D–407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC	30,000	30,000
99–D–141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility Savannah River, SC	33,000	33,000
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	93,000	93,000
Subtotal, Construction	156,000	156,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	448,000	448,000
Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia	801,555	801,555
Program direction	.....	.....
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,177,630	1,187,630
Use of prior year balances	−64,000	−72,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	.....	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,113,630	1,115,630
NAVAL REACTORS		
Naval reactors development	671,290	671,290
Construction:		
03–D–201 Cleanroom technology facility, Bettis atomic power lab, West Mifflin, PA	7,200	7,200
01–D–200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY	2,100	2,100
90–N–102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Construction	11,300	11,300
Total, Naval reactors development	682,590	682,590
Program direction	24,200	24,200
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	706,790	706,790
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR		
Office of the Administrator	335,929	335,929
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	335,929	335,929
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	8,023,349	8,267,308
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.		
Site/project completion:		
Operation and maintenance	779,706	973,106
Construction:		
02–D–402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, INEEL, Idaho Falls, ID	1,119	1,119
02–D–420 Plutonium packaging and stabilization, Savannah River	2,000	2,000
01–D–414 Preliminary project, engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	5,125	5,125
99–D–402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	.....	.....
99–D–404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID	.....	.....
98–D–453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	.....	.....
96–D–471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
86–D–103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility (LLNL), Livermore, CA	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	8,244	8,244
Total, Site/project completion	787,950	981,350
Post 2006 completion:		
Operation and maintenance	1,702,241	2,211,240
Construction: 93–D–187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	14,870	14,870
Office of River Protection: Operation and maintenance	226,256	455,256
Construction:		
03–D–403 Immobilized high-level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA	6,363	6,363
01–D–416 Hanford waste treatment plant, Richland, WA	619,000	619,000
97–D–402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	25,424	25,424
94–D–407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	20,945	20,945
Subtotal, Construction	671,732	671,732
Subtotal, Office of River Protection	897,988	1,126,988
Total, Post 2006 completion	2,615,099	3,353,098
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	.....	.....
Science and technology	92,000	77,000
Excess facilities	1,300	1,300
Multi-site activities	479,871	479,871
Safeguards and security	228,260	228,260
Program direction	344,000	324,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	4,548,480	5,444,879
Use of prior year balances	.....	−34,000
General reduction	.....	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−4,347	−4,347
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	.....	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,544,133	5,406,532
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT CLEANUP REFORM		
Environmental management cleanup reform	800,000	.....
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS		
Site closure	1,054,153	1,088,153
Safeguards and security	37,161	37,161
TOTAL, DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS	1,091,314	1,125,314
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION		
Privatization initiatives, various locations	158,399	158,399
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION	158,399	158,399
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	6,593,846	6,690,245
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
Other national security programs:		
Energy security and assurance:		
Energy security	23,411	52,411

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Program direction	4,275	4,275
Subtotal, Energy security and assurance	27,686	56,686
Office of Security:		
Nuclear safeguards and security	91,102	91,102
Security investigations	45,870	45,870
Corporate management information program	.....	.....
Cyber security and secure communications	.....	.....
Program direction	48,543	48,543
Subtotal, Office of Security	185,515	185,515
Intelligence	41,246	41,246
Counterintelligence	45,955	45,955
Independent oversight and performance assurance	22,430	22,430
Advanced accelerator applications	.....	.....
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	81,892	96,892
Program direction—EH	17,149	17,149
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	99,041	114,041
Worker and community transition	22,965	22,965
Program direction—WT	2,718	2,718
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	25,683	25,683
National Security programs administrative support	25,587	50,587
Office of hearings and appeals	2,933	2,933
Subtotal, Other defense activities	476,076	545,076
Use of prior year balances	−6,700	−6,700
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−712	−712
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	.....	.....
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	468,664	537,664
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL		
Defense nuclear waste disposal	315,000	280,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	15,400,859	15,775,217
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS		
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance:		
Purchase power and wheeling	20,000	34,463
Program direction	4,606	4,606
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	24,606	39,069
Offsetting collections	.....	−8,000
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)	−20,000	−26,463
Use of prior year balances	−72	−72
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	4,534	4,534
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance:		
Operating expenses	3,814	3,814
Purchase power and wheeling	288	2,200
Program direction	17,933	17,933

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Construction	6,031	6,031
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	28,066	29,978
Offsetting collections		−1,912
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)	−288	−288
Use of prior year balances	−400	−400
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	27,378	27,378
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance:		
Construction and rehabilitation	17,784	17,784
System operation and maintenance	37,796	37,796
Purchase power and wheeling	30,000	186,124
Program direction	108,378	108,378
Utah mitigation and conservation		6,100
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	193,958	356,182
Offsetting collections		−152,624
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)	−30,000	−33,500
Use of prior year balances	−1,200	−1,200
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	162,758	168,858
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND		
Operation and maintenance	2,734	2,734
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	197,404	203,504
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION		
Federal energy regulatory commission	192,000	192,000
FERC revenues	−192,000	−192,000
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	20,528,876	20,961,784

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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

Language under section 301 prohibits the use of funds to award, amend or modify a contract in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulations unless on a case-by-case basis, a waiver is granted by the Secretary of Energy. Similar language was contained in last year's Energy and Water Development Act, Public Law 107–66.

Language is included under section 302 which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to develop or implement a workforce restructuring plan or enhanced severance payments and other benefits for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 484. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2002, Public Law 107–66.

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

Language is included under section 304 which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to initiate requests for proposals or expression of interest for new programs which have not yet been presented to Congress in the annual budget submission, and which have not yet been approved and funded by Congress. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2002, Public Law 107–66.

Language is included under section 305 which permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2002, Public Law 107–66.

Language is included under section 306 which provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to dispose of transuranic waste in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant which contains concentrations of plutonium in excess of 20 percent by weight for the aggregate of any material category on the date of enactment of this Act, or generated after such date. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2002, Public Law 107–66.

Language is included under section 307 which provides that the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration may authorize 2 percent of the amount allocated to a nuclear weapons production plant for the production plant to engage in research, development, and demonstration activities with respect to the Engineering and manufacturing capabilities of the plant in order to maintain and enhance such capabilities at the plant. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2002, Public Law 107–66.

Language is included under section 308 which provides that the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration may authorize 2 percent of the amount allocated for national security operations at the Nevada Test Site for investment in innovative research, development, and demonstration activities with respect to the development, test, and evaluation capabilities necessary for operations and readiness of the Nevada Test Site.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2002	$71,290,000
Budget estimate, 2003	66,290,000
Committee recommendation	74,400,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is composed of the Governors of the 13 Appalachian States and a Federal cochairman who is appointed by the President.

The Committee recommendation for the Appalachian Regional Commission totals $74,400,000, $8,000,000 more than the request.

The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 for the newly authorized telecommunications program within the ARC. This program will broaden the availability of advanced telecommunications services throughout Appalachia.

Consistent with the administration's budget request, the Committee recommendation does not include funding for ARC highways. Funding for ARC development highways is provided through the highway trust fund in fiscal years 1999 through 2004 consistent with provision contained in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act.

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

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2002	$18,500,000
Budget estimate, 2003	19,000,000
Committee recommendation	19,000,000

An appropriation of $19,000,000, the amount of the request, is recommended for fiscal year 2003. This is the same as the budget request.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board was created by the Fiscal Year 1989 National Defense Authorization Act. The Board, composed of five members appointed by the President, provides advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy regarding public health and safety issues at the Department's defense nuclear facilities. The Board is also responsible for investigating any event or practice at a defense nuclear facility which has or may adversely affect public health and safety. The Board is responsible for reviewing and evaluating the content and implementation of the standards relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of defense nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2002	$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 2003	10,000,000
Committee recommendation	15,000,000

The Delta Regional Authority (DRA), authorized by Public Law 106–554, was established to assist an eight-state, 236-county region of demonstrated distress in obtaining transportation and basic public infrastructure, skills training, and opportunities for economic development essential to strong local economies.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $15,000,000 for the Delta Regional Authority. The recommended appropriations will be used to carry out the activities of Authority during fiscal year 2003.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2002	$38,000,000
Budget estimate, 2003	29,939,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000

The Denali Commission is a regional economic development agency established in 1998 for the intended purpose of delivering basic utilities, including affordable power, and other essential infrastructure to the nation's most geographically isolated communities. The Committee is encouraged by the progress of the Denali Commission in assisting distressed communities throughout Alaska, and urges continued work among local and State agencies, nonprofit organizations and other participants in meeting the most pressing infrastructure needs.

The Committee recommendation includes $50,000,000 for the Denali Commission.

From within those funds, $5,000,000 shall be made available for basic infrastructure and facilities for those communities without running water including Red Devil and Kaktovik; $10,000,000 for community facilities that can serve multiple purposes in villages such as Anaktuvuk Pass, Atqasuk, Brevig Mission, Elim, Gambell, Koyuk, Savoonga, St. Michael, Stebbins, Teller, Unalakleet, and Barrow. None of the funds may be used for clean-up of leaking fuel tanks.

The Committee recommendation also includes funding for the Pt. MacKenzie gas line extension, Nome power upgrades, Fire Island power upgrade, North Slope grid upgrade, Calista power generation, and the Parks Highway electric line extension. The Com-

mittee recommendation includes up to $1,000,000 to study the rural development opportunities, costs and logistics of shipping and marketing new domestic water supplies outside of Alaska.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2002	$516,900,000
Budget estimate, 2003	578,184,000
Committee recommendation	578,184,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2002	$473,520,000
Budget estimate, 2003	492,545,000
Committee recommendation	520,087,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2002	$79,380,000
Budget estimate, 2003	85,639,000
Committee recommendation	58,097,000

The Committee recommendation includes $578,174,000, the same amount as the request, for the Commission.

Nuclear energy received a strong endorsement in the National Energy Policy of May 2001 and serious industry interest has emerged in building a new generation of nuclear power plants in the United States to meet the Nation's electricity demands. Three nuclear utilities have announced intentions to submit early site permit applications to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Others are also expected to submit early site permit applications over the next few years. Industry has proposed a new risk-informed regulatory framework to license the next generation of plants. The framework would build on the successful structure of the revised reactor oversight process and be reactor design neutral. NRC should evaluate the merits of this approach and establish the new framework through rulemaking.

Because the NRC needs to ensure that its regulatory infrastructure can be responsive to these new applications, some of which may involve new technologies not previously licensed by the NRC, the Committee provided $10,000,000 in additional budget authority to the NRC for fiscal year 2002 so that it can adequately prepare for and respond to these new reactor initiatives without jeopardizing the safety of operating facilities and without impeding ongoing initiatives on license renewals, power uprates, and moving toward a more risk-informed regulatory environment. While the Committee expects the NRC to continue to support these important national initiatives in fiscal year 2003, funds for maintaining these programs should be realized through implementing internal efficiencies in the NRC.

Recognizing the impact of September 11 on NRC's safeguards mission, an additional $36,000,000 was added to the NRC budget authority for fiscal year 2002. The Committee recognizes that these funds were used to strengthen the NRC's ability to respond to ter-

rorist threats and to assess and enhance security requirements at nuclear facilities. The Committee understand that work is well underway with orders issued to all operating and decommissioned commercial nuclear energy plants. Looking to fiscal year 2003, the focus of security will begin to shift from strengthening security regulations and the response capability of the NRC to the implementation of required enhancements by the licensee. The Committee expects that the funds for oversight of these licensee programs should be realized through implementing internal efficiencies in the NRC.

The Committee recommendation for the NRC is $578,184,000. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $520,087,000 resulting in a net appropriation of $58,097,000.

Fee Recovery.—Pursuant to the agreement reached in fiscal year 2001, the NRC is required to recover 94 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the Nuclear Waste Fund, by assessing license and annual fees.

Reports.—The Committee directs the Commission to continue to provide monthly reports on the status of its licensing and other regulatory activities. In addition, continued congressional oversight is necessary to ensure the NRC streamlines its business processes to improve regulatory efficiency while reducing unnecessary burden on licensees. NRC should report to the Congress by March 31, 2003, on efficiencies gained through implementation of the reactor oversight process. NRC should report to the Congress by June 30, 2003, on regulatory efficiencies that would be gained by consolidating or eliminating regional offices.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2002	$6,180,000
Budget estimate, 2003	6,800,000
Committee recommendation	6,800,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2002	$5,933,000
Budget estimate, 2003	6,392,000
Committee recommendation	6,392,000

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $6,800,000 for fiscal year 2003.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2002	$3,100,000
Budget estimate, 2003	3,102,000
Committee recommendation	3,200,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,200,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

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

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

Language is included under section 503 which extends the existing authority for the Denali Commission.

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

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

The recommended appropriations in title III, Department of Energy, generally are subject to annual authorization. However, the Congress has not enacted an annual Department of Energy authorization bill for several years, with the exception of the programs funded within the atomic energy defense activities which are authorized in annual defense authorization acts. The authorization for the atomic energy defense activities, contained in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2003, is currently being considered by the Senate.

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

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on July 24, 2002, the Committee ordered S. 2784, an original Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill, 2003, subject to amendment and each subject to the budget allocations, by a recorded vote of 29–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Hollings	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Johnson	
Mrs. Landrieu	
Mr. Reed	
Mr. Stevens	

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

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

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

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

With respect to this bill, it is the opinion of the Committee that it is necessary to dispense with these requirements in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

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, fiscal year 2003: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Discretionary	26,300	26,300	25,823	[2] 25,704
Mandatory	NA	.....	NA	.....
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2003	.....	.....	.....	[3] 16,909
2004	.....	.....	.....	7,816
2005	.....	.....	.....	1,400
2006	.....	.....	.....	111
2007 and future years	.....	.....	.....	74
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2003	NA	129	NA	24

[1] Levels approved by the Committee, as modified on July 18, 2002.
[2] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[3] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2002 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2002 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
General investigations	154,350	102,483	148,304	−6,046	+45,821
Construction, general	1,715,951	1,415,612	1,745,102	+29,151	+329,490
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	345,992	280,671	337,937	−8,055	+57,266
Operation and maintenance, general	1,874,803	1,913,760	1,956,182	+81,379	+42,422
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	139,000	.....	.....	−139,000	.....
Regulatory program	127,000	144,252	144,252	+17,252	.....
FUSRAP	140,000	140,298	140,298	+298	.....
Flood control and coastal emergencies	.....	20,227	20,227	+20,227	.....
Rescission	−25,000	.....	.....	+25,000	.....
General expenses	153,000	155,651	155,651	+2,651	.....
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	4,625,096	4,172,954	4,647,953	+22,857	+474,999
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	24,169	23,643	23,643	−526	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	10,749	11,259	11,259	+510	.....
Subtotal	34,918	34,902	34,902	−16	.....
Program oversight and administration	1,310	1,326	1,326	+16	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	36,228	36,228	36,228	.....	.....

Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	762,531	726,147	816,147	+53,616	+90,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	30,259	.....	.....	−30,259	.....
Loan program	7,495	.....	.....	−7,495	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(26,000)	.....	.....	(−26,000)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund	55,039	48,904	48,904	−6,135	.....
California Bay-Delta restoration	.....	15,000	.....	.....	−15,000
Policy and administration	52,968	54,870	54,870	+1,902	.....
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	908,292	844,921	919,921	+11,629	+75,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	944,520	881,149	956,149	+11,629	+75,000
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	666,726	693,934	815,306	+148,580	+121,372
Non-defense environmental management	236,372	166,000	176,000	−60,372	+10,000
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation	418,425	382,154	471,154	+52,729	+89,000
Science	3,233,100	3,279,456	3,329,456	+96,356	+50,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal	95,000	209,702	56,000	−39,000	−153,702
Departmental administration	210,853	299,220	235,000	+24,147	−64,220
Miscellaneous revenues	−137,810	−137,524	−137,524	+286	.....
Net appropriation	73,043	161,696	97,476	+24,433	−64,220
Office of the Inspector General	32,430	37,671	37,671	+5,241	.....
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function	(6,489,191)	(6,593,846)	(6,690,245)	(+201,054)	(+96,399)
Non-defense function	(654,797)	(548,154)	(647,154)	(−7,643)	(+99,000)
Total	(7,143,988)	(7,142,000)	(7,337,399)	(+193,411)	(+195,399)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	5,429,238	5,867,000	6,108,959	+679,721	+241,959
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	131,000	.....	.....	−131,000	.....
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	803,586	1,113,630	1,115,630	+312,044	+2,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	226,000	.....	.....	−226,000	.....
Naval reactors	688,045	706,790	706,790	+18,745	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2002 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2002 appropriation	Budget estimate
Office of the Administrator	312,596	335,929	335,929	+23,333	.....
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	7,590,465	8,023,349	8,267,308	+676,843	+243,959
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	5,234,576	4,544,133	5,406,532	+171,956	+862,399
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	8,200	.....	.....	−8,200	.....
Defense environmental management cleanup reform	.....	800,000	.....	.....	−800,000
Defense facilities closure projects	1,092,878	1,091,314	1,125,314	+32,436	+34,000
Defense environmental management privatization	153,537	158,399	158,399	+4,862	.....
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	6,489,191	6,593,846	6,690,245	+201,054	+96,399
Other defense activities	544,044	468,664	537,664	−6,380	+69,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	3,500	.....	.....	−3,500	.....
Defense nuclear waste disposal	280,000	315,000	280,000	.....	−35,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	14,907,200	15,400,859	15,775,217	+868,017	+374,358
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	4,891	4,534	4,534	−357	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	28,038	27,378	27,378	−660	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	171,938	162,758	168,858	−3,080	+6,100
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,663	2,734	2,734	+71	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	207,530	197,404	203,504	−4,026	+6,100
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	184,155	192,000	192,000	+7,845	.....
Revenues applied	−184,155	−192,000	−192,000	−7,845	.....

Total, title III, Department of Energy	19,869,826	20,528,876	20,961,784	+1,091,958	+432,908
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	71,290	66,290	74,400	+3,110	+8,110
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,500	19,000	19,000	+500	.....
Delta Regional Authority	10,000	10,000	15,000	+5,000	+5,000
Denali Commission	38,000	29,939	50,000	+12,000	+20,061
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	516,900	578,184	578,184	+61,284	.....
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	36,000	.....	.....	−36,000	.....
Revenues	−473,520	−492,545	−520,087	−46,567	−27,542
Subtotal	79,380	85,639	58,097	−21,283	−27,542
Office of Inspector General	6,180	6,800	6,800	+620	.....
Revenues	−5,933	−6,392	−6,392	−459	.....
Subtotal	247	408	408	+161	.....
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	79,627	86,047	58,505	−21,122	−27,542
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,100	3,102	3,200	+100	+98
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	220,517	214,378	220,105	−412	+5,727
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	25,659,959	25,797,357	26,785,991	+1,126,032	+988,634
Appropriations	(25,111,000)	(25,797,357)	(26,785,991)	(+1,674,991)	(+988,634)
Emergency appropriations	(573,959)	.....	.....	(−573,959)	.....
Rescissions	(−25,000)	.....	.....	(+25,000)	.....

○