AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

108TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 108–554

# ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2005

JUNE 18, 2004.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

# R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 4614]

The Committee on appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT


| | Page Number Bill | Page Number Report |
|---|---|---|
| Introduction | ..... | 4 |
| I. Department of Defense—Civil: | | |
| Corps of Engineers—Civil: | | |
| Introduction | ..... | 7 |
| General investigations | 2 | 13 |
| Construction, general | 3 | 24 |
| Flood control, Mississippi River and Tributaries | 6 | 39 |
| Operation and maintenance, general | 7 | 42 |
| Regulatory program | 8 | 59 |
| Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program | 8 | 60 |
| Flood control and coastal emergencies | ..... | 60 |
| General expenses | 9 | 61 |
| Administrative provisions | 10 | ..... |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) | 9 | 61 |
| General provisions | 10 | 61 |
| II. Department of the Interior: | | |
| Central Utah Project completion account | 14 | 63 |
| Bureau of Reclamation: | | |
| Water and related resources | 14 | 64 |
| Bureau of Reclamation loan program account | ..... | 71 |
| California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration | ..... | 71 |


94–302

| | Page Number Bill | Page Number Report |
|---|---|---|
| Central Valley Project restoration fund | 16 | 72 |
| Policy and administration | 17 | 73 |
| Working Capital Fund | ..... | ..... |
| Administrative provisions | 17 | ..... |
| General provisions | 17 | 73 |
| III. Department of Energy: | | |
| Introduction | ..... | ..... |
| Energy supply | 19 | 85 |
| Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion | 19 | 95 |
| Non-Defense Environmental Services | 20 | 96 |
| Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund | 20 | 95 |
| Science | 20 | 97 |
| Nuclear waste disposal | ..... | 102 |
| Departmental administration | 21 | 108 |
| Office of Inspector General | 22 | 110 |
| Atomic energy defense activities | 22 | 110 |
| National Nuclear Security Administration: | | |
| Weapons activities | 22 | 112 |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation | 23 | 122 |
| Naval reactors | 23 | 128 |
| Office of the Administrator | 24 | 128 |
| Environmental and Other Defense Activities: | | |
| Defense site acceleration completion | 24 | 132 |
| Defense environmental services | 24 | 134 |
| Other defense activities | 25 | 135 |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 25 | 138 |
| Power marketing administrations: | | |
| Bonneville Power Administration | 25 | 139 |
| Southeastern Power Administration | 26 | 140 |
| Southwestern Power Administration | 26 | 140 |
| Western Area Power Administration | 27 | 141 |
| Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund | 28 | 141 |
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission | 28 | 142 |
| General provisions | 29 | 158 |
| IV. Independent agencies: | | |
| Appalachian Regional Commission | 38 | 161 |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 38 | 161 |
| Delta Regional Authority | 38 | 162 |
| Denali Commission | ..... | 162 |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission | 39 | 162 |
| Office of Inspector General | 40 | 164 |
| Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board | 40 | 164 |
| V. General provisions: | | |
| House reporting requirements | ..... | 167 |


## SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in the Budget of the United States Government, 2005. The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 2004, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2005.

[In thousands of dollars]

| | 2004 | 2005 estimate | 2005 recommendation | 2005 recommendation compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 2004 appropriation | 2005 estimate |
| Title I—Department of Defense—Civil | $4,580,380 | $4,120,000 | $4,823,280 | $+242,900 | $+703,280 |
| Title II—Department of the Interior | 980,641 | 970,333 | 1,016,162 | +35,521 | +45,829 |
| Title III—Department of Energy | 21,967,429 | 23,147,833 | 22,478,342 | 510,913 | −669,491 |
| Title IV—Independent Agencies | 227,925 | 232,216 | 202,216 | −25,709 | −30,000 |
| Subtotal | 27,756,375 | 28,470,382 | 28,520,000 | 763,625 | 49,618 |
| Scorekeeping adjustments | −502,912 | −532,000 | −532,000 | −29,088 | |
| Grand Total of bill | 27,253,463 | 27,938,382 | 27,988,000 | 734,537 | 49,618 |

## INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2005 totals $27,988,000, $49,618,000 above the President's budget request, and $734,537,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2004.

Title I of the bill provides $4,823,280,000 for the programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, an increase of $242,900 over fiscal year 2004 and $703,280,000 over the budget request of $4,120,000,000. Due to constrained budgets in recent years, the Committee elects to concentrate on protecting existing infrastructure and completing ongoing projects and does not include new project study or construction starts or new project authorizations in fiscal year 2005.

Title II provides $1,016,162,000 for the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, an increase of $35,521,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2004 and $45,829,000 over the budget request of $970,333,000. The Committee does not provide funding for the California Bay-Delta Restoration program in California pending the enactment of authorizing legislation, but includes funding for several authorized components of this program.

Title III provides $22,478,342,000 for the Department of Energy, an increase of $510,913,000 over fiscal year 2004 and $669,491,000 below the budget request of $23,147,833,000. The Committee funds the Yucca Mountain repository at the Administration's net budget request of $131,000,000, and does not include the proposed authorization language to reclassify the fees paid into the Nuclear Waste Fund. Within the Energy Supply account, the Committee recommendation provides $463,817,000 for the Office of Nuclear Energy, an increase of $51,223,000 over the budget request. The Committee provides an additional $168,246,000 above the request for the Office of Science to support basic research programs, increase the availability of DOE user facilities to the scientific community, and to support development of a new architecture and software for a leadership-class scientific computer.

Funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), which includes nuclear weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation, naval reactors, and the Office of the NNSA Administrator, is $9,027,171,000, an increase of $372,038,000 over fiscal year 2004 and a decrease of $21,529,000 from the budget request. Within the weapons activities account, the Committee provides no funds for advanced concepts research, the robust nuclear earth penetrator study, the modern pit facility, and enhanced test readiness, but provides significant increases for weapons dismantlement and for security upgrades. For defense nuclear nonproliferation, the Committee has provided $1,348,647,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $28,868,000 over fiscal year 2004.

The Committee provides the requested amount of funding ($943,346,000) for non-defense environmental management, which includes non-defense site acceleration completion, non-defense environmental services, and the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund. For defense environmental management activities, which include defense site acceleration completion

and defense environmental services, the Committee provides $6,888,813,000, an increase of $301,127,000 over fiscal year 2004 and $64,494,000 less than the budget request. The Committee does not provide the full request of $350,000,000 for the Administration's high-level waste proposal for Waste Incident to Reprocessing, and does not support partial solutions that do not address all of the affected States.

Title IV provides $202,216,000 for several Independent Agencies, a decrease of $25,709,000 from fiscal year 2004 and $30,000,000 below the budget request of $232,216,000. The requested funding is provided for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Board, the Delta Regional Authority, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and its Inspector General, the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, and the Office of Inspector General for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Reduced funding is provided for the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Denali Commission.

# TITLE I

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

### CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

#### INTRODUCTION

The Administration's budget request for the Civil Works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers continues the unfortunate trend of recent years by drastically underfunding the Corps Civil Works program for fiscal year 2005. It is not uncommon for the Administration and the Congress to disagree on spending priorities for the Civil Works program, but the fiscal year 2005 budget request reflects a deeper philosophical disconnect about the Civil Works program.

The Civil Works program represents a contract with the American people to protect their economic infrastructure (i.e., ports, inland waterways, flood control, water supply, and hydropower projects), their property and livelihood (i.e, through flood control, navigation, erosion control, and shore protection projects) and their environment. In some cases, this is an unwritten commitment on the part of Congress and the Executive Branch to meet the water resources needs of its citizens. In other cases, however, there are very explicit, written agreements regarding specific Corps projects and programs (i.e., Project Cooperation Agreements with local sponsors, construction contracts to complete ongoing projects, and bill language passed by both chambers of Congress and signed into law by the President). Unfortunately, the Fiscal Year 2005 budget request for the Civil Works program demonstrates a surprising willingness on the part of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to break such commitments, whether made by the Corps of Engineers, the Congress, or the President.

While that strategy may be acceptable to the staff at OMB in their quest to restrain discretionary spending and limit the Civil Works activities of the Corps, it is not acceptable to this Committee. The Committee believes that the Corps, the Administration, and the Congress should honor the commitments made to the American people by protecting the investment in vital water resources infrastructure, completing ongoing projects, fulfilling commitments made to local sponsors, and addressing the critical water resources needs across the country.

This disconnect is nothing new, and the Committee has made repeated offers to work with the Administration to resolve our differences. In the report accompanying the House Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2004 (House Report 108–212), this Committee made two requests of the Administra-

tion. The Committee encouraged the Administration to engage in a constructive dialog with Congress to close the vast gulf in our relative perspectives on the Corps Civil Works program and to set some clear priorities for the Corps. The Committee also encouraged the Administration to begin preparation of a long-term roadmap for the Civil Works program, so that Congress and the Administration can both see the current and future requirements of the Corps Civil Works program.

The Administration's Fiscal Year 2005 budget request rejects both Committee requests. Therefore, in the absence of Administration leadership on these issues, the Committee takes responsibility for providing constructive, albeit unilateral, responses to both challenges. As outlined below, the Committee offers specific guidance on project priorities and on a long-range roadmap for the Corps Civil Works program.

*Project Priorities.*—One of the perceived problems with the Civil Works program is that it represents a mere agglomeration of projects of interest to Congress and the Administration, with no rhyme nor reason underlying the selection of which projects receive funding. There is some truth to this perception, and the Congress bears part of the responsibility for this situation. With the exception of a few programmatic components of the Civil Works program, such as the regulatory and research and development activities, most of what the Corps does relates to individual water resources projects. These may be large multi-state watershed projects or small local flood control projects, but they are all projects that lie in the districts of one or more Members. As a consequence, the Committee has in the past tried to satisfy Member interests by adding an ever-increasing list of projects to each Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. Despite the common misperception that these Congressional priorities are "pork" projects, the vast majority of these Congressional projects have been separately authorized and have net economic or environmental benefits in excess of the project costs. However, the nature of the political process makes it difficult for Congress to take a broad, long-range perspective on water resources projects; the more common perspective is purely local.

The Corps is not entirely blameless in this process, as many in the Corps believe that the addition of a multitude of Member projects ensures higher total funding for the Civil Works program, ensures full employment for the Corps Districts, and ensures a broad base of political support for the Corps Civil Works activities and organization. The Committee reminds the Corps that the Corps districts exist to support the workload—not the other way around.

The unfortunate result of this approach is that the Civil Works program lacks any clear set of priorities to guide either development of the Administration budget request or the development of the Congressional appropriations bills. The lack of clear priorities, and the traditional addition of numerous Member projects in the House and Senate bills and in conference, may be in part responsible for OMB's lack of support for the Civil Works program. It is clear to this Committee, however, that more projects is not necessarily better. In times of constrained budgets, the addition of

more projects has a major adverse consequence because it takes the Corps longer to complete individual projects. Instead of taking three years to complete a simple dredging or local flood control project, it may now take four or five years. Lengthening the schedule has the effect of increasing the cost to both the taxpayers and the local sponsors, and delaying the realization of public benefits to the economy and the environment.

Within the limited resources available in fiscal year 2005 for the Civil Works program, the Committee adopts the following set of priorities to guide its funding decisions for fiscal year 2005:

1. The top priority is to protect the investment already made in major water infrastructure in this country. This includes the commercial ports, the inland waterways, and the dams and other projects that provide flood control, water supply, hydropower, and environmental benefits. In current dollars, the Nation has invested over $300 billion to date in this water infrastructure, and it provides estimated annual benefits of approximately $38 billion. The recent experience in the reconstruction of Iraq provides an abject lesson on the costs and consequences of letting vital public infrastructure deteriorate by deferring critical maintenance and repair activities. This Committee places priority on funding the operation, maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation of the major elements of water resources infrastructure. This priority does not extend to every boat ramp and campground operated by the Corps, but does encompass the major projects that yield significant local, regional, and national benefits.

2. The second priority is to complete projects that are already under construction. In such cases, the Congress has already decided that the benefits of the project justify the costs, project cooperation agreements have already been executed and in many cases non-Federal funds have been committed, and contracts have already been signed. The Committee believes strongly that we should finish what we have started and expedite realization of project benefits for projects already under construction.

To cite one example, the Napa River Flood Protection Project, the optimum funding schedule would complete the project in fiscal year 2007, with annual funding requirements in the remaining fiscal years of approximately $28 million per year. The Administration proposed only $7 million for this project in fiscal year 2005. Each year of delay subjects the community to estimated direct flood damages of $15 million per year, as well as foregone indirect economic benefits of $362 million per year. Each year of delay drives up the total construction cost for the project by several million dollars annually. The cumulative costs of delay, therefore, can become enormous over time. The Committee strives to fund this project, and others in a similar situation, at a rate closer to the optimum than the minimum. Instead of using the Civil Works program to fund a large array of projects at the "life support" level,

the Committee chooses to focus on expediting completion of projects already under construction.

3. The next priority is to move forward with completing ongoing studies that appear to be justified by their economic or environmental benefits. There are major unresolved water resources problems in this country, from communities experiencing recurrent flooding and storm damage to constraints on our commercial navigation network to altered environments in need of restoration. OMB apparently believes that the Corps invents these water resources problems and these problems will vanish if the Corps Civil Works budget is cut deeply enough. This Committee knows otherwise.

4. Throughout the entire Civil Works program, this Committee intends to fulfill prior commitments made to local sponsors, including those made on beach renourishment projects. While the Committee understands that commitments made during prior Administrations and prior Congresses may not always reflect current political priorities, the Committee wants the Federal government to be one that keeps its promises to the American people.

Because of the large backlog of work in the Corps project pipeline, the Committee does not include any new starts for individually-authorized studies or construction projects in fiscal year 2005. The Committee also does not include any new project authorizations in this appropriations bill. There is a Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) that has been passed by the House and is under consideration by the Senate, and the WRDA is the proper vehicle for such authorizations.

*Five-Year Comprehensive Budget Planning*.—The Committee directs the Corps to prepare and submit, beginning with the fiscal year 2006 budget submission and annually thereafter, a comprehensive five-year plan for the Civil Works program. The Committee believes strongly in the value of preparing five-year plans to guide Administration budget requests and Congressional spending decisions. Such plans force discipline in making budgetary decisions and encourage some stability from year to year. By giving Congress and the Administration a view of what lies ahead in the coming years of the Civil Works program, this five-year plan may alleviate some of the pressure to fund every project in the coming fiscal year. By providing a long-range view of the Civil Works program, this five-year plan should also begin to correct the perception that the Corps Civil Works program is nothing more than an assortment of individual projects lacking any coherent focus or guiding principles.

As part of its project planning and budgeting system, the Corps already has developed future-year estimates of the costs and schedules for individual projects. The requirement to develop a five-year comprehensive budget plan for the Civil Works program will require the Corps to make the necessary tradeoffs to integrate these individual projects into a coherent future-years Civil Works program. The Committee directs the Corps to prepare this five-year plan with budget quality detail, and to use the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP) prepared by the Department of Defense as a

model. The existing Civil Works Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2004–2009, issued March 2004, is not of sufficient detail to guide spending decisions on specific projects. As in the Department of Defense, preparation of the five-year plan is not a one-time report but is an ongoing process that is updated regularly to reflect changing circumstances.

The Committee recommends the Corps adopt the aforementioned set of priorities to guide development of its first five-year plan. The Committee is open to alternative priorities, but expects such to be developed through an open process with the involvement of the Committee and other stakeholders.

*Continuing Contracts.*—The Committee strongly objects to the use of continuing contracts by the Corps Civil Works program. Under such contracts, the Corps contractors may perform more work than is budgeted in the current fiscal year, and by doing so can create an obligation for the government to pay for the extra work by reserving funds out of a future appropriation. In effect, when the contractors exhaust the available appropriation for the current fiscal year, the contractors can keep working with a commitment that the Corps will pay the additional amount due, plus interest in some circumstances, out of a future appropriation. Although authorized in several statutes dating back to the turn of the twentieth century, the Committee believes this is an unsound financial practice. Congress determines how much funding is available for each project in a given fiscal year, and the Corps is responsible for managing its contractors to work within these appropriation limits. The Corps abrogates its own management responsibilities, and improperly intrudes on the Congressional appropriations responsibility, when it allows its contractors to decide how much to spend on a given project. In the conference report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004, the conferees directed the Corps to curtail this practice; this guidance has not been followed. Therefore, the Committee renews its direction to prohibit the award of new continuing contracts.

*Reprogramming Authorities.*—The Committee requires the Corps to inform the Committee promptly and fully when a change in program execution and funding is required during the fiscal year. The following guidance is provided for Corps Civil Works programs and activities funded in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

> *Definition.*—A reprogramming includes the reallocation of funds from one activity to another within an appropriation, or any significant departure from a program, project, or activity described in the agency's budget justification as presented to and approved by Congress. For construction projects, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project identified in the justifications to another project or a significant change in the scope of an approved project.
>
> *General Criteria for Reprogramming.*—Reprogramming is allowed only within an appropriation, with the exception, as now exists, that Flood Control and Coastal Emergency may be augmented when necessary from other Corps Civil Works appropriations. Reprogramming is al-

lowed into only previously appropriated activities or those identified in a bill as "within available funds." Reprogrammings should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change program, project, or activity allocations specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require such changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee and be fully explained and justified. The specific criteria outlined below apply to amounts moved into or out of specific projects or studies, and require written notification and approval of the Committee. The Committee has not provided statutory language to define reprogramming guidelines, but expects the Corps to follow the spirit and the letter of the guidance provided in this report.

*General Investigations.*—For a single reprogramming action, the threshold requiring Congressional notification is $50,000 plus 25 percent of the base funding level, which is defined as the amount appropriated for the project or program in the budget plus any amounts carried in from previous fiscal years or reprogrammed during the budget year. There is also a cumulative threshold of $250,000, above which any movement of funds in or out of the project or program requires Congressional approval. The individual and cumulative thresholds apply to restoration of prior year reprogrammings and savings and slippage reductions.

*Construction, General.*—For a single reprogramming action, the threshold requiring Congressional notification is $300,000 plus 20 percent of the base funding level, which is defined as the amount appropriated for the project or program in the budget plus any amounts carried in from previous fiscal years or reprogrammed during the budget year. There is also a cumulative threshold of $4,000,000, above which any movement of funds in or out of the project or program requires Congressional approval. The individual and cumulative thresholds apply to restoration of prior year reprogrammings and savings and slippage reductions.

*Operation and Maintenance.*—For a single reprogramming action, the threshold requiring Congressional notification is $300,000 plus 20 percent of the base funding level, which is defined as the amount appropriated for the project or program in the budget plus any amounts carried in from previous fiscal years or reprogrammed during the budget year. There is also a cumulative threshold of $4,000,000, above which any movement of funds in or out of the project or program requires Congressional approval. The individual and cumulative thresholds apply to restoration of prior year reprogrammings and savings and slippage reductions.

*Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T).*—The Corps should follow the applicable thresholds for the General In-

vestigations, Construction, General, and Operation and Maintenance accounts as provided above.

*Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP).*—The Corps may reprogram up to 15 percent of the base funding level between FUSRAP projects without Committee approval; reprogramming of amounts in excess of 15 percent, individually or cumulatively in a fiscal year, requires Congressional approval.

Within 30 days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is directed to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report detailing the progress of the State of Florida in meeting water quality requirements set forth in the Consent Decree entered in the United States v. South Florida Water Management District. The Committee is aware that some aspects of this matter may be the subject of judicial proceedings, and directs that, if that is still the case thirty days from the date of enactment, the Secretary shall comply to the extent legally possible, and comply fully at the earliest possible date.

In recent years, the Committee has become aware that the Corps of Engineers has a great deal more work to accomplish than funds with which to do it. In order to make the most of scarce dollars, the Committee has encouraged reprogramming from projects which cannot, for whatever reason, use available funds to those other projects which can. The Corps has been aggressive in carrying out that policy. It has repeatedly been brought to the attention of the Committee, however, that often the Corps is less aggressive in returning funds to donor projects when those projects clear their obstacles and require the funds appropriated for them. The Committee wishes to remind the Corps of Engineers that if it is to enjoy the continued confidence and cooperation of Members, it must be as diligent in returning funds to a project when it is ready as it was in taking funds when it was not.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $116,259,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 90,500,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 145,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +28,741,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | +54,500,000 |

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST INV. | REQUEST PLNG. | RECOMMENDED INV. | RECOMMENDED PLNG. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ALABAMA** | | | | |
| BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL | 145 | --- | 145 | --- |
| CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED) | 233 | --- | 233 | --- |
| **ALASKA** | | | | |
| AKUTAN HARBOR, AK | 135 | --- | 135 | --- |
| ALASKA REGIONAL PORTS, AK | 150 | --- | 150 | --- |
| ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK | 1,000 | --- | 800 | --- |
| CRAIG HARBOR, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK | 250 | --- | 250 | --- |
| EKLUTNA RIVER WATERSHED, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| HAINES HARBOR, AK | 135 | --- | 135 | --- |
| HOMER HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| KAKTOVIK, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| MCGRATH, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| SAINT GEORGE NAVIGATION IMPROVEMETS, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| SKAGWAY RIVER, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| UNALASKA HARBOR, AK | 150 | --- | 150 | --- |
| WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| **ARIZONA** | | | | |
| PIMA COUNTY, AZ | 713 | --- | 713 | --- |
| RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ | 253 | --- | 253 | --- |
| RIO SALADO OESTE , SALT RIVER, AZ | --- | --- | 856 | --- |
| SANTA CRUZ RIVER, GRANT RD TO FT LOWELL RD, AZ | 100 | --- | 405 | 195 |
| SANTA CRUZ RIVER, PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS, AZ | 339 | --- | 339 | --- |
| VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT, AZ | 349 | --- | 850 | --- |
| **ARKANSAS** | | | | |
| ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEES, AR | --- | --- | --- | 150 |
| ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, AR & OK | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| HOT SPRINGS, AR | --- | --- | 67 | --- |
| PINE MOUNTAIN DAM, AR | --- | --- | --- | 100 |
| WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO | 1,000 | --- | 1,000 | --- |
| WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOWS, AR AND MO | --- | --- | --- | 200 |
| WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR | --- | --- | --- | 100 |
| **CALIFORNIA** | | | | |
| ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA | 265 | --- | 265 | --- |
| AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA | --- | 415 | --- | --- |
| ARANA GULCH WATERSHED, CA | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| ARROYO SECO WATERSHED RESTORATION, CA | --- | --- | 200 | --- |
| BALLONA CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA | --- | --- | 200 | --- |
| BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA | --- | --- | --- | 100 |
| CALAVERAS COUNTY WATERSHEDS, CA | --- | --- | 500 | --- |
| CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA | 32 | --- | 200 | --- |
| CITY OF SAN BERNADINO, CA | --- | --- | 150 | --- |
| COAST OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGLES COUNTY, CA | --- | --- | 400 | --- |
| COYOTE DAM, CA | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| ESTUDILLO CANAL, SAN LEANDRO, CA | --- | --- | 57 | --- |
| GRAYSON AND MURDERER'S CREEKS, WALNUT CREEK BASIN, CA | 300 | --- | 400 | --- |
| HUMBOLDT BAY LONG TERM SHOAL MANAGEMENT, CA | --- | --- | 45 | --- |
| LAGUNA CREEK WATERSHED, CA | --- | --- | 57 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST INV. | REQUEST PLNG. | RECOMMENDED INV. | RECOMMENDED PLNG. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| LLAGAS CREEK FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT, CA | --- | --- | --- | 400 |
| LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CORNFIELDS, CA | 32 | --- | 57 | --- |
| LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA | 630 | --- | 630 | --- |
| LOS ANGLES RIVER WATERCOURSE, HEADWORKS AREA, CA | --- | --- | 200 | --- |
| LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, WOODLAND AND VICINITY, | --- | 300 | --- | 300 |
| LOWER MISSION CREEK (FLOOD CONTROL AND CREEK REHABILIT | --- | --- | --- | 200 |
| MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA | 325 | --- | 325 | --- |
| MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA | 175 | --- | 175 | --- |
| MATILIJA DAM, CA | 375 | --- | 400 | --- |
| MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA | --- | --- | 100 | --- |
| MUGU LAGOON, CA | 140 | --- | 228 | --- |
| NAPA RIVER SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA | --- | --- | --- | 250 |
| NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| NEWPORT BAY LA-3 SITE DESIGNATION, CA | --- | --- | 200 | --- |
| NEWPORT BAY, SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA | --- | --- | 86 | --- |
| OCEAN BEACH, CA | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| ORANGE COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA | --- | --- | 200 | --- |
| PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA | --- | 400 | --- | 400 |
| POSO CREEK, CA | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| RIVERSIDE COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA | --- | --- | 400 | --- |
| RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA | 200 | --- | 300 | --- |
| SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY, | 500 | --- | 1,500 | --- |
| SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA | 178 | --- | 178 | --- |
| SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORLINE, CA | --- | --- | 250 | --- |
| SAN DIEGO COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA | --- | --- | 250 | --- |
| SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK, CA | --- | --- | 100 | --- |
| SAN JOAQUIN RB, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, ORESTIMBA CREE | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA | 130 | --- | 130 | --- |
| SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA | --- | --- | 35 | --- |
| SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA | 300 | --- | 400 | --- |
| SANTA ANA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BIG BEAR LAKE, CA | 1,000 | --- | 1,000 | --- |
| SANTA CLARA RIVER, CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA | --- | --- | 300 | --- |
| SANTA ROSA CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA | 500 | --- | 550 | --- |
| SOLANA BEACH / ENCINITAS SHORELINE PROTECTION STUDY, C | --- | --- | 121 | --- |
| SONOMA CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CA | 274 | --- | 274 | --- |
| SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO SHORELINE STUDY, CA | --- | --- | 350 | --- |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA | 100 | --- | --- | --- |
| SUN VALLEY WATERSHED, CA | --- | --- | 75 | --- |
| SUTTER COUNTY, CA | 275 | --- | 275 | --- |
| TIJUANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA | --- | --- | 75 | --- |
| UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA | 46 | --- | 500 | --- |
| VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA | --- | --- | 300 | --- |
| WESTMINSTER, COYOTE AND CARBON CANYON CREEK WATERSHEDS | 122 | --- | 122 | --- |
| WESTMINSTER, EAST GARDEN GROVE, CA | 416 | --- | 416 | --- |
| WHITE RIVER AND DEER CREEK, CA | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA | --- | 100 | --- | 600 |
| **COLORADO** | | | | |
| ADAMS COUNTY, CO | 225 | --- | 225 | --- |
| BOULDER CREEK, CO | 100 | --- | --- | --- |
| CACHE LA POUDRE, CO | 185 | --- | 185 | --- |
| CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO. | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO | 273 | --- | 273 | --- |
| **COMMONWEALTH OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS** | | | | |
| ROTA HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| TINIAN HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST INV. | REQUEST PLNG. | RECOMMENDED INV. | RECOMMENDED PLNG. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **DELAWARE** | | | | |
| CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL, ENV RESTORATION, DE & MD. | 100 | --- | --- | --- |
| **FLORIDA** | | | | |
| BISCAYNE BAY FEASIBILITY STUDY, FL | --- | --- | 100 | --- |
| DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FL | --- | --- | 400 | --- |
| EGMONT KEY SHORELINE STABILIZATION, FL | --- | --- | 500 | --- |
| FLAGLER COUNTY, FL | --- | --- | 100 | --- |
| HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| MILE POINT, FL | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL | --- | --- | 125 | --- |
| SARASOTA COUNTY, LIDO KEY, FL | --- | --- | --- | 200 |
| ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL | --- | --- | 200 | --- |
| WALTON COUNTY, FL | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FL | 100 | --- | 400 | --- |
| **GEORGIA** | | | | |
| ALLATOONA LAKE, GA | 150 | --- | 750 | --- |
| ARABIA MOUNTAIN, GA | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS, | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA | 122 | --- | 122 | --- |
| SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA | 250 | --- | 250 | --- |
| SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA | --- | 200 | --- | 800 |
| SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA & SC | 250 | --- | 250 | --- |
| TYBEE ISLAND NORTH BEACH SHORE PROTECTION PROJECT, GA. | --- | --- | 110 | --- |
| UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| **GUAM** | | | | |
| HAGATNA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, GUAM | 100 | --- | 200 | --- |
| **HAWAII** | | | | |
| ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI | 150 | --- | 150 | --- |
| BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| KAHUKU, HI | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI | 150 | --- | 150 | --- |
| KIHEI AREA EROSION, HI | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| NAWILIWILI HARBOR MODIFICATION, KAUAI, HI | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| WAIKIKI BEACH, HONOLULU, HI | --- | --- | --- | 200 |
| WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, HI | --- | --- | --- | 200 |
| **IDAHO** | | | | |
| BOISE RIVER, ID | --- | --- | 200 | --- |
| **ILLINOIS** | | | | |
| DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II) | 800 | --- | 1,600 | --- |
| ILLINOIS RIVER AT BEARDSTOWN, IL | 32 | --- | 32 | --- |
| ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL | 400 | --- | 400 | --- |
| ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| ILLINOIS SHORELINE EROSION, IL | 60 | --- | 60 | --- |
| KEITH CREEK, ROCKFORD, IL | 32 | --- | 32 | --- |
| PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL | --- | 100 | --- | 100 |
| ROCK RIVER, IL & WI | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| UPPER MISSISSIPPI & ILINOIS RIVERS NAVIGATION STUDY, I | --- | --- | --- | 12,000 |
| UPPER MISS RVR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN & WI | 944 | --- | 944 | --- |
| WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL | --- | 185 | --- | 185 |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST | | RECOMMENDED | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | INV. | PLNG. | INV. | PLNG. |
| **INDIANA** | | | | |
| INDIANA HARBOR, IN | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY | --- | 700 | --- | --- |
| **IOWA** | | | | |
| CLEAR LAKE WATERSHED, IA | --- | --- | 285 | --- |
| DAVENPORT, IA | --- | 156 | --- | --- |
| DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA | 150 | --- | 150 | --- |
| **KANSAS** | | | | |
| BRUSH CREEK BASIN, KS & MO | 75 | --- | 200 | --- |
| GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER BASIN WATERSHED, KS & OK | --- | --- | 100 | --- |
| MANHATTAN, KS | 110 | --- | 200 | --- |
| TOPEKA, KS | 70 | --- | 147 | --- |
| UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS | 219 | --- | 250 | --- |
| **KENTUCKY** | | | | |
| GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & OH | --- | 310 | --- | 310 |
| METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY | 90 | --- | 90 | --- |
| METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY | 244 | --- | 244 | --- |
| OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV | 1,080 | --- | 1,080 | --- |
| **LOUISIANA** | | | | |
| AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA. | 250 | --- | 250 | --- |
| AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BAYOU MANCHAC, LA | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L | 350 | --- | 1,000 | --- |
| BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA | --- | 550 | --- | 550 |
| CALCASIEU LOCK, LA | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA | 350 | --- | 350 | --- |
| CALCASIEU RIVER PASS SHIP CHANNEL ENLARGEMENT, LA | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| CROSS LAKE WATER SUPPLY IMPROVEMENTS, LA | --- | --- | 200 | --- |
| LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA | 8,000 | --- | 8,000 | --- |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, L | 225 | --- | --- | --- |
| PLAQUEMINES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| PORT OF IBERIA, LA | 350 | --- | 649 | --- |
| RED RIVER NAVIGATION, SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS, AR AND LA | --- | --- | 27 | --- |
| ST BERNARD PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| ST CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA | 300 | --- | 800 | --- |
| **MAINE** | | | | |
| SEARSPORT HARBOR, ME | --- | --- | 25 | --- |
| **MARYLAND** | | | | |
| ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC | --- | --- | 220 | --- |
| ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD & | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| CHES BAY SHORELINE-SEDI BUDG, MODEL & REG SEDI MGT, MD | 220 | --- | 220 | --- |
| CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE EROSION, MD, PA & VA | 221 | --- | 500 | --- |
| EASTERN SHORE, MID CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND, MD | 324 | --- | 1,500 | --- |
| LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S WATERSHED, | 103 | --- | 103 | --- |
| MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN, MD | --- | --- | 200 | --- |
| **MASSACHUSETTS** | | | | |
| BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA | 650 | --- | 650 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST INV. | REQUEST PLNG. | RECOMMENDED INV. | RECOMMENDED PLNG. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **MICHIGAN** | | | | |
| DETROIT RIVER MASTERPLAN, MI | --- | --- | 250 | --- |
| GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA | 800 | --- | 2,500 | --- |
| JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN (STRATEGIC PLAN), MI, IL, | --- | --- | 50 | --- |
| JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN (BIOHYDROLOGICAL), MI, IL | --- | --- | 50 | --- |
| JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN (RECREATION BOATING), MI, | --- | --- | 100 | --- |
| ST. CLAIR RIVER & LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI | --- | --- | 100 | --- |
| **MINNESOTA** | | | | |
| MINNEHAHA CREEK WATERSHED, UMR LAKE ITASCA TO L&D 2, M | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| MINNESOTA RIVER BASIN, MN & SD | 43 | --- | 43 | --- |
| RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD & MANITOBA, C | 751 | --- | 751 | --- |
| ROSEAU, MN (RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN) | 149 | --- | 149 | --- |
| SOUTH WASHINGTON CTY WATERSHED, UMR LAKE ITASCA TO L&D | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| WILD RICE RIVER, MN (RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN) | 400 | --- | 400 | --- |
| **MISSISSIPPI** | | | | |
| HANCOCK COUNTY SEAWALL RESTORATION, MS | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| NORTHEAST MISSISSIPPI REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY DISTRICT, | --- | --- | 300 | --- |
| PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS | 400 | --- | 400 | --- |
| **MISSOURI** | | | | |
| KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS | 325 | --- | 325 | --- |
| MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, MO | 60 | --- | 300 | --- |
| SPRINGFIELD, MO | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO | --- | 450 | --- | 450 |
| ST LOUIS MISSISSIPPI RIVERFRONT, MO & IL | 338 | --- | 338 | --- |
| SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO | --- | --- | --- | 250 |
| WEARS CREEK, JEFFERSON CITY, MO | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| **MONTANA** | | | | |
| YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT | 158 | --- | 158 | --- |
| **NEBRASKA** | | | | |
| LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE | 257 | --- | 257 | --- |
| **NEVADA** | | | | |
| TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV | --- | 1,000 | --- | 1,000 |
| **NEW HAMPSHIRE** | | | | |
| MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA | 200 | --- | 300 | --- |
| **NEW JERSEY** | | | | |
| DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, NJ, PA & DE | --- | --- | 250 | --- |
| GOFFLE BROOK, BOROUGH OF HAWTHORNE, NJ | 25 | --- | 25 | --- |
| GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ | --- | 135 | --- | 135 |
| HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ | 100 | --- | 600 | --- |
| HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ | 50 | --- | 450 | --- |
| MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ | --- | --- | --- | 300 |
| MID DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, NJ & PA | --- | --- | --- | 30 |
| NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTOR | --- | --- | --- | 100 |
| NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLE | 460 | --- | 460 | --- |
| NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT | 256 | --- | 256 | --- |
| PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ | --- | 200 | --- | 750 |
| PECKMAN RIVER BASIN, NJ | 100 | --- | 400 | --- |
| RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ | 100 | --- | 250 | --- |
| RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ | 150 | --- | 250 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST INV. | REQUEST PLNG. | RECOMMENDED INV. | RECOMMENDED PLNG. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, KEYPORT, NJ | 150 | --- | 250 | --- |
| RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ | 198 | --- | 250 | --- |
| RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ | --- | --- | --- | 100 |
| SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ | --- | 50 | --- | 250 |
| STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, NJ | --- | --- | 25 | --- |
| WOODBRIDGE RIVER BASIN, NJ | 100 | --- | 300 | --- |
| NEW MEXICO | | | | |
| EAST MESA LAS CRUCES, NM | 106 | --- | 106 | --- |
| ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| MIDDLE RIO GRANDE BOSQUE, NM | 175 | --- | 175 | --- |
| RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX | 125 | --- | 125 | --- |
| SANTA FE, NM | 175 | --- | 250 | --- |
| NEW YORK | | | | |
| BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY | 50 | --- | 250 | --- |
| BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY | 130 | --- | 130 | --- |
| EIGHTEEN MILE CREEK, NY | --- | --- | 100 | --- |
| FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY | --- | --- | 250 | 50 |
| HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, GOWANUS CANAL, NY | 150 | --- | 450 | --- |
| HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ | 450 | --- | 500 | --- |
| LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| MONTAUK POINT, NY | --- | --- | --- | 200 |
| NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY | 175 | --- | 205 | --- |
| NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| ONONDAGA LAKE, NY | 400 | --- | 1,200 | --- |
| SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY | --- | --- | --- | 209 |
| UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, CATATONK CREEK WATERSHE | 49 | --- | 49 | --- |
| NORTH CAROLINA | | | | |
| CURRITUCK SOUND, NC | 210 | --- | 210 | --- |
| DARE COUNTY BEACHES, HATTERAS AND ORACOKE ISLANDS, NC. | 250 | --- | 250 | --- |
| NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC | 120 | --- | 120 | --- |
| SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC | 214 | --- | 214 | --- |
| TAR RIVER AND PAMLICO SOUND, NC | 66 | --- | 66 | --- |
| OHIO | | | | |
| ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH | --- | 564 | --- | 564 |
| COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| CUYAHOGA RIVER BULKHEAD STUDY, CLEVELAND, OH | --- | --- | 200 | --- |
| HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MONDAY. | --- | --- | --- | 600 |
| MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH & PA | 450 | --- | 450 | --- |
| MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH | --- | --- | --- | 200 |
| OHIO RIVERFRONT, CINCINNATI, OH | --- | --- | --- | 2,000 |
| WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH, IN & MI | 210 | --- | 210 | --- |
| OKLAHOMA | | | | |
| GRAND LAKE, OK | --- | --- | 450 | --- |
| MIAMI AND VICINITY, OK | 177 | --- | 177 | --- |
| OOLOGAH LAKE WATERSHED, OK & KS | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| WASHITA RIVER BASIN, OK | --- | --- | 214 | --- |
| OREGON | | | | |
| AMAZON CREEK, OR | 264 | --- | 264 | --- |
| LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA | 136 | --- | 136 | --- |
| WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA | 500 | --- | 1,000 | --- |
| WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR | 61 | --- | 61 | --- |
| WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR | 228 | --- | 228 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST INV. | REQUEST PLNG. | RECOMMENDED INV. | RECOMMENDED PLNG. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR | 411 | --- | 411 | --- |
| PENNSYLVANIA | | | | |
| SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN ESTUARINE, PA | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN, WISSAHICKON CREEK BASIN, PA | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| SUSQUEHANNA AND DELAWARE RIVER BASIN (SOUTHERN ANTHRAC | --- | --- | 500 | --- |
| TOWN OF BLOOMSBURG LOCAL FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT, PA. | --- | --- | --- | 250 |
| UNAMI CREEK, PA | 10 | --- | 10 | --- |
| UPPER OHIO NAVIGATION STUDY, PA | 500 | --- | 2,080 | --- |
| PUERTO RICO | | | | |
| RIO YAGUEZ IN MAYAGUEZ, PR | 35 | --- | 35 | --- |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | | | | |
| ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC | --- | --- | --- | 250 |
| BROAD RIVER BASIN, SC | 16 | --- | 16 | --- |
| EDISTO ISLAND, SC | --- | --- | 100 | --- |
| PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC | --- | --- | --- | 274 |
| REEDY RIVER, SC | 194 | --- | 194 | --- |
| SANTEE DELTA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, SC | 23 | --- | 23 | --- |
| WACCAMAW RIVER, SC | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | | | | |
| JAMES RIVER, SD & ND | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| TENNESSEE | | | | |
| DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN | 214 | --- | 214 | --- |
| TEXAS | | | | |
| ABILENE, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN) | --- | --- | 150 | --- |
| BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX | 500 | --- | 500 | 100 |
| BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX | 350 | --- | 350 | --- |
| CEDAR BAYOU, TX | --- | 135 | --- | 135 |
| COLONIAS - LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX | --- | --- | --- | 250 |
| CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX | --- | 800 | --- | 800 |
| FREEPORT HARBOR, TX | 300 | --- | --- | --- |
| FREEPORT HURRICANE PROTECTION LEVEE, TX | 150 | --- | --- | --- |
| GIWW MODIFICATIONS, TX | 350 | --- | --- | --- |
| GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX | 250 | --- | --- | --- |
| GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER REALIGNMENTS, TX | 275 | --- | --- | --- |
| GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX | 250 | --- | --- | --- |
| GIWW, VICINITY OF PORT ISABEL, TX | --- | --- | 831 | --- |
| GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX | --- | 340 | --- | 340 |
| GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX | 250 | --- | 750 | --- |
| HARRIS GULLY, TX | 250 | --- | 800 | --- |
| LEON CREEK, TX | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX | 1,200 | --- | 1,700 | --- |
| LOWER GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TX | 250 | --- | --- | --- |
| LOWER SABINE RIVER, TX | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| LOWER SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASIN (TRI-COUNTY), TX | 200 | --- | 400 | --- |
| MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX | 300 | --- | --- | --- |
| MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX | 150 | --- | 150 | --- |
| NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX | 305 | --- | 305 | --- |
| NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX | --- | 300 | --- | 300 |
| RESACAS AT BROWNSVILLE, TX | 250 | --- | 250 | --- |
| RIVERSIDE OXBOW, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, FT WORTH, | --- | --- | --- | 275 |
| SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX | 350 | --- | 400 | --- |
| SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX | 325 | --- | 325 | --- |
| SALADO CREEK, TX | 180 | --- | 180 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST INV. | REQUEST PLNG. | RECOMMENDED INV. | RECOMMENDED PLNG. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX | --- | --- | 338 | --- |
| SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX | 256 | --- | 256 | --- |
| SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX | --- | --- | 100 | --- |
| TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX | --- | 1,180 | --- | 1,180 |
| UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX | 600 | --- | 1,300 | --- |
| VIRGINIA | | | | |
| ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, | --- | --- | --- | 312 |
| DISMAL SWAMP AND DISMAL SWAMP CANAL, VA | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENV RESTORATION, VA (PHASE II) | 232 | --- | 232 | --- |
| FOURMILE RUN, VA | 350 | --- | 400 | --- |
| JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216) | 290 | --- | 290 | --- |
| LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA | 483 | --- | 483 | --- |
| NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA | --- | --- | 421 | --- |
| POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| VIRGIN ISLANDS | | | | |
| CROWN BAY CHANNEL, ST. THOMAS, VI | --- | --- | --- | 281 |
| WASHINGTON | | | | |
| CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA | 340 | --- | 340 | --- |
| ELLIOTT BAY SEAWALL, WA | 240 | --- | 240 | --- |
| LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA | 450 | --- | 450 | --- |
| PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA | 450 | --- | 450 | --- |
| SKAGIT RIVER, WA | 450 | --- | 600 | --- |
| WHITE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, W | 450 | --- | 450 | --- |
| WEST VIRGINIA | | | | |
| ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV | --- | --- | --- | 117 |
| LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV | 125 | --- | 125 | --- |
| NEW RIVER BASIN, WV, NC & VA | 160 | --- | 160 | --- |
| WISCONSIN | | | | |
| BARABOO RIVER, WI | 270 | --- | 270 | --- |
| FOX RIVER, WI | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| ST, CROIX RIVER BASIN, MN & WI | --- | --- | 200 | --- |
| MISCELLANEOUS | | | | |
| COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION | 1,875 | --- | 3,500 | --- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES | 94 | --- | 94 | --- |
| FLOOD DAMAGE DATA | 248 | --- | 248 | --- |
| FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES | 5,625 | --- | 5,625 | --- |
| GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS | --- | --- | 500 | --- |
| HYDROLOGIC STUDIES | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| NATIONAL SHORELINE | 375 | --- | 375 | --- |
| OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS | 3,899 | --- | 3,899 | --- |
| PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES | 4,650 | --- | 6,000 | --- |
| PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE) | 225 | --- | 225 | --- |
| REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT | 152 | --- | 152 | --- |
| RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 20,800 | --- | 21,800 | --- |
| SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS | 78 | --- | 78 | --- |
| STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY) | 600 | --- | 600 | --- |
| TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS | 375 | --- | 375 | --- |
| TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER | 402 | --- | 402 | --- |
| REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE | -22,464 | --- | -17,976 | --- |
| TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS | 81,930 | 8,570 | 119,408 | 29,592 |

*American River Watershed (Folsom Dam Mini-Raise), California.*—Funds for the American River Watershed (Folsom Dam Mini-Raise), California, project are shown in the Construction, General account.

*John T. Myers Lock and Dam, Indiana and Kentucky.*—Funding for this project are shown in the Construction, General account.

*Ohio River Mainstem Ecosystem Restoration Study, Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio.*—The Committee recommends an additional $1,000,000 for a systems analysis to address the level of investment needed to provide an efficient navigation system through the year 2060 for the Ohio River from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to Cairo, Illinois.

*Eastern Shore-Mid Chesapeake Bay Island, Maryland.*—The Committee recommends $1,500,000 to continue the feasibility phase of this study, which will focus on the use of dredged material to restore and expand the habitat of a variety of animal life. It is the intent of the Committee that this funding be for the identification and study of existing islands in need of restoration, and not artificial islands.

*Middle Potomac Watershed, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania.*—It is the intent of the Committee that the Holmes Run watershed in Virginia continue to be within the scope of this study.

*Middle Brazos River, Texas.*—Within the funds provided for this project, the Committee recommends $100,000 to amend the existing reconnaissance report and initiate an interim feasibility study for Hearne, Texas.

*Upper Trinity River Basin, Texas.*—The Committee recommends additional funds in the amount of $700,000 to proceed with Planning, Engineering and Design and continue preparation and coordination of an Environmental Impact Statement associated with the locally-preferred alternative for the Central City River Segment of the Trinity River Vision Master plan dated April 2003.

*Floodplain Management Services.*—The Committee recommends $5,625,000 for the Flood Plain Management Services program, including $776,000 to complete the Geographic Information System for East Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and $200,000 for a Blind Brook, City of Rye, New York, hydrological analysis.

*Planning Assistance to States.*—The amount recommended for the Planning Assistance to States includes $100,000 for the Arkansas River Corridor Master Plan; $100,000 to continue the Ingham County, Michigan, Geographic Information System Study; $100,000 to finish the Arkansas River Corridor Master Plan, Oklahoma; $100,000 to initiate geotechnical investigations of a proposed damsite near Mangum, Oklahoma; $250,000 to initiate a groundwater study for Greene County, Missouri; and $134,000 to complete the Memphis Riverfront Development, Tennessee, study. The amount recommended for the Planning Assistance to States program also includes $250,000 to continue a New Jersey Marine Fish Evaluation Study. The Corps of Engineers is urged to consider using the Fisheries Conservation Trust, formerly known as the Save the Fish Foundation, to carry out this investigation. Within funds provided for this program, the Corps of Engineers is directed to work with the Chagrin River Land Conservancy to develop strat-

egies for preserving, and acquisition of funding for preservation of the properties known as Wilde Fields and Mayer Preserve in Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

*Coastal Field Data Collection.*—The Committee includes $3,500,000 for the Coastal Field Data Collection program. The additional funds are provided to ensure not less than $1,000,000 for the Southern California Beach Process Study and not less than $1,000,000 for continuation of the Coastal Data Information Program.

*Research and Development.*—The Committee has added $1,000,000 for Large Scale Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Restoration Research in the Chesapeake Bay, Maryland and Virginia.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $1,712,157,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 1,421,500,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 1,871,680,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +159,523,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | +450,180,000 |

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

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| **ALABAMA** | | |
| WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REH | 1,700 | 1,700 |
| WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB)..... | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| **ALASKA** | | |
| CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK..... | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK..... | 20,000 | 17,000 |
| SAND POINT HARBOR, AK..... | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| ST PAUL HARBOR, AK..... | 13,000 | 11,000 |
| **ARIZONA** | | |
| NOGALES WASH, AZ..... | --- | 1,500 |
| RIO DE FLAG, AZ..... | --- | 3,000 |
| RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ..... | 13,000 | 15,000 |
| TRES RIOS, AZ..... | --- | 4,000 |
| TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA (TUCSON ARROYO), AZ..... | --- | 2,500 |
| **ARKANSAS** | | |
| MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR. | --- | 3,000 |
| MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR..... | 9,090 | 9,090 |
| OZARK - JETA TAYLOR POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)..... | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| **CALIFORNIA** | | |
| AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MINI-RAISE), CA.. | --- | 8,000 |
| AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), C | 6,175 | 7,175 |
| AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA..... | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| CITY OF INGLEWOODS, CA..... | --- | 500 |
| CITY OF NORWALK, CA..... | --- | 160 |
| CAMBRIA SEAWATER DESALINIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE, CA.... | --- | 350 |
| CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA..... | --- | 400 |
| CITY OF SANTA CLARITA (PERCHLORATE), CA..... | --- | 350 |
| CORTE MADERA CREEK FLOOD CONTROL, CA..... | --- | 200 |
| COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEK, CA..... | --- | 300 |
| DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CA..... | --- | 200 |
| FARMINGTON GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, | --- | 2,000 |
| GUADALUPE RIVER, CA..... | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA..... | 5,100 | 6,100 |
| HARBOR / SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT, LOS ANGELE | --- | 2,000 |
| KAWEAH RIVER, CA..... | 5,624 | 5,624 |
| LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA (STORMWATER MANAGEMEN | --- | 250 |
| LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA..... | 23,000 | 23,000 |
| MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA..... | 3,686 | 3,686 |
| MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA..... | --- | 500 |
| MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA..... | 2,300 | 2,300 |
| MURRIETA CREEK, CA..... | --- | 3,000 |
| NAPA RIVER, CA..... | 7,000 | 20,000 |
| NORTH VALLEY REGIONAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE (CITY OF LA | --- | 3,500 |
| OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA..... | 20,000 | 35,000 |
| PETALUMA RIVER, CA..... | 3,404 | 1,000 |
| SACRAMENTO AREA, CA..... | --- | 3,500 |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA..... | 1,000 | 2,500 |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA..... | --- | 750 |
| SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA..... | 13,200 | 20,500 |
| SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA..... | --- | 2,019 |
| SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA..... | --- | 500 |
| SAN RAMON VALLEY RECYCLED WATER PROJECT, CA..... | --- | 750 |
| SOUTH PERRIS, CA (WATER SUPPLY DESALINATION)..... | --- | 500 |
| SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA..... | 1,000 | 3,500 |
| STOCKTON METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSEMENT, CA. | --- | 5,000 |
| SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)..... | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| TULE RIVER, CA..... | 3,500 | 3,500 |

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| UPPER NEWPORT BAY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA | --- | 500 |
| UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA | 2,400 | 2,400 |
| **DELAWARE** | | |
| DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, BETHANY TO SOUTH BETHANY, DE | --- | 350 |
| DELAWARE COAST, CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| DELAWARE COAST, REHOBOTH BEACH TO DEWEY BEACH, DE | 3,675 | 3,675 |
| DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES BEACH | --- | 352 |
| **DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA** | | |
| WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY | 500 | --- |
| **FLORIDA** | | |
| BREVARD COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, FL | --- | 1,000 |
| BROWARD COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, FL | --- | 2,500 |
| CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL | 3,016 | 3,016 |
| CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL | 85,600 | 80,000 |
| DADE COUNTY, FL | --- | 125 |
| DUVAL COUNTY FEDERAL SHORE PROTECTION PROJECT, FL | --- | 750 |
| EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL | 27,000 | 25,000 |
| FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS, FL | --- | 4,000 |
| FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL | --- | 1,500 |
| HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (MAJOR REHAB) | 1,896 | 1,896 |
| JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL | 900 | 3,500 |
| JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R | 2,502 | 2,502 |
| KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL | 18,000 | 18,000 |
| LAKE WORTH INLET SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL | --- | 290 |
| LEE COUNTY (SHORE PROTECTION, ALL ELEMENTS), FL | --- | 1,500 |
| MANATEE HARBOR, FL | --- | 2,000 |
| MARTIN COUNTY, FL | --- | 1,000 |
| MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL | --- | 1,000 |
| NASSAU COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, FL | --- | 750 |
| PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL | --- | 1,000 |
| PANAMA CITY BEACH RENOURISHMENT, FL | --- | 100 |
| PINELLAS COUNTY BEACH RESTORATION, FL | --- | 6,500 |
| PONCE DE LEON INLET, SOUTH JETTY, FL | --- | 400 |
| PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL | --- | 600 |
| ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL | --- | 500 |
| TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER, FL | --- | 6,000 |
| TAMPA HARBOR, BIG BEND, FL | 500 | 5,400 |
| TAMPA HARBOR, SUTTON CHANNEL, FL | --- | 1,000 |
| **GEORGIA** | | |
| BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA | 9,267 | 10,000 |
| BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB) | 7,345 | 7,345 |
| HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB) | 733 | 733 |
| RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC | 4,600 | 4,600 |
| THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB) | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| TYBEE ISLAND SHORE PROTECTION (LRR), GA | --- | 204 |
| **HAWAII** | | |
| IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR) | 500 | 500 |
| KAUMALAPAU HARBOR, LANAI, HI | --- | 2,000 |
| KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI | --- | 100 |
| **IDAHO** | | |
| RURAL IDAHO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, ID | --- | 4,500 |

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| **ILLINOIS** | | |
| CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR) | 3,900 | 3,900 |
| CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL | 17,300 | 20,000 |
| COOK COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, IL | --- | 500 |
| DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE I) | --- | 500 |
| EAST ST. LOUIS, IL | --- | 840 |
| GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL, IN, | --- | 1,000 |
| LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH | 8,800 | 8,800 |
| MADISON AND ST. CLAIR COUNTIES ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRU | --- | 3,250 |
| MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL | 25,300 | 28,000 |
| MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO | 960 | 960 |
| OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO | 28,000 | 16,000 |
| WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL | --- | 600 |
| **INDIANA** | | |
| CALUMET REGION ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, IN | --- | 3,500 |
| GRAND CALUMET RIVER REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN, IN | --- | 500 |
| INDIANA HARBOR (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY), IN | 5,000 | 6,700 |
| INDIANA SHORELINE, IN | --- | 1,000 |
| INDIANAPOLIS, ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (C | --- | 1,000 |
| INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN | 819 | 819 |
| JOHN T MYERS LOCK AND DAM, IN & KY | --- | 2,000 |
| LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN (CADY MARSH DITCH), IN | --- | 6,500 |
| LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN | 5,000 | 6,000 |
| MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB) | 8,477 | 8,477 |
| OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN | 1,600 | 1,600 |
| **IOWA** | | |
| DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA | --- | 4,000 |
| LOCK AND DAM 19, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB) | 4,800 | 4,800 |
| MISSOURI R FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA,KS,MO,MT,NE, | 69,000 | 18,000 |
| MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO | 1,250 | 1,250 |
| PERRY CREEK, IA | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| **KANSAS** | | |
| ARKANSAS CITY, KS | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS (DAM SAFETY) | 20,000 | 15,000 |
| **KENTUCKY** | | |
| KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY | 25,000 | 45,000 |
| MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN | 58,000 | 80,000 |
| METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY | 3,275 | 3,275 |
| METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY | 2,543 | 2,543 |
| SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY | --- | 2,500 |
| **LOUISIANA** | | |
| ASCENSION PARISH ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, LA | --- | 400 |
| COMITE RIVER, LA | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA | --- | 500 |
| EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, | --- | 500 |
| INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA | 10,000 | 20,000 |
| J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT | 3,937 | 7,500 |
| LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION) | 583 | 583 |
| LIVINGSTON PARISH ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, LA | --- | 500 |
| NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION) | 2,965 | 2,965 |
| OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA | --- | 800 |
| SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA | 30,000 | 35,000 |
| WEST BANK AND VICINITY, NEW ORLEANS, LA | 37,000 | 37,000 |

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| **MARYLAND** | | |
| ASIAN OYSTER INTRODUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEME | --- | 400 |
| ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD | --- | 500 |
| BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES, GWYNNS FALLS, | --- | 1,000 |
| CHESAPEAKE BAY ENV. RESTORATION & PROTECTION PROGRAM, | --- | 1,000 |
| CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA | 1,000 | 3,000 |
| CUMBERLAND, MD | --- | 2,500 |
| JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV (DAM SAFETY) | 640 | 640 |
| POPLAR ISLAND, MD | 15,130 | 15,130 |
| **MASSACHUSETTS** | | |
| MUDDY RIVER, BOSTON & BROOKLINE, MA | --- | 1,000 |
| **MICHIGAN** | | |
| GEORGE W. KUHN DRAIN RETENTION FACILITY, OAKLAND COUNT | --- | 150 |
| NEGAUNEE, MI (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE) | --- | 200 |
| SAULT STE. MARIE REPLACEMENT LOCK, MI | --- | 4,000 |
| **MINNESOTA** | | |
| CROOKSTON, MN | --- | 1,100 |
| MILLE LACS REGIONAL SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT, MN | --- | 750 |
| NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA, MN | --- | 1,500 |
| **MISSISSIPPI** | | |
| MISSISSIPPI ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, MS | --- | 2,000 |
| PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS | 1,981 | 1,981 |
| **MISSOURI** | | |
| BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO | 500 | 500 |
| BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO | 1,525 | 1,525 |
| BOIS BRULE LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, MO | --- | 1,200 |
| CAPE GIRARDEAU (FLOODWALL), MO | --- | 1,000 |
| CHESTERFIELD, MO | --- | 500 |
| MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO | 2,060 | 2,060 |
| MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| ST GENEVIEVE, MO | --- | 350 |
| ST. LOUIS, MO (COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS PROJECT) | --- | 1,000 |
| TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY) | 3,896 | 3,896 |
| **MONTANA** | | |
| FORT PECK FISH HATCHERY, MT | --- | 8,539 |
| **NEBRASKA** | | |
| MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD | 1,000 | 295 |
| SAND CREEK WATERSHED, SAUNDERS COUNTY, NE | --- | 1,000 |
| **NEVADA** | | |
| TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV | 8,475 | 8,475 |

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| **NEW HAMPSHIRE** | | |
| LEBANON, NH (CSOS) | --- | 500 |
| NASHUA, NH (CSOS) | --- | 500 |
| OTTER BROOK DAM, NH (DAM SAFETY) | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| **NEW JERSEY** | | |
| BARNEGAT TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ | --- | 1,000 |
| BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET (ABSECON ISLAND) | --- | 2,000 |
| BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET, BRIGANTINE ISLAND | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ | --- | 182 |
| DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ, REEDS BEACH TO PIERCE | --- | 750 |
| DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE | --- | 300 |
| GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO PECK BEACH, NJ | --- | 100 |
| HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NJ | --- | 600 |
| JOSEPH G. MINISH PASSAIC RIVER WATERFRONT PARK & HISTO | --- | 1,000 |
| LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ | 5,164 | 5,164 |
| PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS | 3,000 | 3,350 |
| RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, NJ | --- | 350 |
| RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ | --- | 250 |
| RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ | 9,100 | 9,100 |
| SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ | --- | 500 |
| TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ | 12,600 | 12,600 |
| **NEW MEXICO** | | |
| ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM | 1,200 | 1,200 |
| ALAMOGORDO, NM | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| CENTRAL NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRA | --- | 1,000 |
| NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, NM | --- | 1,000 |
| RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE, | --- | 600 |
| **NEW YORK** | | |
| ATLANTIC COAST OF LONG ISLAND, LONG BEACH ISLAND, NEW. | --- | 300 |
| ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK CITY, EAST ROCKAWAY INLET T | --- | 500 |
| ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK CITY, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NOR | --- | 500 |
| EAST RIVER SEAWALL, QUEENS, NY | --- | 500 |
| FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY | 6,600 | 6,600 |
| NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ | 103,000 | 100,000 |
| NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY | --- | 4,000 |
| NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM, NY | --- | 1,000 |
| ONONDAGA LAKE, NY | --- | 5,000 |
| ORCHARD BEACH, NY | --- | 250 |
| **NORTH CAROLINA** | | |
| BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC | --- | 200 |
| DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC (BODIE ISLAND) | --- | 250 |
| STANLY COUNTY WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE, NC | --- | 1,000 |
| WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| **NORTH DAKOTA** | | |
| BUFORD - TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION, | 200 | 1,000 |
| GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB) | 9,740 | 9,740 |
| GRAFTON, PARK RIVER, ND | --- | 500 |
| GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN | 31,190 | 31,190 |
| **OHIO** | | |
| OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, OH | --- | 22,000 |
| LOWER GIRARD LAKE DAM, OH | --- | 1,000 |
| METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH | 760 | 760 |

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| **OKLAHOMA** | | |
| LAWTON WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE REHABILITATION PROJEC | --- | 1,000 |
| TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY) | 4,400 | 4,400 |
| **OREGON** | | |
| BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB) | 4,900 | 4,900 |
| COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR & WA | --- | 3,000 |
| COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA | 4,200 | 4,200 |
| ELK CREEK LAKE, OR | 300 | 300 |
| LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR | 6,200 | 6,200 |
| **PENNSYLVANIA** | | |
| LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA | 2,600 | 2,600 |
| LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA | 31,000 | 42,000 |
| NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, PA | --- | 3,000 |
| SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTUR | --- | 12,500 |
| SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA WATERWAYS INFRASTUCTURE IMPR | --- | 500 |
| 3 RIVERS WET WEATHER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM, ALLEGHENY | --- | 750 |
| WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING) | 7,300 | 7,300 |
| **PUERTO RICO** | | |
| ARECIBO RIVER, PR | 1,200 | 1,200 |
| PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR | 15,786 | 14,000 |
| RIO GUANAJIBO, PR | 2,396 | --- |
| RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR | 17,000 | 15,000 |
| **SOUTH CAROLINA** | | |
| CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING & WIDENING) | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| FOLLY BEACH, SC | --- | 500 |
| HARTWELL LK,CLEMSON UPPER & LOWER DIVERSION, SC (DAM S | 3,800 | 3,800 |
| LAKES MARION & MOULTRIE, SC | --- | 6,000 |
| **SOUTH DAKOTA** | | |
| BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| PIERRE, SD | 4,038 | 4,038 |
| **TENNESSEE** | | |
| CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN | --- | 14,000 |
| **TEXAS** | | |
| BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX | 9,500 | --- |
| CLEAR CREEK, TX | --- | 1,200 |
| COLONIAS - LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX | --- | 250 |
| DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TX | --- | 10,000 |
| EL PASO, TX | 1,232 | 1,232 |
| HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX | 18,000 | 24,000 |
| HUNTING BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX | --- | 750 |
| JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX | 2,200 | 2,200 |
| NORTH PADRE ISLAND , PACKERY CHANNEL, TX | --- | 3,000 |
| RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL PROJECT WICHITA RIVER BASI | --- | 1,500 |
| SALT CREEK, GRAHAM, TX | --- | 500 |
| SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, TX | --- | 2,250 |
| SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| WHITNEY LAKE POWERHOUSE, TX (MAJOR REHAB) | 1,750 | 1,750 |

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| VIRGINIA | | |
| CLINCH RIVER WATER PROJECT, VA | --- | 500 |
| EMBREY DAM, RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, VA | --- | 500 |
| JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (MAJOR REHAB) | 8,200 | 8,200 |
| LAKE MERRIWEATHER, LITTLE CALFPASTURE RIVER (GOSHEN DA | --- | 1,000 |
| NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA (DEEPENING) | 1,000 | 5,000 |
| WASHINGTON | | |
| CHIEF JOSEPH DAM GAS ABATEMENT, WA | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID | 98,000 | 80,000 |
| DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA | --- | 500 |
| HOWARD HANSON DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA | 8,000 | 9,000 |
| LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA | 200 | 200 |
| MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY) | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS RESTORATION, WA | --- | 500 |
| SHOALWATER BAY SHORELINE EROSION, WA | --- | 600 |
| WISCONSIN | | |
| NORTHERN WISCONSIN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, | --- | 10,000 |
| WEST VIRGINIA | | |
| BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY) | 11,400 | 11,400 |
| CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, WV | --- | 3,000 |
| GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV | --- | 1,000 |
| LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V | 6,000 | 23,500 |
| LOWER MUD RIVER, WV | --- | 250 |
| MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV | 50,000 | 70,000 |
| ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH | 600 | 1,200 |
| SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE , | --- | 1,000 |
| WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM, | --- | 1,000 |
| WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| MISCELLANEOUS | | |
| AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206) | 10,000 | 20,000 |
| AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM | 2,500 | 4,000 |
| BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SEC 204,207,933) | 2,000 | 6,000 |
| DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM | 8,834 | 8,834 |
| EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC 14) | 7,000 | 10,000 |
| EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205) | 14,000 | 25,000 |
| INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE | 45 | 45 |
| INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE | 185 | 185 |
| NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111) | 500 | 500 |
| NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107) | 3,000 | 9,000 |
| PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME | 13,500 | 20,000 |
| SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATIO | 5,000 | 6,000 |
| SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103) | 2,500 | 3,500 |
| SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECT (SECTION 208) | 400 | 500 |
| REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE | -127,649 | -56,635 |
| TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL | 1,421,500 | 1,876,680 |

*Red River below Denison Dam (Bowie County Levee), Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.*—The Committee is aware that additional work is required to develop the scope and prepare a design document that describes a locally preferred option to provide flood damage reduction along the Red River in Bowie County, Texas. To that end, the Committee directs the Secretary to use funds previously appropriated for the project to develop the scope and design of a revised locally preferred plan, and if technically sound and environmentally acceptable, construct the project in accordance with the cost sharing provisions of Section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946.

*McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas and Oklahoma.*—The Committee recommends $3,000,000 to continue reevaluation studies for the Arkansas-White cutoff.

*American River Watershed (Folsom Dam Mini-Raise), California.*—Within funds provided for the American River Watershed (Folsom Dam Mini-Raise), California, project, the Corps is directed to continue design to the Folsom Dam replacement road and permanent bridge to assure their completion at the earliest possible date consistent with the pace of the Mini-Raise project as a whole.

The Committee includes language directing the Corps of Engineers to expend its full capability, up to $5,000,000, to advance the permanent bridge to replace Folsom Bridge Dam Road, Folsom, California, as authorized by the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–137) with all remaining funds devoted to the Mini-Raise. The Committee is aware of reports that there have been attempts to place obstacles in the way of this work, and insists that it be allowed to proceed, unimpeded.

*Sacramento Area, California.*—The bill includes $3,500,000 for the Sacramento Area, California, project authorized by section 502 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. The amount provided includes funding for the water meter retrofit program in the City of Roseville; the Placer County Water Agency meter replacement, water line replacement, and canal lining project; hydraulic improvements at the San Juan District water treatment plant; the redundant water supply intake at Folsom Reservoir; and the San Juan Water District, groundwater well development for conjunctive use program.

*Santa Ana River Mainstem, California.*—The Committee recommends $20,500,000 for continued construction of the Santa Ana River Mainstem project, including $7,500,000 for the continuation of work on the San Timoteo Creek element.

*Manatee Harbor, Florida.*—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 to continue work on the turning basin and wideners as well as the design and award of a construction contract for the south channel extension authorized as a modification to the Manatee Harbor Project in Section 156 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–137).

*Mississippi Environmental Infrastructure Program, Mississippi.*—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Mississippi Environmental Infrastructure program authorized by section 592 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to continue to address the most critical

water resources needs within the State of Mississippi particularly the De Soto County Wastewater Treatment Facility.

*New York and New Jersey Harbors, New York and New Jersey.*—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use $2,000,000 of the funds provided for the project to plan for and enter into an agreement with a state or non-Federal sponsor to develop a dredged material processing facility that would accomplish the objectives of reducing the cost of dredged material management in the port, preparing dredged material for beneficial uses, and implementing innovative dredged material management technologies.

*New York City Watershed, New York.*—Within the funds provided for the New York City Watershed, New York, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to give priority consideration to the Bovina Community Wastewater Project; the Highway Stormwater Inventory, Assessment, and Prioritization Program of Delaware County; and the Terrace Avenue and South Street Projects, Walton, New York.

*Ohio Environmental Infrastructure, Ohio.*—The bill contains $22,000,000 for the Ohio Environmental Infrastructure program authorized by section 594 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. The amount provided includes: $15,000 for the Winchester Vega Road, Bloomfield Township, water line project; $100,000 for the Morgan County, Bishopville, water project; $475,000 for the Morgan County, McConnelsville, storm water project; $1,000,000 for the Muskingum County, Zanesville, wastewater treatment facility; $25,000 for the Vinton County, Arbaugh/Hope water line extension; $350,000 for the Buckeye Lake, water line project; $500,000 for the Hancock County, Village of Jenera, wastewater collection system; $1,000,000 for the Village of West Jefferson, water treatment facility; $1,000,000 for the City of Louisville, protection for wastewater treatment plant; $1,000,000 for the Stark County, Zimber Ditch project; $1,000,000 for the City of Louisville, sanitary sewer system; $500,000 for the Noble County, sewer system; $500,000 for the Youngstown, Orchard Meadow Combined Sewer Overflow project; $500,000 for the Liberty Little Squaw Creek sewer upgrade; $1,000,000 for the Lake County, Concord Township sanitary sewer line improvement; $100,000 for the Lake County, Perry Township, Shepard Road waterline extension; $900,000 for the Lake County, Perry Township, Sanitary sewer system; $1,000,000 for the Toledo Combined Sewer Overflow project; $1,000,000 for the Tech Town Dayton Technology Campus water and sewer project; $2,500,000 for the University of Dayton, Brown and Stewart water and sewer project; $640,000 for the Clinton County, Clinton Massie School District sewer project; $1,500,000 for the Springfield Applied Research and Technology Park water and sewer project; $700,000 for the Clark County, Southwest Regional Waste Water Treatment Plant expansion; $500,000 for the Clark County, Village of Donnelsville sewer system project; $1,500,000 for the Fayette County, Village of Bloomingberg, Waste Water Treatment Plant; $100,000 for the Pickaway County, Harrison and Madison Township water and sewer project; $1,880,000 for the Scioto County, Minford Wastewater Treatment Facility; and $250,000 for the City of Dayton, Northeast Quadrant water and sewer infrastructure.

*Elk Creek Lake, Oregon.*—Funds provided in this Act and funds previously appropriated for the Elk Creek Lake, Oregon, project are available to plan and implement long-term management measures at the project to maintain the project in an uncompleted state, including design and construction of a permanent trap-and-haul facility to replace the existing, interim facility. Funds may not be used for any further work on the Corps of Engineers proposal to remove a section of the dam for fish passage.

*South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Infrastructure Program, Pennsylvania.*—The Committee recommends $8,000,000 for the South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Infrastructure Program, Pennsylvania. When executing this program, the Corps of Engineers is encouraged to consider the needs of Union Township (Clearfield County), Pennsylvania; the Industrial Park in Mifflin County, Pennsylvania; and the Borough of Lewistown, Pennsylvania.

*Black Fox, Murfree, and Oaklands Springs Wetlands, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.*—In the fiscal year 2004 appropriation, the Committee provided funding in the amount which the Corps of Engineers stated would be needed to complete this project. Within available funds, the Corps is directed to complete this project without further delay.

*San Antonio Channel Improvement Project, Texas.*—Consistent with existing project authorities for the San Antonio Channel Improvement Project in Texas, with specific reference to Section 335 of Water Resources Development Act of 2000, which modified the project to include environmental restoration and recreation as project purposes, the Committee directs the Secretary of Army to designate all components of the project for flood control, environmental restoration and recreation as one integral and combined project. The Committee recommends $2,250,000 to continue construction of such project. The Secretary of Army shall use a portion of these funds and subsequent funding appropriated for the San Antonio Channel Improvement Project, Texas to design and construct these combined improvements in accordance with the draft report of the Ft. Worth District Engineer for plan DC3B.

*Aquatic Plant Control Program.*—Within the amount provided for the Aquatic Plant Control program, $250,000 is for aquatic plant control in the State of South Carolina and $100,000 is for the control of aquatic nuisance vegetation in the Potomac and Tributaries, Virginia, Maryland, and District of Columbia. The Committee is aware of the growing aquatic invasive plant infestation problem around the country and supports efforts of the Corps and the private sector to develop new management and control technologies. The Committee believes that success in the management of these invasive species is dependent upon a strong, stable research program.

*Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material.*—The Committee recommends $6,000,000 for the beneficial uses of dredged material (Section 933) program. The additional funds are to continue the beneficial placement of sand from the dredging of the Morehead City, North Carolina, harbor.

*Shoreline Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Project.*—The Committee has added $200,000 for continued work on the Sacred Falls Beach Park Demonstration Project, Oahu, Hawaii.

*Continuing Authorities Program (CAP).*—The Committee departs from its usual practice in the presentation of CAP projects chosen for funding. In previous Committee reports, CAP funding for individual projects was presented in an unstructured text form. For fiscal year 2005, in order to increase uniformity and simplify use of the report, CAP funding will be shown in a table, with information limited to identification of the CAP authority under which the project is authorized, the name of the project, and the amount of funding provided.

The Committee is aware that many projects selected for funding under the Continuing Authorities Program have not received any funds due to overwhelming demand and limited funding authority within the Continuing Authorities Program. The Committee directs that such projects should receive priority consideration for any available funds, in fiscal 2005, and in the future.

*Small Flood Control Projects (Section 205).*—Funding for the Zimber Ditch, Stark County, Ohio, project is now provided under the Ohio Environmental Infrastructure program. The Committee is informed that $700,000 in funding was provided for Butler Lake, Illinois, in fiscal year 2004, most of which has not been expended, and directs that, if true, the Corps of Engineers utilize funding provided to initiate construction on an expedited basis.

CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAMS
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

| | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|
| **SMALL BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)** | |
| NANTASKET BEACH, HULL, MA | 150 |
| CRESCENT BEACH, STATEN ISLAND, NY | 250 |
| CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, HAMPTON, VA | 300 |
| **SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)** | |
| POINT MALLARD PARK, DECATUR, AL | 200 |
| BLYTHEVILLE HARBOR, AR | 600 |
| OYSTER POINT HARBOR BREAKWATER, CA | 125 |
| SAN DIEGO HARBOR DEEPENING, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA | 750 |
| WHITING, IN | 300 |
| BASS HARBOR, TREMONT, ME | 80 |
| BUCKS HARBOR, MACHIASPORT, ME | 38 |
| ROUGE RIVER NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT, MI | 55 |
| DULUTH (MCQUADE ROAD) HARBOR, MN | 100 |
| TWO HARBORS, MN | 100 |
| BUFFALO INNER HARBOR, SOUTH BASIN NAVIGATION IMPROVEME | 150 |
| CHARLESTOWN BREACHWAY AND NINIGRET POND, RI | 45 |
| CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA | 500 |
| **MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGE DUE TO FEDERAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 111)** | |
| MATTITUCK INLET, NY | 100 |
| **PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 1135)** | |
| DITCH 28, MISSISSIPPI COUNTY, AR | 90 |
| HORSESHOE LAKE, AR | 20 |
| GREENVILLE MARSH, LUCAS COUNTY, IA | 334 |
| SPUNKY BOTTOMS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, BROWN COUNTY, IL | 150 |
| DUCK CREEK, STODDARD COUNTY, MO | 50 |
| KANSAS CITY RIVERFRONT, KANSAS CITY, MO | 122 |
| DELAWARE BAY OYSTER RESTORATION, NJ | 300 |
| PINE MOUNT CREEK, NJ | 350 |
| ONTARIO BEACH, ROCHESTER, NY | 80 |
| BIG LAKE AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OK | 135 |
| WALLA WALLA RIVER, OR & WA | 200 |
| ALLIN'S COVE, BARRINGTON, RI | 279 |
| LOWER OBION RIVER AND VICINITY, TN | 130 |
| **STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES (SECTION 14)** | |

CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAMS
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

| | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|
| WINDSOR POND RESERVOIR, DALTON, MA | 100 |
| HOLMES BAY, WHITING, ME | 505 |
| DETROIT RIVER SHORELINE, MI | 215 |
| COUNTY ROAD 228 BRIDGE, HUBBLE CREEK, MO | 152 |
| MT. PLEASANT AVENUE, HANOVER TOWNSHIP, NJ | 200 |
| NORTHPORT, HUNTINGTON, NY | 350 |
| OAKLAND, TN | 65 |
| BOGGY CREEK, AUSTIN, TX | 100 |
| SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205) | |
| WYNNE, AR | 50 |
| TEHAMA FLOOD REDUCTION PROJECT, CA | 500 |
| YUCCA VALLEY, WEST BURNT MOUNTAIN BASIN, CA | 300 |
| CITY OF ALBANY, GA | 250 |
| INDIAN AND DRY RUN CREEKS (AND CEDAR RIVER, CEDAR RAPI | 205 |
| DEER CREEK RESERVOIR, FORD HEIGHTS, IL | 500 |
| EAST PEORIA, IL | 400 |
| KANKAKEE RIVER, LAKE & NEWTON COUNTIES, IN | 100 |
| COWSKIN CREEK, WICHITA, KS | 150 |
| HINKSTON CREEK FLOOD CONTROL, KY | 120 |
| DETROIT BEACH, FRENCHTOWN TOWNSHIP, MI | 90 |
| FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO | 432 |
| JAMES RIVER, NEEDMORE BRANCH, HIDDEN VALLEY, GREENE CO | 225 |
| LILBOURN, MO | 76 |
| GREENS MILL RUN, GREENVILLE, NC | 60 |
| WAHPETON, ND | 320 |
| JACKSON BROOK, NJ | 300 |
| POPLAR BROOK, MONMOUTH COUNTY, NJ | 200 |
| UPPER PASSAIC RIVER, LONG HILL TOWNSHIP, NJ | 250 |
| FULMER CREEK, NY | 321 |
| MOYER CREEK, NY | 312 |
| SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY | 204 |
| BUCKEYE LAKE, OH | 250 |
| LITTLE MILL CREEK, SOUTHHAMPTON, PA | 125 |
| MILL CREEK, SOUTHHAMPTON, PA | 90 |
| FRENCH BROAD WATERSHED, TN | 500 |
| TOWN CREEK, LENOIR CITY, TN | 200 |
| LITTLE LIMESTONE CREEK, JONESBOROUGH, TN | 300 |
| BEAVER CREEK, BRISTOL, VA & TN | 500 |
| CHRISTIANSTED GUT FLOOD CONTROL, ST. CROIX, VI | 350 |
| AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS (SECTION 206) | |
| ENGLISH CREEK AQUATIC RESTORATION, CA | 100 |
| ST. HELENA NAPA RIVER RESTORATION, CA | 600 |
| SWEETWATER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA | 180 |

CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAMS
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

| | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|
| THOMPSON CREEK, CA | 300 |
| UPPER YORK CREEK DAM REMOVAL AND RESTORATION, CA | 400 |
| MILL RIVER, STAMFORD, CT | 250 |
| C-1 REDIVERSION, BREVARD CO, FL | 300 |
| DAVIS LAKE RESTORATION PROJECT, FL | 200 |
| LAKE HELL'N BLAZES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL | 245 |
| LAKE SAWGRASS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL | 245 |
| STEVENSON CREEK, FL | 300 |
| TSALA APOPKA LITTORAL SHELF RESTORATION PROJECT, FL | 200 |
| BIG PAINT CREEK RESTORATION, WAUKON, IA | 100 |
| CLEAR CREEK AND IOWA RIVERAQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATIO | 200 |
| CLEAR LAKE, IA (VENTURA MARSH) | 175 |
| CHARITON RIVER / RATHBUN LAKE WATERSHED, IA | 250 |
| STORM LAKE WATER QUALITY PROJECT, IA | 10 |
| LAKE MAUVAISTERRE, JACKSONVILLE, IL | 50 |
| ORLAND TRACT, IL | 210 |
| SQUAW CREEK BASIN, IL | 220 |
| CEDAR LAKE, IN | 300 |
| CHAPMAN LAKES, KOSCIUSKO CO, IN | 100 |
| EFROYMSON, NEWTON COUNTY, IN | 100 |
| LONG LAKE, IN | 200 |
| WOLF LAKE, IN | 1,000 |
| MILFORD POND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MILFORD, MA | 182 |
| NASHAWANNUCK POND, EASTHAMPTON, MA | 183 |
| NEPONSET RIVER, BOSTON, MA | 63 |
| PAINT BRANCH FISH PASSAGE AND STREAM RESTORATION, MD | 200 |
| WESTERN CARY STREAM RESTORATION, CARY, NC | 193 |
| ASSUNPINK CREEK, TRENTON, NJ | 100 |
| CHENANGO LAKE, NY | 125 |
| SOUNDVIEW PARK, BRONX, NY | 400 |
| EUGENE DELTA PONDS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR | 250 |
| KELLOGG CREEK, OR | 200 |
| CORDORUS CREEK WATERSHED, PA | 722 |
| NINIGRET AND CROSS MILLS PONDS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, | 200 |
| PISTOL CREEK, MARYSVILLE, TN | 400 |
| LAKE ANNA, VA | 200 |
| POWELL RIVER, ELY & PUCKETTS CREEK, VA | 250 |
| PORT OF SUNNYSIDE YAKIMA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, | 233 |
| LAKE KOSHKONONG, WI | 160 |

## FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

### ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $322,309,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 270,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 325,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +2,691,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | +55,000,000 |

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

FLOOD CONTROL - MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| **GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS** | | |
| ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA | 435 | 435 |
| ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM LAND STUDY, LA | 100 | --- |
| BAYOU METO BASIN, AR | --- | 2,447 |
| DELTA HEADWATERS PROJECT, MS | --- | 20,000 |
| DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA | 800 | 800 |
| SPRING BAYOU, LA | 500 | 500 |
| COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS | 203 | 203 |
| FLETCHER CREEK, TN | 93 | 93 |
| GERMANTOWN, TN | 27 | 27 |
| MILLINGTON AND VICINITY, TN | 100 | 100 |
| MORGANZA TO THE GULF, LA | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| TENSAS RIVER BASIN, LA | --- | 200 |
| COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA | 700 | 700 |
| SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS | 4,458 | 27,005 |
| **CONSTRUCTION** | | |
| CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN | 36,882 | 44,000 |
| FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR | 1,357 | 1,357 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN | 38,960 | 45,000 |
| ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO | 3,000 | 6,610 |
| ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA | 7,200 | 7,200 |
| ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA | 22,495 | 22,495 |
| HORN LAKE CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & TN | --- | 204 |
| MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA | 1,800 | 1,800 |
| YAZOO BASIN: | (5,850) | (5,850) |
| BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS | 3,850 | 3,850 |
| ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO | 8,300 | 8,300 |
| NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS | 2,153 | 2,153 |
| SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION | 127,997 | 144,969 |
| **MAINTENANCE** | | |
| CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN | 69,275 | 69,275 |
| HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR | 385 | 385 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR | 318 | 318 |
| LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR | 146 | 146 |
| LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR | 122 | 122 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN | 7,665 | 9,000 |
| ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO | 6,080 | 8,000 |
| TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA | 2,160 | 2,160 |
| WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR | 1,316 | 1,316 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL | 174 | 174 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY | 61 | 61 |
| ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA | 2,775 | 2,775 |
| ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA | 13,000 | 13,000 |
| BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA | 14 | 14 |
| BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA | 65 | 65 |
| BONNET CARRE, LA | 2,310 | 2,310 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA | 585 | 585 |
| LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA | 105 | 105 |
| MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA | 588 | 588 |
| OLD RIVER, LA | 7,350 | 7,350 |
| TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA | 3,083 | 3,600 |
| GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS | 29 | 29 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS | 168 | 168 |
| VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS | 32 | 32 |

FLOOD CONTROL - MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| YAZOO BASIN: | (27,492) | (33,216) |
| ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS | 5,710 | 7,000 |
| BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS | 139 | 139 |
| ENID LAKE, MS | 4,954 | 6,000 |
| GREENWOOD, MS | 585 | 585 |
| GRENADA LAKE, MS | 5,553 | 6,000 |
| MAIN STEM, MS | 1,013 | 3,000 |
| SARDIS LAKE, MS | 7,046 | 8,000 |
| TRIBUTARIES, MS | 923 | 923 |
| WILL M WHITTINGTON AUXILLIARY CHANNEL, MS | 400 | 400 |
| YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS | 440 | 440 |
| YAZOO CITY, MS | 729 | 729 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO | 116 | 116 |
| WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO | 4,046 | 5,000 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN | 78 | 78 |
| MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN | 1,205 | 1,205 |
| MAPPING | 1,112 | 1,112 |
| SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE | 151,855 | 162,305 |
| REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE | -14,310 | -9,279 |
| TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES | --- 270,000 | --- 325,000 |

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

*Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas.*—The Committee recommends $2,447,000 to complete Preconstruction, Engineering and Design on this project.

CONSTRUCTION

*McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas & Oklahoma.*—Within the funds provided, the Corps of Engineers is directed to continue to study and construct demonstration projects to address a cutoff between the Arkansas and White Rivers.

*Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.*—The Committee recognizes the critical need of continuing to advance much needed work in this project to ensure the integrity of the levee system and to protect people and property from flooding. Therefore, the Committee has included $45,000,000 for Mississippi River Levees, and urges the Corps of Engineers to prioritize its work so that high-value projects under way may be finished as quickly as possible, affording the greatest possible protection for the investment.

*St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.*—The Committee is aware of frequent and prolonged flooding along the uncompleted portions of the St. Francis Basin project. The bill includes $6,610,000 for this project, including $1,625,000 to continue 10 & 15 Mile Bayous, Arkansas, relocations; $1,600,000 to continue construction on 10 & 15 Mile Channel improvement in Arkansas; and $385,000 to continue construction of Steele Bypass Weir, Steele, Missouri.

MAINTENANCE

*Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.*—The Committee is aware of the backlog of critical maintenance items in this project and recommends $9,000,000 for the project. The additional funds are intended to allow the Corps to address several specific items, including the need to maintain or replace gravel surfaces on levees, including those below Helena, Arkansas; to provide for environmental improvements at the Drinkwater II pumping station in Missouri, and to scour repair at Blue Bank Outlet Channel in Tennessee.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $1,956,314,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 1,931,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 1,982,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +25,686,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | +51,000,000 |

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| **ALABAMA** | | |
| ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL | 500 | 500 |
| ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL | 549 | 4,000 |
| BAYOU LA BAIRE, AL | --- | 200 |
| BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL | 18,377 | 19,077 |
| GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL | 50 | 50 |
| MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA | 4,543 | 3,780 |
| MOBILE HARBOR, AL | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL | 4,590 | 4,218 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL | 100 | 100 |
| TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS | 22,354 | 22,354 |
| WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA | 5,989 | 5,989 |
| **ALASKA** | | |
| ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK | 3,154 | 3,154 |
| CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK | 1,886 | 1,886 |
| DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK | 603 | 603 |
| HOMER HARBOR, AK | 445 | 445 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK | 43 | 43 |
| NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK | 278 | 278 |
| NOME HARBOR, AK | 2,815 | 2,815 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK | 554 | 554 |
| **ARIZONA** | | |
| ALAMO LAKE, AZ | 1,528 | 1,528 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ | 90 | 90 |
| PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ | 1,571 | 1,571 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ | 35 | 35 |
| WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ | 221 | 221 |
| **ARKANSAS** | | |
| BEAVER LAKE, AR | 5,060 | 5,060 |
| BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR | 7,192 | 7,192 |
| BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR | 1,189 | 1,189 |
| BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR | 4,401 | 5,000 |
| DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR | 5,337 | 5,337 |
| DEGRAY LAKE, AR | 6,164 | 6,164 |
| DEQUEEN LAKE, AR | 1,001 | 1,001 |
| DIERKS LAKE, AR | 1,030 | 1,030 |
| GILLHAM LAKE, AR | 931 | 931 |
| GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR | 5,016 | 5,016 |
| HELENA HARBOR, AR | --- | 350 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR | 191 | 191 |
| MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR | 35,489 | 35,489 |
| MILLWOOD LAKE, AR | 1,418 | 1,418 |
| NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR | 5,613 | 5,613 |
| NIMROD LAKE, AR | 1,793 | 1,793 |
| NORFORK LAKE, AR | 3,152 | 3,152 |
| OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR | 20 | 590 |
| OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA | 1,974 | 9,974 |
| OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR | 4,866 | 4,866 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR | 6 | 6 |
| WHITE RIVER, AR | --- | 1,000 |
| YELLOW BEND PORT, AR | 14 | 135 |
| **CALIFORNIA** | | |
| BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA | 1,882 | 1,882 |
| BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA | 1,958 | 1,958 |
| CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA | 4,985 | 4,985 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA | 4,348 | 4,348 |
| DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA | 4,779 | 5,779 |
| FARMINGTON DAM, CA | 526 | 526 |
| HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA | 1,828 | 1,828 |
| HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA | 2,864 | 2,864 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA | 1,271 | 1,271 |
| ISABELLA LAKE, CA | 2,080 | 2,080 |
| LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA | 175 | 175 |
| LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA | 5,376 | 5,376 |
| MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA | 292 | 292 |
| MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA | 328 | 328 |
| MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA | --- | 578 |
| MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA | --- | 500 |
| NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA | 2,044 | 2,044 |
| NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA | 1,335 | 1,335 |
| OAKLAND HARBOR, CA | 7,098 | 7,098 |
| OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA | 1,110 | 1,110 |
| PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA | --- | 250 |
| PINE FLAT LAKE, CA | 2,941 | 2,941 |
| PORT HUENEME, VENTURA COUNTY, CA | --- | 500 |
| PORT SAN LUIS, SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY, CA | --- | 1,000 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA | 2,173 | 2,173 |
| REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA | --- | 1,000 |
| RICHMOND HARBOR, CA | 7,572 | 7,572 |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA | 2,745 | 2,745 |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA | 1,246 | 1,246 |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA | 145 | 145 |
| SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (LTMS) | --- | 1,250 |
| SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA | 1,277 | 1,100 |
| SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL) | 2,674 | 3,300 |
| SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA | 2,255 | 2,250 |
| SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA | --- | 3,800 |
| SAN PABLO BAY & MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA | --- | 1,000 |
| SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA | 4,023 | 4,023 |
| SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA | --- | 2,090 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA | 1,285 | 1,285 |
| SUCCESS LAKE, CA | 2,007 | 2,007 |
| SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA | 4,559 | 4,559 |
| TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA | 2,268 | 2,268 |
| VENTURA HARBOR, CA | 2,910 | 2,910 |
| YUBA RIVER, CA | 126 | 126 |
| **COLORADO** | | |
| BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO | 292 | 292 |
| CHATFIELD LAKE, CO | 1,109 | 1,109 |
| CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO | 911 | 911 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO | 102 | 102 |
| JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO | 2,573 | 2,573 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO | 308 | 308 |
| TRINIDAD LAKE, CO | 1,110 | 1,110 |
| **COMMONWEALTH OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS** | | |
| ROTA HARBOR, CNMI | 200 | 200 |
| **CONNECTICUT** | | |
| BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT | 414 | 414 |
| COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT | 541 | 541 |
| CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD, CT | --- | 1,500 |
| HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT | 288 | 288 |
| HOP BROOK LAKE, CT | 985 | 985 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT | 36 | 36 |
| MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT | 585 | 585 |
| NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT | 416 | 416 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| NORWALK HARBOR, CT | --- | 1,500 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT | 1,486 | 1,486 |
| SOUTHPORT HARBOR, CT | --- | 1,000 |
| STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT | 456 | 456 |
| THOMASTON DAM, CT | 616 | 616 |
| TREATMENT OF DREDGED MATERIAL, LONG ISLAND SOUND, CT | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT | 575 | 575 |
| DELAWARE | | |
| INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE | 500 | 500 |
| INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D | 13,800 | 13,800 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE | 80 | 80 |
| WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE | 3,570 | 3,570 |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | | |
| POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL) | 1,122 | 1,122 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC | 36 | 36 |
| FLORIDA | | |
| ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, FL | --- | 750 |
| CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL | 10,559 | 10,559 |
| ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL | 1,980 | 1,980 |
| GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, FL | --- | 1,000 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL | 300 | 300 |
| INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL | --- | 3,000 |
| JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL | 6,945 | 6,945 |
| JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA | 5,380 | 6,500 |
| MIAMI RIVER, FL | --- | 3,000 |
| OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL | 3,055 | 3,055 |
| PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL | 1,985 | 1,985 |
| PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL | 906 | 906 |
| PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL | 975 | 975 |
| REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| TAMPA HARBOR, FL | 4,286 | 4,286 |
| GEORGIA | | |
| ALLATOONA LAKE, GA | 5,986 | 5,986 |
| APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & | 117 | 5,000 |
| BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA | 3,993 | 3,993 |
| BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA | 9,697 | 9,697 |
| CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA | 12,955 | 12,955 |
| HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC | 12,238 | 12,238 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA | 41 | 41 |
| J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC | 11,106 | 11,106 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA | 71 | 71 |
| RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC | 8,128 | 8,128 |
| SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA | 11,687 | 11,687 |
| SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA | 134 | 134 |
| WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL | 5,676 | 5,676 |
| HAWAII | | |
| BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI | 248 | 248 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI | 180 | 180 |
| LAUPAHOEHOE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HAWAII, HI | 100 | 100 |
| POHIKI BAY, HAWAII, HI | 100 | 100 |
| PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI, HI | 1,770 | 1,770 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI | 550 | 550 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| **IDAHO** | | |
| ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID | 2,412 | 2,412 |
| DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID | 2,399 | 2,399 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID | 74 | 74 |
| LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID | 3,234 | 3,234 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID | 406 | 406 |
| **ILLINOIS** | | |
| CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN | 2,124 | 2,124 |
| CARLYLE LAKE, IL | 4,366 | 4,366 |
| CHICAGO HARBOR, IL | 2,599 | 2,599 |
| CHICAGO RIVER, IL | 385 | 385 |
| FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL | 192 | 257 |
| ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN | 33,273 | 33,643 |
| ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN | 1,814 | 2,149 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL | 605 | 605 |
| KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL | 392 | 2,000 |
| LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL | 547 | 547 |
| LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL | 5,309 | 5,309 |
| MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION) | 42,473 | 42,473 |
| MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION) | 17,907 | 17,907 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL | 33 | 33 |
| REND LAKE, IL | 4,435 | 4,435 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL | 120 | 120 |
| WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL | 2,680 | 2,680 |
| **INDIANA** | | |
| BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN | 670 | 670 |
| BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN | 3,764 | 3,764 |
| CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN | 652 | 652 |
| CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN | 713 | 713 |
| INDIANA HARBOR, IN | 371 | 871 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN | 370 | 370 |
| J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN | 707 | 707 |
| MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN | 316 | 316 |
| MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN | 810 | 810 |
| MONROE LAKE, IN | 775 | 775 |
| PATOKA LAKE, IN | 687 | 687 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN | 59 | 59 |
| SALAMONIE LAKE, IN | 634 | 634 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN | 117 | 117 |
| **IOWA** | | |
| CORALVILLE LAKE, IA | 2,806 | 2,806 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA | 191 | 191 |
| MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA | 157 | 157 |
| MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE | 11,015 | 11,015 |
| RATHBUN LAKE, IA | 2,907 | 2,907 |
| RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA | 3,350 | 3,350 |
| SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA | 3,860 | 3,860 |
| **KANSAS** | | |
| CLINTON LAKE, KS | 2,074 | 2,074 |
| COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS | 1,259 | 1,259 |
| EL DORADO LAKE, KS | 480 | 480 |
| ELK CITY LAKE, KS | 389 | 389 |
| FALL RIVER LAKE, KS | 1,516 | 1,516 |
| HILLSDALE LAKE, KS | 899 | 899 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS | 172 | 172 |
| JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS | 1,260 | 1,260 |
| KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS | 1,645 | 1,645 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| MARION LAKE, KS | 1,687 | 1,687 |
| MELVERN LAKE, KS | 2,227 | 2,227 |
| MILFORD LAKE, KS | 2,122 | 2,122 |
| PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS | 932 | 932 |
| PERRY LAKE, KS | 2,869 | 2,869 |
| POMONA LAKE, KS | 1,984 | 1,984 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS | 68 | 68 |
| TORONTO LAKE, KS | 389 | 389 |
| TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS | 2,169 | 2,169 |
| WILSON LAKE, KS | 2,816 | 2,816 |
| KENTUCKY | | |
| BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN | 8,982 | 8,982 |
| BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY | 2,054 | 2,054 |
| BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY | 35 | 1,200 |
| BUCKHORN LAKE, KY | 1,282 | 1,282 |
| CARR CREEK LAKE, KY | 1,270 | 1,270 |
| CAVE RUN LAKE, KY | 812 | 812 |
| DEWEY LAKE, KY | 1,498 | 1,498 |
| ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY | 19 | 490 |
| FISHTRAP LAKE, KY | 1,558 | 1,558 |
| GRAYSON LAKE, KY | 1,249 | 1,249 |
| GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY | 1,180 | 1,180 |
| GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY | 1,596 | 1,596 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY | 97 | 97 |
| KENTUCKY RIVER, KY | 21 | 21 |
| LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY | 1,389 | 1,389 |
| MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY | 686 | 686 |
| MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY | 122 | 122 |
| NOLIN LAKE, KY | 1,892 | 1,892 |
| OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH | 32,687 | 32,687 |
| OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH | 4,560 | 4,560 |
| PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY | 1,026 | 1,026 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY | 6 | 6 |
| ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY | 2,421 | 2,421 |
| TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY | 895 | 895 |
| WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY | 8,804 | 8,804 |
| YATESVILLE LAKE, KY | 1,069 | 1,069 |
| LOUISIANA | | |
| ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L | 13,813 | 13,813 |
| BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA | 776 | 776 |
| BAYOU PIERRE, LA | 28 | 28 |
| BAYOU SEGNETTE, LA | --- | 750 |
| CADDO LAKE, LA | 182 | 182 |
| CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA | 13,285 | 13,285 |
| FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA | 1,678 | 1,678 |
| GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA | 17,476 | 17,476 |
| HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA | 3,070 | 3,070 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA | 747 | 747 |
| J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA | 10,600 | 14,000 |
| LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA | 38 | 38 |
| MADISON PARISH PORT, LA | 20 | 20 |
| MERMENTAU RIVER, LA | 4,410 | 4,410 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA | 424 | 424 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO | 59,125 | 59,125 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA | 13,004 | 13,004 |
| REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA | 1,800 | 1,800 |
| WALLACE LAKE, LA | 290 | 290 |
| MAINE | | |
| DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME | 1,390 | 1,390 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME | 11 | 11 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| KENNEBUNK RIVER, KENNEBUNK AND KENNEBUNKPORT, ME | --- | 500 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME | 646 | 646 |
| SCARBOROUGH RIVER, ME | --- | 500 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME | 17 | 17 |
| MARYLAND | | |
| BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD | 15,796 | 15,796 |
| BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL) | 510 | 510 |
| BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSI | 700 | 700 |
| CHESAPEAKE CITY, MD (DREDGING) | --- | 250 |
| HERRING BAY & ROCKHOLD CREEK, MD | --- | 90 |
| HERRING CREEK & TALL TIMBERS, MD | --- | 250 |
| JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV | 2,662 | 2,662 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD | 372 | 372 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD | 95 | 95 |
| ST JEROME CREEK, MD | --- | 85 |
| WICOMICO RIVER, MD | 720 | 720 |
| MASSACHUSETTS | | |
| AUNT LYDIA'S COVE, MA | 350 | 350 |
| BARRE FALLS DAM, MA | 680 | 680 |
| BIRCH HILL DAM, MA | 585 | 585 |
| BOSTON HARBOR, MA | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA | 601 | 601 |
| CAPE COD CANAL, MA | 10,225 | 12,255 |
| CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA | 310 | 310 |
| CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA | 211 | 211 |
| EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA | 461 | 461 |
| GREEN HARBOR, MA | 387 | 387 |
| HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA | 646 | 646 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA | 114 | 114 |
| KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA | 559 | 559 |
| LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA | 498 | 498 |
| NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, | 750 | 750 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA | 1,511 | 1,511 |
| SESUIT HARBOR, MA | --- | 130 |
| TULLY LAKE, MA | 564 | 564 |
| WEST HILL DAM, MA | 736 | 736 |
| WESTVILLE LAKE, MA | 569 | 569 |
| MICHIGAN | | |
| CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI | --- | 255 |
| CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI | 97 | 97 |
| CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI | 159 | 159 |
| CLINTON RIVER, MI | --- | 800 |
| DETROIT RIVER, MI | 4,357 | 4,357 |
| GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI | 637 | 637 |
| GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI | 181 | 181 |
| HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI | 38 | 38 |
| HOLLAND HARBOR, MI | 1,214 | 1,214 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI | 144 | 144 |
| KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI | 399 | 399 |
| LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI | 17 | 17 |
| LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI | 538 | 538 |
| MANISTEE HARBOR, MI | 521 | 521 |
| MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI | 10 | 10 |
| MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI | 154 | 154 |
| MONROE HARBOR, MI | 184 | 184 |
| MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI | 47 | 47 |
| ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI | 569 | 569 |
| PENTWATER HARBOR, MI | --- | 120 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI | 152 | 152 |
| ROUGE RIVER, MI | 1,241 | 1,241 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| SAGINAW RIVER, MI | 2,708 | 3,000 |
| ST CLAIR RIVER, MI | 947 | 947 |
| ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI | 605 | 605 |
| ST MARYS RIVER, MI | 16,705 | 16,705 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI | 2,410 | 2,410 |
| MINNESOTA | | |
| BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD | 228 | 228 |
| DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI | 4,917 | 4,917 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN | 123 | 123 |
| LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN | 565 | 565 |
| MINNESOTA RIVER, MN | 178 | 178 |
| MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION) | 51,030 | 51,030 |
| ORWELL LAKE, MN | 361 | 361 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN | 72 | 72 |
| RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN | 98 | 98 |
| RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN | 6,026 | 6,026 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN | 282 | 282 |
| MISSISSIPPI | | |
| BILOXI HARBOR, MS | 1,250 | 1,250 |
| CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS | 7 | 7 |
| EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS | 170 | 170 |
| GULFPORT HARBOR, MS | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS | 57 | 57 |
| MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS | 24 | 24 |
| OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS | 1,320 | 1,320 |
| PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS | 3,900 | 3,900 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS | 355 | 355 |
| ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS | 20 | 20 |
| YAZOO RIVER, MS | 140 | 140 |
| MISSOURI | | |
| CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO | 12 | 350 |
| CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO | 5,821 | 5,821 |
| CLEARWATER LAKE, MO | 1,974 | 2,874 |
| HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO | 8,369 | 8,369 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO | 781 | 781 |
| LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO | 841 | 841 |
| LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO | 926 | 926 |
| MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO | 21,236 | 21,236 |
| NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO | 16 | 360 |
| POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO | 2,252 | 2,252 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO | 6 | 6 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO | 319 | 319 |
| SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO | 1,175 | 1,175 |
| SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MO | --- | 375 |
| STOCKTON LAKE, MO | 3,760 | 3,760 |
| TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO | 5,972 | 5,972 |
| UNION LAKE, MO | 10 | 10 |
| MONTANA | | |
| FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT | 5,280 | 5,280 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT | 19 | 19 |
| LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT | 3,837 | 3,837 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT | 87 | 87 |
| NEBRASKA | | |
| GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD | 6,842 | 6,842 |
| HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE | 2,005 | 2,005 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE | 102 | 102 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,. | 350 | 350 |
| PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE..... | 619 | 619 |
| SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE..... | 644 | 644 |
| NEVADA | | |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV..... | 44 | 44 |
| MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA..... | 612 | 612 |
| PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV..... | 261 | 261 |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | | |
| BLACKWATER DAM, NH..... | 617 | 617 |
| EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH..... | 527 | 527 |
| FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH..... | 722 | 722 |
| HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH..... | 1,175 | 1,175 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH..... | 12 | 12 |
| OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH..... | 648 | 648 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH..... | 343 | 343 |
| SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH..... | 639 | 639 |
| NEW JERSEY | | |
| BARNEGAT INLET, NJ..... | --- | 1,590 |
| COLD SPRING INLET, NJ..... | 245 | 245 |
| DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ..... | 20 | 20 |
| DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE.. | 20,100 | 20,600 |
| DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ..... | 3,415 | 3,415 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ..... | 40 | 40 |
| MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ..... | 190 | 190 |
| NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ..... | --- | 2,000 |
| NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ..... | 120 | 120 |
| PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ..... | 425 | 425 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ..... | 1,670 | 1,670 |
| RARITAN RIVER, NJ..... | --- | 500 |
| SALEM RIVER , NJ..... | --- | 250 |
| SHARK RIVER, NJ..... | 100 | 100 |
| NEW MEXICO | | |
| ABIQUIU DAM, NM..... | 1,920 | 1,920 |
| COCHITI LAKE, NM..... | 2,881 | 2,881 |
| CONCHAS LAKE, NM..... | 1,733 | 2,033 |
| GALISTEO DAM, NM..... | 432 | 432 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM..... | 192 | 192 |
| JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM..... | 721 | 721 |
| RIO GRANDE BOSQUE REHABILITATION, NM..... | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM..... | 1,289 | 1,289 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM..... | 172 | 850 |
| TWO RIVERS DAM, NM..... | 525 | 725 |
| NEW YORK | | |
| ALMOND LAKE, NY..... | 530 | 530 |
| ARKPORT DAM, NY..... | 283 | 283 |
| BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY..... | 1,681 | 1,681 |
| BROWNS CREEK, NY..... | 750 | 750 |
| BUFFALO HARBOR, NY..... | 309 | 309 |
| BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY..... | 1,030 | 1,030 |
| DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY..... | 345 | 345 |
| EAST RIVER, NY..... | 370 | 370 |
| EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY..... | 2,100 | 2,100 |
| EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY..... | 466 | 466 |
| FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY..... | 180 | 180 |
| FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY..... | --- | 750 |
| GREAT SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY..... | --- | 300 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| GREAT SOUTH BAY, PATCHOGUE RIVER, NY | --- | 200 |
| HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT) | 2,005 | 2,005 |
| HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C) | 1,950 | 1,950 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY | 594 | 594 |
| JAMAICA BAY, NY | 2,200 | 2,200 |
| LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY | 750 | 750 |
| LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY | --- | 600 |
| MORICHES INLET, NY | 50 | 50 |
| MT MORRIS LAKE, NY | 2,129 | 2,129 |
| NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY | 5,700 | 5,700 |
| NEW YORK HARBOR, NY | 4,235 | 4,235 |
| NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL) | 5,414 | 5,414 |
| OSWEGO HARBOR, NY | 500 | 500 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY | 1,075 | 1,075 |
| ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY | 60 | 60 |
| SAUGERTIES HARBOR, NY | 500 | 500 |
| SHINNECOCK INLET, NY | 100 | 100 |
| SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY | 788 | 788 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY | 596 | 596 |
| WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY | 577 | 577 |
| WILSON HARBOR, NY | --- | 350 |
| NORTH CAROLINA | | |
| ATLANTIC INTERCOASTAL WATERWAY, NC | --- | 3,000 |
| B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC | 1,915 | 1,915 |
| CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC | 123 | 123 |
| FALLS LAKE, NC | 1,793 | 1,793 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC | 35 | 35 |
| LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC | --- | 1,000 |
| MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC | 6,970 | 6,970 |
| MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC | 4,112 | 4,112 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC | 227 | 227 |
| W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC | 2,524 | 2,524 |
| WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC | 8,157 | 8,157 |
| NORTH DAKOTA | | |
| BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND | 242 | 242 |
| GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND | 13,597 | 13,597 |
| HOMME LAKE, ND | 196 | 196 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND | 79 | 79 |
| LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND | 1,216 | 1,216 |
| PIPESTEM LAKE, ND | 534 | 534 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND | 116 | 116 |
| SOURIS RIVER, ND | 387 | 387 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND | 30 | 30 |
| OHIO | | |
| ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH | 715 | 715 |
| ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH | 1,940 | 1,940 |
| BERLIN LAKE, OH | 1,830 | 1,830 |
| CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH | 1,187 | 1,187 |
| CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH | 758 | 758 |
| CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH | 4,653 | 4,653 |
| CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH | 420 | 420 |
| DEER CREEK LAKE, OH | 727 | 727 |
| DELAWARE LAKE, OH | 719 | 719 |
| DILLON LAKE, OH | 653 | 653 |
| FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH | 954 | 954 |
| HURON HARBOR, OH | 1,104 | 1,104 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH | 175 | 175 |
| LORAIN HARBOR, OH | 1,615 | 1,615 |
| MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH | 25 | 25 |
| MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH | 795 | 795 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH | 985 | 985 |
| MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH | 5,776 | 8,276 |
| NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH | 169 | 169 |
| PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH | 747 | 747 |
| PORT CLINTON HARBOR, OH | 5 | 365 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH | 98 | 98 |
| ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH | 30 | 30 |
| SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH | 950 | 950 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH | 170 | 170 |
| TOLEDO HARBOR, OH | 3,569 | 3,569 |
| TOM JENKINS DAM, OH | 269 | 269 |
| WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH | 397 | 397 |
| WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH | 848 | 848 |
| OKLAHOMA | | |
| ARCADIA LAKE, OK | 280 | 280 |
| BIRCH LAKE, OK | 459 | 459 |
| BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK | 1,294 | 1,294 |
| CANDY LAKE, OK | 20 | 20 |
| CANTON LAKE, OK | 3,111 | 3,111 |
| COPAN LAKE, OK | 734 | 734 |
| EUFAULA LAKE, OK | 5,435 | 5,435 |
| FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK | 6,190 | 6,190 |
| FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK | 733 | 733 |
| GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK | 129 | 129 |
| HEYBURN LAKE, OK | 557 | 557 |
| HUGO LAKE, OK | 2,997 | 2,997 |
| HULAH LAKE, OK | 337 | 337 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK | 131 | 131 |
| KAW LAKE, OK | 1,835 | 1,835 |
| KEYSTONE LAKE, OK | 4,233 | 4,233 |
| OOLOGAH LAKE, OK | 2,094 | 2,094 |
| OPTIMA LAKE, OK | 41 | 41 |
| PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK | 18 | 18 |
| PINE CREEK LAKE, OK | 848 | 848 |
| ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK | 4,734 | 4,734 |
| SARDIS LAKE, OK | 604 | 604 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK | 616 | 616 |
| SKIATOOK LAKE, OK | 1,196 | 1,196 |
| TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK | 3,217 | 3,217 |
| WAURIKA LAKE, OK | 946 | 946 |
| WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK | 6,706 | 6,706 |
| WISTER LAKE, OK | 1,885 | 1,885 |
| OREGON | | |
| APPLEGATE LAKE, OR | 669 | 669 |
| BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR | 256 | 256 |
| CHETCO RIVER, OR | --- | 518 |
| BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA | 8,807 | 8,807 |
| COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA | 19,768 | 19,768 |
| COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA | 17,791 | 17,791 |
| COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O | 614 | 614 |
| COOS BAY, OR | 5,796 | 6,533 |
| COQUILLE RIVER, OR | --- | 263 |
| COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR | 793 | 793 |
| COUGAR LAKE, OR | 1,037 | 1,037 |
| DEPOE BAY, OR | --- | 300 |
| DETROIT LAKE, OR | 627 | 627 |
| DORENA LAKE, OR | 599 | 599 |
| FALL CREEK LAKE, OR | 521 | 521 |
| FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR | 993 | 993 |
| GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR | 1,350 | 1,350 |
| HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR | 526 | 526 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR | 165 | 165 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA | 5,898 | 5,898 |
| LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR | 1,456 | 1,456 |
| LOST CREEK LAKE, OR | 2,805 | 2,805 |
| MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA | 5,678 | 5,678 |
| PORT ORFORD, OR | --- | 350 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR | 200 | 200 |
| ROGUE RIVER, GOLD BEACH, OR | --- | 350 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR | 62 | 62 |
| SIUSLAW RIVER, OR | --- | 250 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR | 134 | 134 |
| TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR | --- | 500 |
| UMPQUA RIVER, OR | --- | 450 |
| WILLAMETTE FALLS LOCKS, OR | --- | 420 |
| WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR | 60 | 60 |
| WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR | 723 | 723 |
| YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR | 2,182 | 2,182 |
| PENNSYLVANIA | | |
| ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA | 4,540 | 4,540 |
| ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA | 614 | 614 |
| AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA | 204 | 204 |
| BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA | 906 | 906 |
| BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA | 2,355 | 2,355 |
| CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA | 1,012 | 1,012 |
| COWANESQUE LAKE, PA | 2,010 | 2,010 |
| CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA | 1,210 | 1,210 |
| CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA | 716 | 716 |
| DELAWARE RIVER, FAIRLESS TURNING BASIN, BUCKS CO, PA | --- | 1,000 |
| EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA | 1,086 | 1,500 |
| ERIE HARBOR, PA | 70 | 70 |
| FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA | 758 | 758 |
| FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA | 617 | 617 |
| GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA | 231 | 231 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA | 4 | 4 |
| JOHNSTOWN, PA | 18 | 2,000 |
| KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA | 1,206 | 1,206 |
| LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA | 934 | 934 |
| MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA | 795 | 795 |
| MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA | 13,963 | 14,663 |
| OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV | 21,603 | 21,603 |
| OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV | 578 | 578 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA | 30 | 30 |
| PROMPTON LAKE, PA | 399 | 399 |
| PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA | 17 | 17 |
| RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA | 4,078 | 4,078 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA | 55 | 55 |
| SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA | 1,480 | 1,480 |
| SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA | 2,336 | 2,336 |
| STILLWATER LAKE, PA | 378 | 378 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA | 82 | 82 |
| TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA | 2,642 | 2,642 |
| TIONESTA LAKE, PA | 1,551 | 1,551 |
| UNION CITY LAKE, PA | 244 | 244 |
| WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA | 798 | 798 |
| YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA | 538 | 638 |
| PUERTO RICO | | |
| SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PR | 30 | 30 |
| RHODE ISLAND | | |
| BULLOCKS COVE, RI | --- | 500 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI | 10 | 10 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| PAWTUXET COVE, CRANSTON AND WARWICK, RI | --- | 800 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI | 414 | 414 |
| PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI | 9,000 | 8,000 |
| RHODE ISLAND REGION, LONG-TERM DREDGE DISPOSAL EVAL, R | 500 | 500 |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | | |
| ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC | --- | 2,500 |
| CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC | 14,052 | 14,052 |
| COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC | 3,315 | 3,315 |
| FOLLY RIVER, SC | --- | 450 |
| GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC | 1,988 | 1,988 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC | 30 | 30 |
| MURRELLS INLET, SC | --- | 56 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC | 349 | 349 |
| TOWN CREEK, SC | --- | 425 |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | | |
| BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD | 9,263 | 9,263 |
| COLD BROOK LAKE, SD | 308 | 308 |
| COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD | 215 | 215 |
| FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD | 9,749 | 9,749 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD | 17 | 17 |
| LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN | 512 | 512 |
| MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT | 350 | 350 |
| OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND | 13,580 | 13,580 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD | 49 | 49 |
| TENNESSEE | | |
| CENTER HILL LAKE, TN | 5,057 | 5,057 |
| CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN | 6,062 | 6,062 |
| CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN | 1,080 | 1,080 |
| CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN | 5,688 | 5,688 |
| DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN | 4,461 | 4,461 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN | 116 | 116 |
| J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN | 4,245 | 4,245 |
| OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN | 9,163 | 9,163 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN | 6 | 6 |
| TENNESSEE RIVER, TN | 15,210 | 17,000 |
| WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN | 19 | 19 |
| TEXAS | | |
| AQUILLA LAKE, TX | 644 | 644 |
| ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI | 1,185 | 1,185 |
| BARDWELL LAKE, TX | 1,621 | 1,621 |
| BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX | 2,785 | 2,785 |
| BELTON LAKE, TX | 2,712 | 2,712 |
| BENBROOK LAKE, TX | 2,481 | 2,481 |
| BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX | 2,875 | 2,875 |
| BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX | 1,835 | 1,835 |
| CANYON LAKE, TX | 2,732 | 2,732 |
| CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX | 7,945 | 7,945 |
| DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX | 7,715 | 7,715 |
| ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX | 5 | 5 |
| FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX | 2,635 | 2,635 |
| FREEPORT HARBOR, TX | 6,320 | 6,320 |
| GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX | 8,551 | 8,551 |
| GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX | 1,600 | 1,600 |
| GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX | 2,834 | 2,834 |
| GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX | 15,527 | 15,527 |
| HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX | 1,276 | 1,276 |
| HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX | 13,438 | 16,000 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX | 448 | 448 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX | 1,283 | 1,283 |
| JOE POOL LAKE, TX | 769 | 769 |
| LAKE KEMP, TX | 158 | 158 |
| LAVON LAKE, TX | 2,580 | 2,580 |
| LEWISVILLE DAM, TX | 3,832 | 3,832 |
| NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX | 1,603 | 1,603 |
| NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX | 1,724 | 1,724 |
| O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX | 813 | 813 |
| PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX | 724 | 724 |
| PROCTOR LAKE, TX | 1,701 | 1,701 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX | 50 | 50 |
| RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX | 1,061 | 1,061 |
| SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX | 10,985 | 10,985 |
| SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX | 4,291 | 4,291 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX | 129 | 129 |
| SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX | 2,600 | 2,600 |
| STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX | 1,782 | 1,782 |
| TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX | 100 | 100 |
| TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX | 1,801 | 1,801 |
| WACO LAKE, TX | 2,291 | 3,291 |
| WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX | 1,295 | 1,295 |
| WHITNEY LAKE, TX | 4,516 | 4,516 |
| WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX | 2,672 | 2,672 |
| **UTAH** | | |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT | 76 | 76 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT | 393 | 393 |
| **VERMONT** | | |
| BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT | 789 | 789 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT | 42 | 42 |
| NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY | 50 | 50 |
| NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT | 659 | 659 |
| NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT | 849 | 849 |
| TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT | 759 | 759 |
| UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT | 602 | 602 |
| **VIRGINIA** | | |
| ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA | 1,934 | 1,934 |
| ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA | 435 | 435 |
| CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA | --- | 500 |
| GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA | 1,682 | 1,682 |
| HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM | 1,100 | 1,100 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA | 176 | 176 |
| JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA | 3,770 | 3,770 |
| JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC | 11,881 | 11,881 |
| JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA | 1,401 | 1,401 |
| LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA | 1,635 | 1,635 |
| NORFOLK HARBOR, VA | 8,678 | 8,678 |
| NORFOLK HARBOR, VA (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS | 190 | 190 |
| NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA | 347 | 347 |
| PHILPOTT LAKE, VA | 3,905 | 3,905 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA | 760 | 760 |
| **WASHINGTON** | | |
| CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA | 839 | 839 |
| EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA | 1,589 | 1,589 |
| GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA | 8,215 | 9,215 |
| HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA | 4,166 | 4,166 |
| ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA | 6,022 | 6,022 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA | 303 | 303 |
| LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA | 6,480 | 6,480 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA | 1,607 | 1,607 |
| LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA | 2,931 | 2,931 |
| LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA | 2,337 | 2,337 |
| MILL CREEK LAKE, WA | 1,763 | 1,763 |
| MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA | 272 | 272 |
| MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA | 2,705 | 4,005 |
| NEAH BAY, WA | 128 | 128 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA | 343 | 343 |
| PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA | 1,003 | 1,003 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA | 490 | 490 |
| SEATTLE HARBOR, WA | 1,152 | 1,152 |
| STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA | 262 | 262 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA | 64 | 64 |
| SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA | 510 | 510 |
| TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA | 118 | 118 |
| THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR | 3,138 | 3,407 |
| WATERWAY CONNECTING PORT TOWNSEND AND OAK BAY, WA | 221 | 221 |
| WEST VIRGINIA | | |
| BEECH FORK LAKE, WV | 1,062 | 1,062 |
| BLUESTONE LAKE, WV | 1,047 | 1,047 |
| BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV | 1,531 | 1,531 |
| EAST LYNN LAKE, WV | 1,672 | 1,672 |
| ELKINS, WV | 18 | 18 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV | 80 | 80 |
| KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV | 7,454 | 7,454 |
| OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH | 26,269 | 26,269 |
| OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH | 2,494 | 2,494 |
| R D BAILEY LAKE, WV | 1,416 | 1,416 |
| STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV | 859 | 859 |
| SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV | 1,587 | 1,587 |
| SUTTON LAKE, WV | 1,685 | 1,685 |
| TYGART LAKE, WV | 3,809 | 3,809 |
| YOUGHIOGHENY LAKE, WV | --- | 1,753 |
| WISCONSIN | | |
| CORNUCOPIA HARBOR, WI | --- | 120 |
| EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI | 722 | 722 |
| FOX RIVER, WI | 1,776 | 1,776 |
| GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI | 3,585 | 3,585 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI | 38 | 38 |
| KENOSHA HARBOR, WI | 190 | 190 |
| KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI | 95 | 95 |
| MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI | 72 | 72 |
| MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI | 768 | 768 |
| PORT WING HARBOR, WI | --- | 130 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI | 61 | 61 |
| SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI | 2,450 | 2,450 |
| STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI | 1,324 | 1,324 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI | 472 | 472 |
| TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI | 15 | 15 |
| WYOMING | | |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY | 11 | 11 |
| JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY | 1,281 | 1,281 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY | 86 | 86 |
| MISCELLANEOUS | | |
| AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH | 653 | 4,000 |
| AUTOMATED BUDGET SYSTEM (ABS) | 250 | 250 |
| COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM | 2,475 | 2,875 |
| CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION) | 1,391 | 1,391 |

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|---|---|
| DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM | 1,062 | 1,062 |
| DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER) | 6,080 | 6,080 |
| DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM | 1,391 | 1,545 |
| EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM | 270 | 270 |
| RESERVE FOR KEY EMERGENCY MAINTENANCE/REPAIRS | 35,000 | --- |
| FACILITY PROTECTION | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS | 900 | 1,000 |
| HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION | 608 | 608 |
| INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS | 3,708 | 3,708 |
| MONITORING OF COMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS | 1,575 | 1,575 |
| NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM | 250 | 250 |
| NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM | 31 | 31 |
| NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP) | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| NATIONAL LEWIS AND CLARK COMMEMORATION COORDINATOR | 319 | 319 |
| PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM | 734 | 734 |
| PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SEC 3) | 45 | 45 |
| RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM (RMSP) | 1,600 | 1,600 |
| REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM | 1,391 | 1,591 |
| RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION | 608 | 608 |
| REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS | 450 | 450 |
| WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) | 653 | 653 |
| WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS | 4,271 | 4,271 |
| REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE | -12,325 | -24,037 |
| TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE | 1,926,000 | 1,982,000 |

*Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama.*—On the Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama, project, the Committee recommends an additional $700,000 to complete bankhead gate installation.

*Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California.*—The Committee urges that the Corps of Engineers remove all debris dumped by the Corps into the Hansen Dam Lower Lakes in 2003 and undertake all appropriate mitigation.

*Delaware River, Philadelphia to the Sea, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware.*—The Committee recommends an additional $500,000 for bank stabilization action for the preservation of historic structures on Pea Patch Island.

*Stockton Lake, Missouri.*—The bill provides an additional $340,000 for continued investigations of the pre-historic Big Eddy archaeological site at Stockton Lake, Missouri. The Committee is not unmindful of the need to replace the administration building, but needs additional information about the planned structure before appropriating funds for it.

*Illinois Waterway (MVR portion), Illinois and Indiana.*—The Committee recommends $33,643,00 for operation and maintenance of the Rock Island District portion of the Illinois Waterway, Illinois and Indiana, including $370,000 for the Sangamon River (Beardstown) Sediment Trap. The Committee directs that, within available funds, $100,000 under the Illinois Waterway Operation and Maintenance, General to continue reporting activities associated with Lucas Berg Pit, Worth, Illinois, which is part of the Illinois Waterway (MVR Portion), Illinois and Indiana project.

*Kaskaskia River Navigation, Illinois.*—The Committee commends the Corps of Engineers for shifting its project evaluation to a watershed approach. The Committee believes that the consensus building among partners and stakeholders and interagency cooperation between Federal, State, and Local government that results from a watershed approach will produce overall cost savings without sacrificing service or safety; economic development that is built and operated in a sustainable manner; and improved environmental quality within watersheds. The Kaskaskia River, Illinois, watershed, cited in the Corps of Engineers Civil Works Strategic Plan, March 2004, is an outstanding example of this concept. The Committee notes the dramatic underfunding of this project by the Administration, and recommends additional funding. The Committee directs the Corps to continue in this direction and to develop watershed performance measures that will provide measurable results of such initiatives and directs the Corps to submit to the Committees, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, a report that outlines these procedures.

*Burns Harbor, Indiana.*—The Committee directs the Corps to address issues related to the Bailey pumping station located at Burns Harbor, Indiana.

*Muskingum River Lakes, Ohio.*—The Committee has provided $8,276,000 for the operation and maintenance at all Muskingum River Lakes projects, including $500,000 to continue efforts to correct the seepage problem at Bolivar Dam, $500,000 for seepage study at Mohawk Dam; and $500,000 to analyze outlet tunnel deterioration at Atwood, Clendenning, Leesville, Piedmont, and Tappan

Lakes. The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 to enable the Corps of Engineers to initiate a comprehensive review, study and update of the lake, replacing paper files which are out of date and available to only a few decisionmakers with digital mapping, hydrographic surveys widely available in order to better manage the assets within the basin.

*Cape Cod Canal, Massachusetts.*—The Committee recommends an additional $2,030,000 for acquisition of a vessel identification system for the Cape Cod Canal, and to expedite the sandblasting and painting of the Bourne Highway Bridge.

*Clearwater Lake, Missouri.*—The Committee recommends $2,874,000 for Clearwater Lake Missouri, including $900,000 to complete a new Water Control Plan for this reservoir project.

*Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.*—The Committee recommends an additional $100,000 for mosquito control and prevention at Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.

*Whitney Lake, Texas.*—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to consider solutions to existing conditions in and around Ham Creek Park, and within available funds, to identify modernization possibilities in the vicinity of Kimble Bend Park.

*Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Washington, and Portland, Oregon.*—In the fiscal year 2004 appropriation, the Committee provided an additional $1,600,000 to complete the rehabilitation of the breakwater at the East Astoria Boat Basin. The Corps of Engineers now states that it needs an additional $1,200,000 to complete this work. Within the amount provided, $19,768,000, the Committee directs the Corps to complete this long-delayed project.

*Tennessee River, Tennessee.*—Within the funds provided for this project, the Committee recommends $500,000 for the removal of debris.

*Aquatic Nuisance Research Program.*—Within the funding provided for the Aquatic Nuisance Research Program, the Corps of Engineers is directed to undertake an aggressive program to determine the causes of, and to discover methods for the control or elimination of, the coastal phenomena known as "red tide". In pursuit of these goals, the Corps is urged to seek out and work with academic and industry experts already involved in similar study.

*Regional Sediment Management Demonstration Program.*—The Committee recommends an additional $200,000 for field investigation and related work on the Southeast Coast of Oahu, Hawaii.

## REGULATORY PROGRAM

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $139,174,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 150,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 140,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +826,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −10,000,000 |

This appropriation provides for salaries and related costs to administer laws pertaining to the regulation of navigable waters and wetlands of the United States in accordance with the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, the Clean Water Act of 1977, and the Marine Protection Act of 1972.

For fiscal year 2005, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $140,000,000, which is $10,000,000 less than the budget request and $826,000 more than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2004.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $139,174,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 140,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 190,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +50,826,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | +50,000,000 |

The Committee recommendation for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) is $190,000,000, an increase of $50,826,000 over the current fiscal year and $50,000,000 over the requested amount of $140,000,000. The Committee provides the additional $50,000,000 to expedite completion of ongoing FUSRAP projects and to address pending new FUSRAP projects.

Congress transferred FUSRAP from the Department of Energy (DOE) to the Army Corps of Engineers in fiscal year 1998. 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 FUSRAP sites where DOE had not completed cleanup. The Committee did not intend to transfer to the Corps ownership of and accountability for real property interests, which remain with DOE. The Committee expects DOE to continue to provide its institutional knowledge and expertise to serve the Nation and the affected communities to ensure the success of this program.

The Committee renews its guidance to the Corps to prepare a biannual report that provides a brief summary on the status of remediation efforts ongoing at all FUSRAP sites. Copies of this report should be made available to Congress, local stakeholders, and appropriate local, state, and Federal officials.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | ..... |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | $50,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | ..... |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | ..... |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −50,000,000 |

The Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies appropriation funds flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations, and repair of flood control and Federal hurricane or shore protection works. It also provides funds for emergency supplies of drinking water where the source has been contaminated, and, in drought distressed areas, provides for adequate supplies of water for human and livestock consumption.

For fiscal year 2005, the Committee has recommended no additional funding, which is $50,000,000 less than the budget request and the same as appropriated in fiscal year 2004.

Within available funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to begin pilot tests of systems alternative to sandbags, such as the Rapid Deployment Flood Wall. The Committee is aware that the

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Districts use Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and GIS applications as part of the technological tool kit for a broad range of business activities including emergency management. These include Corps support to FEMA during disasters as part of the Federal Response Plan and the Corps' Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies authority (P.L. 84–99). The Committee encourages the Corps to look at Rapid Environmental Decision Support Environment software to fill current technology gaps in GIS-based approaches with respect to fire, post-fire flooding, and landslide analysis.

## GENERAL EXPENSES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $159,056,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 167,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 167,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +7,944,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommendation for General Expenses is $167,000,000, the same as the budget request and $7,944,000 above the fiscal year 2004 amount.

The recommendation also includes bill language prohibiting the use of funds to support a congressional affairs office within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers. This language has been included in Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act since fiscal year 2000.

The Committee is aware of the many efforts which the Corps of Engineers is making to improve its management structure and toolset, and commends this desire to continue to improve its performance. These include reorganization initiatives, primarily USACE 2012, and massive supporting software systems like P2 and FEM. In order to realize the greatest degree of synergy possible out of these efforts, the Committee urges the Corps to consider adding a data visualization component to its software suite.

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

The Committee recommendation includes $2,600,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) in fiscal year 2005. This office has previously been funded under the defense appropriation for Operation and Maintenance, Army.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

### CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Section 101. The Committee includes language proposed by the Administration that places a limit on credits and reimbursements allowable per project and annually for all projects. The Administration also proposed that this provision be made permanent law; however, the Committee has elected not to make that change.

Section 102. The Committee includes language prohibiting the expenditure of funds related to a proposed landfill in Tuscarawas County, Ohio.

Section 103. The Committee includes language prohibiting the transfer of Civil Works missions, functions, or responsibilities to other government agencies without specific direction by Congress.

Section 104. The Committee includes language prohibiting the expenditure of funds related to a proposed landfill in Stark County, Ohio.

Section 105. The Committee includes language regarding the level of protection and the cost share for the flood detention basin for the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico.

Section 106. The Committee includes language amending the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 extending the date by which the Secretary may accept funding contributed by non-Federal interests to expedite the evaluation of permits.

Section 107. The Committee includes language, included in the fiscal year 2004 conference report, directing the Secretary to complete the General Reevaluation Report for the Mill Creek, Ohio, project at 100 percent Federal cost.

Section 108. The Committee includes language addressing the non-Federal share of the environmental dredging project at Ashtabula River, Ohio.

Section 109. The Committee includes language directing the Secretary to design the Central Riverfront Park project on the Ohio Riverfront in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Section 110. The Committee includes language restricting use of the Revolving Fund for performance of certain proposed expenditures on specific Corps of Engineers dredges.

# TITLE II

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

#### CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $37,965,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 48,009,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 48,009,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +10,044,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Central Utah Project Completion Act (Titles II–VI of P.L. 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, and 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.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2005 to carry out the provisions of the Act is $48,009,000, the same as the budget request and $10,044,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2004. The Committee recommendation includes the requested amount of $15,469,000, an increase of $6,102,000 over fiscal year 2004 funding, for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission.

### BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The funds provided in this bill for the Bureau of Reclamation include the following accounts: Water and Related Resources, the Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program, the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, California Bay-Delta Restoration, and Policy and Administration. The Committee recommendation provides a total of $968,153,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation in fiscal year 2005, an increase of $25,477,000 over fiscal year 2004 and $45,829,000 over the request.

## WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $852,439,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 794,476,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 855,305,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +2,866,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | +60,829,000 |

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

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST RES. MGMT. | REQUEST FAC. OM&R | RECOMMENDED RES. MGMT. | RECOMMENDED FAC. OM&R |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES | | | | |
| ARIZONA | | | | |
| AK CHIN INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT.... | --- | 6,893 | --- | 6,893 |
| CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER BASIN..... | 33,993 | 94 | 33,993 | 94 |
| COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM..... | 3,647 | --- | 4,347 | --- |
| FORT MCDOWELL SETTLEMENT ACT..... | 712 | --- | 712 | --- |
| NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM..... | 460 | --- | 460 | --- |
| PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE PROJECT | --- | --- | 250 | --- |
| SALT RIVER PROJECT..... | 498 | --- | 498 | --- |
| SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT.. | 5,078 | --- | 5,078 | --- |
| SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM..... | 870 | --- | 1,380 | --- |
| TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION..... | 400 | --- | 400 | --- |
| YUMA AREA PROJECTS..... | 1,560 | 20,666 | 1,560 | 20,666 |
| CALIFORNIA | | | | |
| CACHUMA PROJECT..... | 939 | 822 | 939 | 822 |
| CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMS..... | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJECT.. | 1,000 | --- | 1,000 | --- |
| CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT: | | | | |
| AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION..... | 1,867 | 7,499 | 4,867 | 7,499 |
| AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT..... | 6,397 | 125 | 6,397 | 125 |
| DELTA DIVISION..... | 7,262 | 6,372 | 8,762 | 6,372 |
| EAST SIDE DIVISION..... | 1,548 | 2,455 | 1,548 | 2,455 |
| FRIANT DIVISION..... | 1,955 | 3,970 | 3,955 | 3,970 |
| MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS..... | 13,324 | 1,210 | 19,287 | 1,210 |
| REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, & EXTRAORDINARY MAINT.... | --- | 23,200 | --- | 23,200 |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION..... | 3,337 | 1,689 | 5,337 | 1,689 |
| SAN FELIPE DIVISION..... | 969 | --- | 969 | --- |
| SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION..... | 295 | --- | 295 | --- |
| SHASTA DIVISION..... | 1,110 | 7,171 | 1,110 | 7,171 |
| TRINITY RIVER DIVISION..... | 6,641 | 3,100 | 6,641 | 3,100 |
| WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS..... | 1,900 | 9,724 | 1,900 | 9,724 |
| WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT..... | 41,484 | 7,766 | 8,484 | 7,766 |
| YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION..... | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT... | 1,000 | --- | 1,000 | --- |
| LONG BEACH DESALINATION PROJECT..... | --- | --- | 1,500 | --- |
| NAPA -SONOMA MARIN AGRICULTURE REUSE PROJECT..... | --- | --- | 250 | --- |
| NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT... | 2,000 | --- | 3,000 | --- |
| ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WTR RECLAMATION PROJECT, PHS 1. | 2,000 | --- | 3,000 | --- |
| ORLAND PROJECT..... | 40 | 547 | 40 | 547 |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVERSION STUDY, CA..... | --- | --- | 1,000 | --- |
| SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT..... | 1,000 | --- | 3,500 | --- |
| SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM..... | 3,500 | --- | 3,500 | --- |
| SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT..... | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION PROJECT..... | --- | --- | 9,000 | --- |
| SANTA MARGARITA RIVER CONJUNCTIVE USE PROJECT..... | --- | --- | 500 | --- |
| SOLANO PROJECT..... | 1,576 | 2,677 | 1,576 | 2,677 |
| SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM..... | 740 | --- | 1,240 | --- |
| VENTURA RIVER PROJECT..... | 524 | --- | 524 | --- |
| WATSONVILLE AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT..... | --- | --- | 1,000 | --- |
| COLORADO | | | | |
| ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP SECTIONS 5 & 8..... | 52,000 | --- | 52,000 | --- |
| COLLBRAN PROJECT..... | 184 | 1,159 | 184 | 1,159 |
| COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT..... | 627 | 10,334 | 627 | 10,334 |
| COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM..... | 65 | --- | 65 | --- |
| GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II..... | 189 | 527 | 189 | 527 |
| PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II..... | 67 | 2,054 | 67 | 2,054 |
| FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT..... | 87 | 130 | 87 | 130 |
| FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT..... | 366 | 4,941 | 366 | 4,941 |
| LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY..... | 592 | 2,179 | 592 | 2,179 |

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST RES. MGMT. | REQUEST FAC. OM&R | RECOMMENDED RES. MGMT. | RECOMMENDED FAC. OM&R |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| MANCOS PROJECT | 133 | 99 | 133 | 99 |
| PINE RIVER PROJECT | 31 | 111 | 31 | 111 |
| SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT | 279 | 4,771 | 279 | 4,771 |
| UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT | 202 | 153 | 202 | 153 |
| IDAHO | | | | |
| BOISE AREA PROJECTS | 2,717 | 2,810 | 2,717 | 2,810 |
| COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT | 17,500 | --- | 17,500 | --- |
| IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 750 | --- | 750 | --- |
| MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS | 3,355 | 2,122 | 3,355 | 2,122 |
| MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT PROJECT | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| KANSAS | | | | |
| KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| WICHITA PROJECT | 250 | 328 | 250 | 328 |
| MONTANA | | | | |
| FORT PECK DRY PRAIRIES RURAL WATER SYSTEM | --- | --- | 4,000 | --- |
| HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT | --- | 521 | --- | 521 |
| HUNTLEY PROJECT | 28 | 120 | 28 | 120 |
| MILK RIVER PROJECT | 508 | 839 | 508 | 839 |
| MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS | 519 | --- | 519 | --- |
| NORTH DAKOTA | | | | |
| DAKOTAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 230 | --- | 230 | --- |
| DAKOTAS TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 191 | --- | 191 | --- |
| PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM, GARRISON DIVERSION | 18,659 | 3,414 | 18,659 | 3,414 |
| NEBRASKA | | | | |
| MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT | 12 | 91 | 12 | 91 |
| NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 85 | --- | 85 | --- |
| NEW MEXICO | | | | |
| CARLSBAD PROJECT | 907 | 994 | 907 | 994 |
| MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT | 7,199 | 10,801 | 7,199 | 10,801 |
| NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT | --- | 31 | --- | 127 |
| RIO GRANDE PROJECT | 909 | 3,314 | 909 | 3,314 |
| SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 188 | --- | 188 | --- |
| SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 238 | --- | 238 | --- |
| TUCUMCARI PROJECT | --- | 13 | --- | 13 |
| NEVADA | | | | |
| HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY | 150 | --- | 150 | --- |
| LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT (HUMBOLT, NEWLANDS, WASHOE) | 6,475 | 1,844 | 6,475 | 1,844 |
| LAKE MEAD /LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM | 1,450 | --- | 2,044 | --- |
| OKLAHOMA | | | | |
| ARBUCKLE PROJECT | 13 | 168 | 13 | 168 |
| MCGEE CREEK PROJECT | 26 | 463 | 26 | 463 |
| MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT | 13 | 331 | 13 | 331 |
| NORMAN PROJECT | 13 | 303 | 13 | 303 |
| OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 190 | --- | 690 | --- |
| W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT | 150 | 387 | 150 | 387 |
| WASHITA BASIN PROJECT | 13 | 1,053 | 13 | 1,053 |

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST RES. MGMT. | REQUEST FAC. OM&R | RECOMMENDED RES. MGMT. | RECOMMENDED FAC. OM&R |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **OREGON** | | | | |
| CROOKED RIVER PROJECT | 373 | 388 | 373 | 388 |
| DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT | --- | --- | 1,000 | --- |
| DESCHUTES PROJECT | 448 | 143 | 448 | 143 |
| EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS | 818 | 354 | 818 | 354 |
| KLAMATH PROJECT | 24,191 | 809 | 28,191 | 809 |
| OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 655 | --- | 655 | --- |
| ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION | 820 | 181 | 820 | 181 |
| SAVAGE RAPIDS DAM REMOVAL | 2,000 | --- | 2,400 | --- |
| TUALATIN PROJECT | 222 | 118 | 222 | 118 |
| UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| UMATILLA PROJECT | 816 | 2,259 | 816 | 2,259 |
| **SOUTH DAKOTA** | | | | |
| LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM | 17,500 | --- | 17,500 | --- |
| MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT | 17,000 | 15 | 17,000 | 15 |
| MNI WICONI PROJECT | 18,246 | 6,254 | 18,246 | 6,254 |
| PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER SALVAGE PROJECT | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM | --- | 16 | --- | 16 |
| **TEXAS** | | | | |
| CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT | --- | --- | 63 | 173 |
| EL PASO WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE | 63 | 117 | 263 | 117 |
| LOWER RIO GRANDE VALEY WATER RESOURCES | 50 | --- | 2,500 | --- |
| NUECES RIVER | 31 | 609 | 31 | 609 |
| SAN ANGELO PROJECT | 63 | 333 | 63 | 333 |
| SUN RIVER PROJECT | --- | 204 | --- | 204 |
| TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 208 | --- | 208 | --- |
| **UTAH** | | | | |
| HYRUM PROJECT | 152 | 26 | 152 | 26 |
| MOON LAKE PROJECT | 26 | 22 | 26 | 22 |
| NEWTON PROJECT | 62 | 19 | 62 | 19 |
| NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 220 | --- | 220 | --- |
| OGDEN RIVER PROJECT | 314 | 27 | 314 | 27 |
| PARK CITY FEASIBILITY STUDY | --- | --- | 500 | --- |
| PROVO RIVER PROJECT | 883 | 314 | 883 | 314 |
| PROVO RIVER PROJECT, DEER CREEK DAM | --- | 4,150 | --- | 4,150 |
| SCOFIELD PROJECT | 109 | 22 | 109 | 22 |
| SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 133 | --- | 133 | --- |
| STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT | 194 | 7 | 194 | 7 |
| WEBER BASIN PROJECT | 1,808 | 379 | 1,808 | 379 |
| WEBER BASIN PROJECT, PINEVIEW PROJECT | --- | 1,375 | --- | 1,375 |
| WEBER RIVER PROJECT | 103 | 75 | 103 | 75 |
| **WASHINGTON** | | | | |
| COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT | 3,991 | 11,277 | 3,991 | 11,277 |
| MAKAH INDIAN COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY | --- | --- | 300 | --- |
| STORAGE DAM FISH PASSAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 470 | --- | 720 | --- |
| YAKIMA PROJECT | 1,948 | 7,107 | 1,948 | 7,107 |
| YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT | 9,190 | --- | 9,190 | --- |
| YAKIMA RIVER BASIN STORAGE STUDY | --- | --- | 1,500 | --- |
| **WYOMING** | | | | |
| KENDRICK PROJECT | 19 | 3,774 | 19 | 3,774 |
| NORTH PLATTE PROJECT | 25 | 1,686 | 25 | 1,686 |
| SHOSHONE PROJECT | 20 | 1,354 | 20 | 1,354 |
| WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM | 40 | --- | 40 | --- |

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | REQUEST RES. MGMT. | REQUEST FAC. OM&R | RECOMMENDED RES. MGMT. | RECOMMENDED FAC. OM&R |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| VARIOUS | | | | |
| COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PRJCT, TITLE I.. | 781 | 9,988 | 781 | 10,469 |
| COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PRJCT, TITLE II. | 9,064 | --- | 9,064 | --- |
| COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, (CRSP), SECTION 5..... | 8,514 | 3,333 | 8,514 | 3,333 |
| COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8..... | 1,995 | --- | 1,995 | --- |
| COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM..... | 450 | --- | 450 | --- |
| DAM SAFETY PROGRAM: | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM..... | --- | 1,700 | --- | 1,700 |
| INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION..... | --- | 38,253 | --- | 38,253 |
| SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS..... | --- | 18,000 | --- | 18,000 |
| SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES..... | --- | 500 | --- | 500 |
| DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE..... | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM..... | 1,798 | --- | 1,798 | --- |
| EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM..... | --- | 451 | --- | 451 |
| ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION..... | 12,464 | --- | 12,464 | --- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES... | 1,557 | --- | 1,557 | --- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION..... | 883 | --- | 883 | --- |
| EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES..... | --- | 5,920 | --- | 5,920 |
| FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM..... | --- | 1,575 | --- | 1,575 |
| GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES..... | 1,931 | --- | 1,931 | --- |
| LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM..... | 8,631 | --- | 8,631 | --- |
| LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM..... | 564 | --- | 564 | --- |
| LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM..... | 15,322 | --- | 15,322 | --- |
| MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS..... | --- | 626 | --- | 626 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM..... | 7,720 | --- | 7,720 | --- |
| NATURAL RESOURCES DAMAGE ASSESSMENT..... | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING..... | 1,699 | --- | 1,699 | --- |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT..... | 156 | 1,031 | 156 | 1,031 |
| PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM, OTHER PROJECTS..... | 3,589 | 36,019 | 3,589 | 36,019 |
| POWER PROGRAM SERVICES..... | 802 | 226 | 802 | 226 |
| PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM..... | 603 | --- | 603 | --- |
| RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION..... | 4,144 | --- | 4,144 | --- |
| RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT..... | 300 | --- | 300 | --- |
| RECREATION AND FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION. | 1,743 | --- | 1,743 | --- |
| SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM: | | | | |
| IMPROVING WATER & POWER INFRASTRUCTURE RELIABILITY | 2,000 | --- | 2,000 | --- |
| IMPROVING WATER DELIVERY RELIABILITY..... | 4,184 | --- | 4,184 | --- |
| IMPROVING WATER SUPPLY TECHNOLOGIES..... | 1,800 | --- | 1,800 | --- |
| IMPROVING WATER OPERATIONS DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS. | 1,450 | --- | 1,450 | --- |
| APPLIED SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT..... | --- | --- | 1,000 | --- |
| DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM..... | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| SITE SECURITY..... | --- | 43,216 | --- | 43,216 |
| SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION..... | 290 | --- | 290 | --- |
| TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES..... | 2,071 | --- | 2,071 | --- |
| TITLE XVI, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM..... | 1,530 | --- | 2,655 | --- |
| UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES - TECHNICAL SUPPORT | 78 | --- | 78 | --- |
| WATER MANAGEMENT & CONSERVATION PROGRAM..... | 5,580 | --- | 5,580 | --- |
| WATER 2025..... | 20,000 | --- | 20,000 | --- |
| WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT..... | --- | --- | 1,000 | --- |
| UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIP DELAYS..... | -36,601 | --- | -30,577 | --- |
| TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES..... | 461,839 | 366,637 | 487,918 | 367,387 |

*Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title I, Arizona.*—The Committee recommends additional funds for the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title I, and urges that, within the funds provided, sufficient funding be dedicated to the Yuma desalting plant so that one-third operational capacity may be achieved by the end of calendar year 2006.

*South/Central Arizona Investigations Program, Arizona.*—The Committee recommends $1,380,000 for the South/Central Arizona Investigations Program, including $200,000 for the West Salt River Water Management Study, an additional $60,000 for the Central Arizona Salinity Study, and $250,000 to continue the Sierra Vista Subwatershed Study, also known as the Upper San Pedro Watershed Study.

*Colorado River Front Work and Levee System, Arizona and California.*—The Committee recommends an additional $700,000 to continue planning and design of regulating reservoirs near the All-American Canal.

*Central Valley Project, American River Division, California.*—Within the funds provided for the Central Valley Project, American River Division, $3,000,000 is for the continuation of the design for the El Dorado Irrigation District temperature control device at Folsom Dam and Reservoir, California.

*Central Valley Project, Auburn/Folsom South Unit, California.*—The Committee is aware that, when the Bureau of Reclamation closed the road on Folsom Dam to public traffic in February 2003, it did so out of a genuine concern for public security and safety. However, many responsible people in the community, in the Congress, and elsewhere believe this closure, with its attendant impact on the commuters and businesses of the region, was precipitous and unwise. The Committee is also aware that the Bureau is exploring the possibility of a limited re-opening of the Dam Road, and urges that this be given the highest possible priority and accomplished at the earliest possible date, if it may be done within acceptable limits when all risk factors are considered.

*Central Valley Project, Delta Division, California.*—The Committee recommends an additional $1,000,000 to continue work on the Delta Mendota Canal-California Aqueduct Intertie project, and an additional $500,000 for Reclamation to continue participation in planning and study activities associated with enlarging Los Vaqueros reservoir.

*Central Valley Project, Friant Division, California.*—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Upper San Joaquin River Basin storage investigation.

*Central Valley Project, Sacramento Division, California.*—Congress has provided a total of $1,100,000 over the past three fiscal years for the implementation of the Colusa Basin Integrated Resources Management Plan, and the Committee is disturbed at reports alleging that the Bureau has allocated less than half that amount to the program. The Committee directs the Bureau to continue project-level implementation of the Colusa Basin plan in fiscal year 2005. Within the amount made available for the Sacramento River Division, the Committee recommends an additional

$2,000,000 to reimburse the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District for costs associated with the fish passage improvement project.

*Sacramento River Diversion Study, California.*—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for continuation of the Sacramento River Diversion Study by the Placer County Water Agency, pursuant to Public Law 106–554.

*Central Valley Project, West San Joaquin Division, California.*—The Committee recommendation does not provide the funds requested for payment of settlement costs in the case of *Sumner Peck Ranch* v. *Bureau of Reclamation*. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $1,000,000 for implementation of the Westside Regional Drainage Plan, which includes the Grassland Area Regional Drainage Plan.

*Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs, California.*—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $163,000 to complete the Kaweah River Delta Corridor Enhancement study, an additional $300,000 for the Mokelumne River Regional Water Storage and Conjunctive Use Appraisal, and an additional $500,000 for work with the California Agricultural Water Management Council. The Committee also includes an additional $5,000,000 for the continuation of work on the Natomas Mutual Water Company, Reclamation District 108, and Sutter Mutual Water Company fish screen projects.

*Southern California Investigations Program, California.*—The Committee recommends $1,240,000 for the Southern California Investigations Program, including an additional $500,000 for the Los Angeles Basin Watershed Water Supply Augmentation study.

*Salton Sea Research Project, California.*—The Committee recommends $3,500,000 for the Salton Sea Research Project, including $2,000,000 to continue environmental restoration efforts at the New and Alamo Rivers, and for other authorized pilot projects.

*Equus Beds Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Project, Kansas.*—The Committee is aware that the pilot program for the Equus Beds project is complete. The Committee strongly urges the Bureau of Reclamation to work with the impacted communities and the State of Kansas on design and engineering of the full-scale project.

*Oklahoma Investigations Program, Oklahoma.*—The Committee recommends an additional $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue studying ways to improve management of the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer.

*Klamath Project, Oregon and California.*—The Committee recommends an additional $4,000,000 for the Klamath Project water bank program within available funds, the Committee includes $1,000,000 for water quality multi-probe and flow measurement instrumentation.

*Washington Investigations Program, Washington.*—The Committee recommendation provides an additional $250,000 for appraisal of the Odessa Subaquifer.

*Yakima River Basin Storage Study, Washington.*—The Committee recommends $1,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue work on the feasibility study of options for additional water storage in the Yakima River Basin.

*Science and Technology Program.*—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue

its successful alliance with the International Center for Water Resources Management at Central State University in Ohio, the Ohio View Consortium, and Colorado State University, for the development of advanced remote sensing technologies for use in operational decisions to deal with the current drought conditions, and to develop optimal strategies for managing water resources to deal with future constraining events. The Committee is aware of the serious water shortage issues in Central Texas. There is significant potential to address these issues if salinity problems in the Lake Whitney watershed could be ameliorated. The Bureau is encouraged to work with local and State officials as well as researchers at Baylor University to address this problem.

*Title XVI, Water Reclamation and Reuse Program.*—The Committee recommends $2,655,000 for the Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program. Within the amount made available, $1,000,000 is to continue support to the WateReuse Foundation's research program and $125,000 is provided for the Bureau to work with the Mission Springs, California, Water District to evaluate further the possibilities of using recycled water for groundwater recharge or other non-potable uses.

*Wetlands Development.*—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue work on the East Wetlands Restoration project in Yuma, Arizona.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $199,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |
| Recommended, 2005 | ..... |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | −199,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

Under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (43 U.S.C. 422a–422l), loans and/or grants may be made to non-Federal organizations for construction or rehabilitation and betterment of small water resource projects. As required by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, this account records the subsidy costs associated with the direct loans, as well as administrative expenses of this program.

Consistent with the budget request, the Committee provides no funds for the loan program in fiscal year 2005.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | ..... |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | $15,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | ..... |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | ..... |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −15,000,000 |

The purpose of the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration account is to fund the Federal share of ecosystem restoration and other activities being developed for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta by a State and Federal partnership (CALFED). Federal participation in this program was authorized in the California Bay-Delta Environmental and Water Security Act enacted in the fall of 1996. That Act authorized the appropriation of $143,300,000 for ecosystem restoration activities in each of fiscal

years 1998, 1999, and 2000. Attempts to reauthorize the program have thus far been unsuccessful. Accordingly, no funds were provided in this account for the CALFED effort in fiscal years 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004.

The Committee remains supportive of the efforts that have been taken in the State of California to develop this program, which will provide a safe, clean, and reliable water system for millions of people while improving the environment. However, for fiscal year 2005, the Committee has again recommended no funding in the absence of authorizing legislation for this multi-year, multi-billion dollar effort. Should this program be reauthorized, the Committee will reconsider funding as the bill moves through the appropriations process. Certain elements of the CALFED program which have prior authorizations are funded individually under the Water and Related Resources account.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $39,366,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 54,695,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 54,695,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +15,329,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Central Valley Project Restoration Fund was authorized in Title 34 of Public Law 102–575, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. 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 (e.g., 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.

For fiscal year 2005, the Committee recommends $54,695,000, the same as the budget request and $15,329,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2004. The Committee again includes language in the bill which provides that none of the funds made available from the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund may be used for the acquisition or leasing of water for in-stream purposes if the water is already committed to in-stream purposes by a court adopted decree or order.

The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to make available the $5,382,000 for the Anadromous Fish Screen Program to continue work on the American Basin Fish Screen and Habitat Improvement Project (Natomas Mutual Water Company) as well as the fish screen projects being undertaken by the Sutter Mutual Water Company and Reclamation District 108 provided under this heading in fiscal year 2003.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $55,197,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 58,153,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 58,153,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +2,956,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Policy and Administration account provides for the executive direction and management of all Reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, DC, and Denver, Colorado, and in the 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. For fiscal year 2005, the Committee recommends $58,153,000, the same as the budget request and $2,956,000 above the fiscal year 2004 amount.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Section. 201. The Committee has included language regarding the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson Reservoir in California. This language has been included in Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts for several years.

Section 202. The Committee has included language which prohibits the use of funds for any water acquisition or lease in the Middle Rio Grande or Carlsbad Projects in New Mexico unless the acquisition is in compliance with existing State law and administered under State priority allocation.

# TITLE III

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in Title III provide for Department of Energy (DOE) programs relating to: Energy Supply, Non-Defense Environmental Management (Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion, Non-Defense Environmental Services, and Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund), Science, Nuclear Waste Disposal, Departmental Administration, the Inspector General, the National Nuclear Security Administration (Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and Office of the Administrator), Defense Environmental Management (Defense Site Acceleration Completion, and Defense Environmental Services), Other Defense Activities, Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the Power Marketing Administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Budget constraints limited the Committee's ability to fully fund the Administration's budget request for the Department of Energy. In addition, the Committee made a number of adjustments to reflect specific Congressional interests and priorities. Total funding for the Department of Energy is $22,478,342,000, an increase of $510,913,000 over fiscal year 2004 and $669,491,000 less than the budget request.

### CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

The Committee renews the direction provided in House Report 108–212 requiring the Secretary to submit to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development a quarterly report on the status of all projects, reports, fund transfers, and other actions directed in this report and the conference report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005.

### BUDGET JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The fiscal year 2006 budget justifications submitted by the Department must include the following: (1) a section identifying the last year that authorizing legislation was provided by Congress for each program; (2) funding within each construction project data sheet for elimination of excess facilities at least equal to the square footage of the new facilities being requested; and (3) funding to eliminate excess facilities at least equal to the square footage of new facilities being constructed as general plant projects (GPP). The budget justifications must also include a statement that all appropriate project management requirements from DOE Order 413.3 will have been met at the time the budget justifications are sub-

mitted to Congress. The Committee understands that all such requirements may not be met, and need not be met, at the time the budget request is formulated. The Committee does expect, however, that these project management requirements will have been fulfilled at the time the fiscal year 2006 budget request is delivered to Congress.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY FUNDING

The rapid increase in security funding to address the revised Design Basis Threat (DBT) leads the Committee to conclude that the Department should continue to provide direct funding for safeguards and security costs by including a separate line item for these costs within the major programs. The Committee concurs with the Department that it is not appropriate at this time to shift to indirect funding of safeguards and security costs. Until these costs stabilize, it is important to maintain the control and visibility afforded by direct funding of these costs.

The Committee is aware that additional security funding is required to meet the revised DBT signed out by the Secretary in May 2003. However, based on the lack of information provided to date, the Committee has no confidence that the significant cost growth for safeguards and security activities is improving actual security in any measurable sense. The Committee is unaware of any DBT implementation guidance developed by the Department that would result in consistent and comparable cost estimates from the site contractors or security standards that might ensure some uniformity and cost control across the complex.

The Committee expects the Secretary to direct the program offices under the purview of the Under Secretary for Energy, Science, and Environment, and the Under Secretary for National Security to develop their safeguards and security budgets and implementation plans in a DOE-wide framework and under standard criteria and policy management and guidance issued by the Secretary through the Office of Security and Safety Performance. The Committee directs the Secretary to submit a report with the fiscal year 2006 budget request to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services outlining the Department's overall security strategy and how it will result in the revised DBT requirements being met by the end of fiscal year 2006.

FIVE-YEAR BUDGET PLANS

Certain offices within the Department have prepared strategic plans or facility plans that attempt to define program priorities for the coming years. The National Nuclear Security Administration has prepared the Future Years Nuclear Security Plan (FYNSP) and the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Plan (FIRP). The Office of Science recently completed its Twenty-Year Science Facility Plan and a Twenty-Year Strategic Plan. The Office of Environmental Management has detailed project management plans for each of its cleanup sites and has issued various complex-wide cleanup plans in the past.

The Committee believes strongly in the value of five-year plans to guide Administration budget requests and Congressional spending decisions, to force discipline in making budgetary decisions, and

to encourage some stability from year to year. In its recent report on project management at the Department, the National Research Council observed that "[p]erhaps the most important single point that the committee has stressed, and continues to stress, is the absolute need for DOE management to develop the strategic plans that define the need for capital improvement projects."

Departmental program offices face four competing priorities for funding: maintaining and operating existing facilities and research instruments, investing in new facilities and research instruments, paying for research and production work done at the DOE laboratories and plants, and funding research work done outside of the DOE complex. Making the difficult trade-offs between these competing priorities is not easy, but without a methodological approach to such trade-offs, a strategic or facility plan is a mere wish list unconstrained by fiscal realities and other competing demands. The Department needs to prepare a comprehensive department-wide five-year budget plan that will make explicit the choices made between competing priorities such as science research versus nuclear nonproliferation versus environmental cleanup. Preparation of such a comprehensive five-year plan will no doubt be challenging for the Department, but the challenge is not fundamentally different from that facing the Department of Defense (DoD), which regularly produces and updates its Future Year Defense Plan (FYDP) to reflect future resource requirements among the various Services in DoD.

Inherent in producing five-year budget plans for major programs and the entire Department is the need to define missions and activities, and therefore the future budget requirements, of the various laboratories. The large multi-program labs (i.e., Argonne, Brookhaven, Lawrence Berkeley, Lawrence Livermore, Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, and Pacific Northwest) have been very aggressive in pursuing a wide range of new missions and funding sources—first climate change, then genomics, then nanotechnology, now advanced computing and proteinomics. And these labs continue to jockey for position at the homeland security funding trough.

The Committee recognizes the vast pool of talent present in the labs, and the fact that such talent can be brought to bear on a wide range of problems facing the Nation. However, the Committee also believes that such talent requires more active guidance and supervision from the Headquarters program offices to be sure the labs are using DOE resources to tackle the right problems. In times of limited funding, the question can no longer be "What *can* the labs do?" but must instead be "What *should* the labs do?" Answering this latter question should not be left up to the contractors running the labs; it must be answered by the Federal managers in the Department. The five-year plans prepared by the major program offices, and the comprehensive five-year plan for the Department, should include business plans for each of these laboratories. These business plans should include a clear statement of the primary mission of each laboratory as such mission relates to each lab's lead program office(s), a clear statement of secondary missions to support other DOE program offices and other Federal agencies, and a five-year plan identifying the research, facilities, and resource requirements necessary to fulfill these primary and secondary missions.

Concurrent with the submission of the fiscal year 2006 budget request, the Department should submit to Congress budget quality five-year program plans for weapons activities program of the NNSA (i.e., the FYNSP), the Office of Science, and the Office of Environmental Management. Beginning with submission of the fiscal year 2007 budget request and every fiscal year thereafter, the Department should submit to Congress detailed five-year budget plans for all major program offices and a consolidated five-year budget plan for the entire Department. The Committee considers the preparation of these five-year program plans and the comprehensive five-year DOE plan to be a Federal function. The Department should consult with its contractors in developing its five-year plans, but the actual preparation of these plans is not to be contracted out; this work is to be done by Federal employees of the Department of Energy.

NON-NNSA WORK AT NNSA FACILITIES

Section 3213 of Public Law 106–65, as subsequently modified by Section 3157 of Public Law 106–398, imposes a statutory limitation on the individuals within the Department of Energy who can exercise authority, direction, and control over the officers, employees, and contractors of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The law specifies that NNSA officers, employees, and contractors are subject to the authority, direction, and control only of the Secretary of Energy acting through the NNSA Administrator, and the NNSA Administrator's designee within the NNSA. Although Section 3123 of Public Law 106–65 initially applied this constraint only to the functions of the NNSA, Section 3157 of Public Law 106–398 subsequently modified this to apply to all work executed by the elements of the NNSA.

The NNSA was officially established over four years ago on March 1, 2000. Since that time, this Committee has repeatedly expressed concerns about the propriety of non-NNSA program offices (e.g., Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Nuclear Energy, Science, and Technology, Science, Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, and Environmental Management) continuing to send non-NNSA program funding to NNSA elements, including the three nuclear weapons laboratories. Government program managers are responsible and accountable for ensuring their program funds are spent for the intended purpose, and they must exercise sufficient control over those funds to ensure that outcome. The plain language of the NNSA statute is very clear that NNSA officers, employees, and contractors are not subject to the authority, direction, and control of anyone in DOE other than the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the NNSA, or the Administrator's designee. Therefore, non-NNSA program offices are continuing to send significant program funding to NNSA laboratories that are, by statute, not subject to the authority, direction, or control of those non-NNSA offices. The NNSA statute does not allow NNSA employees or contractors to subject themselves voluntarily to the authority, direction, and control of non-NNSA program officials, nor does it allow the NNSA elements the option of waiving the statutory constraint for certain work.

The Committee is concerned that non-NNSA program offices continue to send significant funding from the Energy Supply, Science, and Defense Site Acceleration Completion accounts to the three NNSA nuclear weapons laboratories and continue to exercise "authority, direction, and control" over the weapons labs for the execution of this non-NNSA work. Both the sending non-NNSA program offices and the recipient NNSA laboratories are operating in the same manner as they did prior to the establishment of the NNSA. This practice places the Department in clear violation of the statutes. The statutes do not preclude such transfers from non-NNSA program offices to NNSA laboratories, but these provisions specify the chain of command that must be followed. Unfortunately, the Department has not bothered to put in place a new process that ensures compliance with these statutory constraints. The Department is fully aware of the constraint imposed by Sections 3213 and 3157 as demonstrated by its proposal to modify the statutory language as part of its legislative proposal to consolidate the counterintelligence office.

The Committee directs the Office of Science, the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, the Office of Electricity Transmission and Distribution, the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, and the Office of Environmental Management to suspend immediately any further funding transfers to elements of the NNSA until the Secretary establishes procedures that comply fully with the letter of the law established in Section 3213 of Public Law 106–65, as amended by Section 3157 of Public Law 106–398. It is the Committee's view that these statutory provisions require all taskings to the NNSA elements be routed through the Secretary and the Administrator of the NNSA to the recipient NNSA employees and contractors. The Committee does not agree with the Department's farcical interpretation that passing the work order from the non-NNSA program office through the NNSA site office or service center and then to the M&O contractor somehow satisfies the statutory requirements. The use of middlemen and pass-throughs does not relieve the Department of the responsibility of complying with the plain language of the law. With the exception of environmental cleanup, all of this work is optional and could be executed outside of the NNSA. The Committee directs the Department to place priority on establishing procedures to enable the Environmental Management work to continue uninterrupted at the NNSA laboratories, plants, and sites.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Committee continues to emphasize the importance of improving the project management culture within the Department. The Committee considers compliance, by all parts of the Department, with Project Management Order 413.3 to be essential. The Committee also expects that all elements of the Department, including the NNSA, will comply with the requirements of Project Management Manual 413.3–1 for capital asset acquisition. The Committee urges all elements of the Department, including the NNSA, to apply the project planning and management principles identified in the Manual in the management of the entire pro-

grammatic portfolio in addition to specific capital assets. As noted above, the Committee expects compliance with Project Management Order 413.3 requirements for all projects included in future budget submissions. When Congress directs funding for a new facility, the Department should deem the requirement for CD–0 (i.e., determination of mission need) has been met and should proceed forward from the CD–0 milestone and continue implementation of the project management process.

COST AND SCHEDULE BASELINES

The estimated cost for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (Project 01–D–416) at Hanford increased 33 percent, or $1.4 billion, in fiscal year 2003. Based on that increase, the Committee directed the Department to transfer funds to the Corps of Engineers to conduct an independent review of the cost and schedule baseline for this project. In addition to revealing the risk of significant future cost growth on this particular project, the completed Corps review identified several problems that are likely systemic with DOE's cost and schedule baselines: inadequate government estimating, inadequate government contract management, and inadequate contingency amounts.

The uncontrolled cost growth experienced at the Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant is apparent at other major projects such as the Tritium Extraction Facility, the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, the Elimination of Weapons Grade Plutonium Production (EWGPP) plants in Russia, and the Depleted Uranium Hexaflouride (DUF6) Conversion Project. The Committee has little confidence in the accuracy of the current cost and schedule baselines for these projects and even less confidence in the ability and motivation of DOE and its contractors to control these costs.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to notify, in writing, the House and Senate Appropriations Committee immediately when there is a projected increase of 10 percent or more in the total estimated cost (TEC) for all line-item construction projects with a TEC in excess of $20 million. The baseline for triggering this requirement is the TEC as presented in the fiscal year 2005 budget justification. The written notification shall be handled like a reprogramming request, and will require the Department to provide a detailed justification for the cost increase and identify funding sources to pay for the increased costs. The notification to Congress must include a copy of the government estimate for the cost increase, and a written statement confirming that the project's cost and schedule baseline (prior to the proposed cost increase) has been verified through a detailed External Independent Review.

In several instances (i.e., the depleted uranium hexaflouride conversion plants and the elimination of weapons grade plutonium production plants in Russia), the Committee directs the Department to use the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers expertise in cost engineering to conduct independent verifications of the cost and schedule baselines for these specific projects. For other projects over the $20 million threshold, the Committee encourages the Department to use the Corps, other qualified Federal agencies, or qualified independent contractors to conduct independent reviews of cost and schedule baselines.

In considering the cost growth in DOE projects, it is unclear that there are any consequences for DOE managers who provide erroneous estimates to Congress (i.e., estimates that are well below what an external and independent cost estimate would have stated). Unrealististically low estimates deprive the Secretary of Energy and the Congress of the opportunity to consider alternatives before contracts are let and major construction is begun. The Committee, therefore, directs that before any further construction projects in excess of $20 million are initiated, the Secretary establish a baseline cost and schedule estimate for the project and will establish consequences within the Department for DOE managers who significantly underestimate costs (i.e., by more than 15 percent) and report to Congress his action.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee continues to be concerned about the deterioration of the Department's facilities and the Department's inability to evaluate and address the readiness and maintenance status of its facilities. The National Nuclear Security Administration is to be commended for establishing its Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP) and maintaining management focus on this program. The Committee is concerned whether the Office of Science is paying sufficient attention to its facilities and infrastructure, given the precipitous decline in the budget request for Science Laboratories Infrastructure. The Committee is also concerned about the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, which, as the new landlord of the Idaho National Laboratory and the Idaho cleanup site, will have to pay much more attention to this issue than it has in the past. The five-year plans for each program and for the entire Department must provide a clear strategy for protecting the Federal investment in existing facilities and infrastructure throughout the DOE complex.

The Committee directs that funds provided for the disposal of excess facilities should be competed to the maximum extent practicable, so that contractors with experience in the efficient decontamination, decommissioning, and demolition of facilities have the opportunity to bid on this work. The Committee also directs that the costs of D&D for the facilities that are being replaced be included in the costs of all construction projects and identify such D&D costs clearly in the construction project data sheets.

SAFETY AT DOE FACILITIES

Improving safety at the Department's laboratories, sites, and plants continues to be one of this Committee's top priorities. In fiscal year 2003, this Committee directed a series of compliance audits to identify the backlog of safety deficiencies at the Department's non-defense Science laboratories; additional funding was provided in fiscal year 2004, and is provided again in fiscal year 2005, to correct these deficiencies. In the conference report for fiscal year 2004, the conferees directed the Department to submit an annual report, beginning in fiscal year 2005, on the backlog of safety-related deficiencies at NNSA and defense cleanup sites, and present an estimate and schedule for the corrective actions. The Committee directs the Department to budget explicitly for actions

to correct safety deficiencies throughout the DOE complex beginning with the fiscal year 2006 budget submission.

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (LDRD)

The Committee recognizes the value of conducting discretionary research at DOE's national laboratories. Such research provides valuable benefits to the Department and to other Federal agencies, and is useful for attracting and retaining scientific talent at the laboratories.

However, the Committee continues to have serious reservations about the financial execution of this program, specifically with how the Department's laboratories levy the LDRD "tax" on work being performed for other agencies (Work for Others). The Secretary is currently required to include in the annual LDRD report to Congress an affirmation that "all LDRD activities derived from funds of other agencies have been conducted in a manner . . . consistent with the Appropriations Acts that provided funds to those agencies." The Department has implemented this guidance by including boilerplate language into its standard project proposal and funding acceptance documents that it requires the funding WFO agencies to sign. According to a review conducted last year by this Committee's investigative staff, only a little more than half of the WFO customers indicated they could reliably certify that DOE's LDRD activities are consistent with the funding agencies' appropriations acts.

More troubling, a recent review by the General Accounting Office (GAO–04–489) reveals the lack of controls on LDRD work conducted for other agencies. In fiscal year 2003, the nine DOE laboratories that conduct LDRD (Argonne, Brookhaven, Idaho, Lawrence Berkeley, Lawrence Livermore, Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, Pacific Northwest, and Sandia) received total Federal funding of $7.656 billion, of which $356 million (or 4.5 percent) was for LDRD; research that is solely at the discretion of the laboratory directors and is outside of effective Federal control. Of this amount for LDRD, $293 million (or 84.4 percent) was funded from DOE sources and $54 million (or 15.6 percent) was funded from other agencies.

The GAO analysis of LDRD performed for other agencies revealed a bizarre rationale by DOE regarding how this WFO-related LDRD is actually funded. DOE claims that it is not actually "spending" the funds appropriated to other agencies when it conducts LDRD, and therefore is not bound by any statutory requirements attached to other agencies' appropriations. Instead, when DOE agrees to perform reimbursable work for another agency, it automatically levies its LDRD tax (up to 6 percent) as an overhead cost and initiates the LDRD work using its own DOE funds. Then, at the end of the reimbursable work, DOE reimburses its overhead accounts using the funds received from the other agencies.

The Committee does not support and does not provide funds for the Department to continue this practice. Specific statutory guidance is provided in the General Provisions at the end of this title. Beginning in fiscal year 2005, the Department may not use the funds appropriated in this bill to finance the cost of doing LDRD for other agencies. The other federal agencies are encouraged to

continue using the capabilities of DOE's national laboratories, on a reimbursable basis, to conduct specific work. When the other agencies desire less constrained research by the DOE labs to support those other agencies' mission, the other agencies are free to hire DOE for such assistance.

Beginning with the fiscal year 2006 budget submission, the Committee directs the Department to request direct funding for LDRD activities within each major appropriation in this bill (e.g., Energy Supply, Science, Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, etc.). The amount allocated to each laboratory shall be decided explicitly by the program managers at DOE Headquarters responsible for each major appropriation. Beginning in fiscal year 2006, laboratories, sites, plants, and other elements in the DOE complex will not be permitted to fund LDRD from any other funding source. Given the magnitude of LDRD work being performed annually, and the apparent lack of control by the DOE program offices over this research, the Committee insists on the visibility and control provided by direct-funded LDRD activities in the future.

SAVANNAH RIVER NATIONAL LABORATORY

On May 7, 2004, the Secretary of Energy declared, without any consultation with the Committees on Appropriations, that the existing Savannah River Technology Center would become the Savannah River National Laboratory. This Committee believes that the Department already has too many national laboratories, and that the Secretary has not lived up to his prior promise to make the Idaho National Laboratory into the Nation's centerpiece for nuclear energy research. The Department should be looking seriously at reducing the number of its national laboratories, not adding to the list. Therefore, no funds are provided in this bill for the Savannah River National Laboratory. Funds are provided within the various accounts, primarily Defense Site Acceleration Completion, Weapons Activities, and Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, to continue activities in fiscal year 2005 at the existing Savannah River Technology Center.

AUGMENTING FEDERAL STAFF

The Committee continues to believe there is too much reliance on support service contractors and other non-Federal employees throughout the Department of Energy, but particularly in the Department's Washington operations. The number of management and operating (M&O) contractor employees assigned to the Washington metropolitan area in fiscal year 2005 shall not exceed 220, the same as the fiscal year 2004 ceiling.

*Report on M&O contractor and subcontractor employees.*—The Department is to provide a report to the Committee at the end of fiscal year 2004 on the use of M&O employees and M&O subcontractors assigned to the Washington metropolitan area. The report is to identify all M&O employees who work in the Washington metropolitan area, including the name of the employee, the name of the contractor, the organization to which he or she is assigned, the job title and a description of the tasks the employee is performing, the annual cost of the employee to the Department, the Headquarters program organization sponsoring each M&O em-

ployee, the program account funding that employee, and the length of time the employee has been detailed to the Department or elsewhere in the Washington metropolitan area (e.g., the Congress, the Executive Office of the President, and other Federal agencies). The report should also include detailed information on the cost of maintaining each M&O office in the Washington metropolitan area. This report is to include actual data for the period October 1, 2003 through September 30, 2004, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2005.

*Report on support service contractors.*—The report is to include for each support service contract at Headquarters: the name of the contractor; the program organization (at the lowest organization level possible) hiring the contractor; a description and list of the tasks performed; the number of contractor employees working on the contract; and the annual cost of the contract. This report is to include actual data for the period October 1, 2003 through September 30, 2004, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2005.

*Inspector General review of M&O report.*—The Committee is concerned that recent M&O reports are not entirely accurate and fail to identify many M&O employees and M&O subcontractors who are assigned to the Washington metropolitan area. The Committee directs the Inspector General to review the fiscal year 2004 M&O report before it is submitted to the Committee.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The Committee requires the Department to inform the Committee promptly and fully when a change in program execution and funding is required during the fiscal year. To assist the Department in this effort, the following guidance is provided for programs and activities funded in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

*Definition.*—A reprogramming includes the reallocation of funds from one activity to another within an appropriation, or any significant departure from a program, project, or activity described in the agency's budget justification as presented to and approved by Congress. For construction projects, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project identified in the justifications to another project or a significant change in the scope of an approved project.

*Criteria for Reprogramming.*—A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises, and then only if delay of the project or the activity until the next appropriations year would result in a detrimental impact to an agency program or priority. Reprogrammings may also be considered if the Department can show that significant cost savings can accrue by increasing funding for an activity. Mere convenience or preference should not be factors for consideration.

Reprogrammings should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change program, project, or activity allocations specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require such changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee and be fully explained and justified.

*Reporting and Approval Procedures.*—The Committee has not provided statutory language to define reprogramming guidelines, but expects the Department to follow the spirit and the letter of the guidance provided in this report. Consistent with prior years, the Committee has not provided the Department with any internal reprogramming flexibility in fiscal year 2005, unless specifically identified in the House, Senate, or conference reports. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the Committees in writing by the Department's Chief Financial Officer and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee's recommendations for Department of Energy programs are described in the following sections. A detailed funding table is included at the end of this title.

ENERGY SUPPLY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $738,161,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 835,266,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 817,126,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +78,965,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −18,140,000 |

The Energy Supply account includes the following programs: Renewable Energy Resources; Nuclear Energy; Electricity Transmission and Distribution; and Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense). The Department's fiscal year 2005 proposal also includes contributions to Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, the new Office of Future Liabilities, and the Office of Legacy Management. The Committee recommends that the funds for Energy Supply activities remain available until expended.

The Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) should give top priority to full funding of grants, contracts and cooperative agreements selected through open competition and peer review. The Congress is aware that in fiscal year 2004, some of those receiving funds under the Superconductivity for Electric Power Systems program received significantly less than the agreed level of funding. Funding for such groups outside DOE, whose research proposals are competitively selected and peer reviewed, should be provided before this Office gives funds to DOE laboratories.

The Committee expects that the House and Senate will designate during conference certain Congressionally-directed projects within the various Energy Supply programs. These Congressionally-directed projects, as well as the projects and programs requested by the Department, are subject to the cost sharing requirements specified in the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (P.L. 102–486) and other relevant statutes.

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

The total Committee recommendation for renewable energy resources is $343,172,000, a decrease of $31,640,000 compared to the

budget request. This reduction is due primarily to the reduction in the Hydrogen Technology program.

The Committee supports the efforts by the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) and his staff to strengthen project management in EERE, and provides the requested funds in the Program Direction line to implement the EERE Project Management Center. The Committee also notes continued improvement in the presentation of metrics in the budget request to show the performance to date and potential future contributions of the various renewable energy technologies.

RENEWABLE ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

Renewable Energy Technologies include biomass and biorefinery systems R&D, geothermal technology, hydrogen technology, hydropower, solar energy, and wind energy.

*Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D.*—The Committee recommendation for integrated research and development on biomass and biorefinery systems is $72,596,000, the same as the budget request. Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research (CPBR).

*Geothermal Technology.*—The Committee provides $25,800,000 for geothermal technology development, the same as the budget request. The Department is directed to maintain funding for university research at the fiscal year 2004 funding level.

*Hydrogen Technology.*—The fiscal year 2005 budget request seeks $95,325,000 for hydrogen research, an increase of $17,785,000 or 23 percent over the fiscal year 2004 enacted level. In House Report 108–212 and again in the statement of managers accompanying the fiscal year 2004 conference report (House Report 108–357), this Committee reminded the Department of the competition and cost-sharing requirements specified in the Hydrogen Future Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–271) and directed the Department to compete the hydrogen research program to the fullest extent possible. Unlike most DOE research programs, the hydrogen technology research has a specific statutory authorization with specific conditions attached.

The Department blatantly ignored the Congressional direction contained in statute and report language regarding competition and cost sharing and announced in April 2004 the award of $150 million in new hydrogen storage research projects. Of this amount, approximately $120 million is dedicated to establishing three hydrogen storage "centers of excellence" that are led by DOE national laboratories. The so-called competition was restricted to DOE laboratories, each of which selected its other laboratory, industry, and academic partners without competition. None of these funds for the "centers or excellence" were awarded consistent with the Congressional view of competition; only the $30 million awarded to fifteen independent storage projects was awarded competitively. The Department was clearly determined to award the bulk of these hydrogen storage funds to its national laboratories without full and open competition and to persist in the fiction of "pre-competitive R&D" despite explicit Committee guidance to the contrary. Further, the $150 million of federal funding for hydrogen storage is to be

matched by only $20 million of private sector funding. The Hydrogen Future Act of 1996 directs the Secretary to require a commitment from non-Federal sources of at least 20 percent of the cost of proposed hydrogen research and development projects; the Secretary may reduce or eliminate the cost-sharing requirement if the Secretary determines that the research and development is of a basic or fundamental nature. However, the Department requested $21.4 million for basic research on hydrogen under the Basic Energy Sciences program within the Office of Science. It is this Committee's view that the hydrogen research conducted and funded by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy is applied research and is subject to the minimum cost sharing requirements established by the Hydrogen Future Act.

The Committee recommends $64,285,000 for hydrogen technology work by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy in fiscal year 2005, a reduction of $31,040,000 from the budget request. This reduction represents the proposed fiscal year 2005 funding for the DOE laboratories that was awarded without full and open competition and without any cost sharing. The reduction includes the proposed awards for the three hydrogen storage "centers of excellence" that were awarded to DOE laboratories, and their chosen industry and academic partners, without full and open competition. No funds are provided for the proposed $7 million effort on hydrogen education. The Committee continues to support hydrogen research and provides funds for the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science, and Technology and the Office of Science for hydrogen-related research, with the expectation that those offices understand the distinction between basic and applied research and understand the Committee's guidance regarding competition and cost sharing. The Committee directs the Department to submit its budget request for fiscal year 2006 with all basic research on hydrogen included within the Office of Science; all hydrogen-related research of an applied nature is to be funded within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy or the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology. The Committee expects the Department to comply with the spirit and the letter of the statutory cost-sharing requirements for applied research on hydrogen technologies, and to compete this work fully and openly. The awards to DOE laboratories, which this Committee views as non-competitive, are not funded under this fiscal year 2005 appropriation, and the Committee does not intend to fund such non-competitive awards in future fiscal years.

*Hydropower*.—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for hydropower research, $1,000,000 less than the budget request and essentially the same as provided in fiscal year 2004. As directed previously, the Department should focus its efforts on completing a limited program of testing and demonstration of new turbine technologies and then transfer these technologies to other Federal agencies and private sector firms for deployment. The proposed increase for advanced hydropower technology should be funded by the agencies that own and operate the Federal hydropower facilities, not by the Department of Energy.

*Solar Energy*.—Solar energy technologies include: photovoltaic energy systems; solar heating and lighting, and concentrating solar

power. These subprograms are combined into a single account for solar energy, and the control level for fiscal year 2005 continues at the solar energy program account level. The total Committee recommendation for solar energy in fiscal year 2005 is $82,733,000, an increase of $2,400,000 over the budget request. The Committee believes that the Department continues to underfund Concentrating Solar Power (CSP) technologies despite recent analyses documenting the potential of these technologies. The additional funds are provided to conduct CSP research at a level comparable to fiscal year 2004. The Committee directs Solar Heating and Lighting subprogram to be equally split between the Heating and Lighting research areas.

*Wind energy systems*.—The Committee recommends $41,600,000 for wind energy systems, the same as the budget request.

*Intergovernmental activities*.—The Committee recommends $17,000,000 for intergovernmental activities, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request. This amount includes $6,500,000 for the international renewable energy program, including $1,500,000 for the International Utility Electricity Partnership (IUEP), $5,500,000 for tribal energy, and $5,000,000 for the Renewable Energy Production Incentive (REPI).

DEPARTMENTAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation for Departmental Energy Management is $1,967,000, the same as the budget request.

NATIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE

The Committee recommendation provides no funds for the National Climate Change Technology Initiative (NCCTI), a reduction of $3,000,000 from the budget request. Given the plethora of other Department research that is related to climate change science and technology, the Committee does not see a need for this additional $3,000,000 for NCCTI.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommendation for renewable energy Facilities and Infrastructure is $11,480,000, the same as the budget request and a decrease of $1,642,000 compared to fiscal year 2004. This amount includes $4,800,000 for operations and maintenance of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) in Golden, Colorado, and $6,680,000 to continue construction of the new Science and Technology facility at NREL (project 02–E–001).

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation for program direction is $20,711,000, the same as the requested amount and an increase of $8,185,000 over fiscal year 2004. This increase includes the requested amounts to improve project management at the Golden Field Office and to provide analytical and technical support to the U.S. Climate Change Technology Program.

ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION

The Committee recommendation for Electricity Transmission and Distribution is $75,354,000, $15,526,000 less than the budget request and $6,537,000 less than fiscal year 2004. The Committee does not support the requested 176 percent increase for program direction, which was to support a doubling of Federal staff. Instead, the Committee recommends $4,400,000 for program direction activities, which funds program direction at the fiscal year 2004 level plus $700,000 for the 6 FTEs related to the Import/Export Authorization activity. Funding for the proposed GridWorks and GridWise initiatives is not provided in this account; these initiatives are funded instead under the Energy Assurance program within Other Defense Activities. Detailed allocations are shown on the attached table at the end of Title III. The Committee recommendation provides $775,000 for the Department to continue the Project Engineering and Design work for the Energy Reliability and Efficiency Laboratory (project 04–E–001) at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which was initiated in fiscal year 2004.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy programs under the Energy Supply appropriation is $339,470,000, an increase of $39,723,000 over the budget request and $40,481,000 over the current fiscal year. Of the total funding of $466,817,000 provided for Nuclear Energy programs and facilities, $124,347,000 represents costs allocated to the 050 budget function (i.e., defense activities); these defense-related costs, which include $3,003,000 representing the security charges for reimbursable work, are funded under the Other Defense Activities and Naval Reactors accounts.

The Secretary announced in July 2002 that the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory would become the Nation's leading center for nuclear energy research and development. Unfortunately, the Secretary's rhetoric has not been matched by the Department's budget request for nuclear energy research and development. In fact, nuclear energy research and development at the Idaho National Laboratory would actually decrease by over $6 million under the Administration's fiscal year 2005 budget request. The Committee intends to reverse this trend by providing sufficient funds in fiscal year 2005 for research and facilities at Idaho to deliver on the Secretary's promise to make the Idaho National Laboratory the epicenter of nuclear energy research in this country.

The Committee strongly endorses the Administration's commitment to cooperate with the People's Republic of China in its expansion of nuclear power. As China begins a substantial program of nuclear power plant construction to meet its rising energy requirements, the Committee supports making the most advanced U.S. reactor technology available to ensure a safe and efficient nuclear power sector in China.

UNIVERSITY REACTOR FUEL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT

The Committee recommends $24,000,000, an increase of $3,000,000 over the budget request and $639,000 over the current year. The Committee continues to support DOE's programs to sus-

tain existing university reactors and provide grants and fellowships that support nuclear science and engineering education. The additional funds are to be used to fund university reactor consortia under the Nuclear Infrastructure and Education (NIE) program.

NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee believes that we will not build another nuclear power plant in this country until the spent fuel disposal question is resolved and the Yucca Mountain repository is on a secure path to licensing, construction, and operation. However, the Committee supports continued research and development to assist with the development of the next generation of reactor designs, and to develop advanced fuel cycles to minimize waste and proliferation concerns. The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy research and development is $122,546,000, an increase of $26,500,000 from the budget request.

*Nuclear Energy Plant Optimization*.—The Committee concurs with the Administration's proposal to eliminate funding for the nuclear energy plant optimization (NEPO) program in fiscal year 2005.

*Nuclear Energy Research Initiative*.—The Committee concurs with the Department's proposal to integrate nuclear energy research initiative (NERI) activities into the other nuclear R&D programs: Nuclear Power 2010, Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems, Nuclear Hydrogen, and the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative. Consistent with the request, no separate funds are provided for NERI in fiscal year 2005.

*Nuclear Power 2010*.—The Committee provides $5,000,000 for Nuclear Power 2010, a reduction of $5,246,000 from the budget request. The Committee generally supports the efforts of the Department, working with industry, to facilitate the deployment of a Generation III+ reactor by demonstrating the Early Site Permit and combined Construction and Operation License processes. However, in the absence of a licensed repository for spent nuclear fuel, the Committee does not believe the Nuclear Regulatory Commission should license any new reactor plants in this country.

*Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems*.—The Committee supports the Department's collaborative efforts on the research and development of a Generation IV reactor design that will be safer, more cost effective, and more proliferation resistant than current designs. Further, the Committee encourages the Department to focus on early deployment of a Next Generation Nuclear Plant (NGNP) at the Idaho National Laboratory, and believes the Department's efforts are better spent on the demonstration of a Generation IV NGNP rather than a Generation III+ plant under Nuclear Power 2010. The Committee recommends a total of $40,546,000 for Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. Of these additional funds, $6,000,000 is for work on the NGNP and $4,000,000 is for Generation IV R&D. The Committee directs the Department to spend all of these additional funds at the Idaho National Laboratory. Included in this research should be an aggressive effort to improve the reliability of ceramic-coated fuel granules that are critical to achieving many of the benefits of Generation IV designs.

*Nuclear hydrogen initiative*.—The Committee provides $9,000,000 for the nuclear hydrogen initiative, the same as the budget request. The Committee expects the Department to meet the requirements of the Hydrogen Future Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–271) for competition and industry cost sharing, and expects the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology to coordinate the nuclear hydrogen initiative fully with the other hydrogen research being conducted by the Office of Science and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

*Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative*.—The Committee recommendation for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative (AFCI) is $68,000,000, an increase of $401,000 over the current year and $21,746,000 more than the budget request. The additional funds are to be used for separations technology development and advanced fuels development. Not less than half of the total funding provided for AFCI shall be spent at the Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee expects the Department to focus its AFCI research efforts on selecting the most promising technologies to be incorporated into the Next Generation Nuclear Plant early in the next decade.

RADIOLOGICAL FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The purpose of the Radiological Facilities Management program is to maintain the critical infrastructure necessary to support users from the defense, space, and medical communities. These outside users fund DOE's actual operational, production, and research activities on a reimbursable basis. The Committee is concerned that the Department is not dedicating sufficient resources to maintain and upgrade its radiological facilities necessary to support this work. The Department's current policies allow the customers to pay only their share of operational costs at these facilities, with the Department assuming full responsibility for the costs of constructing, maintaining, and upgrading the necessary supporting infrastructure. The Committee directs the Department to review its current policies with respect to funding these facilities and make, not later than December 31, 2004, one of two possible recommendations to Congress—either the Department should maintain its current policies, in which case the Department must budget sufficient funds for these facilities beginning in the fiscal year 2006 budget request, or the Department must change its policies to require the users of these facilities to pay not only the operational costs but also their fair share of the capital cost of building, repairing, and upgrading these facilities. If the Department decides on the latter course of action, it must notify the users of these facilities promptly so that those agencies can budget sufficient funds in their respective fiscal year 2006 budget requests.

*Space and defense infrastructure*.—The Committee recommendation is $33,800,000, the same as the budget request. This includes the requested amounts to complete the transfer of radioisotope power systems capabilities from Mound to the Idaho National Laboratory, for the plutonium-238 facilities at Los Alamos National Laboratory, and for nepturnium-237 storage facilities at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

*Medical isotopes infrastructure*.—The Committee recommendation is $34,810,000, the same as the budget request. Included with-

in this program amount is the requested funding of $13,616,000 for continuation of work on Building 3019 for the U–233 disposition project at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and for various facility costs at Brookhaven, Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, and Sandia national laboratories.

*Enrichment facility infrastructure.*—The Committee recommendation includes the requested $500,000 for oversight of enrichment facilities at the Government-owned, USEC-operated gaseous diffusion plant at Paducah.

IDAHO FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

This program funds the operations and construction activities at the Idaho National Laboratory (INL), including ANL–West and the Test Reactor Area. The Committee provides $123,050,000 for Idaho Facilities Management, an increase of $15,000,000 over the budget request. Of this total, $92,269,000 is allotted to the 270 budget function and the balance, $30,886,000, is allotted to the 050 function and funded under Other Defense Activities and Naval Reactors.

*Idaho National Laboratory operations.*—The Committee recommends $123,050,000, an increase of $15,000,000 over the budget request. Included in the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) operations request is $43,800,000 for laboratory transition and restructuring to prepare the site to complete its cleanup mission and meet new program missions. The Committee notes that the Secretary has done little to deliver on his promise of nearly two years ago to make INL the Department's and the Nation's lead laboratory for nuclear science and engineering. Although INL has unique facilities such as the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR), and will hopefully have the Next Generation Nuclear Plant sometime in the next decade, INL presently lacks a modern building to provide flexible office and laboratory space for resident and visiting researchers. Further, much of the existing office and laboratory space will be demolished in the near future as a result of the accelerated cleanup efforts at the Idaho site. Therefore, the Committee provides $8,000,000 of additional funds in the laboratory transition and restructuring program to begin planning and design for a new office-laboratory building at INL to replace those facilities that will be eliminated under the accelerated cleanup program. The Department is directed to include line-item PED funds for this facility in the fiscal year 2006 budget request. The Committee notes that the Naval Reactors program is the principal user of the ATR and includes an additional $10,000,000, to be transferred from the Naval Reactors program, to fund necessary repairs and upgrades to the ATR.

*INL Construction.*—The Committee recommends $1,523,000 for Idaho facilities construction, the same as the budget request. This includes the requested amount to complete project 99–E–200, the electrical utility upgrade at the Test Reactor Area.

IDAHO SITEWIDE SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

Consistent with the budget request, this activity is funded at the requested level of $58,103,000 as a 050 defense activity under the Other Defense Activities account.

SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation for spent nuclear fuel management is $6,723,000. The Committee recommendation provides the requested amount of funding, $5,223,000, plus an additional $1,500,000 (funded from Other Defense Activities) to inspect and repackage the spent fuel stored at the Lynchburg Technology Center in Virginia. The Department proposed to transfer responsibility for the management and operation of two NRC-licensed, Department-owned independent spent fuel storage installations (Ft. St. Vrain in Colorado and INTEC in Idaho) from the Office of Environmental Management to the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. The Department also proposed to transfer responsibility for the transportation of domestic research reactor fuel, from NRC-licensed university reactors and the High Flux Isotope Reactor at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, from the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology to the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. Given the low funding level provided to the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management under the Administration's budget request for fiscal year 2005, the Committee does not support the proposed transfers to the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management at this time. Because the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology already manages the Ft. St. Vrain and INTEC spent fuel storage installations, and is already responsible for university reactor fuel as well, the Committee directs the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology to assume these responsibilities that were proposed for transfer to the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends a total funding level for program direction of $60,285,000, the same as the budget request and $1,434,000 more than the current fiscal year. Of this amount, $26,427,000 is funded in the Energy Supply appropriation under budget function 270, and $33,858,000 is funded in the Other Defense Activities appropriation under budget function 050.

CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT

As noted above, the Committee does not agree with the Department's proposed transfer from the Office of Environmental Management to the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. The activities proposed for transfer are funded in the Spent Nuclear Fuel Management program of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation is $28,000,000, a reduction of $2,474,000 from the budget request but an increase of approximately $5,135,000 over fiscal year 2004. Within this amount, the Department is directed to transfer $1,000,000 to OSHA for the costs of OSHA regulation of worker health and safety at the Department's non-nuclear facilities not covered under the Atomic Energy Act. The Department requested a 133 percent increase in funding for policy, standards and guidance, in part justified by the

need to publish and implement the new occupational safety and health rule (10 CFR 851) as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2002. The Committee does not support the new safety rule as proposed by the Department, and does not agree to fund such a rule with non-defense funds (i.e., 270 budget function dollars in the Energy Supply appropriation). In addition, the Department has voluntarily withdrawn this proposed rule based on adverse comments received from the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, among others. Therefore, the Committee provides no funds for the Department to finalize or implement this proposed safety rule in fiscal year 2005.

FUTURE LIABILITIES

The Committee does not agree with the proposal to establish a new Office of Future Liabilities. The Department should maintain these responsibilities within the existing Office of Environmental Management. Accordingly, no funds are provided in the Energy Supply appropriation to fund the non-defense activities of the proposed Office of Future Liabilities.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation includes $31,130,000 for the Office of Legacy Management, the same as the budget request. This funding is provided for the long-term surveillance and maintenance of non-defense DOE sites where remediation has been substantially completed, to oversee post-retirement benefits for former DOE contractor employees, and for records management and retrieval.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The Non-Defense Environmental Management program includes funds to manage and clean up sites used for civilian, energy research, and non-defense related activities. These past activities resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination that requires remediation, stabilization, or some other type of action. The Non-Defense Environmental Management activities are funded in three separate accounts: Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion for accelerated cleanup and closure activities; Non-Defense Environmental Services for those activities that indirectly support closure activities, or that support other missions of the Department; and the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund for environmental management responsibilities at the three gaseous diffusion enrichment plants (Oak Ridge, Portsmouth, and Paducah) and for reimbursement of licensees conducting cleanup of uranium and thorium processing sites.

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

## NON-DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $162,411,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 151,850,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 151,850,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | −10,561,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The committee recommendation for Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion is $151,850,000, the same as the budget request.

*Accelerated Completions, 2006.*—The recommendation provides $45,435,000, the same as the budget request, including $29,017,000 for soil and water remediation at Brookhaven National Laboratory; $8,453,000 for graphite research reactor decontamination and decommissioning at Brookhaven National Laboratory; $4,070,000 for soil and water remediation at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; $2,500,000 for soil and water remediation at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center; and $1,395,000 for various cleanup activities at Argonne National Laboratory, the Inhalation Toxicology Laboratory, and the Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research. The Committee encourages the Department to maintain its accelerated schedule for completion of several of these remediation projects during fiscal year 2005.

*Accelerated Completions, 2012.*—The recommendation provides $98,191,000, the same as the budget request, including $41,000,000 for solid waste stabilization and disposition at the West Valley Demonstration Project; $32,000,000 for nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning at West Valley; $19,000,000 for nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning at the Energy Technology Engineering Center; $5,734,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of the High Flux Beam Reactor at Brookhaven National Laboratory; and $457,000 for cleanup work at Argonne National Laboratory and various sites in California.

*Accelerated Completions, 2035.*—The recommendation provides $8,224,000, the same as the budget request. This amount includes the requested $7,773,000 for soil and water remediation measures at the former Atlas uranium mill tailings site at Moab, Utah, consistent with the recommendations of the final Environmental Impact Statement; and $451,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of the Tritium System Test Assembly Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

## URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $414,027,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 500,200,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 500,200,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +86,173,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund was established by the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (P.L. 102–486) to carry out environmental remediation at the nation's three gaseous diffusion plants, at the East Tennessee Technology Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, at Portsmouth, Ohio, and at

Paducah, Kentucky. Title X of the 1992 Act also authorized use of a portion of the Fund to reimburse private licensees for the Federal government's share of the cost of cleaning up uranium and thorium processing sites.

The Committee recommends $500,200,000 for activities funded from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, the same as the budget request. This amount includes $399,586,000 for decontamination and decommissioning activities at the gaseous diffusion plants and $100,614,000 for uranium and thorium reimbursements.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $337,465,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 291,296,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 291,296,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | −46,169,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The committee recommendation for Non-Defense Environmental Services is $291,296,000, the same as the budget request. This amount includes the requested funding of $245,123,000 for Non-Closure Environmental Activities ($7,987,000 for nuclear materials stabilization at East Tennessee Technology Park; $4,931,000 for nuclear materials stabilization at Paducah; $51,000,000 for the depleted uranium hexaflouride conversion facility at Paducah; $11,705,000 for nuclear materials stabilization at Portsmouth; $51,000,000 for the depleted uranium hexaflouride conversion facility at Portsmouth; $20,000,000 for decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) of the gaseous diffusion plant at Portsmouth; and $98,500,000 for cold standby and technetium–99 removal at Portsmouth). The Committee allows the Department to reprogram funds between the Portsmouth D&D and cold standby subaccounts and encourages the Department to focus on cost-effective cleanup of the former gas centrifuge plant by June 2006 to facilitate deployment of the advanced centrifuge program, while meeting cold standby requirements as necessary. The Committee directs the Department to use its existing authorities to complete the uranium inventory exchange described in the June 17, 2002, agreement between the Department and the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, and to use uranium assets to finance the full costs of the technetium–99 removal program in fiscal year 2005.

The total for Non-Defense Environmental Services also includes the requested amount of $46,083,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of the Fast Flux Test Reactor and $90,000 for community and regulatory support at Brookhaven and Oakland. Note that funds for Legacy Management previously appropriated in this account are funded in Energy Supply in fiscal year 2005.

*Depleted Uranium Hexaflouride Conversion Project.*—Since the Department's previous budget request, the construction schedule for these two depleted uranium hexaflouride (DUF6) conversion plants, one at Portsmouth, Ohio, and the other at Paducah, Kentucky, has slipped by half a year, and the estimate of total project cost has increased by approximately ten percent. The Congressionally-directed independent review of the cost and schedule baseline

for the Hanford Waste Treatment Plant identified a number of significant problems in the Department's estimating, change control, and contract management processes at that project. These results have not inspired confidence in the reliability of the Department's cost and schedule baselines for other Environmental Management projects. Given the recent increases to the cost and schedule for the DUF6 conversion project, the Committee directs the Department to transfer $1,250,000 each from the Portsmouth and Paducah DUF6 plants to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers center of expertise on cost engineering to conduct a thorough independent review of the cost and schedule baseline for these two plants. In addition, this review should evaluate the recommendations of the DOE Inspector General (see DOE/IG–0642) regarding the economic advantages of adding another processing line to the Portsmouth plant. The Corps should provide a report on its review to DOE not later than May 15, 2005, and should provide a concurrent submission to the Committees on Appropriations.

## SCIENCE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $3,482,283,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 3,431,718,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 3,599,964,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +117,681,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | +168,246,000 |

The Science account funds the Department's work on high energy physics, nuclear physics, biological and environmental sciences, basic energy sciences, advanced scientific computing, maintenance of the laboratories' physical infrastructure, fusion energy sciences, safeguards and security, science workforce development, and science program direction. The Committee recommendation is $3,599,964,000, an increase of $168,246,000 compared to the budget request.

The Committee has provided additional funding for the Office of Science to address the following Committee priorities: high performance computing; additional operating time, equipment upgrades, and staffing to support increased research opportunities at Office of Science user facilities; nanoscale science research; remediation of safety deficiencies at DOE Science laboratories; and restoration of domestic fusion funding displaced by the new international fusion initiative. The Committee also provides additional funding to continue essential research and development and preconceptual design for the Rare Isotope Accelerator.

*External Regulation of DOE Science Laboratories.*—In July 2002, the Department produced a Committee-directed implementation plan for external regulation. The Department identified several key unresolved questions about external regulation, specifically the unknown costs of transitioning to external regulation and the unknown cost savings that might result from such a transition. However, the Department stated that it "believes that these issues can be resolved" and "favors the prospect of a transition to external regulation . . ." The Committee has subsequently taken steps to resolve these questions, tasking the General Accounting Office (GAO) to identify the current costs of DOE's self-regulation of the

Science laboratories and the potential savings that might result under external regulation. In its report (GAO–03–633R), the GAO found that the Department could save as much as $41 million annually by shifting to external regulation of its Science laboratories. To address the question of transition costs, the Committee, in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2003, directed the transfer of funds from the Department of Energy to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) to conduct compliance audits of the ten DOE Science laboratories. Upon completion of these audits, the Office of Science was tasked to prepare estimates of the costs to correct the identified deficiencies and bring these ten laboratories into compliance with NRC and OSHA safety standards.

The compliance audits revealed a backlog of safety-related deficiencies at the Department's ten Science laboratories. The existence and persistence of such a backlog is one of the unfortunate consequences of the Department's adherence to its current scheme of self-regulation. The Department is able to identify safety problems but is unable or unwilling to dedicate the necessary resources to correct these problems. The Committee added funding in fiscal year 2004 to address these safety deficiencies and is disappointed that the Department did not consider these safety deficiencies of sufficient importance to request any funding in fiscal year 2005. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 in fiscal year 2005 to continue resolving these outstanding safety deficiencies.

Through the direction of this Committee and with the cooperation of the ten Science laboratories, the Department's principal substantive objections to external regulation (i.e., unknown cost savings and unknown transition costs) have been resolved. The benefits of external regulation appear significant and the transition costs appear manageable. The Department's sole remaining objection to external regulation seems to be nothing more than a bureaucratic determination to preserve the Secretary's discretion to continue business as usual. In the Committee's view, the exercise of Secretarial discretion to continue neglecting worker safety by preserving the current ineffective scheme of self-regulation is not good public policy. When faced with mounting evidence of the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of external regulation, the Committee is unable to understand the Department's continued intransigence on this matter.

*Open Competition.*—In general, the Committee believes that new research facilities for the Office of Science should be openly competed among universities, private entities, federal laboratories and others qualified to build and operate such facilities. There are obviously exceptions, as when the new facility is specifically dependent on an existing reactor, light source, or accelerator located at an existing DOE laboratory or when the new facility represents a replacement of an existing facility. However, there should not be a default assumption that such facilities must be built at DOE national laboratories. The Committee is aware that research experiments associated with NASA flight missions, including those involving the development and delivery for flight of sophisticated instruments, are openly competed with universities, private companies, government laboratories, and others all able to submit pro-

posals. The Committee is also aware that DOE laboratories compete, actively against universities, private companies, and other government laboratories, for work from other Federal agencies. The Committee expects the Office of Science to apply the same standard of open competition for its own DOE-funded facilities. Accordingly, to enable many of Science facilities proposed in the Twenty-Year Facility Outlook to proceed, DOE is directed to determine how to accomplish such competition under current law and regulation or to develop proposals for changes to law or regulations to enable such competitions to proceed.

*Performance Measures.*—The Committee commends the Office of Science for its efforts to develop quantifiable performance measures for its research activities. Some of the measures (e.g., inverse picobarns) are less comprehensible to Congress than others, but the overall approach to quantitative performance measurement is worthwhile. The Office of Science presented clear data on operating time for user facilities within each Science subaccount, but future budget requests should include a standardized summary presentation for all Office of Science user facilities.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The Committee recommends a total of $753,380,000 for high energy physics, an increase of $16,000,000 over the budget request. The control level is at the High Energy Physics level. The additional funds are provided to meet increased electricity costs at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) and to increase operating time and enhance user support at SLAC and the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory. The Committee supports the Department's collaboration with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) on the Gamma-ray Large Area Space Telescope (GLAST), the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer (AMS), and the Joint Dark Energy Mission (JDEM), and encourages NASA to maintain the planned schedule for these missions.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee recommendation for nuclear physics is $415,040,000, an increase of $14,000,000 over the budget request. An additional $7,000,000 is provided to continue research and development and initiate conceptual design activities for the Rare Isotope Accelerator, and an additional $7,000,000 is provided to increase utilization of the user facilities in the Nuclear Physics program.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation for biological and environmental research is $571,590,000, an increase of $75,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation provides an additional $75,000,000 to maintain the program at approximately the same funding level as fiscal year 2004, which included several Congressionally-directed projects.

The Committee does not provide the requested $5,000,000 to initiate Project Engineering and Design for the proposed new facility for the production and characterization of proteins and molecular

tags. The Committee does not agree with the Department's strategy of restricting competition for such a facility to only the DOE national laboratories. The Department should present in the fiscal year 2006 budget request an alternate procurement strategy for this and future Genomes to Life (GTL) facilities that will maximize rather than limit competition and will allow universities and other entities to compete with DOE national laboratories for these new GTL facilities. The Committee is aware that NASA has, for decades, conducted competitions for the development of research instrumentation among universities, NASA, DOE, and other government laboratories, and other entities. The Department is directed to develop a comparable approach to competition.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for basic energy sciences is $1,076,530,000, an increase of $13,000,000 over the budget request. For purposes of reprogramming during fiscal year 2005, the Department may allocate funding among all operating accounts within Basic Energy Sciences.

*Research.*—The Committee recommendation includes $612,228,000 for materials sciences and engineering, and $232,422,000 for chemical sciences, geosciences, and energy biosciences. The additional $13,000,000 in these accounts is to fund additional research on nanoscale science, including research on low cost nanoparticles using plasma reactors at the Idaho National Laboratory, and increase operating time on the Basic Energy Sciences user facilities. Also included within this account is $7,673,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR), the same as the budget request.

*Construction.*—The Committee recommendation includes $231,880,000 for Basic Energy Sciences construction projects, the same as the requested amount. The Committee recommendation provides the requested funding of $80,535,000 for the Spallation Neutron Source (99–E–334) at Oak Ridge National Laboratory; $32,085,000 for the Molecular Foundry (04–R–313) at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; $30,897,000 for the Center for Integrated Nanotechnologies (03–R–313) at Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories; $20,075,000 for PED (03–SC–002) and $30,000,000 for long-lead procurements (05–R–320) for the Linac Coherent Light Source at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center; $18,465,000 for the Center for Functional Nanomaterials (05–R–321) at Brookhaven National Laboratory; $17,811,000 for the Center for Nanophase Material Sciences (03–R–312) at Oak Ridge National Laboratory; and $2,012,000 for PED to support the various nanoscale science research centers (02–SC–002).

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation is $234,340,000, an increase of $30,000,000 over the budget request, with not more than $25,000,000 of the increase devoted to hardware. The Committee provides these additional funds to support the Office of Science initiative to develop the hardware, software, and applied mathematics necessary for a leadership-class supercomputer to meet scientific computation needs. The Committee is disappointed that the efforts

of the High End Computing Revitalization Task Force (HEC RTF), under the lead of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), did not translate into increased fiscal year 2005 funding requests for advanced scientific computing by any non-defense agencies other than the Department of Energy. The Department is encouraged to make substantial time available on its new leadership-class supercomputer to the laboratories of other government agencies, universities, and others with a compelling need for this capability, and to select these external users on a competitive basis as is presently done for users of the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $42,336,000 for Science Laboratories Infrastructure, an increase of $13,246,000 over the budget request but $11,931,000 less than the current fiscal year. Of this increase, $4,500,000 additional is provided to continue infrastructure subproject 18 under MEL–001 to support continuing activities at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory to replace the infrastructure being displaced by the closure of the 300 Area at the Hanford site. The Committee directs the Department to include sufficient funds in the fiscal year 2006 budget request to continue this activity. An additional $3,500,000 is provided to accelerate the other laboratory infrastructure projects under MEL–001. The Committee does not concur with the lack of a budget request to correct safety deficiencies at the Office of Science laboratories and provides $5,000,000 to continue the corrective actions necessary to address the estimated $56.6 million of deficiencies identified at these laboratories by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. An additional $246,000 is provided to meet the Department's obligation for PILT payments at Argonne National Laboratory-East in fiscal year 2005 without offsetting reductions.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is $276,110,000, an increase of $12,000,000 over the budget request. The additional $12,000,000 is to be used to increase the utilization of existing large and small experiments; further work in inertial fusion technology; take advantage of opportunities in High Energy Density Physics, including research on fast ignition, and large-scale scientific computing; and provide for cost-effective construction and development of the National Compact Stellarator Experiment. The Committee notes the delay in site selection for the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) and expects the Department to reduce its planned expenditures on ITER in fiscal year 2005 in consideration of this delay.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $73,315,000, the same as the budget request, to meet additional safeguards and security requirements at Office of Science facilities.

SCIENCE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

The Committee provides $7,660,000 for Science Workforce Development in fiscal year 2005, the same as the requested amount.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation is $155,268,000 for Science program direction. This amount includes: $89,341,000 for program direction at DOE field offices and $65,927,000 for program direction at DOE headquarters. The control level for fiscal year 2005 is at the program account level of Science Program Direction.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes an offset of $5,605,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work, as proposed in the budget request.

## NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $188,879,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 749,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | ..... |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | −188,879,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −749,000,000 |

The Department of Energy requested a total of $880,000,000 for work on the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository in fiscal year 2005, $749,000,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal and $131,000,000 for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal. However, the Department also assumed in its budget request that the full amount of $749,000,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal would be offset through the enactment of legislation to reclassify the fees paid into the Nuclear Waste Fund. The net request for discretionary spending for the repository in fiscal year 2005 is, therefore, only $131,000,000. The Committee recommendation for Yucca Mountain mirrors the Administration's net request for discretionary spending in fiscal year 2005: $0 for Nuclear Waste Disposal and $131,000,000 for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal. Within these limited funds, the Committee directs the Department to focus on maintaining the schedule for a December 2004 submittal of the License Application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

This Committee strongly supports the proposed reclassification legislation, and encourages the House and Senate authorizing committees to pass promptly such legislation and the President to sign it into law. At this time, however, there are no indications that the reclassification language will be enacted in the near future. At best, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) made an unwise budget calculation to assume this offset; at worst, OMB took a foolish political gamble by assuming that reclassification legislation would be enacted this year.

The consequences of this miscalculation are far-reaching. In response to an April 29, 2004, request from the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, the Department of Energy provided on May 24, 2004, the following

information on the impacts of funding the repository at $131,000,000 in fiscal year 2005:

*Effect on submission of the license application.*—Approximately 70 percent of the 2,400 person Federal/contractor workforce would have to be eliminated. The remaining workforce would focus on completing the license application document. However, because the Reduction-In-Force (RIF) would likely cause turmoil within the program and result in the loss of highly skilled technical personnel, the submittal of the license application would be at risk.

*Effect on planned initiation of repository operations in 2010.*—The Department would be unable to initiate repository operations in 2010. With a shutdown of most program activities and the enormous challenge associated with replacing the Federal and contractor workforce should funds become available after such a shutdown, there would be an indefinite delay in opening the repository.

*Effect on ongoing Federal and contract work on the repository.*—The current payroll for the more than 2,200 contractors and 231 Federal staff working on the Program is approximately $400 million in fiscal year 2004. The Department would direct its contractors to begin reduction-in-force activities, and would begin a reduction of the Federal workforce. In order to do this, the Department would have to undertake a radical descoping of the contract and begin reduction-in-force notifications to Federal staff by no later than July 31, 2004, in order to have RIFs take effect on October 1, 2004. An orderly shutdown would not be possible with such a precipitous reduction (nearly 80 percent) in resources from the previous fiscal year.

*Effect, on state-by-state basis, on total Federal and contractor employment.*—The program has approximately 231 Federal employees (Department of Energy and U.S. Geological Survey) and over 2,200 contractor employees who would be subject to a RIF. Site specific impacts would be:

| | Federal employees | Contractor employees |
|---|---|---|
| Nevada | 105 | 1,650 |
| Idaho | | 161 |
| California | | 159 |
| New Mexico | | 96 |
| Washington, DC metropolitan area | 92 | 92 |
| Colorado | 34 | 34 |
| Washington | | 63 |
| Tennessee | | 5 |
| Arizona | | 2 |
| Texas | | 2 |
| Totals | 231 | 2,264 |

Additionally, Nevada and local government employees and their contractors who are supported by the over $36 million budgeted in fiscal year 2005 for State, local government and university funding would not receive this funding.

*DOE sites which possess high-level radioactive waste for disposal at Yucca Mountain.*—There are three Department Sites in three states that possess high-level radioactive waste slated for disposal at Yucca Mountain.

| State | Site |
|---|---|
| Idaho | Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (Idaho Falls). |
| South Carolina | Savannah River (Aiken). |
| Washington | Hanford (Richland). |

*DOE sites, and any other Federal sites, which possess spent nuclear fuel for disposal at Yucca Mountain.*—There are 15 Department or Federal sites in 9 states which possess spent nuclear fuel slated for disposal at Yucca Mountain.

| State | Site |
|---|---|
| Colorado | Fort St. Vrain (Platteville). |
| | U.S. Geological Survey (Denver). |
| Idaho | Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (Idaho Falls). |
| | Naval Reactors Facility (Idaho Falls). |
| | Argonne National Laboratory—West (Idaho Falls). |
| Illinois | Argonne National Laboratory—East (Argonne). |
| Maryland | National Institute of Standards and Technology (Gaithersburg). |
| | Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute (Bethesda). |
| | U.S. Army Aberdeen Proving Grounds (Aberdeen). |
| New Mexico | White Sands Missile Range (White Sands). |
| | Sandia National Laboratory (Albuquerque). |
| New York | Brookhaven National Laboratory (Upton). |
| South Carolina | Savannah River (Aiken). |
| Tennessee | Oak Ridge National Laboratory (Oak Ridge). |
| Washington | Hanford (Richland). |

*Non-federal sites, including commercial reactors, commercial storage sites, university reactors, and private research reactors, which possess spent nuclear fuel for disposal at Yucca Mountain.*—There are 72 commercial reactor sites in 33 states that possess spent nuclear fuel slated for disposal at Yucca Mountain.

| State | Commercial reactor sites |
|---|---|
| Alabama | Browns Ferry 1,2,3 (Decatur). |
| | Farley 1, 2 (Dothan). |
| Arizona | Palo Verde 1, 2, 3 (Wintersburg). |
| Arkansas | Arkansas Nuclear 1, 2 (Russellville). |
| California | Diablo Canyon 1, 2 (Avila Beach). |
| | Rancho Seco 1 (Ione). |
| | San Onofre 1, 2, 3 (San Clemente). |
| | Humboldt Bay 3 (Eureka). |
| Connecticut | Haddam Neck (Haddam). |
| | Millstone 1, 2, 3 (Waterford). |
| Florida | Crystal River 3 (Red Level). |
| | St. Lucie 1,2 (Hutchinson Island). |
| | Turkey Point 3, 4 (Florida City). |
| Georgia | Hatch 1, 2 (Baxley). |
| | Vogtle 1, 2 (Waynesboro). |
| Illinois | Clinton 1 (Clinton). |
| | Quad Cities 1, 2 (Cordova). |
| | Braidwood 1, 2 (Braidwood). |
| | Zion 1, 2 (Zion). |
| | Byron 1, 2 (Byron). |
| | Dresden 1, 2, 3 (Morris). |
| | LaSalle County 1, 2 (Seneca). |
| Iowa | Duane Arnold (Palo). |
| Kansas | Wolf Creek (Burlington). |
| Louisiana | Waterford 3 (Taft). |
| | River Bend 1 (St. Francisville). |
| Maine | Maine Yankee (Wiscasset). |

| State | Commercial reactor sites |
|---|---|
| Maryland | Calvert Cliffs 1, 2 (Lusby). |
| Massachusetts | Pilgrim 1 (Plymouth). |
| | Yankee-Rowe (Rowe). |
| Michigan | Enrico Fermi 2 (Newport). |
| | Cook 1, 2 (Bridgeman) |
| | Palisades (South Haven). |
| | Big Rock Point (Charlevoix). |
| Minnesota | Monticello (Monticello). |
| | Prairie Island 1, 2 (Red Wing). |
| Mississippi | Grand Gulf (Port Gibson). |
| Missouri | Callaway 1 (Fulton). |
| Nebraska | Cooper (Brownville). |
| | Fort Calhoun (Calhoun). |
| New Hampshire | Seabrook (Seabrook). |
| New Jersey | Oyster Creek (Forked River). |
| | Salem 1, 2/Hope Creek 1 (Lower Alloways). |
| New York | FitzPatrick/Nine Mile Point 1, 2 (Scriba). |
| | Indian Point 1, 2, 3 (Buchanan). |
| | Ginna (Ontario). |
| North Carolina | Brunswick 1, 2 (Southport). |
| | Harris (New Hill). |
| | McGuire 1, 2 (Cornelius). |
| Ohio | Davis-Besse (Oak Harbor). |
| | Perry (Perry). |
| Oregon | Trojan (Prescott). |
| Pennsylvania | Susquehanna 1, 2 (Berwick). |
| | Limerick 1, 2 (Pottstown). |
| | Peach Bottom 2, 3 (Delta). |
| | Three Mile Island 1 (Middletown). |
| | Beaver Valley 1, 2 (Shippingport). |
| South Carolina | Robinson 2 (Hartsville). |
| | Catawba 1, 2 (Clover). |
| | Oconee 1, 2, 3 (Seneca). |
| | Summer (Parr). |
| Tennessee | Sequoyah 1, 2 (Soddy-Daisy). |
| | Watts Barr (Spring City). |
| Texas | Comanche Peak 1, 2 (Glen Rose). |
| | South Texas Project 1, 2 (Palacios). |
| Vermont | Vermont Yankee (Vernon). |
| Virginia | North Anna 1, 2 (Mineral). |
| | Surry 1, 2 (Gravel Neck). |
| Washington | Columbia Generating Station (Richland). |
| Wisconsin | Point Beach 1, 2 (Two Creeks). |
| | Kewaunee (Carlton). |
| | LaCrosse (Genoa). |

There are two commercial storage sites in two states with spent nuclear fuel slated for Yucca Mountain.

| State | Commercial storage sites |
|---|---|
| Illinois | General Electric (Morris). |
| Virginia | BWX Technologies, Inc. (Lynchburg). |

There are 33 University and Private Research Reactor sites in 22 States with spent nuclear fuel slated for Yucca Mountain.

| State | University and private research reactors |
|---|---|
| Arizona | University of Arizona (Tucson). |
| California | University of California (Irvine). |
| | General Electric (Pleasanton). |
| | University of California at Davis (Sacramento). |
| | General Atomics (2) (San Diego). |
| | Aerotest Research (San Ramon). |

| State | University and private research reactors |
|---|---|
| Florida | University of Florida (Gainesville). |
| Idaho | Idaho State University (Pocatello). |
| Illinois | University of Illinois (2) (Urbana). |
| Indiana | Purdue University (West Lafayette). |
| Kansas | Kansas State University (Manhattan). |
| Maryland | University of Maryland (College Park). |
| Massachusetts | University of Lowell (Lowell). |
| | Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Cambridge). |
| | Worcester Polytechnic Institute (Worchester). |
| Michigan | Dow Chemical Company (Midland). |
| Missouri | University of Missouri (Columbia). |
| | University of Missouri (Rolla). |
| New Mexico | University of New Mexico (Albuquerque). |
| New York | State University of New York (Buffalo). |
| | Manhattan College (Bronx). |
| | Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (Troy). |
| North Carolina | North Carolina State University (Raleigh). |
| Ohio | Ohio State University (Columbus). |
| Oregon | Oregon State University (Corvallis). |
| | Reed College (Portland). |
| Pennsylvania | Pennsylvania State University (University Park). |
| Rhode Island | Rhode Island Atomic Energy Commission (Narragansett). |
| Texas | Texas A&M University (2) (College Station). |
| | University of Texas (Austin). |
| Utah | University of Utah (Salt Lake City). |
| Washington | Washington State University (Pullman). |
| Wisconsin | University of Wisconsin (Madison). |

*Reactor sites that are undergoing or have completed decontamination and decommissioning which possess high-level waste or spent nuclear fuel slated for disposal at Yucca Mountain.*—There are 13 commercial and Federal reactor sites in 10 States that are shutdown and are undergoing or have completed decontamination which possess spent nuclear fuel.

| State | Reactor site |
|---|---|
| California | Rancho Seco 1 (Ione). |
| | Humboldt Bay 3 (Eureka). |
| | General Atomics (2) (San Diego). |
| Colorado | Fort St. Vrain. |
| Connecticut | Haddam Neck (Haddam). |
| Illinois | University of Illinois (2) (Urbana). |
| Maine | Maine Yankee (Wiscasset). |
| Maryland | U.S. Army Aberdeen Proving Grounds (Aberdeen). |
| Massachusetts | Yankee-Rowe (Rowe). |
| Michigan | Big Rock Point (Charlevoix). |
| New York | State University of New York (Buffalo). |
| | Manhattan College (Bronx). |
| Oregon | Trojan (Prescott). |

In addition, there are two commercial reactor sites in two States that are shutdown that have not begun decontamination.

| State | Reactor site |
|---|---|
| Illinois | Zion 1,2. |
| Wisconsin | LaCrosse. |

*All other domestic sites that possess material, either high-level radioactive waste or spent nuclear fuel, which is destined for disposal at Yucca Mountain.*—Three other domestic sites in three States

possess material that may be disposed at Yucca Mountain either high-level radioactive waste or spent nuclear fuel.

| State | Site |
|---|---|
| New Mexico | Los Alamos National Laboratory (Albuquerque). |
| New York | West Valley Demonstration Project (West Valley). |
| Texas | Pantex Plant (Amarillo). |

*All foreign reactor sites that possess spent nuclear fuel or high-level waste destined for disposal at Yucca Mountain.*—The Department's 1995 Record of Decision on the Foreign Research Reactor (FRR) Acceptance Program Final Environmental Impact Statement identified 104 reactors in 41 countries that are eligible to participate in the program. The reactors conduct research activities and are significantly smaller than any commercial reactor. The FRR Acceptance Program was designed to promote the United States' nonproliferation objectives by returning spent fuel containing enriched uranium of U.S. origin from other countries. Although 104 reactors were identified as eligible, the Department does not expect that all reactors will choose to participate in the program. It is estimated that about 19 metric tons of spent fuel from these foreign reactors would require disposal at Yucca Mountain.

*Legal and financial consequences for the Federal government if it fails to remove high-level radioactive waste from the Department's cleanup sites such as Hanford, Idaho, and Savannah River.*—If the Federal government fails to remove waste from the Department's cleanup sites, the Department will incur costs of continued storage of the high-level waste until such time as it can be removed. In fact, the cost of storing and handling this waste is estimated to increase by up to $500 million for each year that removal is delayed.

*Legal and financial consequences for the Federal government if it fails to remove spent nuclear fuel from existing Federal storage sites such as the Idaho National Laboratory.*—The Department has an agreement with the State of Idaho regarding removal of spent nuclear fuel from existing Federal storage sites, such as the Idaho National Environmental and Engineering Laboratory (INEEL), that was memorialized in a 1996 settlement agreement. This agreement, referred to as the "Batt Agreement," sets out the rights and responsibilities of the State of Idaho and the Departments of Energy and the Navy regarding management or storage of various types of nuclear fuel, including spent nuclear fuel. The Batt agreement provides that if the Federal government fails to remove all spent fuel from INEEL by 2035, then, subject to the availability of appropriations provided in advance, the Federal parties will pay to the State of Idaho $60,000 for each day such removal requirement has not been met. Additionally, to the extent DOE fails to meet substantive obligations or requirements under the agreement, e.g., exceeding shipment limitations set out in the agreement, shipments of DOE spent fuel to INEEL will be suspended until such time that the obligations or requirements are satisfied.

Similarly, the Department has an agreement with the State of Colorado that provides if the Federal government fails to remove all the spent fuel located at Fort St. Vrain, Colorado, from the State by January 1, 2035, then, subject to the availability of appropriations provided in advance for this purpose, the Department will

provide annual funding to the State of Colorado in the amount of $15,000 for each day after January 1, 2035, until the fuel is removed.

*Legal and financial consequences for the Federal government if it continues to be unable to accept spent nuclear fuel from commercial reactors, as is required by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, and by the Department's contracts with the utilities operating those reactors.*—To date, more than 65 claims have been filed by utilities in the Court of Federal Claims for breach of contract to recover monetary damages incurred as a result of the Department's delay. For each year of delay beyond 2010 that the Department is unable to begin accepting spent nuclear fuel from commercial reactors pursuant to the Department's contracts with utilities, the Department estimates that the utilities will incur costs of $500 million a year to store their spent fuel at utility sites, some portion of which the Department would be liable for. A delay in opening the repository could substantially increase the Department's liability.

## DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

### GROSS APPROPRIATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $215,255,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 261,873,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 243,876,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +28,621,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −17,997,000 |

### MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $−123,000,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −122,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | −122,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +1,000,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Committee recommendation for Departmental Administration is $243,876,000, a decrease of $17,997,000 from the budget request of $261,873,000. Funding recommended for Departmental Administration provides for general management and program support functions benefiting all elements of the Department of Energy, including the National Nuclear Security Administration. The account funds a wide array of headquarters activities not directly associated with program execution.

Of the total $261,873,000 requested for Departmental Administration, the majority ($213,336,000) represents salaries and benefits for the Federal employees at DOE headquarters, and for related expenses (i.e., travel, training, and support service contracts). The Committee is concerned that the requested funding for the Departmental Administration salaries and expenses accounts increased on average by 12 percent in fiscal year 2005 compared to fiscal year 2004. Several accounts (e.g., Office of the Secretary, Chief Information Officer, and Policy and International Affairs) show increases of approximately 30 percent, and other accounts (e.g., Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, Economic Impact and Diversity, General Counsel, and Public Affairs) show in-

creases in excess of 10 percent. When the Administration's proposed pay raise for Federal civilian workers is only 1.7 percent in fiscal year 2005, and when staffing levels stay relatively constant from fiscal year 2004 to fiscal year 2005, the Committee considers any proposed increase for salaries and expenses greater than 10 percent to be excessive and unjustified. Therefore, the Committee reduces the various salaries and expenses accounts within Departmental Administration to limit increases to no more than 10 percent in fiscal year 2005. The Committee also reduced the large (i.e., 58 percent) increase requested for the Corporate Management Information Program due to budget constraints.

*Office of Engineering and Construction Management*.—The Committee continues to support the Office of Engineering and Construction Management within the Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation as the focal point for improving project management within the Department. An essential part of this project management effort is the External Independent Review (EIR) conducted by this office to verify the accuracy of cost and schedule baseline estimates. The recent Corps of Engineers review of the baseline for the Hanford Waste Treatment Plant implies that existing EIRs may not have sufficient depth and detail to identify cost increases such as occurred with the Waste Treatment Plant. The Committee directs the Chief Financial Officer to reserve the appropriate amount of funds in the first quarter of the fiscal year from the Offices of Nuclear Energy, Science, Environmental Management, the National Nuclear Security Administration, and any other program offices with construction projects to conduct EIRs at a sufficient level of detail to verify project baselines as required under Project Management Order 413.3.

*Working Capital Fund*.—The Committee renews its guidance as presented in House Report 107–681 regarding management of the Working Capital Fund.

*Revenues*.—The recommendation for revenues is $122,000,000, consistent with the estimate of revenues provided by the Congressional Budget Office.

*Transfer from Other Defense Activities*.—For many years, full funding for all corporate and administrative activities of the Department has been provided in the energy portion of this bill despite the fact that the Department's funding is provided in the national security and defense-related cleanup programs account for approximately 75 percent of the Department's total budget. In fiscal year 2004, the Committee directed the Department to submit its fiscal year 2005 budget request showing a proportional contribution to Departmental Administration from Other Defense Activities. The Committee recommendation transfers $92,440,000 from Other Defense Activities for national security programs, the same as the amount requested in the budget and authorized by the House Armed Services Committee.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $39,229,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 41,508,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 41,508,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +2,279,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Office of Inspector General performs agency-wide audit, inspection, and investigative functions to identify and correct management and administrative deficiencies that create conditions for existing or potential instances of fraud, waste and mismanagement. The audit function provides financial and performance audits of programs and operations. The inspections function provides independent inspections and analyses of the effectiveness, efficiency, and economy of programs and operations. The investigative function provides for the detection and investigation of improper and illegal activities involving programs, personnel, and operations.

The Committee recommendation is $41,508,000, the same as the budget request.

## ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The Atomic Energy Defense Activities programs of the Department of Energy include the National Nuclear Security Administration that consists of Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and the Office of the Administrator; Defense Environmental Management programs which include Site Acceleration Completion and Defense Environmental Services; Other Defense Activities; and Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal. Descriptions of each of these accounts are provided below.

### NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The Department of Energy is responsible for enhancing U.S. national security through the military application of nuclear technology and reducing the global danger from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), a semi-autonomous agency within the Department, carries out these responsibilities. Established in March 2000 pursuant to Title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (P.L. 106–65), NNSA is responsible for the management and operation of the Nation's nuclear weapons complex, naval reactors, and nuclear nonproliferation activities. Three offices within the NNSA carry out the Department's national security mission: the Office of Defense Programs, the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and the Office of Naval Reactors. The Office of the NNSA Administrator oversees all NNSA programs.

The Committee recommendation for the NNSA is $9,027,171,000, a decrease of $21,529,000 from the budget request of $9,048,700,000, but an increase of $372,038,000 over fiscal year 2004.

*Nuclear Weapons Complex Wide Review.*—The Committee commends the Department for finally submitting a revised Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Report that reflects the President's commitment, announced back on November 13, 2001, to draw down our

nuclear forces toward the goal of 1,700–2,200 operationally-deployed strategic nuclear warheads between now and 2012. The revised Stockpile Plan makes a significant reduction to the total stockpile size in recognition of post-Cold War realities. During the fiscal year 2005 budget hearings, the Committee pressed the Secretary on the need for a systematic review of requirements for the weapons complex over the next twenty-five years, and the Secretary committed to conducting such a review. The Secretary's report should assess the implications of the President's decisions on the size and composition of the stockpile, the cost and operational impacts of the new Design Basis Threat, and the personnel, facilities, and budgetary resources required to support the smaller stockpile. The report should evaluate opportunities for the consolidation of special nuclear materials, facilities, and operations across the complex to minimize security requirements and the environmental impact of continuing operations.

The Secretary should assemble a team of outside experts to assist with this review. Prior reviews have largely been conducted by insiders from the weapons complex, who produce the predictable but not very credible recommendation that the Department should preserve the status quo and maintain all existing facilities and capabilities. As part of the five-year integrated budget plan for the entire Department that is directed elsewhere in this report, the Secretary will have to balance NNSA requirements against competing needs for other DOE programs. This will require an objective review that is only possible with the help of independent experts who are not, and have not been, part of the NNSA weapons complex.

The Committee directs the Secretary to submit a written report on his findings and recommendations on the NNSA complex to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services not later than April 30, 2005.

*Nevada Test Site Land Withdrawal.*—The Committee supports the efforts of the NNSA to find expanded uses for the unique capabilities associated with the Nevada Test Site (NTS). The recent NNSA announcement outlining plans to build a new complex for testing and evaluating sensor systems for border crossings, ports, and other transportation facilities at the NTS is an important effort to integrate many of the vital research and development activities done by the Department's national laboratories in support of new homeland security requirements. The Committee notes, however, that the original administrative land withdrawal in 1952 (Public Land Order 805) transferred land from the Bureau of Land Management to the Atomic Energy Commission for use as a "weapons testing site." Although the Nevada Test Site is presently being used for a number of other purposes, and is being proposed for new uses as outlined above, the Department has not updated the original land withdrawal to reflect the multitude of existing and proposed uses in addition to weapons testing. The Committee directs the Department of Energy to enter into formal consultations with the Department of the Interior regarding the multiple uses and, if necessary, revise and update the land withdrawal to reflect those additional uses.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $6,235,502,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 6,568,453,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 6,514,424,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +278,922,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −54,029,000 |

The goal of the Weapons Activities program is to ensure the safety, security, reliability and performance of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. The program seeks to maintain and refurbish nuclear weapons to sustain confidence in their safety and reliability under the nuclear testing moratorium and arms reduction treaties. The Committee's recommendation for Weapons Activities is $6,514,424,000, a decrease of $54,029,000 from the budget request of $6,568,453,000, but an increase of $278,922,000 over fiscal year 2004.

*NNSA production plant revitalization.*—The Committee is concerned with the condition of the operating facilities and security infrastructure of the weapons complex production plants. The Committee's concern derives from the systematic under-funding of the production plants after the cessation of full weapons production and testing over a decade ago. In subsequent years, the weapons activities budget increases went primarily to the weapons complex laboratory facilities to support the unproven experiment of science-based stockpile stewardship, but at the expense of funding for infrastructure requirements at the production plants. As the NNSA resumes production activities to refurbish the enduring stockpile under the Life Extension Programs (LEPs), the work requirements on the production plants will increase significantly. Inadequate production plant budgets will not support the maintenance of LEP schedules while at the same time meeting increased security requirements, an increased pace of dismantlements, and safely operating sixty-year-old industrial facilities. The Committee has made supporting the revitalization of the production plants a priority for the fiscal year 2005 weapons activity budget.

*Budgeting by warhead number.*—The Committee notes that the Directed Stockpile Work for fiscal year 2005 budget request was developed so that Congress can appropriate and the NNSA can manage by the individual weapons systems that make up the U.S. nuclear stockpile. The Committee commends the NNSA for achieving this milestone and will work with the NNSA to ensure that the transition to budgeting by weapons system creates a more efficient and transparent budget process for both the Congress and the Executive Branch.

While the NNSA has made great progress in budgeting by weapons type, the weapons activities campaign costs are still unassigned to specific weapons systems even though the budget justifications for many of the proposed campaign activities are tied directly to the life extension requirements. The Committee is particularly concerned that the NNSA has yet to develop a managerial cost accounting system that provides the full cost of the refurbishments programs and validates the cost estimates that are used to develop the budget requests. The Committee directs the NNSA to assign the associated life extension costs by weapons type associ-

ated with each campaign, and thereby provide a comprehensive cost accounting of each life extension program.

*Reprogramming Authority.*—The Committee provides limited reprogramming authority within the Weapons Activities account without submission of a reprogramming to be approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. The reprogramming control levels will be as follows: directed stockpile work, retired warheads stockpile systems, science campaigns, engineering campaigns, advanced simulation and computing, pit manufacturing and certification, readiness campaigns, and operating expenses for readiness in technical base and facilities. The reprogramming control level for inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign is at the major technical effort subprogram level reflected in the Committee Report table. This should provide the needed flexibility to manage these programs.

In addition, funding of not more than $5,000,000 may be transferred between each of these categories and each construction project subject to the following limitations: only one transfer may be made to or from any program or project; the transfer must be necessary to address a risk to health, safety or the environment or to assure the most efficient use of weapons activities funds at a site. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be notified within 15 days of the use of this reprogramming authority.

Transfers during the fiscal year which would result in increases or decreases in excess of $5,000,000 or which would be subject to the limitations outlined in the previous paragraph require prior notification by the Department's Chief Financial Officer and approval from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

Directed Stockpile Work (DSW) includes all activities that directly support weapons in the nuclear stockpile, including maintenance, research, development, engineering, certification and dismantlement and disposal activities. The Directed Stockpile Work account has been restructured to budget by weapons system beginning with the fiscal year 2005 budget request. The DSW account provides all the direct funding for the Department's life extension activities, which are designed to extend the operational service life of the existing nuclear weapons stockpile, by providing new subsystems and components for each warhead.

The Committee's recommendation is $1,324,878,000, a decrease of $81,557,000 from the budget request. The Committee notes that the submittal of the new Stockpile Plan with lower overall stockpile numbers obviates the need for any programmatic acceleration in the Life Extension Program activities for the B61, W76, and W80. The Committee reiterates its direction to the Department to reassess the entire scope and schedule of the stockpile refurbishment efforts to account for the changes mandated in the revised Stockpile Plan.

The Committee recommendation includes $437,438,000 for the DSW Life Extension Programs, a reduction of $40,000,000 from the

budget request. The Committee directs the reduction to be taken against the W80 LEP activity. The Committee provides $496,095,000 for the DSW Stockpile Systems activities, a decrease of $40,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes a $40,000,000 reduction to the DSW Stockpile Systems activities of the W80 and the W87 to reduce the significant program increase over current year levels pending the recommendations of the weapons complex review.

*Retired Warhead Stockpile Systems.*—The Committee recommendation includes $130,258,000 for Retired Warhead Stockpile Systems, an increase of $65,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee expects the NNSA to develop a robust program of continuous dismantlements, with aggressive near-term milestones, rather than treating dismantlement as low priority work used to fill in during lulls in the LEP schedule. The Committee notes with disappointment the funding levels for warhead dismantlement in the out-years of the NNSA Future Years Nuclear Security Plan. The NNSA's fiscal year 2005 budget request of $65,258,000 drops to less than $14,000,000 in fiscal year 2007 and continues at a level insufficient to accomplish the dismantlements required as a logical outcome of the Presidentially-directed reductions to the overall stockpile inventory of weapons. The Committee directs the NNSA to develop a dismantlement program plan to be submitted with the fiscal year 2006 budget request that details the reduction goals and budget requirements year by year to achieve the 2012 stockpile levels agreed to in the Moscow Treaty. The Committee encourages the NNSA to examine expanding warhead dismantle capacity within the weapons complex by using the Device Assembly Facility at the Nevada Test Site. The Committee expects the NNSA to request a funding level sufficient to continue the aggressive dismantlement work in the fiscal year 2006 budget request.

The Committee provides $261,087,000 for DSW Stockpile Services, a reduction of $66,557,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommendation provides $147,986,000 for research and development certification and safety, a decrease of $10,000,000 from the budget request, and $113,101,000 for stockpile services management, technology, and production, a decrease of $20,000,000 from the budget request. DSW Stockpile Services activities funds are unallocated to a specific weapons system life extension program. In light of the reductions in the revised Nuclear Stockpile Plan, the Committee's reductions should be assessed against accelerated DSW stockpile services activities not directly associated with a specific life extension program pending the recommendations in the Complex wide review.

*Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and Advanced Concepts research.*—The Committee provides no funds for the Advanced Concept Initiative and the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) feasibility study. The National Nuclear Security Administration requested $36,557,000 in Directed Stockpile Work to explore advanced weapons concepts, including $27,557,000 to continue feasibility and cost studies for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) and $9,000,000 for other advanced concepts definition studies. The Committee eliminates funding for RNEP and additional advanced concepts research in favor of higher priority cur-

rent mission requirements. The Committee continues to oppose the diversion of resources and intellectual capital away from the most serious issues that confront the management of the nation's nuclear deterrent. The NNSA Future Years Nuclear Security Plan includes a funding profile with $484.7 million for the RNEP over the next five years and indicates plans to move the program all the way to Phase 6.4, one step short of production. The Department has not provided the Committee with any budget justification describing how a study to modify an existing nuclear weapon could conceivably cost half a billion dollars.

Given the FYNSP funding profile, the Committee remains unconvinced by the Department's superficial assurances that the RNEP activity is only a study and that advanced concepts is only a skills exercise for weapons designers. The Committee notes that the management direction for fiscal year 2004 sent to the directors of the weapons design laboratories left little doubt that the objective of the program was to advance the most extreme new nuclear weapon goals irrespective of any reservations expressed by Congress. The Committee cautions the Department to be more consistent in the tone and content of its communication exchanges with the Congress and subsequent Departmental policy direction sent to its employees and contractors. The use of artful language to communicate one message with Congress and another with its employees on issues of special interest erodes the credibility of the NNSA and destroys the trust necessary for a useful dialogue in setting public policy.

The Committee recognizes the dilemma the NNSA's nuclear weapon design laboratories find themselves in after the Cold War. In the absence of a Cold War between nuclear-armed superpowers, the importance of nuclear weapons to the war fighters in the Pentagon has steadily diminished. The pressure on the nuclear weapon design laboratories to maintain the canonical role for their weapons in order to justify increasing budgets becomes very difficult. By contrast, the Committee's priorities are maintaining our Nation's nuclear deterrent in a safe and secure condition and maintaining our Nation's integrity in the international effort to halt the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The Department's obsession with launching a new round of nuclear weapons development runs counter to those priorities. The Committee directs the NNSA to focus wholly on its primary mission of maintaining the safety, security, and viability of the existing stockpile by executing the Stockpile Life Extension Program and Science-based Stewardship activities on time and within budget.

CAMPAIGNS

Campaigns are focused efforts involving the three weapons laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, the weapons production plants, and selected external organizations to address critical capabilities needed to achieve program objectives. The Committee recommendation is $2,252,048,000, a decrease of $141,792,000 below the budget request of $2,393,840,000.

In order to facilitate review of the President's annual budget request, the Committee continues to direct the Department to provide project baseline data for each campaign to include a brief de-

scription of the campaign with planned completion dates, the total estimated cost of each campaign, the costs by fiscal year for each major component of the campaign, and a list of major milestones by year. The Committee expects the Department to provide detailed project baseline data for each campaign showing the annual and five-year costs, schedule, scope, and key deliverables for individual project activities as part of the fiscal year 2006 budget request.

From within funds provided for the various campaigns, the Committee directs that $4,350,000 be provided to continue the University Research Program in Robotics (URPR) for the development of advanced robotic technologies for strategic national applications.

*Science campaigns.*—The Committee recommendation for science campaigns is $256,962,000, a reduction of $44,000,000 from the budget request. The primary assessment technology campaign was reduced $15,000,000 to limit the enhanced test readiness initiative to the goal of achieving a 24-month test readiness posture. The Committee continues to oppose the 18-month test readiness posture and refers the Department to the unambiguous Congressional language provided in the fiscal year 2004 Conference Report requiring the Department to achieve and maintain a 24-month test readiness posture. The Committee has not been kept informed, as requested in the fiscal year 2004 Conference Report, on the progress of the Department's efforts to restore the current 24-month test readiness requirement and, therefore, continues to have unanswered questions on the efficacy of the overall test readiness initiative. The Committee recommendation includes $81,521,000 for dynamic materials properties campaign, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $48,371,000 for the advanced radiography campaign, a reduction of $14,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee is disappointed with the continued delay in the commissioning of the Dual-Axis Radiographic Hydrotest facility (DARHT), which is significantly over budget and behind schedule. The secondary assessment technologies campaign recommendation is $60,597,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 to the significant increase proposed over the current year funding level pending the outcome of the Secretary's review of the weapons complex.

*Engineering campaigns.*—The Committee recommendation for engineering campaigns is $222,984,000, a decrease of $20,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommendation for the enhanced surety campaign is $33,121,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 to the budget request. The Committee's recommendation maintains current year funding levels. The Committee provides $27,270,000 for the Weapons Systems Engineering Assessment Technology campaign, the same as the budget request. The Committee questions the continued high level of funding requested in the Nuclear Survivability campaign to assess the ability of the weapons in the stockpile to continue to function as designed during a massive nuclear exchange. In the post-Cold War world with no new weapon production ongoing, this activity is a waste of scarce resources. The Committee provides $9,460,000 for the Nuclear Survivability campaign, a reduction of $15,000,000 to the budget re-

quest. The Committee recommendation for the enhanced surveillance campaign is $99,879,000, the same as the budget request.

*Construction projects.*—The Committee recommends $48,654,000, the same as the budget request, for Project 01–D–108, Microsystems and engineering science applications (MESA), at Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico.

*Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign.*—The Committee recommends $545,034,000 for the inertial confinement fusion program, an increase of $53,000,000 over the budget request of $492,034,000.

The Committee is greatly concerned by the Department's fiscal year 2005 budget justification as it related to the program goals for the National Ignition Facility (NIF). In the budget justification, the NNSA seemed to waiver in its commitment to NIF by delaying the proposed date for achieving ignition from 2010 to 2014. The Committee views ignition as the sole benchmark for success in this program and is very concerned the four-year slip in the ignition milestone buried in the NNSA's budget justification documents represents a change in the Department's commitment to ignition in favor of less challenging goals for the NIF. The Committee's priority is on completion of the project in 2008 and achieving the functional requirement of first ignition in 2010. The Committee directs that no funds be expended, directly or indirectly, for additional capabilities for NIF that are not specified in the current baseline until the NIF project is completed in 2008 and ignition attempted in 2010. Any diversions represent significant risk to a project that has already experienced well-publicized cost and schedule problems. The Committee's appropriation for the ICF campaign will be controlled at the major technical effort (MTE) subprogram level noted in the Committee Report tables. Neither the Department nor the national laboratory will divert funds from within the control levels as appropriated without first submitting a formal reprogramming request to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees.

The Committee directs the NNSA to develop a management process that is consistent with DOE Order 413.3 and manages the ignition, diagnostic, cryogenic and experimental subprograms as projects incorporating a work breakdown structure to track scope, cost, schedule, and key milestones within a management control system. The Committee directs the NNSA to report quarterly on the milestone cost and schedule variance within the respective experimental programs from the NIF 2000 rebaselined program.

The Committee notes that the Defense Science Board (DSB) has been asked to review the NIF Activation and Early Use Plan. The Committee expects the NNSA to submit a copy of the NIF Activation and Early Use Plan to the Committee by September 30, 2004, and a copy of the DSB report when it is completed. The Committee expects the NNSA to insist on a review body that represents the best independent external review capability, free of professional or personal relationships that may lead to the appearance of partiality in the content of the report.

The Committee recommendation provides $130,000,000 for construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF), the same as the budget request.

The Committee recommendation includes $25,000,000 to continue development of high average power lasers and supporting science and technology within the Inertial Fusion Technology line. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $11,049,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory, and $73,469,000 for the University of Rochester, an increase of $28,000,000 over the budget request. The additional funding has been provided for the University of Rochester's Laboratory for Laser Energetics within the High-Energy Petawatt Laser Development MTE to accelerate the OMEGA Extended Performance capability, a four beam super-high-intensity, high-energy laser facility for support of the nation's stockpile stewardship program. The Committee notes that, other than the few operational beams of NIF, the OMEGA facility is the only large laser implosion facility available for NNSA weapons work and will continue to be a primary laser facility for NNSA Stockpile Stewardship activities. The Committee notes that the University of Rochester is providing over $20 million for the building to house the OMEGA extended performance.

*Advanced simulation and computing (ASCI).*—The Committee recommendation for Advanced Simulation and Computing is $666,260,000, a reduction of $75,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee has consistently requested budget justifications that include project plans with scope, cost, schedule and key milestones tied to ASCI program goals in order to understand and track program progress in the NNSA's computing activities. The Committee requests that NNSA work with the Committee to define and develop ASCI program products with associated milestones to make progress transparent for the Committee and the Department in future years. Within available funds, the Committee recommendation provides $10,000,000 for power and fiber-optic upgrades, development of a technology training center, and hardware and software upgrades in conjunction with the Ohio Supercomputer Center at Springfield, Ohio, and $2,500,000 to complete the three-dimensional chip-scale packaging integrated with spray cooling at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

*Pit Manufacturing and Pit Certification.*—The Committee recommendation for the pit manufacturing and certification campaign is $295,681,000, a reduction of $40,792,000 from the budget request. The Committee's recommendation maintains the current year funding level. The Committee commends the Los Alamos National Laboratory for its work restoring the pit production capability to the nuclear weapons production complex. The Committee continues to oppose the Department's accelerated efforts to site and begin construction activities on a modern pit facility and urges the Department to continue to concentrate its management attention on meeting the fiscal year 2007 schedule for a certified pit ready for the stockpile. The Committee provides $142,005,000, a $10,000,000 increase to the budget request, for W88 Pit Manufacturing and $101,470,000 for W88 Certification, the same as the budget request. The Committee provides the additional $10,000,000 in pit manufacturing to accelerate the ongoing work to expand the capacity of TA–55 at Los Alamos National Laboratory to address near-term pit manufacturing requirements as a production hedge

while the Department completes the accelerated plutonium aging experiments.

The Committee provides no funds for pit manufacturing capability, a reduction of $20,992,000 to the budget request. The Committee continues to believe that work on pit manufacturing should be focused on expansion of the pit production capability of TA–55 at Los Alamos National Laboratory and notes that the sooner an expanded capability comes on line, the smaller its capacity needs to be to meet future stockpile requirements. Accordingly, the Committee provides no funds for the modern pit facility (MPF) pending the outcome of the Secretary's review of the weapons complex and the accelerated pit aging experiments. The current suite of DOE facilities (e.g. NIF, Hanford vitrification plant, DARHT) that were proposed with great promise only to experience extended schedule delays and enormous cost overruns leads this Committee to take a very cautious approach with the taxpayers' money when considering another major infrastructure investment. The Committee will consider a modern pit facility design only when the pit aging experiments are completed and the future MPF capacity requirements as a function of the 2012 stockpile and the expanded TA–55 production capability are determined.

The Committee provides the budget request for Pit Campaign Support Activities at the Nevada Test Site.

*Readiness campaigns.*—The Committee recommendation for Readiness Campaigns is $265,127,000, a reduction of $15,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommends $45,812,000, for Stockpile Readiness, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommends $34,220,000 for High Explosives Manufacturing and Weapons Assembly/Disassembly, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommends $30,457,000 for Nonnuclear Readiness, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $74,788,000 for Advanced Design and Production Technologies, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee's reductions limit program growth and maintain current year funding levels. The Committee recommends $79,850,000 for Tritium Readiness, the same as the budget request.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

The Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF) program supports the physical and operational infrastructure at the laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, and the production plants. The Committee recommendation is $1,652,454,000, an increase of $178,000,000 above the budget request of $1,474,454,000.

*Operations of facilities.*—The Committee recommendation for Operations of facilities is $1,151,557,000, an increase of $134,000,000 over the budget request. Additional funding of $45,000,000 has been provided for the Pantex Plant in Texas, $5,000,000 for the Kansas City Plant in Kansas, and $80,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant in Tennessee to address chronic under-funding in the maintenance of production plant facilities. The Committee encourages the NNSA to accelerate the reduction of the facility footprint at the Y–12 plant in order to modernize operations and reduce security costs. The Committee provides an additional $4,000,000 to accelerate the

relocation of the special nuclear material at TA–18 in Los Alamos National Laboratory to the Device Assembly Facility at the Nevada Test Site.

*Program Readiness.*—The Committee recommendation is $101,204,000, a decrease of $5,000,000 to the budget request. The Committee does not support the Department's proposal for NNSA to fully fund the Nuclear Criticality Safety Program (NCSP). The Committee directs the Department to continue to fund this DOE-wide infrastructure program with multiple DOE program sponsors.

*Special Projects.*—The Committee recommendation for Special Projects is $15,534,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommendation reduces Special Project funding for independent and internal reviews and independent cost estimating requirements for RTBF activities. The Committee directs the NNSA to include direct funding for those activities within the construction activities.

The Committee recommendation for Material Recycle and Recovery is $86,965,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation for Containers is $17,910,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation for Storage is $18,982,000, the same as the budget request.

*Construction projects.*—

Project 05–D–140, Project engineering and design (PED)—RTBF, various locations. The Committee recommends $21,600,000, an increase of $10,000,000. The additional PED funds are provided to begin planning and design for impact-resistant bunkers for additional warhead storage facilities for nuclear warheads with conventional high explosives at the Pantex Plant in Texas.

Project 05–D–401, Building 12–64 Upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX. The Committee recommends $25,100,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 05–D–402, Beryllium Capability (BeC) Project, Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN. The Committee recommends $3,627,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 03–D–102, LANL Administration Building, LANL, Los Alamos, NM. The Committee recommends $37,348,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 04–D–125, Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Facility Replacement (CMRR)—LANL. The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for the CMRR project, a decrease of $14,000,000 from the budget request. The NNSA's fiscal year 2005 budget justification states that significant budget reductions in fiscal year 2004 and Departmental reductions to the fiscal year 2005 request will impact the outyear funding profile and schedule for this project. The NNSA concludes in its budget justification that additional analysis is required to validate cost estimates that are coming in at the high end of the pre-conceptual baseline range. Due to the complexity of this project and the uncertainty of the current estimates, the Committee directs the NNSA to complete its pre-conceptual baseline cost estimating and include in the fiscal year 2006 budget request the revised schedule and cost estimates.

Project 04–D–128, TA–18 mission relocation project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM. The Committee recommends $8,000,000, an increase of $8,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee's rec-

ommendation accelerates the relocation of the special nuclear material at TA–18 in Los Alamos National Laboratory to the Device Assembly Facility at the Nevada Test Site.

Project 01–D–124, Highly Enriched Uranium Materials Facility, Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN. The Committee recommends $114,000,000, an increase of $50,000,000 over the budget request. Consistent with the Secretary of Energy's security initiatives announced in May 2004, the Committee directs the Department to accelerate the construction and operational start of the HEU Materials Facility to the maximum extent practicable to provide for consolidated storage of HEU at the Y–12 Plant. This acceleration is intended to address security issues raised by the General Accounting Office and internal Departmental security reviews related to multiple HEU storage locations at the facility.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION

The Committee recommendation for Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP) is $273,544,000, a reduction of $42,680,000 from the budget request, but an increase of $34,838,000 over the current year.

FIRP is a corporate program to restore, rebuild, and revitalize the physical infrastructure of the nuclear weapons complex. Its purpose is to stem the deterioration of the complex and address the backlog of maintenance, repair, and upgrade projects. The Committee directs NNSA to ensure that funds for recapitalization are not diverted to fund ongoing maintenance and programmatic needs while at the same time guarding against the inefficiency of large uncosted balances.

The Committee directs that at least $50,000,000 of the facilities and infrastructure funding in fiscal year 2005 be used to dispose of excess facilities. The Committee encourages continuation of this program to reduce the overall facilities footprint of the complex. The Committee continues to expect that services for D&D and demolition of excess facilities services be procured through open-competition where such actions provide the best return on investment for the federal government. The Committee directs the NNSA to continue a free and open competition process for at least 70 percent of the funds provided for disposing of excess facilities.

*Facility Infrastructure and Recapitalization Construction Projects.*—The Committee recommendation provides $24,681,000 for FIRP construction projects, the same as the budget request.

SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Secure Transportation Asset program provides for the safe, secure movement of nuclear weapons, special nuclear materials, and non-nuclear weapon components between military locations and nuclear weapons complex facilities within the United States. The Committee recommendation is $201,300,000, the same as the budget request.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS INCIDENT RESPONSE

The Committee recommendation for nuclear weapons incident response is $99,209,000, the same as the budget request. This activ-

ity was funded at $89,167,000 in Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities in fiscal year 2004.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

This program provides for all safeguards and security requirements at NNSA landlord sites. The Committee recommendation is $740,991,000, an increase of $34,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee increase includes $30,000,000 for the Y–12 National Security Complex to accelerate security infrastructure upgrades and consolidate the facility footprint. The Committee provides $4,000,000 for safeguard and security upgrades at the Device Assembly Facility (DAF) at the Nevada Test Site to accelerate the Secretary of Energy's security initiative to remove all category I and II nuclear material from TA–18 at Los Alamos National Laboratory as soon as practicable. The Committee urges the Department to bring innovative technology to bear on the problems of increased physical safeguards and security measures. Additional manpower is only a stopgap solution to address security concerns throughout the weapons complex. With program needs going unmet and infrastructure deteriorating, the Committee strongly encourages the NNSA to review these growing costs and seek smarter and more efficient ways to meet security needs.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The budget request included an offset of $30,000,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work, the same as the budget request.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $1,364,514,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 1,348,647,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 1,348,647,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | −15,867,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account includes funding for Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development; Nonproliferation and International Security; Nonproliferation Programs with Russia including International Materials Protection, Control, and Cooperation, Russian Transition Initiative, Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Transparency Implementation, Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production, and Fissile Materials Disposition; and Offsite Source Recovery Project. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

NONPROLIFERATION AND VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The nonproliferation and verification research and development program conducts applied research, development, testing, and evaluation of science and technology for strengthening the United States response to threats to national security and to world peace posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons and special nuclear materials. Activities center on the design and production of operational sensor systems needed for proliferation detection, treaty

verification, nuclear warhead dismantlement initiatives, and intelligence activities.

The Committee recommendation is $241,500,000, an increase of $21,500,000 over the budget request, and includes $118,044,000 for proliferation detection, an increase of $6,500,000 over the budget request for high priority research requirements; $111,931,000 for nuclear explosion monitoring, an increase of $10,000,000 over the request, of which $25,000,000 is for ground-based systems for treaty monitoring; and $11,525,000 for supporting activities, an increase of $5,000,000 over the request. The Committee provides the additional $5,000,000 within Supporting Activities for project engineering and design funding to support the relocation of laboratory personnel and facilities displaced by the planned shutdown and cleanup of the 300 Area at the Hanford reservation in Washington. The Committee supports the timely development of replacement infrastructure at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) and directs the Office of Nuclear Nonproliferation to coordinate closely with the Office of Science on the transition schedule and construction plans to maintain the national security capabilities resident at PNNL. As the largest single programmatic customer of PNNL, the NNSA should work with the Office of Science and request sufficient funds in the fiscal year 2006 budget request to maintain the construction schedule to replace facilities at PNNL to accommodate the 300 Area closure. From within available funds, the Committee recommendation provides $2,000,000 for testing of high-pressure xenon radiation detectors at the Brookhaven National Laboratory Rad-Tech facility for portal applications.

The Committee expects the Department to continue to provide greater opportunity for open competition, where appropriate, for nonproliferation and verification research and development activities and directs the Department to continue a free and open competitive process for at least 50 percent of its research and development activities during fiscal year 2005 for ground-based systems treaty monitoring. The competitive process should be open to all Federal and non-Federal entities.

*Annual Report Requirement.*—The Committee directs the Department to prepare an annual report of each project with the baseline cost, scope and schedule, deliverables, lab performing the research and development, and the proposed user and submit this with the fiscal year 2006 budget.

NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The Nonproliferation and International Security program (formerly the Arms Control program) seeks to detect, prevent, and reverse the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction materials, technology, and expertise. The major functional areas of the program include: nonproliferation policy; international safeguards; export control; treaties and agreements; and international emergency management and cooperation. The Committee recommendation for Nonproliferation and International Security is $124,000,000, the same as the budget request. The recommendation includes $63,216,000 for Nonproliferation Policy, $31,330,000 for International Safeguards, $22,246,000 for Export Control activities, $3,208,000 for Treaties and Agreements, and $4,000,000 for Inter-

national Emergency Management and Cooperation. From within available funds, the Committee recommendation provides $150,000 to continue the successful collaboration between Texas A&M and Russian universities on nuclear facilities safety, nuclear materials management, and decontamination and decommissioning technologies.

While the Committee has consistently been a strong supporter of nuclear nonproliferation activities conducted by the Department, the Secretary of Energy's recent announcement outlining a new nonproliferation initiative called the Global Threat Reduction Initiative was poorly timed for consideration during the current appropriations process. The Committee does not support initiatives with substantial funding requirements without sufficient prior consultation and coordination with the appropriate Congressional Committees. The Committee looks forward to considering a funding request for this new initiative when the Department either submits a formal reprogramming request with appropriate offsets or requests a fiscal year 2005 budget amendment. Given the current austere budget environment, the Committee directs the Department to include with any proposed budget amendment or reprogramming request a justification including a detailed description of the nonproliferation risk-based priority setting process as it relates to relative risk and resource allocation.

The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $2,000,000 for the Kazakhstan Spent Fuel Disposition initiative to secure three tons of weapons-grade plutonium in the BN–350 reactor spent fuel at Aktau, Kazakhstan. None of the funds provided for this activity in fiscal year 2005, or previous fiscal years, may be obligated for transportation equipment or activities without first notifying the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees.

NONPROLIFERATION PROGRAMS WITH RUSSIA

The Department of Energy funds many nonproliferation programs with Russia. These programs help secure Russian nuclear weapons and weapons material, prevent the outflow of scientific expertise from Russia, eliminate excess nuclear weapons materials, and downsize the Russian nuclear weapons complex.

*Limitation on Russian Program Funds.*—The Committee remains concerned that the Department is not putting a high enough management priority on ensuring that as much of the funds appropriated for the Russian programs as practical are spent in Russia rather than at the Department's own national laboratories in the U.S. The Department's contracting mechanisms are resulting in excess funds going to pay laboratories for contract administration and oversight that would be better performed by Federal personnel. The Committee expects more direct contracting will be a result of the Nuclear Nonproliferation office achieving its Federal staffing goals in the current year. The Department's national laboratories should be used to provide technical oversight and programmatic guidance in those areas where they have special expertise. The Committee directs that not more than 40 percent of the funding for Russian programs may be spent in the U.S.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS PROTECTION AND COOPERATION

The International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation program, commonly know as Materials Protection Control and Accounting (MPC&A), is designed to work cooperatively with Russia to secure weapons and weapons-usable nuclear material. The focus is to improve the physical security at facilities that possess or process significant quantities of nuclear weapons-usable materials that are of proliferation concern. Activities include installing monitoring equipment, inventorying nuclear material, improving the Russian security culture, and establishing a security infrastructure.

The Committee recommendation is $415,250,000 an increase of $177,250,000 over the budget request. The Committee's increase to the MPC&A program is provided to take advantage of the expanded opportunities for additional high priority work in Russia that came to light after the budget request was submitted to the Congress. The Committee supports the Department's efforts to continue to negotiate greater access to the Russian serial production enterprise and move promptly to secure material when site access is granted. The Committee recognizes the importance of expanding new opportunities and supports the MPC&A program's aggressive nonproliferation work while other areas of the Nuclear Nonproliferation program continue to be mired in bureaucratic battlefields accomplishing nothing for the taxpayer. The Committee will concentrate its limited nonproliferation resources on the vast quantities of highly attractive material that exists in Russia. The Committee views the hundreds of metric tons of nuclear material in Russia still stored under inadequate security and subject to theft or diversion as the highest risk potential for diversion of weapons-usable nuclear materials.

Within funds provided for MPC&A, the Committee provides an additional $32,000,000 for Strategic Rocket Forces activities to accelerate securing nuclear warhead sites in Russia. The Committee recommendation includes $78,250,000, for the MinAtom Weapons Complex, an increase of $35,250,000 to begin MPC&A upgrades at one serial production enterprise site and to begin construction of a central storage facility for weapons-usable material. The Committee provides an additional $20,000,000 for the Second Line of Defense program to accelerate installation activities in the Baltic and Caucasus regions and other critical border activities. The Committee provides $45,000,000 in the Second Line of Defense program for the MegaPorts initiative, a $30,000,000 increase over the budget request. An increase of $60,000,000 is provided for other high priority MPC&A activities, to include countries outside the former Soviet Union.

RUSSIAN TRANSITION INITIATIVE

The Committee recommendation for the Russian Transition Initiative (RTI) program is $41,000,000, the same as the budget request. The Russian Transition Initiative includes the Initiative for Proliferation Prevention (IPP) program and the Nuclear Cities Initiatives (NCI) to develop projects to employ Russian weapons scientists and downsize the Russian weapons complex. The Committee expects the Department to accelerate by two years, from

2008 to 2006, its Annual Performance target for the RTI program to achieve matching contributions of non-US Government sources from the current goal of 80 percent of project funds to a 100 percent full match in 2006.

HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM (HEU) TRANSPARENCY IMPLEMENTATION

The highly enriched uranium (HEU) transparency implementation program develops and implements mutually agreeable transparency measures for the February 1993 agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation. This agreement, which has an estimated value of $12 billion, covers the purchase over 20 years of low enriched uranium (LEU) derived from 500 metric tons of HEU removed from dismantled Russian nuclear weapons. Under the agreement, conversion of HEU components into LEU is performed in Russian facilities. The Committee recommendation is $20,950,000, the same as the budget request.

ELIMINATION OF WEAPONS-GRADE PLUTONIUM PRODUCTION PROGRAM

The Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production Program (EWGPP) was transferred from the Department of Defense to the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2003. This is a cooperative effort with the Federation of Russia to stop plutonium production at three nuclear reactors still in operation in Russia, two located at Seversk and one at Zheleznogorsk. The three reactors have approximately 15 years of remaining lifetime and could generate an additional 25 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium. They also provide heat and electricity required by the surrounding communities. The current approach is to shut down these three reactors within six years by providing two alternate fossil-fueled energy plants to supply heat and electricity to the surrounding communities. The original cost estimate provided to the Committee in 2002 included a high-end estimate of $470,000,000 for the total cost of the program. A preliminary revised cost estimate discussed with the Committee in May 2004 now indicates a total program cost approaching $1.2 billion. The Committee is unprepared to perpetuate the Department's preference for proposing new initiatives with inadequate cost estimates, only to be confronted with significant cost increases once Congress has begun funding the activity. From within available funds, the Committee directs the Department to transfer $4,000,000 to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to conduct a detailed independent cost estimate for both fossil fuel plant projects in Russia. This independent cost estimate should be completed no later than April 30, 2005. Faced with such significant cost growth, the Committee must consider other alternatives to control costs or terminate the project. The Committee recommendation is $15,097,000, a $35,000,000 reduction to the President's request.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The fissile materials disposition program is responsible for the technical and management activities to assess, plan and direct efforts to provide for the safe, secure, environmentally sound long-term storage of all weapons-usable fissile materials and the disposition of fissile materials declared surplus to national defense

needs. The Committee is greatly concerned with the continued impasse between the United States and Russia on negotiations over liability protections for U.S. companies and personnel conducting nonproliferation work in Russia. Because Congress requires both the U.S. and Russian disposition programs proceed in parallel, the protracted liability negotiations have already resulted in a one-year delay in the planned construction start in Russia and the U.S. from summer 2004 to summer 2005. The Committee has no reason to proceed with fiscal year 2005 budget decisions under the assumption that the liability dispute is nearing resolution.

While the Committee supports successful implementation of the department's nuclear nonproliferation activities, the inability of the Department to maintain the continuity of the government-to-government implementing agreements for Plutonium Disposition activities calls into question its commitment to completing this program. Given the Committee's budget constraints, it would be irresponsible to allocate hundreds of millions for a program that is currently prohibited from spending the funds. The Committee notes that the program received full funding in the current year anticipating a construction start in July 2004, and the subsequent one-year delay results in the carryover of significant uncosted funds. If the liability negotiations are concluded successfully and program activities can proceed on schedule in 2005, the Committee directs the department to seek a reprogramming to restore the required funding.

The Committee recommendation is $483,250,000, a reduction $165,750,000 from the budget request, to accommodate a delay in full funding until program activities can continue under a revised U.S.-Russia Plutonium Disposition implementing agreement. Funding of $184,700,000 is provided for U.S. surplus materials disposition and $31,500,000 for the Russian plutonium disposition program.

*Construction projects.*—The Committee recommendation includes $234,750,000 for Project 99–D–143, the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication facility project, a reduction of $133,250,000 from the budget request. Funding of $32,300,000 is provided for Project 99–D–141, the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility project.

OFF-SITE SOURCE RECOVERY PROJECT

The Off-Site Source Recovery Project recovers excess and unwanted sealed sources from non-Department of Energy sites and stores the material at Department facilities to reduce and ultimately eliminate the risk these sources pose to homeland security by their possible use in a radiological dispersal device. The Committee recommendation is $7,600,000, an increase of $2,000,000 above the budget request. The additional $2,000,000 is provided for the Nuclear and Other Hazardous Materials Transportation Research Project at the South Carolina State University's Transportation Center.

## NAVAL REACTORS

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $761,878,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 797,900,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 807,900,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +46,022,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | +10,000,000 |

The Naval Reactors program is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion—from technology development through reactor operations to ultimate reactor plant disposal. The program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. These efforts are critical to ensuring the safety and reliability of 102 operating Naval reactor plants and to developing the next generation reactor. The Committee recommendation is $807,900,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. This additional amount is to be transferred to the Office of Nuclear Energy to support the Idaho National Laboratory's Advanced Test Reactor (ATR). As the primary user of the Advanced Test Reactor, the Naval Reactors program should ensure its future budget requests support the ongoing requirements to upgrade and maintain the ATR.

## OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $337,974,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 333,700,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 356,200,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +18,226,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | +22,500,000 |

The Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) provides corporate planning and oversight for Defense Programs, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Naval Reactors, including the NNSA field offices in New Mexico, Nevada, and California. The Committee recommendation is $356,200,000, an increase of $22,500,000 above the budget request. This additional amount is provided to increase the NNSA contribution to the Department's support for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). The Committee's recommendation for the Office of the Administrator removes the separate line for the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program direction to allow greater management flexibility for the Administrator. However, the Committee expects the Administrator to continue to maintain separate program direction budget and reporting accounting codes for the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation to maintain cost accountability between the separate programs within the NNSA.

The Committee directs the Administrator of NNSA to provide at least $5,000,000 for the NNSA Office of Engineering and Construction Management for External Independent Reviews (EIRs) of NNSA projects and continue to provide financial support for training and mentoring programs to improve the skills of NNSA project managers. The Committee recommendation provides $12,000, the same as the budget request, for official reception and representation expenses for the NNSA.

*Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).*—The Committee is troubled by the level of the NNSA's support for Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Funding data provided to the Committee by the Department documents this disappointing level of support. Annual funding for the NNSA is now in excess of nine billion dollars, while the NNSA contribution to the nation's HBCUs in fiscal year 2003 (the last year of available cost data) was a paltry $1.2 million. The Committee finds it difficult to reconcile the NNSA's level of support for the HBCUs juxtaposed against the level of discretionary funding available to the NNSA's national laboratories under the authority of the Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) program, which the Department justifies principally as a means to recruit and retain competent scientific and technical staff. In fiscal year 2003, the three weapons labs taxed appropriated program funds to create an LDRD pool of more than $250,000,000 that was spent at the sole discretion of the individual laboratory directors and was neither controlled by the Congress nor managed by the Federal managers at the Department. Given that degree of financial flexibility built into the NNSA's weapons budget, the Committee feels it is in the Nation's best interest to support the HBCU educational institutions across the country in order to deepen the recruiting pool of diverse scientific and technical staff available to the NNSA and its national laboratories in support of the nation's national security programs.

The Committee recommendation provides $22,500,000, one-quarter of one percent of the NNSA budget request, to support the HBCUs scientific and technical programs. The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 each for Wilberforce University and Central State University in Wilberforce, Ohio; and $2,000,000 each for Claflin College in Orangeburg, SC and Allen University in Columbia, SC; $500,000 each for Morris College in Sumter, SC and Benedict College in Columbia, SC; and $1,000,000 for Voorhees College in Denmark, SC. The Committee notes that the NNSA provided $19,800,000 million in fiscal year 2003 in support of Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs). The Committee encourages continued generous support of the HSIs and intends the addition of fiscal year 2005 funding for the HBCUs will result in year-to-year funding parity for both sets of institutions in future fiscal years.

## ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

### DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Management totals $6,888,813,000, a reduction of $64,494,000 from the budget request of $6,953,307,000. Details of the recommended funding levels follow below for the specific Defense Environmental Management accounts.

The Defense Environmental Management program is responsible for identifying and reducing risks and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out defense-related nuclear research and production activities that resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination requiring remediation, stabilization, or some other type of cleanup action. These responsibilities include facilities and areas at 114 geographic sites. These sites are

located in 30 states and one territory and occupy an area equal to that of Rhode Island and Delaware combined—or about two million acres.

Defense Environmental Management activities are funded in two separate accounts: Defense Site Acceleration Completion and Defense Environmental Services. Defense Site Acceleration Completion, with a request of $5.97 billion, has as its primary mission the closure of cleanup sites centered on three timeframes: 2006, 2012 and 2035. Defense Environmental Services, with a request of $982 million, represents those activities that support closure (e.g. Federal salaries, and payments to States and communities) and non-mission environmental work (e.g. storage of spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste, and management of newly generated low level radioactive waste for other programs).

*High Level Waste Legislative Proposal (Waste Incidental to Reprocessing).*—In 2003, a Federal district court in Idaho held that the Department does not have the authority to reclassify certain high-level wastes as "waste incidental to reprocessing" and dispose of them as other than high-level waste. The Department proposed legislation in late fiscal year 2003 to overturn the court decision, but neither chamber of Congress passed such legislation. In its fiscal year 2005 budget request, the Department identified $350,000,000 of work at the Hanford, Idaho, and Savannah River sites that cannot proceed in light of the Idaho court decision. While the Department is seeking to overturn the Idaho district court decision on appeal, the Department is also working to overturn the court decision through legislation affirming the Department's authority to reclassify radioactive waste.

The Committee supports resolution of this issue through the judicial appeals process or through comprehensive legislation that would address the problem in a consistent manner nationwide. Unfortunately, the State of South Carolina and the Department have elected to pursue a strategy that would only resolve the issue for the Savannah River site, and by doing so, may very well hinder a solution for the other affected sites. The Committee does not support such an approach, and directs the Department to continue working toward a comprehensive solution. The Committee encourages the Department to take advantage of the radioactive waste rules already promulgated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (10 C.F.R. Part 61), rather than insisting that the Department have the authority to make its own discretionary determination as to which wastes are high-level and which are low-level. This determination should be based on quantitative, objective measurements using the NRC criteria, not based on the Department's subjective determination or on the court's literal interpretation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

The Committee agrees with the Department that two specific projects at the Savannah River site, the Salt Waste Processing Facility (05–D–401) and the Salt Waste Process Facility Alternative (03–D–414), would be prohibited by the court decision, and no funds are provided for these projects in fiscal year 2005. The balance of the $350,000,000 requested for waste incidental to reprocessing is provided to the Hanford ($64,100,000), Idaho ($97,300,000), and Savannah River ($112,942,000) sites, and the

Committee directs the Department to spend these funds at these three sites on other cleanup activities that are not precluded by the court decision.

*Cost and Schedule Baselines.*—Based on the 33 percent increase last year in the estimated cost for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (project 01–D–416) at Hanford, the Committee directed the Department to transfer funds to the Corps of Engineers to conduct an independent review of the cost and schedule baseline for this project. The Corps completed this review and reached several significant conclusions: (1) the Department and its contractor have known for quite a while that the real cost of the project would be much higher than the previously-claimed cost of $4.35 billion; (2) there is a high probability the cost will increase above the current baseline of $5.8 billion; (3) there has been insufficient contingency through the life of the project; (4) DOE agreed to a $1.4 billion modification to this project without preparing an independent government estimate; (5) the current contract arrangement of cost-plus-incentive-fee is not the best contract mechanism for this type of project; and (6) the greatest risk of cost and schedule overruns lies with the commissioning phase of the project.

The Committee is greatly troubled by these findings, and even more troubled by DOE management's apparent lack of concern about these findings. The history of uncontrolled cost growth on this project, and the underlying management deficiencies that led to such cost growth, does not inspire Congressional confidence in the cost and schedule estimates for other major cleanup projects, nor for the Department's claims of cost savings resulting from accelerated cleanup.

While the Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant is too far along to terminate, and to do so would cause irreparable harm to the Department's plans to remediate the high-level radioactive waste at Hanford, the Committee intends to limit any further cost increases for this project. The language accompanying the introductory section for Title III of this report imposes new notification, reporting, and cost estimating requirements on the Department for all projects with total estimated costs (TECs) in excess of $20 million. This requirement applies to a number of line-item projects with the Defense Site Acceleration Completion account, including the Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Project. As part of this requirement, the Committee directs the Department to conduct detailed independent reviews of the existing cost and schedule baselines for those projects with TECs in excess of $20 million. The Committee understands that the Department is already using the estimating expertise of the Corps of Engineers at a number of DOE sites, and the Committee strongly encourages the Department to have the Corps conduct these independent reviews, as was done for the Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant, on a reimbursable basis. The External Independent Reviews, as presently conducted by the Office of Engineering and Construction Management (EIR), are too cursory to be of much value.

*Statutory Changes Required for Accelerated Cleanup.*—In the statement of managers accompanying the conference report for the Energy and Water Development Act, 2004, the Committee directed the Department to submit a report to Congress identifying all

changes to existing statutory law that are necessary to execute accelerated cleanup. This report was due to Congress within 60 days of enactment; five months later, the Committee is still waiting for this report. There are two possible explanations for this lengthy delay: either the Department does not know what statutory changes are required and is waiting for its contractors to tell it what to do, or the Department knows but is reluctant to inform Congress. Neither alternative explanation leads Congress to trust the Department's claims for accelerated cleanup.

*State Agreement for Accelerated Performance Management Plans.*—The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2005 funding assumes, based on information provided to the Committee by the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management at the end of May 2004, that the relevant State regulators have agreed to all of the Department's accelerated Performance Management Plans (PMPs). If that situation changes during the course of the fiscal year such that a State indicates it no longer agrees with or supports one or more accelerated PMPs, the Department is to inform the Committee immediately and submit a reprogramming request within 60 days to direct the affected funds to another site that has a valid State agreement for accelerated cleanup.

*Economic development.*—None of the Defense Environmental Management funds are available for economic development activities unless specifically authorized by law.

*Reprogramming Authority.*—The Committee continues to support the need for flexibility to meet changing funding requirements at sites which are undergoing accelerated cleanup activities. However, the cost growth at Hanford and other sites leads the Committee to reduce some of the flexibility previously provided to the Department. In fiscal year 2005, each site manager may transfer up to $3,000,000 between Defense Site Acceleration Completion subaccounts (i.e., accelerated completions 2006, accelerated completions 2012, accelerated completions 2035, and line item construction projects) to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increased or decreased by more than $3,000,000 once during the fiscal year. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be notified within thirty days of the use of this reprogramming authority.

DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $5,617,719,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 5,970,837,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 5,930,837,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +313,118,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −40,000,000 |

The Committee recommendation for Defense Site Acceleration Completion in fiscal year 2005 is $5,930,837,000, a reduction of $40,000,000 from the budget request of $5,970,837,000, but an increase of $313,118,000 over the current fiscal year.

*Accelerated Completions, 2006.*—The Committee recommendation provides $1,264,999,000, an increase of $13,200,000 over the budget request. This funding supports the closure by the year 2006 of the Rocky Flats, West Jefferson, Fernald, Miamisburg, and Ashtabula sites, and the completion of significant cleanup projects at various other sites such as Melton Valley, Kansas City, and Savannah River. The additional $13,200,000 is provided to cover pension shortfalls and accelerate low-level waste shipments during fiscal year 2005 from the Miamisburg Closure Project. The Committee directs the Department to provide Congress, not later than March 31, 2005, with a plan and estimate for remediating the OU–1 landfill at the Miamisburg site. The Committee encourages the Department to work with the State of Nevada and other affected States to resolve the impasse over disposal of 11e.(2) waste from the Fernald site. The language included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004, was intended to allow the Department to consider commercial NRC-regulated disposal options as well as use of Government-owned disposal sites.

*Accelerated Completions, 2012.*—The Committee recommendation provides $2,150,641,000, the same as the budget request. This amount includes the requested funding for cleanup of the East Tennessee Technology Park and Oak Ridge Reservation, Hanford, Idaho, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Nevada Test Site, Pantex, and various other sites. The primary components include $690,000,000 for the Office of River Protection at Hanford, $524,818,000 for the Hanford site, and $415,178,000 for the Idaho Cleanup Project.

*Accelerated Completions, 2035.*—The Committee recommendation provides $1,893,339,000, the same as the budget request. This amount includes the requested funding of $43,827,000 for construction of the Glass Waste Storage Building #2 at the Savannah River Site (project 04–D–408) and the requested funding for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, the Idaho Cleanup Project, the Y–12 and Oak Ridge National Laboratory sites, Hanford and the Office of River Protection, Savannah River, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Nevada Test Site, and various other sites and facilities.

*Waste Incidental to Reprocessing.*—Of the $350,000,000 requested for activities that are precluded by the court decision on waste incidental to reprocessing, the Committee provides $274,342,000 and directs the Department to apply these funds to other cleanup activities that are not prohibited by the court decision. The Committee recommendation provides $64,100,000 for the Hanford site, $97,300,000 for the Idaho site, and $112,942,000 for the Savannah River site. The Committee directs the Department to submit a reprogramming request within 30 days of enactment identifying how these funds will be used for other cleanup activities at these three sites.

*Safeguards and Security.*—The Committee recommendation provides $265,059,000, the same as the budget request.

*Technology Development and Deployment.*—The Committee recommendation provides $82,600,000, an increase of $22,458,000 over the budget request. The additional funds are provided for the Department to conduct a competitive evaluation of the various advanced remediation technologies available in the private sector. If

testing and evaluation with surrogate materials is not sufficient, the Department should consider using one of the many existing contaminated facilities that are scheduled for decontamination and decommissioning within the next several years at sites such as Idaho or the 300 Area of Hanford to conduct testing with real radioactive materials. Within remaining available funds, the Committee provides $5,000,000 to continue the five-year international agreement with AEA Technology, and $7,000,000 to continue the five-year agreement with Florida International University's Hemispheric Center for Environmental Technology.

*Funding adjustments.*—The Committee recommendation includes an offset of $143,000 the same as the budget request, for the security costs associated with reimbursable work.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $985,296,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 982,470,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 957,976,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | −27,320,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −24,494,000 |

The Defense Environmental Services account incorporates the activities that indirectly support the cleanup and closure of contaminated sites. These include activities such as the management of non-legacy spent nuclear fuel and newly-generated waste as well as community and regulatory support, the Federal contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, and program direction for the Department's environmental management efforts. The Committee recommendation for Defense Environmental Services in fiscal year 2005 is $957,976,000, a decrease of $24,494,000 from the budget request.

*Community and Regulatory Support.*—The Committee recommendation is $60,547,000, the same as the budget request.

*Federal Contribution to Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.*—The Energy Policy Act of 1992, Public Law 102–486, created the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund to pay for the cost of cleanup of the gaseous diffusion facilities located in Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Paducah, Kentucky; and Portsmouth, Ohio. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $463,000,000 for the Federal contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.

*Non-Closure Environmental Activities.*—The Committee recommendation is $146,038,000, a reduction of $41,826,000 to the budget request resulting from the transfer of safety, health and security activities to Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance. Within available funds, the Committee directs the Department to provide $10,000,000 for the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program and $8,000,000 for the Volpentest Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) training and education center.

*Spent Nuclear Fuel Management.*—The Department proposed to transfer responsibility for the management and operation of the DOE national spent fuel program, the foreign research reactor

spent nuclear fuel acceptance program, and the management of chemical processing plant 666 at Idaho from the Office of Environmental Management to the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. The Secretary announced in April 2004 that the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation would henceforth manage the foreign research reactor spent fuel acceptance program. At the present time, the Committee does not agree with the proposed transfer of the remaining two programs (i.e., DOE national spent fuel program and management of chemical processing plant 666) and directs the Department to continuing managing these activities under the Office of Environmental Management. The Committee recommendation includes the requested amounts of $8,217,000 for the DOE national spent fuel program, $8,055,000 for management of chemical processing plant 666, and $1,060,000 for associated program direction costs. It is the Committee's expectation that these activities will continue to be managed at the Idaho site.

*Program Direction.*—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $271,059,000, the same as the budget request.

*Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP).*—The Committee continues to expect the Department to fulfill its responsibilities at FUSRAP sites, exclusive of the remedial actions to be performed by the Corps of Engineers.

## OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $670,510,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 663,636,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 697,059,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +26,549,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | +33,423,000 |

This account provides funding for Energy Security and Assurance; the Office of Security; Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance; Intelligence; Counterintelligence; Environment, Safety and Health (Defense); Legacy Management; National Security Programs Administrative Support; and the Office of Hearings and Appeals. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

### ENERGY SECURITY AND ASSURANCE

The Committee recommendation for the office of energy security and assurance is $21,000,000, an increase of $10,400,000 above the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to accelerate the operation of the national SCADA testbed at the Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee provides $5,500,000 for the GridWorks initiative, the same as the budget request and $6,500,000 for the GridWise initiative to address grid security and reliability through the application of modern information technologies. The Committee recommendation provides an additional $1,500,000 in GridWise for a regional demonstration project. These activities were originally proposed within the Office of Electric Transmission and Distribution budget request.

*Program direction.*—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for program direction, a reduction of $1,500,000 from the budget request.

OFFICE OF SECURITY

The Office of Security provides a domestic safeguards and security program for protection of nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, nuclear facilities, and classified and unclassified information, and security operations against sabotage, espionage, terrorist activities, or any loss or unauthorized disclosure that could endanger the national security or disrupt operations. The Committee recommendation for security and emergency operations is $306,374,000, an increase of $51,273,000 over the budget request. The Committee's recommendation provides additional capability to oversee the implementation of the new Design Basis Threat.

In fiscal year 2005, the Department of Energy will spend over $1.4 billion on safeguards and security activities at Headquarters and field locations. The $306,374,000 provided to the Office of Security is for Headquarters activities only. Funding for safeguards and security activities at Departmental facilities and laboratories in the field is included within each program budget.

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE

The intelligence program provides information and technical analyses on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy related matters to policy makers in 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.

OFFICE OF COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

The Office of Counterintelligence seeks to develop and implement an effective counterintelligence program throughout the Department of Energy. The goal of the program is to identify, neutralize, and deter foreign government or industrial intelligence threats directed at the Department's facilities, personnel, information, and technologies.

INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance is the focal point for independent evaluation of safeguards, security, emergency management, and cyber security. The Committee recommendation is $24,669,000, the same as the budget request.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Office of Environment, Safety and Health develops programs and policies to protect the workers and the public, conducts independent oversight of performance, and funds health effects studies. The Committee recommendation is $119,519,000, the same as the budget request.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $63,525,000 for the Office of Legacy Management to manage the long-term

stewardship responsibilities at the Department of Energy clean up sites. From within available funds, the Committee provides $1,200,000 to complete the transition of the STAR Center in Pinellas County, Florida and $4,000,000 for the final payment, subject to the existing requirement for matching funds, to the Miamisburg Mound Community Improvement Corporation. The Committee recommendation provides $32,395,000 in Other Defense Activities and the balance of $31,130,000 is provided in the non-defense Energy Supply account.

DEFENSE ACTIVITIES AT IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY

The Committee recommendation includes $114,347,000 to fund the defense-related (050 budget function) activities at the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) and associated Idaho cleanup sites. This amount includes $20,886,000 for INL infrastructure, the same as the budget request, for activities at this site previously funded under the Defense Environmental Management account; $58,103,000 for Idaho site wide safeguards and security, the same as the budget request; and $33,858,000 for program direction to support Headquarters and Idaho Field Office personnel previously funded under Defense Environmental Management. The Committee provides an additional $1,500,000 for the Office of Nuclear Energy to inspect and repackage, as necessary, the 77 kilograms of nuclear fuel and highly enriched uranium (HEU) at the Lynchburg Technology Center in Virginia.

DEFENSE RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $92,440,000, to provide administrative support for programs funded in the atomic energy defense activities accounts. This will fund Departmental activities performed by offices such as the Secretary, Deputy Secretary and Under Secretary, the General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer, Human Resources, Congressional Affairs, and Public Affairs, which support the organizations and activities funded in the atomic energy defense activities accounts.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

The Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) is responsible for all of the Department's adjudicatory processes, other than those administered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommendation is $4,318,000, the same as the budget request.

OFFICE OF FUTURE LIABILITIES

The Committee does not support the creation of a redundant Departmental office to address the planning function for long term environmental cleanup liabilities. The Committee views the more than seven billion dollars appropriated for the Department's environmental management activities as sufficient resources to address all possible planning activities. The Committee provides no funds for the Office of Future Liabilities.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation for funding adjustments includes the use of $15,000,000 in prior year balances and an offset of $3,003,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work, the same as the budget request.

## DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $387,699,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 131,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 131,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | −256,699,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

Since passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, the Nuclear Waste Fund has incurred costs for activities related to the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel generated from the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy. The Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriation was established to ensure payment of the Federal government's contribution to the nuclear waste repository program. Through fiscal year 2004, a total of $2.4 billion has been appropriated to support nuclear waste repository activities attributable to atomic energy defense activities. An estimated defense contribution of $3.4 billion will be required from fiscal year 2005 to fiscal year 2010 to fulfill the remaining defense obligation.

The Committee recommendation is $131,000,000, the same as the budget request. Because the Administration assumed that $749,000,000 of spending from the Nuclear Waste Fund would be offset through enactment of reclassification legislation, the Administration's net request for Yucca Mountain is only the $131,000,000 in Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal. Although program direction has traditionally been funded on the non-defense side of nuclear waste disposal, the Committee directs the Department to use Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal to fund this activity in fiscal year 2005.

## POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Management of the Federal power marketing functions was transferred from the Department of Interior to the Department of Energy by the Department of Energy Organization Act (P.L. 95–91). These functions include the power marketing activities authorized under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation that have been transferred to the Western Area Power Administration.

All power marketing administrations except the Bonneville Power Administration are funded annually with appropriated funds. Revenues collected from power sales and transmission services are deposited in the Treasury to offset expenditures. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2005 does not support the Administration proposal to continue the phase-out of federal fi-

nancing of the customers' purchase power and wheeling expenses for the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration. Also, the Committee recommendation does not at this time incorporate the Administration proposal for the Power Marketing Administrations to fund directly from revenues the costs of operation and maintenance of Federal hydropower facilities at Corps of Engineers dams.

Operations of the Bonneville Power Administration are self-financed under the authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act (P.L. 93–454). Under this Act, the Bonneville Power Administration is authorized to use its revenues to finance the costs of its operations, maintenance, and capital construction, and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any additional capital program requirements.

*Purchase power and wheeling*.—The Committee finds 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 2005 maintains purchase power and wheeling activities at approximately the fiscal year 2004 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

The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is the Department of Energy's marketing agency for electric power in the Pacific Northwest. Bonneville provides electricity to a 300,000 square mile service area in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets the power from Federal hydropower projects in the Northwest, as well as power from non-Federal generating facilities in the region, and exchanges and markets surplus power with Canada and California.

The Committee continues to have concerns about Bonneville's financial situation. In the fiscal year 2004 Conference Report the conferees tasked the Secretary of Energy to report to the House and Senate Committees on the mission, management, and financial condition of the BPA. The Committee notes two concerns with this reporting requirement. First, the report is overdue. Second, according to the Department's Quarterly Reporting on Congressional Requirements, the Secretary of Energy assigned the drafting of the report to the Bonneville Power Administration. Although no doubt knowledgeable on the subject the Committee questions the rationale of assigning the responsibility of an oversight report to the subject at issue.

The Committee has asked the General Accounting Office (GAO) to conduct a thorough review of the Bonneville Power Administration. The Committee has received the GAO's preliminary findings that are structured to help BPA control future costs and implement a risk management process. The initial recommendations include (1) limiting the amount of power that BPA sells at its lowest cost-based rate, (2) charging incremental rates for any power sold beyond this amount that reflects BPA's cost of acquiring that power, and (3) consider using a rulemaking procedure under the Adminis-

trative Procedures Act to set these limits and the terms of incremental rates. The Committee will withhold its recommendations pending the final GAO report.

### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $4,869,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 5,200,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 5,200,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +331,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Southeastern Power Administration markets the hydroelectric power produced at 23 Corps of Engineers projects in eleven states in the Southeast. Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities, so it contracts to "wheel" its power using the existing transmission facilities of area utilities.

The Committee recommendation for the Southeastern Power Administration is $5,200,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Southeastern in fiscal year 2005 is $39,200,000, with $34,000,000 for purchase power and wheeling and $5,200,000 for program direction. The purchase power and wheeling costs will be offset by collections of $34,000,000 provided in this Act.

### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $28,420,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 29,352,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 29,352,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +932,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Southwestern Power Administration markets the hydroelectric power produced at 24 Corps of Engineers projects in the six-state area of Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma and Texas. Southwestern operates and maintains 1,380 miles of transmission lines, with the supporting substations and communications sites. Southwestern gives preference in the sale of its power to publicly and cooperatively owned utilities.

The Committee recommendation for the Southwestern Power Administration is $29,352,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Southwestern in fiscal year 2005 is $31,152,000, including $4,676,000 for operating expenses, $1,800,000 for purchase power and wheeling, $19,324,000 for program direction, and $5,352,000 for construction. The offset of $1,800,000 from collections for purchase power and wheeling yields a net appropriation of $29,352,000. The offsetting collections for purchase power and wheeling include $1,800,000 provided in this Act.

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $175,778,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 173,100,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 173,100,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | −2,678,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Western Area Power Administration is responsible for marketing the electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission. Western also operates and maintains a system of transmission lines nearly 17,000 miles long. Western provides electricity to 15 Central and Western states over a service area of 1.3 million square miles.

The Committee recommendation for the Western Area Power Administration is $173,100,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Western in fiscal year 2005 is $362,768,000, which includes $20,191,000 for construction and rehabilitation, $39,821,000 for system operation and maintenance, $186,000,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and $116,756,000 for program direction. Consistent with the budget request, no funds are provided for Utah mitigation and conservation. Offsetting collections for purchase power and wheeling total $186,000,000; with the use of $3,668,000 of offsetting collections from the Colorado River Dam Fund (as authorized in P.L. 98–381), this requires a net appropriation of $173,100,000. The offsetting collections for purchase power and wheeling include $186,000,000 provided in this Act.

The Committee has become increasingly concerned that the Western Area Power Administration has thus far failed to affiliate its Sierra-Nevada region's transmission operations with a parent control area operator, as identified in Federal Register Notice dated February 23, 2004. The Committee recognizes that the Bonneville Power Administration's tardy entry into this issue has helped create unanticipated timing issues. This failure has put many of the regional water and power users in an uncertain and unacceptable transmission cost environment. Pursuant to the established Federal Register Notice process, the Committee strongly urges Western and the Bonneville Power Administration to resolve concerns in order for the agency to join a regional control area by January 1, 2005.

Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 for Topock-Davis-Mead Transmission Line Upgrades to provide additional transmission capacity by using aluminum matrix composite conductor technology.

## FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $2,624,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 2,827,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 2,827,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +203,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

Falcon Dam and Amistad Dam are two international water projects located on the Rio Grande River between Texas and Mexico. Power generated by hydroelectric facilities at these two dams is sold to public utilities through the Western Area Power Administration. The Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 created the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund to defray the costs of operation, maintenance, and emergency activities. The Fund is administered by the Western Area Power Administration for use by the Commissioner of the U.S. Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission.

The Committee recommendation is $2,827,000, the same as the budget request.

## FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $203,194,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 210,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 210,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +6,806,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

### REVENUES APPLIED

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $ −203,194,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −210,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | −210,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | −6,806,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Committee recommendation for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is $210,000,000, the same as the budget request. Revenues for FERC are established at a rate equal to the budget authority, resulting in a net appropriation of $0.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee's detailed funding recommendations for programs in Title III are contained in the following table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| ENERGY SUPPLY | | | |
| RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES | | | |
| Renewable energy technologies | | | |
| Biomass and biorefinery systems R&D | 74,558 | 72,596 | 72,596 |
| Geothermal technology | 25,847 | 25,800 | 25,800 |
| Hydrogen technology | 77,540 | 95,325 | 64,285 |
| Hydropower | 4,971 | 6,000 | 5,000 |
| Solar energy | 84,499 | 80,333 | 82,733 |
| Wind energy | 41,355 | 41,600 | 41,600 |
| Intergovernmental activities | 14,912 | 16,000 | 17,000 |
| Total, Renewable energy technologies | 323,682 | 337,654 | 309,014 |
| Renewable support and implementation | | | |
| Departmental energy management program | 1,988 | 1,967 | 1,967 |
| Renewable program support | 3,976 | --- | --- |
| Total, Renewable support and implementation | 5,964 | 1,967 | 1,967 |
| National climate change technology initiative | --- | 3,000 | --- |
| Facilities and infrastructure | | | |
| National renewable energy laboratory | 9,146 | 4,800 | 4,800 |
| Construction | | | |
| 02-E-001 Science and technology facility, NREL Golden, CO | 3,976 | 6,680 | 6,680 |
| Total, Facilities and infrastructure | 13,122 | 11,480 | 11,480 |
| Program direction | 12,526 | 20,711 | 20,711 |
| Subtotal, Renewable Energy Resources | 355,294 | 374,812 | 343,172 |
| Use of prior year balances | -12,923 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES | 342,371 | 374,812 | 343,172 |
| ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION | | | |
| Research and development | 70,389 | --- | --- |
| High temperature superconductivity R&D | --- | 45,000 | 45,000 |
| Transmission reliability R&D | --- | 10,720 | 10,720 |
| Electricity distribution transformation R&D | --- | 5,459 | 5,459 |
| Energy storage R&D | --- | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| Gridwise | --- | 5,000 | --- |
| Gridworks | --- | 5,500 | --- |
| Total, Research and development | 70,389 | 75,679 | 65,179 |
| Electricity restructuring | 7,017 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Program direction | 3,739 | 10,201 | 4,400 |
| Construction | | | |
| 04-E-001 Project engineering and design (PED), energy reliability and efficiency laboratory | 746 | --- | 775 |
| TOTAL, ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION | 81,891 | 90,880 | 75,354 |
| NUCLEAR ENERGY | | | |
| University reactor fuel assistance and support | 23,361 | 21,000 | 24,000 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| Research and development | | | |
| Nuclear energy plant optimization | 2,982 | --- | --- |
| Nuclear energy research initiative | 10,935 | --- | --- |
| Nuclear power 2010 | 43,740 | 10,246 | 5,000 |
| Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative | --- | 30,546 | 40,546 |
| Nuclear hydrogen initiative | 6,462 | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| Advanced fuel cycle initiative | 67,599 | 46,254 | 68,000 |
| Total, Research and development | 131,718 | 96,046 | 122,546 |
| Infrastructure | | | |
| Radiological facilities management | | | |
| Space and defense infrastructure | 36,016 | 33,800 | 33,800 |
| Medical isotopes infrastructure | 28,257 | 21,194 | 21,194 |
| Isotope support and production | --- | --- | --- |
| Construction | | | |
| 05-E-203 Facility modifications for U-233 disposition, Oak Ridge | --- | 13,616 | 13,616 |
| Subtotal, Medical isotopes infrastructure | 28,257 | 34,810 | 34,810 |
| Enrichment facility and uranium management | --- | 500 | 500 |
| Subtotal, Radiological facilities management | 64,273 | 69,110 | 69,110 |
| Idaho facilities management | | | |
| ANL-West operations | 42,364 | 30,781 | 30,781 |
| INL infrastructure | 31,419 | 75,746 | 90,746 |
| Construction | | | |
| 99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Lab, ID | 1,829 | 1,523 | 1,523 |
| 95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements (INEL) | 497 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Construction | 2,326 | 1,523 | 1,523 |
| Subtotal, INL infrastructure | 33,745 | 77,269 | 92,269 |
| Subtotal, Idaho facilities management | 76,109 | 108,050 | 123,050 |
| Idaho sitewide safeguards and security | 56,320 | 58,103 | 58,103 |
| Total, Infrastructure | 196,702 | 235,263 | 250,263 |
| Spent nuclear fuel management | --- | --- | 6,723 |
| Program direction | 58,851 | 60,285 | 60,285 |
| Subtotal, Nuclear Energy | 410,632 | 412,594 | 463,817 |
| Funding from other defense activities | -111,643 | -112,847 | -114,347 |
| Funding from Naval Reactors | --- | --- | -10,000 |
| TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY | 298,989 | 299,747 | 339,470 |
| CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT | | | |
| Spent nuclear fuel management | --- | 5,223 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH | | | |
| Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense) | 6,959 | 10,000 | 8,000 |
| Program direction | 15,906 | 20,474 | 20,000 |
| TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH | 22,865 | 30,474 | 28,000 |
| OFFICE OF FUTURE LIABILITIES | | | |
| Future liabilities | --- | 3,000 | --- |
| OFFICE OF LEGACY MANAGEMENT | | | |
| Legacy management | --- | 31,130 | 31,130 |
| Subtotal, Energy supply | 746,116 | 835,266 | 817,126 |
| General reduction | -9,941 | --- | --- |
| Less security charge from reimbursable work | -2,985 | --- | --- |
| Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 108-199) | 4,971 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY | 738,161 | 835,266 | 817,126 |
| NON-DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION | | | |
| Accelerated completions, 2006 | 48,390 | 45,435 | 45,435 |
| Accelerated completions, 2012 | 119,043 | 98,191 | 98,191 |
| Accelerated completions, 2035 | 4,919 | 8,224 | 8,224 |
| Subtotal, Non-defense Site Acceleration Completion | 172,352 | 151,850 | 151,850 |
| Use of prior year balances | -9,941 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION | 162,411 | 151,850 | 151,850 |
| URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND | | | |
| Decontamination and decommissioning | 363,328 | 399,586 | 399,586 |
| Uranium/thorium reimbursement | 50,699 | 100,614 | 100,614 |
| TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT D&D FUND | 414,027 | 500,200 | 500,200 |
| NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES | | | |
| Community and regulatory support | 1,028 | 90 | 90 |
| Environmental cleanup projects | 43,583 | 46,083 | 46,083 |
| Office of Legacy Management (non-defense) | 28,180 | --- | --- |
| Non-closure environmental activities | 176,398 | 152,523 | 152,523 |
| Construction | | | |
| 02-U-101 Depleted uranium hexafluoride conversion project, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH | 98,217 | 92,600 | 92,600 |
| Total, Non-closure environmental activities | 274,615 | 245,123 | 245,123 |
| Subtotal, Non-defense Environmental Services | 347,406 | 291,296 | 291,296 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| Use of prior year balances | -9,941 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES | 337,465 | 291,296 | 291,296 |
| SCIENCE | | | |
| High energy physics | | | |
| Proton accelerator-based physics | 397,137 | 412,092 | 417,092 |
| Electron accelerator-based physics | 158,545 | 150,890 | 161,890 |
| Non-accelerator physics | 42,746 | 42,936 | 42,936 |
| Theoretical physics | 42,007 | 49,630 | 49,630 |
| Advanced technology R&D | 80,763 | 81,081 | 81,081 |
| Subtotal, | 721,198 | 736,629 | 752,629 |
| Construction | | | |
| 98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab | 12,426 | 751 | 751 |
| Total, High energy physics | 733,624 | 737,380 | 753,380 |
| Nuclear physics | 389,618 | 401,040 | 415,040 |
| Biological and environmental research | 588,507 | 496,590 | 571,590 |
| Construction | | | |
| 05-SC-004 Project engineering and design (PED), facility for the production and characterization of proteins and molecular tags | --- | 5,000 | --- |
| Basic energy sciences | | | |
| Research | | | |
| Materials sciences and engineering research | 572,314 | 603,228 | 612,228 |
| Chemical sciences, geosciences and energy biosciences | 219,611 | 228,422 | 232,422 |
| Subtotal, Research | 791,925 | 831,650 | 844,650 |
| Construction | | | |
| 05-R-320 LINAC coherent light source (LCLS) | --- | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| 05-R-321 Center for functional nanomaterials (BNL) | --- | 18,465 | 18,465 |
| 04-R-313 The molecular foundry (LBNL) | 34,794 | 32,085 | 32,085 |
| 03-SC-002 Project engineering & design (PED) SLAC. | 7,456 | 20,075 | 20,075 |
| 03-R-312 Center for nanophase materials sciences, ORNL | 19,882 | 17,811 | 17,811 |
| 03-R-313 Center for Integrated Nanotechnology | 29,674 | 30,897 | 30,897 |
| 02-SC-002 Project engineering and design (VL) | 2,982 | 2,012 | 2,012 |
| 99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL) | 123,865 | 80,535 | 80,535 |
| Subtotal, Construction | 218,653 | 231,880 | 231,880 |
| Total, Basic energy sciences | 1,010,578 | 1,063,530 | 1,076,530 |
| Advanced scientific computing research | 202,289 | 204,340 | 234,340 |
| Science laboratories infrastructure | | | |
| Laboratories facilities support | | | |
| Infrastructure support | 1,511 | 1,520 | 1,766 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| Construction | | | |
| 04-SC-001 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations | 1,988 | --- | --- |
| MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations | 29,759 | 16,391 | 24,391 |
| Subtotal, Construction | 31,747 | 16,391 | 24,391 |
| Subtotal, Laboratories facilities support | 33,258 | 17,911 | 26,157 |
| Oak Ridge landlord | 5,049 | 5,079 | 5,079 |
| Excess facilities disposal | 6,019 | 6,100 | 6,100 |
| Safety-related corrective actions | 9,941 | --- | 5,000 |
| Total, Science laboratories infrastructure | 54,267 | 29,090 | 42,336 |
| Fusion energy sciences | 262,552 | 264,110 | 276,110 |
| Safeguards and security | 51,581 | 73,315 | 73,315 |
| Science workforce development | 6,432 | 7,660 | 7,660 |
| Science program direction | | | |
| Field offices | 79,629 | 89,341 | 89,341 |
| Headquarters | 57,874 | 65,927 | 65,927 |
| Technical information management program | 7,668 | --- | --- |
| Energy research analyses | 1,014 | --- | --- |
| Total, Science program direction | 146,185 | 155,268 | 155,268 |
| Subtotal, Science | 3,445,633 | 3,437,323 | 3,605,569 |
| General reduction/use of prior year balances | -9,941 | --- | --- |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work | -4,357 | -5,605 | -5,605 |
| Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 108-199) | 50,948 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, SCIENCE | 3,482,283 | 3,431,718 | 3,599,964 |
| NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL | | | |
| Repository program | 109,182 | 661,510 | --- |
| Program direction | 79,697 | 87,490 | --- |
| TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL | 188,879 | 749,000 | --- |
| DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION | | | |
| Administrative operations | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | | | |
| Office of the Secretary | 4,226 | 5,441 | 4,649 |
| Board of contract appeals | 649 | 653 | 653 |
| Chief information officer | 34,794 | 44,856 | 38,273 |
| Congressional and intergovernmental affairs | 4,423 | 4,956 | 4,865 |
| Economic impact and diversity | 4,673 | 5,400 | 5,140 |
| General counsel | 19,882 | 23,349 | 21,870 |
| Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation | 103,595 | 106,055 | 107,805 |
| Policy and international affairs | 13,740 | 17,977 | 15,114 |
| Public affairs | 3,831 | 4,649 | 2,464 |
| Subtotal, Salaries and expenses | 189,813 | 213,336 | 200,833 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| Program support | | | |
| Minority economic impact | 1,185 | 830 | 830 |
| Policy analysis and system studies | 395 | 395 | 395 |
| Environmental policy studies | 566 | 567 | 567 |
| Cybersecurity and secure communications | 26,276 | 24,932 | 24,932 |
| Corporate management information program | 23,858 | 37,632 | 32,138 |
| Subtotal, Program support | 52,280 | 64,356 | 58,862 |
| Competitive sourcing initiative (A-76) | --- | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Total, Administrative operations | 242,093 | 282,692 | 264,695 |
| Cost of work for others | 69,271 | 71,621 | 71,621 |
| Subtotal, Departmental Administration | 311,364 | 354,313 | 336,316 |
| Use of prior year balances and other adjustments | -9,941 | --- | --- |
| Funding from other defense activities | -86,168 | -92,440 | -92,440 |
| Total, Departmental administration (gross) | 215,255 | 261,873 | 243,876 |
| Miscellaneous revenues | -123,000 | -122,000 | -122,000 |
| TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net) | 92,255 | 139,873 | 121,876 |
| OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL | | | |
| Office of Inspector General | 39,229 | 41,508 | 41,508 |
| TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL | 39,229 | 41,508 | 41,508 |
| ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES | | | |
| NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION | | | |
| WEAPONS ACTIVITIES | | | |
| Directed stockpile work | | | |
| Stockpile research and development | 410,215 | --- | --- |
| Stockpile maintenance | 407,328 | --- | --- |
| Stockpile evaluation | 200,694 | --- | --- |
| Dismantlement/disposal | 37,499 | --- | --- |
| Production support | 269,513 | --- | --- |
| Field engineering, training and manuals | 7,128 | --- | --- |
| Life extension program | | | |
| B61 | --- | 117,927 | 117,927 |
| W76 | --- | 213,111 | 213,111 |
| W80 | --- | 146,400 | 106,400 |
| Subtotal, Life extension program | --- | 477,438 | 437,438 |
| Stockpile systems | | | |
| B61 | --- | 91,256 | 91,256 |
| W62 | --- | 18,401 | 18,401 |
| W76 | --- | 137,527 | 137,527 |
| W78 | --- | 44,313 | 44,313 |
| W80 | --- | 49,507 | 39,507 |
| B83 | --- | 44,995 | 44,995 |
| W84 | --- | 6,119 | 6,119 |
| W87 | --- | 94,884 | 64,884 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| W88 | --- | 49,093 | 49,093 |
| Subtotal, Stockpile systems | --- | 536,095 | 496,095 |
| Retired warheads stockpile systems | --- | 65,258 | 130,258 |
| Stockpile services | | | |
| Research and development certification and safety | --- | 157,986 | 147,986 |
| Management, technology, and production | --- | 133,101 | 113,101 |
| Advanced concepts | --- | 9,000 | --- |
| Robust nuclear earth penetrator | --- | 27,557 | --- |
| Subtotal, Stockpile services | --- | 327,644 | 261,087 |
| Total, Directed stockpile work | 1,332,377 | 1,406,435 | 1,324,878 |
| Campaigns | | | |
| Science campaigns | | | |
| Primary assessment technologies | 57,508 | 81,473 | 66,473 |
| Dynamic materials properties | 81,766 | 91,521 | 81,521 |
| Advanced radiography | 55,655 | 62,371 | 48,371 |
| Secondary assessment technologies | 54,142 | 65,597 | 60,597 |
| Subtotal, Science campaigns | 249,071 | 300,962 | 256,962 |
| Engineering campaigns | | | |
| Enhanced surety | 32,779 | 38,121 | 33,121 |
| Weapons system engineering assessment technology | 27,077 | 27,270 | 27,270 |
| Nuclear survivability | 22,841 | 24,460 | 9,460 |
| Enhanced surveillance | 91,239 | 99,879 | 99,879 |
| Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), other project costs | 4,473 | 4,600 | 4,600 |
| Construction | | | |
| 01-D-108 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM | 86,487 | 48,654 | 48,654 |
| Subtotal, MESA | 90,960 | 53,254 | 53,254 |
| Subtotal, Engineering campaigns | 264,896 | 242,984 | 222,984 |
| Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign | 365,102 | --- | --- |
| Ignition | --- | 76,437 | 76,437 |
| Support of stockpile program | --- | 38,987 | 38,987 |
| NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experiment support | --- | 44,023 | 44,023 |
| Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion | --- | 10,080 | 10,080 |
| University grants/other support | --- | 7,776 | 7,776 |
| Facility operations and target production | --- | 63,056 | 63,056 |
| Inertial fusion technology | --- | --- | 25,000 |
| NIF demonstration program | --- | 113,700 | 113,700 |
| High-energy petawatt laser development | --- | 7,975 | 35,975 |
| Subtotal | 365,102 | 362,034 | 415,034 |
| Construction | | | |
| 96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL | 149,115 | 130,000 | 130,000 |
| Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion | 514,217 | 492,034 | 545,034 |
| Advanced simulation and computing | 684,265 | 738,032 | 663,032 |
| Construction | | | |
| 01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA | 12,227 | --- | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| 00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA | 24,853 | 3,228 | 3,228 |
| Subtotal, Construction | 37,080 | 3,228 | 3,228 |
| Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing | 721,345 | 741,260 | 666,260 |
| Pit manufacturing and certification | | | |
| W88 pit manufacturing | --- | 132,005 | 142,005 |
| W88 pit certification | --- | 101,470 | 101,470 |
| Pit manufacturing capability | --- | 20,992 | --- |
| Modern pit facility | --- | 29,800 | --- |
| Pit campaign support activities at NTS | 296,767 | 52,206 | 52,206 |
| Subtotal, Pit manufacturing and certification | 296,767 | 336,473 | 295,681 |
| Readiness campaigns | | | |
| Stockpile readiness | 54,833 | 45,812 | 45,812 |
| High explosives weapons operations | 23,509 | 34,220 | 34,220 |
| Non-nuclear readiness | 33,200 | 35,457 | 30,457 |
| Advanced design and production technologies | 77,457 | 84,788 | 74,788 |
| Tritium readiness | 59,540 | 58,850 | 58,850 |
| Construction | | | |
| 98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR | 74,558 | 21,000 | 21,000 |
| Subtotal, Tritium readiness | 134,098 | 79,850 | 79,850 |
| Subtotal, Readiness campaigns | 323,097 | 280,127 | 265,127 |
| Total, Campaigns | 2,369,393 | 2,393,840 | 2,252,048 |
| Readiness in technical base and facilities | | | |
| Operations of facilities | 1,021,709 | 1,017,557 | 1,151,557 |
| Program readiness | 130,320 | 106,204 | 101,204 |
| Special projects | 51,370 | 20,534 | 15,534 |
| Material recycle and recovery | 75,739 | 86,965 | 86,965 |
| Containers | 15,912 | 17,910 | 17,910 |
| Storage | 11,298 | 18,982 | 18,982 |
| Nuclear weapons incident response | 89,165 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac | 1,395,513 | 1,268,152 | 1,392,152 |
| Construction | | | |
| 05-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations | --- | 11,600 | 21,600 |
| 05-D-401 Building 12-64 production bays upgrades, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX | --- | 25,100 | 25,100 |
| 05-D-402 Berylium capability (BEC) project, Y-12 National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN | --- | 3,627 | 3,627 |
| 04-D-101 Test capabilities revitalization, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM | 36,235 | --- | --- |
| 04-D-102 Exterior communications infrastructure modernization, Sandia National Laboratories | 19,882 | --- | --- |
| 04-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations | 3,543 | 1,500 | 1,500 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| 04-D-104 National security sciences building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM..... | 49,705 | --- | --- |
| 04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM..... | 9,941 | 24,000 | 10,000 |
| 04-D-126 Building 12-44 production cells upgrade, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX..... | 8,728 | 2,600 | 2,600 |
| 04-D-127 Cleaning and loading modifications, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC..... | 2,734 | --- | --- |
| 04-D-128 TA-18 mission relocation project, Los Alamos Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM..... | 8,768 | --- | 8,000 |
| 03-D-102, National Security Sciences building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM..... | --- | 37,348 | 37,348 |
| 03-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations..... | 10,508 | 15,275 | 15,275 |
| 03-D-121 Gas transfer capacity expansion, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO..... | 11,233 | --- | --- |
| 03-D-123 Special nuclear materials requalification, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX..... | 7,583 | 4,602 | 4,602 |
| 02-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations..... | 10,885 | 5,250 | 5,250 |
| 02-D-105 Engineering technology complex upgrade, LLNL, CA..... | 9,718 | 5,400 | 5,400 |
| 02-D-107 Electrical power systems safety communications and bus upgrades, NV..... | 2,870 | --- | --- |
| 01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations..... | 1,591 | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| 01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN..... | 44,735 | 64,000 | 114,000 |
| 01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX..... | 2,821 | --- | --- |
| 99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA..... | 3,479 | --- | --- |
| 99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO.... | 12,401 | --- | --- |
| 96-D-102 Sstockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations..... | 1,543 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Construction..... | 258,903 | 206,302 | 260,302 |
| Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities. | 1,654,416 | 1,474,454 | 1,652,454 |
| Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program | 235,009 | 291,543 | 248,863 |
| Construction | | | |
| 05-D-160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program project engineering design (PED), various locations..... | --- | 8,700 | 8,700 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| 05-D-601 Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y-12, National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN.... | --- | 4,400 | 4,400 |
| 05-D-602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM..... | --- | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 05-D-603 New master substation (NMSU), SNL..... | --- | 600 | 600 |
| 04-D-203 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), project engineering design (PED), various locations..... | 3,697 | 981 | 981 |
| Subtotal, Construction..... | 3,697 | 24,681 | 24,681 |
| Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program..... | 238,706 | 316,224 | 273,544 |
| Secure transportation asset | | | |
| Operations and equipment..... | 122,876 | 143,873 | 143,873 |
| Program direction..... | 58,448 | 57,427 | 57,427 |
| Subtotal, Secure transportation asset..... | 181,324 | 201,300 | 201,300 |
| Use of prior year balances..... | -19,882 | --- | --- |
| Total, Secure transportation asset..... | 161,442 | 201,300 | 201,300 |
| Nuclear weapons incident response..... | --- | 99,209 | 99,209 |
| Safeguards and security..... | 578,633 | 669,991 | 703,991 |
| Construction | | | |
| 05-D-170 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations..... | --- | 17,000 | 17,000 |
| 05-D-701 Security perimeter project, Los Alamos, National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM..... | --- | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| 99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM... | 3,661 | --- | --- |
| Total, Safeguards and security..... | 582,294 | 706,991 | 740,991 |
| Subtotal, Weapons activities..... | 6,338,628 | 6,598,453 | 6,544,424 |
| Use of prior year balances..... | -74,312 | --- | --- |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work..... | -28,814 | -30,000 | -30,000 |
| TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES..... | 6,235,502 | 6,568,453 | 6,514,424 |
| DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION | | | |
| Nonproliferation and verification, R&D..... | 231,996 | 220,000 | 241,500 |
| Nonproliferation and international security..... | 110,081 | 124,000 | 124,000 |
| Nonproliferation programs with Russia | | | |
| International nuclear materials protection and cooperation..... | 258,466 | 238,000 | 415,250 |
| Russian transition initiative..... | 39,764 | 41,000 | 41,000 |
| HEU transparency implementation..... | 17,894 | 20,950 | 20,950 |
| International nuclear safety..... | 3,976 | --- | --- |
| Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program..... | 49,705 | 50,097 | 15,097 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fissile materials disposition | | | |
| U.S. surplus materials disposition | 192,662 | 184,700 | 184,700 |
| Russian surplus materials disposition | 46,822 | 64,000 | 31,500 |
| Construction | | | |
| 99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC | 13,520 | 32,300 | 32,300 |
| 99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC | 399,628 | 368,000 | 234,750 |
| Subtotal, Construction | 413,148 | 400,300 | 267,050 |
| Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition | 652,632 | 649,000 | 483,250 |
| Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia | 1,022,437 | 999,047 | 975,547 |
| Offsite source recovery project | --- | 5,600 | 7,600 |
| Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 1,364,514 | 1,348,647 | 1,348,647 |
| Use of prior year balances | -44,735 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION | 1,319,779 | 1,348,647 | 1,348,647 |
| NAVAL REACTORS | | | |
| Naval reactors development | 718,834 | 761,211 | 771,211 |
| Construction | | | |
| 05-N-900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY | --- | 6,200 | 6,200 |
| 03-D-201 Cleanroom technology facility, Bettis atomic power lab, West Mifflin, PA | 298 | --- | --- |
| 90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID | 18,192 | 989 | 989 |
| Subtotal, Construction | 18,490 | 7,189 | 7,189 |
| Total, Naval reactors development | 737,324 | 768,400 | 778,400 |
| Program direction | 26,542 | 29,500 | 29,500 |
| Subtotal, Naval Reactors | 763,866 | 797,900 | 807,900 |
| Use of prior year balances | -1,988 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS | 761,878 | 797,900 | 807,900 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR | | | |
| Office of the Administrator | 280,316 | 333,700 | 356,200 |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation | 57,658 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR | 337,974 | 333,700 | 356,200 |
| TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION | 8,655,133 | 9,048,700 | 9,027,171 |
| DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION | | | |
| Accelerated completions, 2006 | 1,241,087 | 1,251,799 | 1,264,999 |
| Accelerated completions, 2012 | 1,511,521 | 1,437,001 | 1,437,001 |
| Construction | | | |
| 04-D-414 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations | 23,361 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| 04-D-423 Container surveillance capability in 235-F, Savannah River | 1,127 | 20,640 | 20,640 |
| 02-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, INEEL, Idaho Falls, ID | 1,119 | --- | --- |
| 01-D-416 Waste treatment and immobilization plant, Richland, WA | 685,929 | 690,000 | 690,000 |
| Subtotal, Construction | 711,536 | 713,640 | 713,640 |
| Total, Accelerated completions, 2012 | 2,223,057 | 2,150,641 | 2,150,641 |
| Accelerated completions, 2035 | 1,832,944 | 1,849,512 | 1,849,512 |
| Construction | | | |
| 04-D-408 Glass waste storage building #2, Savannah River | 20,139 | 43,827 | 43,827 |
| 03-D-403 Immobilized high-level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA | 13,872 | --- | --- |
| 03-D-414 Project enginnering and design (PED), various locations | 51,196 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Construction | 85,207 | 43,827 | 43,827 |
| Total, Accelerated completions, 2035 | 1,918,151 | 1,893,339 | 1,893,339 |
| Safeguards and security | 301,815 | 265,059 | 265,059 |
| Alternative high level waste actions | --- | --- | 249,442 |
| Construction | | | |
| 04-D-414 04-02 PED: Sodium bearing waste treatment, Idaho | --- | --- | 24,900 |
| Total, Alternative high level waste | --- | --- | 274,342 |
| High level waste (Waste Incidental to Reprocessing) (legislative proposal) | --- | 249,442 | --- |
| Construction | | | |
| 05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River | --- | 52,000 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| 04-D-414 04-02 PED: Sodium bearing waste treatment, Idaho | --- | 24,900 | --- |
| 03-D-414 PED: Salt waste processing facility alt Savannah River, SC | --- | 23,658 | --- |
| Total, High level waste (WIR) (legis. proposal) | --- | 350,000 | --- |
| Technology development and deployment | 66,525 | 60,142 | 82,600 |
| Subtotal, Defense Site Acceleration Completion | 5,684,110 | 5,862,280 | 5,848,380 |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work | -1,336 | -143 | -143 |
| Use of prior year balances | -131,580 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION | 5,617,719 | 5,970,837 | 5,930,837 |
| DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES | | | |
| Community and regulatory support | 61,207 | 60,547 | 60,547 |
| Federal contribution to the uranium enrichment fund | 449,333 | 463,000 | 463,000 |
| Non-closure environmental activities | 209,188 | 187,864 | 146,038 |
| Spent nuclear fuel management | --- | --- | 17,332 |
| Program direction | 285,450 | 271,059 | 271,059 |
| Use of prior year balances | -19,882 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES | 985,296 | 982,470 | 957,976 |
| Defense Environmental Management Privatization (rescission) | -15,329 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT | 6,587,686 | 6,953,307 | 6,888,813 |
| OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES | | | |
| Other national security programs | | | |
| Energy security and assurance | | | |
| Energy security | 19,882 | 6,100 | 18,000 |
| Program direction | 2,457 | 4,500 | 3,000 |
| Subtotal, Energy security and assurance | 22,339 | 10,600 | 21,000 |
| Office of Security | | | |
| Nuclear safeguards and security | 104,095 | 143,197 | 198,144 |
| Security investigations | 54,232 | 53,554 | 49,880 |
| Program direction | 52,180 | 58,350 | 58,350 |
| Subtotal, Office of Security | 210,507 | 255,101 | 306,374 |
| Intelligence | 39,588 | --- | --- |
| Counterintelligence | 45,684 | --- | --- |
| Independent oversight and performance assurance | 22,442 | 24,669 | 24,669 |
| Civilian radioactive waste management | | | |
| Spent nuclear fuel management | --- | 21,190 | --- |
| Program direction | --- | 1,060 | --- |
| Subtotal, Civilian radioactive waste mgmt | --- | 22,250 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| Environment, safety and health (Defense) | 92,800 | 99,105 | 99,105 |
| Program direction - EH | 18,798 | 20,414 | 20,414 |
| Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense) | 111,598 | 119,519 | 119,519 |
| Worker and community transition | 10,658 | --- | --- |
| Program direction - WT | 2,663 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Worker and community transition | 13,321 | --- | --- |
| Office of Legacy Management | | | |
| Legacy management | 19,065 | 19,194 | 19,194 |
| Worker and community transition | --- | 2,500 | --- |
| Program direction | --- | 13,201 | 13,201 |
| Subtotal, Office of Legacy Management | 19,065 | 34,895 | 32,395 |
| Defense related administrative support | 86,168 | 92,440 | 92,440 |
| Defense activities at INEEL | 111,643 | 112,847 | 114,347 |
| Office of hearings and appeals | 3,775 | 4,318 | 4,318 |
| Office of Future Liabilities | --- | 5,000 | --- |
| Subtotal, Other Defense Activities | 686,130 | 681,639 | 715,062 |
| Use of prior year balances | -14,912 | -15,000 | -15,000 |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work | -708 | -3,003 | -3,003 |
| TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES | 670,510 | 663,636 | 697,059 |
| DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL | | | |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 387,699 | 131,000 | 131,000 |
| TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES | 16,301,028 | 16,796,643 | 16,744,043 |
| POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS | | | |
| SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | | | |
| Purchase power and wheeling | 33,799 | --- | 34,000 |
| Program direction | 5,070 | 5,200 | 5,200 |
| Subtotal, Operation and maintenance | 38,869 | 5,200 | 39,200 |
| Offsetting collections | -19,000 | --- | -34,000 |
| Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377) | -15,000 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION | 4,869 | 5,200 | 5,200 |
| SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | | | |
| Operating expenses | 4,635 | 4,676 | 4,676 |
| Purchase power and wheeling | 1,789 | --- | 1,800 |
| Program direction | 19,092 | 19,324 | 19,324 |
| Construction | 4,704 | 5,352 | 5,352 |
| Subtotal, Operation and maintenance | 30,220 | 29,352 | 31,152 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | House Recommended |
|---|---|---|---|
| Offsetting collections | -1,512 | --- | -1,800 |
| Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377) | -288 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION | 28,420 | 29,352 | 29,352 |
| WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | | | |
| Construction and rehabilitation | 12,874 | 20,191 | 20,191 |
| Operation and maintenance | 35,990 | 39,821 | 39,821 |
| Purchase power and wheeling | 185,002 | --- | 186,000 |
| Program direction | 125,841 | 116,756 | 116,756 |
| Utah mitigation and conservation | 6,163 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Operation and maintenance | 365,870 | 176,768 | 362,768 |
| Offsetting collections | -186,100 | --- | -186,000 |
| Offsetting collections (P.L. 98-381) | -3,992 | -3,668 | -3,668 |
| Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377) | -20,000 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION | 175,778 | 173,100 | 173,100 |
| FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 2,624 | 2,827 | 2,827 |
| TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS | 211,691 | 210,479 | 210,479 |
| FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION | | | |
| Federal energy regulatory commission | 203,194 | 210,000 | 210,000 |
| FERC revenues | -203,194 | -210,000 | -210,000 |
| GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | 21,967,429 | 23,147,833 | 22,478,342 |

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

*Contract Competition.*—Section 301 modifies language carried in the conference report for the Energy and Water Development Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–137), requiring the competition of the management and operating contracts for Ames, Argonne, Lawrence Berkeley, Lawrence Livermore, and Los Alamos national laboratories. The Committee appreciates the efforts of the Secretary and his staff to comply with the provisions of the existing Section 301 in P.L. 108–137 and to schedule competitions for these five laboratory contracts. The Committee continues the statutory requirement to compete these five contracts to be sure the Department follows through on the commitments made by the present Secretary.

The Committee understands that the Secretary has decided to compete the Los Alamos contract initially, with the Lawrence Livermore contract to be competed one-to-two years later to allow the incorporation of lessons learned from the Los Alamos competition. The Committee had previously expressed opposition to bundling these two contracts into a single procurement and supports the Secretary's current strategy. In addition to the five laboratory contracts whose competitions are mandated by law, the Department has also elected to compete a number of other laboratory contracts, including the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, the Thomas Jefferson National Laboratory, and the Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee encourages the Department to use the flexibility provided within this section to stagger the award dates for these contracts, so as not to overwhelm the procurement capacity of the Department or the pool of potential bidders for these laboratory contracts.

Section 301 also reiterates language from previous Energy and Water Development Acts requiring notification of Congress if the Secretary awards a management and operating contract in excess of $100 million in annual funding at a current or former management and operating contract site or facility, or awards a significant extension or expansion to an existing management and operating contract, or other contract covered by this section, unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures, or the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. At least 90 days before granting such a waiver, the Secretary of Energy must submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report notifying the Committees of the waiver and setting forth, in specificity, the reasons for the waiver. Section 301 does not preclude extensions of a contract awarded using competitive procedures, but does establish a presumption of competition unless the Secretary invokes the waiver option. The waiver for non-competitive awards or extensions should be invoked only in truly exceptional circumstances or in the case of exceptional performance, not as a matter of routine. A non-competitive award or extension may be in the taxpayers' interest, but the burden of proof is on the Department to make that case in the waiver request.

*Limitation on Benefits for Federal Employees.*—Section 302 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to prepare

or implement workforce restructuring plans or provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484. The Committee has provided no funds to implement workforce restructuring plans which would provide benefits to Federal employees of the Department of Energy which are not available to other Federal employees of the United States Government. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004.

*Limitation on Funding for Section 3161 Benefits.*—Section 303 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used for enhanced severance payments to contractors and other benefits and community assistance grants authorized under the provisions of section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484.

*Limitation on Initiation of Requests for Proposals.*—Section 304 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to initiate requests for proposals or expressions 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. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004.

*Transfer and Merger of Unexpended Balances.*—Section 305 permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004.

*Limitation on Bonneville Power Administration.*—Section 306 provides that none of the funds in this or any other Act may be used by the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration to perform energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory unless the Administrator certifies in advance that such services are not available from private sector businesses. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004.

*User Facilities.*—Section 307 establishes certain notice and competition requirements with respect to the involvement of universities in Department of Energy user facilities. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004. The detailed guidance on the application of this provision was provided in House Report 107–681 and continues to apply.

*Research, Development and Demonstration Activities.*—Section 308 provides authority for up to 2 percent of national security funding to be used for research, development, and demonstration activities at the four nuclear weapons plants (i.e., Kansas City, Pantex, Savannah River, and Y–12) and at the Nevada Test Site. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004.

*Authorization of Intelligence Activities.*—Section 309 authorizes intelligence activities of the Department of Energy for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 during fiscal year 2005 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2005.

*Siting of Modern Pit Facility.*—Section 310 provides that none of the funds made available in this or any other appropriations act may be used to select a site for the Modern Pit Facility during fiscal year 2005. As explained in the NNSA section of this report, the Committee believes any siting decision on the Modern Pit Facility is premature at this time.

*Laboratory Directed Research and Development for Other Federal Agencies.*—Section 311 provides that none of the funds made available in this act may be used to finance laboratory directed research and development (LDRD) activities on behalf of other federal agencies. The DOE laboratories may continue to conduct LDRD for other agencies, but only after the full reimbursement has been received by the Department from the other agencies. The other agencies may, of course, direct fund non-LDRD research by the DOE labs to directly serve the mission requirements of the other agencies.

*Limitation on Nuclear Technology Exports.*—Section 312 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to issue any license, approval, or authorization for export or reexport nuclear materials, equipment or sensitive nuclear technology to any country the Secretary of State has designated as engaged in state sponsorship of terrorist activities.

# TITLE IV

## INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

### APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $65,611,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 66,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 38,500,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +27,111,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −27,500,000 |

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is composed of the Governors of the thirteen Appalachian States and has a Federal co-chairman who is appointed by the President. The budget request is $66,000,000, of which $55,000,000 is for area development activities, $5,000,000 for local development districts, $1,000,000 for technical assistance, and $5,000,000 for salaries and expenses.

The ARC budget justification indicates that it targets only 50 percent of its funds to distressed counties or distressed areas within the Appalachian region. In times of budget austerity, the Committee believes this should be the primary focus of the ARC. The Committee recommendation for ARC is $38,500,000, $27,500,000 less than the budget request. The reduction is to be taken from the area development activities that serve other than distressed counties and distressed areas.

Within available funds, the Committee directs the Commission to provide $1,000,000 to facilitate construction of the Farmers' Ethanol biorefinery and supporting infrastructure in Perry County, Ohio.

### DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $19,444,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 20,268,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 20,268,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +824,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

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 responsible for reviewing and evaluating the content and implementation of the standards relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of defense nuclear fa-

cilities of the Department of Energy. The Committee recommendation is $20,268,000, the same as the budget request.

## DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $4,971,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 2,096,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 2,096,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | −2,875,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The conference report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2003, directed the Delta Regional Authority to submit a detailed budget justification for future budget requests. The Committee commends the Authority for doing so as part of its fiscal year 2005 budget request. The Committee recommendation is $2,096,000, the same as the budget request.

## DENALI COMMISSION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $54,676,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 2,500,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | ..... |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | −54,676,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −2,500,000 |

In the absence of a detailed budget justification as previously directed by this Committee, the Committee recommendation does not provide any funds for the Denali Commission in fiscal year 2005.

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $618,328,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 662,777,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 662,777,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +44,449,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

### REVENUES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $−538,844,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | −534,354,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | −534,354,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +4,490,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

### NET APPROPRIATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $79,484,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 128,423,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 128,423,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +48,939,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) salaries and expenses is $662,777,000, the same as the budget request. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $534,354,000, resulting in a net appropriation of

$128,423,000. The recommendation includes the requested amount of $69,050,000 to be made available from the Nuclear Waste Fund to support the Department of Energy's effort to develop a permanent geologic repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste.

*Fee Recovery.*—Pursuant to the agreement reached in fiscal year 2001, the NRC is required in fiscal year 2005 to recover 90 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the Nuclear Waste Fund, by assessing license and annual fees. Of the $662,777,000 gross appropriation, $69,050,000 is drawn from the Nuclear Waste Fund, 90 percent of the balance of $593,727,000 (i.e., $534,354,000) is funded by fees collected from NRC licensees, and the remaining 10 percent (i.e., $59,373,000) is funded from the General Fund of the Treasury.

*Bar on New Reactor Licensing.*—As stated elsewhere in this report, the Committee believes strongly that having an operational repository for the safe and secure long-term disposal of spent nuclear fuel is a necessary condition before any new commercial nuclear reactors can be built in the United States. For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to license any new reactors without a certain disposal path for the spent nuclear fuel would be unjustifiable and irresponsible. The Committee includes bill language prohibiting the Commission from using funds made available in this Act or other appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2005, or for previous fiscal years, to issue a license during fiscal year 2005 for the construction or operation of a new commercial nuclear power plant. This prohibition extends to the full amount of the NRC appropriation, including that portion which is offset via revenues collected during the year. The prohibition does not extend to license extensions for existing reactors, nor to acceptance and evaluation of new reactor license applications.

*Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage.*—In the conference report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004, the conferees directed the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to conduct a study on the safety and security of spent nuclear fuel storage at commercial reactor sites. The NAS study committee will likely provide a number of technical recommendations, including recommendations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to: (1) take several immediate steps to improve the safety and security of wet storage facilities at commercial nuclear power plants; (2) perform additional analyses of the vulnerabilities of wet storage to specific types of terrorist attacks and, based on the results of these vulnerability analyses, take additional plant-specific actions to address any identified vulnerabilities; and (3) make changes in some operational procedures to enhance communications with operators about possible vulnerabilities and appropriate mitigative actions. The Committee expects the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to take the recommendations in the final NAS report seriously and to take actions to address these recommendations at the earliest possible date. The Committee directs the Commission to report back to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 90 days of enactment identifying the specific actions being taken to address the NAS recommendations.

*Reports.*—The Committee directs the Commission to continue to provide monthly reports on the status of its licensing and other regulatory activities.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

### GROSS APPROPRIATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $7,297,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 7,518,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 7,518,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +221,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

### REVENUES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $ − 6,716,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | − 6,766,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | − 6,766,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | − 50,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

### NET APPROPRIATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $581,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 752,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 752,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +171,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,518,000, the same as the budget request. The Commission is required by law to recover 90 percent of this budget authority in fiscal year 2005 through the assessment of license and annual fees. Therefore, the revenue estimate is $6,766,000, resulting in a net appropriation for the NRC Inspector General of $752,000.

## NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 2004 | $3,158,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | 3,177,000 |
| Recommended, 2005 | 3,177,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2004 | +19,000 |
| Budget Estimate, 2005 | ..... |

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board was established by the 1987 amendments to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to provide independent technical oversight of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Committee sees the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board as having a continuing independent oversight role, as is specified in Section 503 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, as the Department begins to focus on the packaging and transportation of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,177,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, the same as the budget request and an increase of $21,000 over fiscal year 2004 funding.

## TITLE V

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommendation includes several general provisions pertaining to specific programs and activities funded in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill.

*Prohibition on Lobbying.*—Section 501 provides that none of the funds appropriated by 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.

*Buy American.*—Section 502 requires that American-made equipment and goods be purchased to the greatest extent practicable.

*Transfers.*—Section 503 includes language regarding the transfer of funds made available in this Act to other departments or agencies of the Federal government.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

The following items are included in accordance with various requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives states that:

> Each report of a committee on a public bill or public joint resolution shall contain the following: (1) A statement citing the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

The Committee on Appropriations bases its authority to report this legislation from Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America which states:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law.

Appropriations contained in this Act are made pursuant to this specific power granted by the Constitution.

### COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Clause 3(c)2 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an explanation of compliance with section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, which requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how that authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302 of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year from the Committee's section 302(a) allocation. This information follows:

[In millions of dollars]

| | 302(b) Allocation | | This bill | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Budget authority | Outlays | Budget authority | Outlays |
| Discretionary | 27,988 | 27,972 | 27,988 | 27,970 |
| Mandatory | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

### STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is a statement of general performance goals and objectives for which this measure authorizes funding:

The Committee on Appropriations considers program performance, including a program's success in developing and attaining outcome-related goals and objectives, in developing funding recommendations.

## FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the following table contains five-year projections associated with the budget authority in the accompanying bill:

| | *Millions* |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority | |
| Outlays: | |
| 2005 | 18,412 |
| 2006 | 8,130 |
| 2007 | 1,392 |
| 2008 | 48 |
| 2009 and beyond | 9 |

## ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the financial assistance to State and local governments is as follows:

| | *Millions* |
|---|---|
| Budget authority | 37 |
| Fiscal year 2005 outlays resulting therefrom | 4 |

## TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is submitted describing the transfer of funds provided in the accompanying bill.

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources:

> * * * of which $53,299,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $33,794,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund; of which such amounts as may be necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund; * * *
> * * * *Provided further,* That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriations under this heading: * * *

Under Title III, General Provisions:

> Sec. 305. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

## CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1)(A) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill which directly or indirectly change the application of existing law.

### TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Investigations, providing for detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction. Language has also been included under General Investigations providing credit for work done by local interests on the Ohio Riverfront, Cincinnati, Ohio, project, and requiring an evaluation of additional flood damage reduction measures for the Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction Study, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Language has been included under Construction, General, permitting the use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Language has been included under Construction, General, directing the Corps of Engineers to: continue construction of the Dallas Floodway Extension, Texas, project; accept advance funds from the non-Federal sponsor of the Los Angeles Harbor, California, project; proceed with the New York Harbor Deepening project under certain conditions; proceed with certain activities related to elements of the Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland River project; carry out additional activities for the Tampa Harbor, Florida, navigation project, under certain conditions; conduct activities relating to the Cape Girardeau, Missouri, project, under certain conditions; and proceed with Folsom Bridge Dam Road, California, under certain conditions.

Language has been included under Operation and Maintenance, General, stating that funds may be used for: providing security at facilities owned and operated by or on behalf of the Corps of Engineers, including the Washington Aqueduct; maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency that serve essential navigation needs of general commerce; and surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters, clearing and straightening channels, and removing obstructions to navigation.

Language has been included under Operation and Maintenance, General, permitting the use of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund; providing for use of funds from a special account for resource protection, research, interpretation, and maintenance activities at outdoor recreation areas; and allowing use of funds to cover the cost of operation and maintenance of dredged material disposal facilities for which fees have been collected.

Language has been included under Operation and Maintenance, General, directing the use of funds to rehabilitate the existing dredged material disposal site for the Bodega Bay Harbor, California, project to continue maintenance dredging of the Federal channel, and to make excavated material from the site available to the non-Federal sponsor at no cost to the Federal Government for use in development of public facilities.

Language has been included under General Expenses regarding support of the Humphreys Engineer Support Center Activity, the Institute for Water Resources, the United States Army Corps of Engineers Research and Development Center, and headquarters support functions at the United States Army Corps of Engineers Finance Center.

Language has been included under General Expenses prohibiting the use of other Title I funds for the Office of the Chief of Engineers and the division offices, and prohibiting the use of funds to support an office of congressional affairs within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers.

Language has been included to provide funding for the Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Language has been included under Administrative Provisions providing that funds are available for official reception and representation expenses, and for purchase and hire of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 101, placing a limit on credits and reimbursements allowable per project and annually for all projects.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 102, prohibiting the expenditure of funds related to a proposed landfill in Tuscarawas County, Ohio.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 103, prohibiting the use of funds to transfer any functions of the United States Army Corps of Engineers to other government agencies without specific Congressional direction.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 104, prohibiting the expenditure of funds related to a proposed landfill in Stark County, Ohio.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 105, modifying the flood protection project at Alamogordo, New Mexico.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 106, amending Public Law 106–541 by changing the date to "2007".

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 107, directing completion of the general reevaluation report of the Mill Creek, Ohio, project, within 15 months of enactment of this Act.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 108, providing credit to the non-Federal sponsor for work performed at the Ashtabula River, Ohio, project.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 109, relating to design of the Central Riverfront Park project in Cincinnati, Ohio, and providing credit to the non-Federal sponsor for work performed.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 110, prohibiting the use of funds for certain activities on dredges operated by the Corps of Engineers.

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Language has been included under Water and Related Resources providing that funds are available for fulfilling Federal responsibilities to Native Americans and for grants to and cooperative agreements with State and local governments and Indian tribes.

Language has been included under Water and Related Resources allowing fund transfers within the overall appropriation to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund; providing that such sums as necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund; providing that funds may be used for work carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps; and providing that transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriation.

Language has been included under Water and Related Resources providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund or the special fee account established by 16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(i); that funds contributed under 43 U.S.C. 395 by non-Federal entities shall be available for expenditure; and that funds advanced under 43 U.S.C. 397a for operation and maintenance of reclamation facilities are to be credited to the Water and Related Resources account.

Language has been included under Water and Related Resources permitting the use of funds available for the Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program for site remediation on a non-reimbursable basis.

Language has been included under Water and Related Resources amending the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991.

Language has been included under the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund directing the Bureau of Reclamation to assess and collect the full amount of additional mitigation and restoration payments authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102–575.

Language has been included under the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund providing that none of the funds may be used for the acquisition or lease of water for in-stream purposes if the water is already committed to in-stream purposes by a court adopted decree or order.

Language has been included under Policy and Administration providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund and providing that no part of any other appropriation in the Act shall be available for activities budgeted as policy and administration expenses.

Language has been provided under Administrative Provisions providing for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 201, regarding the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson Reservoir in California. This language has been carried in prior appropriations Acts.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 202, prohibiting the use of funds for any water acquisition or lease in the Middle Rio Grande or Carlsbad Projects in New Mexico unless the acquisition is in compliance with existing State law and administered under State priority allocation.

## TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Language has been included under Energy Supply providing for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Science providing for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Departmental Administration, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and consistent with the authorization in Public Law 95–238, to permit the Department of Energy to use revenues to offset appropriations. The appropriations language for this account reflects the total estimated program funding to be reduced as revenues are received. This language has been carried in prior appropriations Acts.

Language has been included under Departmental Administration providing, notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act, such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others, as long as such increases are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amounts. This language has been carried in prior appropriations Acts.

Language has been included under Departmental Administration providing not to exceed $35,000 for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Weapons Activities providing for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under the Office of the Administrator providing not to exceed $12,000 for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Defense Environmental Services providing for the purchase of not to exceed three ambulances.

Language has been included under Bonneville Power Administration Fund providing not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and precluding any new direct loan obligations.

Language has been included under Southeastern Power Administration providing that, not withstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as offsetting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

Language has been included under Southwestern Power Administration providing that, not withstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as offsetting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures, and to provide not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration, providing not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration, providing that, not withstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as offsetting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

Language has been included under Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to permit the hire of passenger motor vehicles, to provide official reception not to exceed $3,000 and representation expenses, and to permit the use of revenues collected to reduce the appropriation as revenues are received. This language has been included in prior appropriation Acts.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 301, providing that none of the funds may be used to make payments for a noncompetitive management and operating contract unless certain conditions are met.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 302, prohibiting the use of funds to prepare workforce restructuring plans or to provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits for Department of Energy employees under section 3161 of Public Law 102–484.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 303, prohibiting the use of funds to augment the funding provided for section 3161 of Public Law 102–484 unless a reprogramming is submitted to the Committee.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 304, prohibiting the use of funds to prepare or initiate requests for proposals for programs which have not yet been funded by Congress.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 305, providing that unexpended balances of prior appropriations may be transferred and merged with new appropriation accounts established in this Act.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 306, prohibiting the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration to enter into any agreement to perform energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 307, requiring the Department of Energy to ensure broad public notice when it makes a user facility available to universities and other potential users or seeks input regarding significant characteristics or equipment in a user facility or a proposed user facility, and requiring competition when the Department partners with a university or other entity for the establishment or operation of a user facility.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 308, allowing the manager of a nuclear weapons facility to engage in research, development, and demonstration activities using no more than 2 percent of the amounts available from national security programs.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 309, providing that funds for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 during fiscal year 2005 until enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2005.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 310, prohibiting the use of funds to select a site for a Modern Pit Facility during fiscal year 2005.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 311, prohibiting the use of funds in this or any other appropriations Act in fiscal year 2005 to finance laboratory directed research and development activities on behalf of other Federal agencies.

Language has been included under the Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 312, providing that none of the funds made available in this act may be expended to support the export of nuclear material, technology, or equipment to countries that have been identified by the Secretary of State as state sponsors of terrorist activities.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Language has been included under Nuclear Regulatory Commission permitting the use of funds for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $15,000, and allowing the purchase of promotional items for use in recruiting new employees.

Language has been included under Nuclear Regulatory Commission to permit the use of revenues collected to offset appropriations, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in prior appropriations Acts.

Language has been included under Nuclear Regulatory Commission prohibiting the use of funds by the Commission to issue a license during fiscal year 2005 to construct or operate a new commercial power plant.

Language has been included under Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Inspector General, to permit the use of revenues collected to offset appropriations, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in prior appropriations Acts.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 501, prohibiting the use of funds in this Act to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 502, requiring, to the greatest extent practicable, that all equipment and goods purchased should be American-made, and prohibiting contracts with persons falsely labeling products as "Made in America."

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 503, prohibiting the transfer of funds in this Act except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

COMPLIANCE WITH CLAUSE 3 OF RULE XIII (RAMSEYER RULE)

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

The accompanying bill would amend subsection 214(a) of Public Law 106–541, the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, as follows:

> (a) IN GENERAL.—In fiscal year 2001 through [2003] *2007,* the Secretary, after public notice, may accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities to expedite the evaluation of permits under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

The accompanying bill would amend section 301 of Public Law 102–250, the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991, as follows:

> Except as otherwise provided in section 2243 of this title (related to temperature control devices at Shasta Dam, California), there is authorized to be appropriated not more than $90,000,000 in total for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, [and 2004] *2004, and 2005.*

## APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized by law:

[In thousands of dollars]

| Agency/program | Last year of authorization | Authorization level | Appropriations in last year of authorization | Appropriations in this bill |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corps of Engineers: | | | | |
| Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program | (1) | (1) | (1) | $190,000 |
| Department of Energy: | | | | |
| Energy Supply: | | | | |
| Renewable Energy Resources: | | | | |
| Biomass and biorefinery systems R&D | 1993 | (2) | (4) | 72,596 |
| Geothermal Technology | 1993 | $23,000 | (4) | 25,800 |
| Hydrogen Technology | 2001 | 40,000 | $27,000 | 64,285 |
| Hydropower | 1982 | 11,700 | (4) | 5,000 |
| Solar Energy | 1993 | (2) | (4) | 82,733 |
| Wind Energy | 1993 | (2) | (4) | 41,600 |
| Intergovernmental Activities | 1995 | (3) | (4) | 17,000 |
| Departmental Energy Management Program | 1984 | (3) | (4) | 1,967 |
| National Renewable Energy Laboratory | 1984 | (3) | (4) | 11,480 |
| Program Direction | 1984 | (3) | (4) | 20,711 |
| Electricity Transmission and Distribution | (6) | (6) | (6) | 75,354 |
| Nuclear Energy: | | | | |
| University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support | 1974 | (2) | (4) | 24,000 |
| Research and Development | 1994 | (7) | (4) | 122,546 |
| Infrastructure | [12] 1974, | 1992 (2) | (4) | 250,263 |
| Spent Nuclear Fuel Management | 1984 | (2) | (4) | 6,723 |
| Program Direction | 1992 | (2) | (4) | 60,285 |
| Environment, Safety and Health | 1974 | (2) | (4) | 28,000 |
| Office of Legacy Management | (10) | (2) | (4) | 31,130 |
| Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion | 1984 | (5) | (5) | 151,850 |
| Non-Defense Environmental Services | 1974 | (2) | (4) | 291,296 |
| Science | 1984 | 500,000 | 635,417 | 3,271,233 |

[In thousands of dollars]

| Agency/program | Last year of authorization | Authorization level | Appropriations in last year of authorization | Appropriations in this bill |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High Energy Physics | 1984 | (3) | 477,947 | 753,380 |
| Nuclear Physics | 1984 | (3) | 155,220 | 415,040 |
| Biological and Environmental Research | 1994 | (3) | 388,298 | 571,590 |
| Basic Energy Sciences | 1994 | (3) | 743,590 | 1,076,530 |
| Advanced Scientific Computing Research | 1996 | 169,000 | 111,068 | 234,340 |
| Science Laboratories Infrastructure | 1994 | (3) | 39,327 | 42,336 |
| Fusion Energy Sciences | 1994 | 380,000 | 322,277 | 276,110 |
| Program Direction | 1984 | (2) | (4) | 155,268 |
| Departmental Administration | 1984 | 246,963 | 185,682 | 121,876 |
| Office of Inspector General | 1984 | (2) | 14,670 | 37,671 |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities: | | | | |
| National Nuclear Security Administration: | | | | |
| Weapons Activities | 2004 | 6,434,772 | 6,272,511 | 6,514,424 |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 2004 | 1,332,195 | 1,327,612 | 1,348,647 |
| Naval Reactors | 2004 | 768,400 | 766,400 | 807,900 |
| Office of the Administrator | 2004 | 341,980 | 339,980 | 356,200 |
| Defense Site Acceleration Completion | 2004 | 5,814,635 | 5,651,062 | 5,930,837 |
| Defense Environmental Services | 2004 | 995,179 | 991,144 | 957,976 |
| Other Defense Activities | 2004 | 489,059 | 674,491 | 697,059 |
| Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal | 2004 | 392,500 | 390,000 | 131,000 |
| Power Marketing Administrations: | | | | |
| Southeastern Power Administration | 1984 | 24,240 | 39,463 | 39,200 |
| Southwestern Power Administration | 1984 | 40,254 | 29,288 | 31,152 |
| Western Area Power Administration | 1984 | 259,700 | 237,037 | 362,768 |
| Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund | 1995 | (2) | 2,663 | 2,827 |
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission | 1984 | 275,000 | 175,200 | 210,000 |
| Independent Agencies: | | | | |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 2004 | 19,500 | 19,444 | 20,268 |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission | 1985 | 460,000 | 448,200 | 662,777 |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Office of Inspector General | 1985 | (9) | (9) | 7,518 |

[1] Program was initiated in 1972 and has never received a separate authorization.
[2] No amount specified.
[3] Authorized level provided for multiple programs with no separate program allowances.
[4] Funding for these activities was spread throughout multiple programs with no individual amount specified.
[5] Funding for these activities was spread throughout many programs with no amount specified. The last year of authorization was 1984. In 1989, cleanup activities were merged into the non-defense environmental management appropriation account. There has not been a separate authorization for this account.
[6] New program in fiscal year 2003.
[7] Such sums as necessary.
[8] Overall program authorized in 1982 and 1987, but without any authorization of appropriations.
[9] The first separate appropriation for the Office of Inspector General in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission was in fiscal year 1990. Prior to that, the NRC-IG was included within the overall authorization and appropriation for the NRC.
[10] New program in fiscal year 2004.
[11] New program in fiscal year 2005.
[12] Part of each year.

The Committee notes that the annual authorizing legislation for many of these programs is in various stages of the legislative process. It is anticipated these authorizations will be enacted into law later this year.

## RESCISSIONS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee reports that it recommends no rescissions in the bill.

## FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the results of each rollcall vote on

an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

There were no rollcall votes.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2004
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2005
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY | | | | | |
| Corps of Engineers - Civil | | | | | |
| General investigations | 116,259 | 90,500 | 149,000 | +32,741 | +58,500 |
| Construction, general | 1,712,157 | 1,421,500 | 1,876,680 | +164,523 | +455,180 |
| Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 108-199) | 13,669 | --- | --- | -13,669 | --- |
| Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 108-199) | 22,268 | --- | --- | -22,268 | --- |
| Rescissions | --- | -94,000 | --- | --- | +94,000 |
| Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee | 322,309 | 270,000 | 325,000 | +2,691 | +55,000 |
| Rescissions | --- | -5,000 | --- | --- | +5,000 |
| Operation and maintenance, general | 1,956,314 | 1,931,000 | 1,982,000 | +25,686 | +51,000 |
| Regulatory program | 139,174 | 150,000 | 140,000 | +826 | -10,000 |
| FUSRAP | 139,174 | 140,000 | 190,000 | +50,826 | +50,000 |
| Flood control and coastal emergencies | --- | 50,000 | --- | --- | -50,000 |
| Rescissions | --- | -1,000 | --- | --- | +1,000 |
| General expenses | 159,056 | 167,000 | 167,000 | +7,944 | --- |
| Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army | --- | --- | 2,600 | +2,600 | +2,600 |
| Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil | 4,580,380 | 4,120,000 | 4,832,280 | +251,900 | +712,280 |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2004
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2005
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | | | |
| Central Utah Project Completion Account | | | | | |
| Central Utah project construction | 26,880 | 30,806 | 30,806 | +3,926 | --- |
| Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation | 9,367 | 15,469 | 15,469 | +6,102 | --- |
| Subtotal | 36,247 | 46,275 | 46,275 | +10,028 | --- |
| Program oversight and administration | 1,718 | 1,734 | 1,734 | +16 | --- |
| Total, Central Utah project completion account | 37,965 | 48,009 | 48,009 | +10,044 | --- |
| Bureau of Reclamation | | | | | |
| Water and related resources | 852,439 | 794,476 | 855,305 | +2,866 | +60,829 |
| Loan program | 199 | --- | --- | -199 | --- |
| Central Valley project restoration fund | 39,366 | 54,695 | 54,695 | +15,329 | --- |
| California Bay-Delta restoration | --- | 15,000 | --- | --- | -15,000 |
| Working capital fund (rescission) | -4,525 | --- | --- | +4,525 | --- |
| Policy and administration | 55,197 | 58,153 | 58,153 | +2,956 | --- |
| Total, Bureau of Reclamation | 942,676 | 922,324 | 968,153 | +25,477 | +45,829 |
| Total, title II, Department of the Interior | 980,641 | 970,333 | 1,016,162 | +35,521 | +45,829 |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2004
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2005
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | | | | | |
| Energy supply | 733,190 | 835,266 | 817,126 | +83,936 | -18,140 |
| Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 108-199) | 4,971 | --- | --- | -4,971 | --- |
| Non-defense site acceleration completion | 162,411 | 151,850 | 151,850 | -10,561 | --- |
| Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund | 414,027 | 500,200 | 500,200 | +86,173 | --- |
| Non-defense environmental services | 337,465 | 291,296 | 291,296 | -46,169 | --- |
| Science | 3,431,335 | 3,431,718 | 3,599,964 | +168,629 | +168,246 |
| Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 108-199) | 50,948 | --- | --- | -50,948 | --- |
| Nuclear Waste Disposal | 188,879 | 749,000 | --- | -188,879 | -749,000 |
| Departmental administration | 215,255 | 261,873 | 243,876 | +28,621 | -17,997 |
| Miscellaneous revenues | -123,000 | -122,000 | -122,000 | +1,000 | --- |
| Net appropriation | 92,255 | 139,873 | 121,876 | +29,621 | -17,997 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 39,229 | 41,508 | 41,508 | +2,279 | --- |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities | | | | | |
| National Nuclear Security Administration: | | | | | |
| Weapons activities | 6,235,502 | 6,568,453 | 6,514,424 | +278,922 | -54,029 |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation | 1,319,779 | 1,348,647 | 1,348,647 | +28,868 | --- |
| Naval reactors | 761,878 | 797,900 | 807,900 | +46,022 | +10,000 |
| Office of the Administrator | 337,974 | 333,700 | 356,200 | +18,226 | +22,500 |
| Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration | 8,655,133 | 9,048,700 | 9,027,171 | +372,038 | -21,529 |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2004
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2005
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Defense site acceleration completion | 5,617,719 | 5,620,837 | 5,930,837 | +313,118 | +310,000 |
| High-level waste (Waste Incidental to Reprocessing) (legislative proposal) | --- | 350,000 | --- | --- | -350,000 |
| Defense environmental services | 985,296 | 982,470 | 957,976 | -27,320 | -24,494 |
| Defense environmental management privatization (rescission) | -15,329 | --- | --- | +15,329 | --- |
| Subtotal, Defense environmental management | 6,587,686 | 6,953,307 | 6,888,813 | +301,127 | -64,494 |
| Other defense activities | 670,510 | 663,636 | 697,059 | +26,549 | +33,423 |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 387,699 | 131,000 | 131,000 | -256,699 | --- |
| Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities | 16,301,028 | 16,796,643 | 16,744,043 | +443,015 | -52,600 |
| Power Marketing Administrations | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration | 4,869 | 5,200 | 5,200 | +331 | --- |
| Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration | 28,420 | 29,352 | 29,352 | +932 | --- |
| Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration | 175,778 | 173,100 | 173,100 | -2,678 | --- |
| Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund | 2,624 | 2,827 | 2,827 | +203 | --- |
| Total, Power Marketing Administrations | 211,691 | 210,479 | 210,479 | -1,212 | --- |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2004
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2005
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 203,194 | 210,000 | 210,000 | +6,806 | --- |
| Revenues applied | -203,194 | -210,000 | -210,000 | -6,806 | --- |
| Total, title III, Department of Energy | 21,967,429 | 23,147,833 | 22,478,342 | +510,913 | -669,491 |
| TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES | | | | | |
| Appalachian Regional Commission | 65,611 | 66,000 | 38,500 | -27,111 | -27,500 |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 19,444 | 20,268 | 20,268 | +824 | --- |
| Delta Regional Authority | 4,971 | 2,096 | 2,096 | -2,875 | --- |
| Denali Commission | 54,676 | 2,500 | --- | -54,676 | -2,500 |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 618,328 | 662,777 | 662,777 | +44,449 | --- |
| Revenues | -538,844 | -534,354 | -534,354 | +4,490 | --- |
| Subtotal | 79,484 | 128,423 | 128,423 | +48,939 | --- |
| Office of Inspector General | 7,297 | 7,518 | 7,518 | +221 | --- |
| Revenues | -6,716 | -6,766 | -6,766 | -50 | --- |
| Subtotal | 581 | 752 | 752 | +171 | --- |
| Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission | 80,065 | 129,175 | 129,175 | +49,110 | --- |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2004
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2005
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2004 Enacted | FY 2005 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board | 3,158 | 3,177 | 3,177 | +19 | --- |
| Tennessee Valley Authority: | | | | | |
| Office of Inspector General | --- | 9,000 | --- | --- | -9,000 |
| Total, title IV, Independent agencies | 227,925 | 232,216 | 193,216 | -34,709 | -39,000 |
| Grand total: | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 27,756,375 | 28,470,382 | 28,520,000 | +763,625 | +49,618 |
| Appropriations | (27,776,229) | (28,570,382) | (28,520,000) | (+743,771) | (-50,382) |
| Rescissions | (-19,854) | (-100,000) | --- | (+19,854) | (+100,000) |

○