AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

109TH CONGRESS, 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT 109–86

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2006

MAY 18, 2005.—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. 2419]

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, 2006, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page Number Bill	Page Number Report
Summary of Estimates and Recommendations	.....	2
Introduction	.....	3
I. Department of Defense—Civil:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
Introduction	2	7
General investigations	2	19
Construction, general	3	24
Flood control, Mississippi River and Tributaries	5	42
Operation and maintenance, general	5	45
Regulatory program	7	66
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	7	66
Flood control and coastal emergencies	.....	67
General expenses	7	67
Administrative provisions	8	.....
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	8	70
General provisions	8	71
II. Department of the Interior:		
Central Utah Project completion account	12	73
Bureau of Reclamation:		
Water and related resources	12	75
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	14	83

20–967

	Page Number Bill	Report
Central Valley Project restoration fund	14	83
Policy and administration	15	85
Administrative provisions	15	.....
General provisions	16	85
III. Department of Energy:		
Energy supply and conservation	18	87
Clean coal technology	19	110
Fossil energy research and development	19	110
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	22	113
Elk Hills School lands funds	22	113
Strategic petroleum reserve	23	114
Northeast home heating oil reserve	.....	114
Energy Information Administration	23	115
Non-defense environmental management:		
Non-defense environmental cleanup	23	116
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	24	117
Science	24	118
Nuclear waste disposal	25	124
Departmental administration	27	127
Office of Inspector General	28	128
Atomic energy defense activities	28	128
National Nuclear Security Administration:		
Weapons activities	28	129
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	29	140
Naval reactors	29	145
Office of the Administrator	29	146
Environmental and Other Defense Activities	30	147
Defense environmental management	30	147
Defense environmental cleanup	30	149
Other defense activities	30	151
Defense nuclear waste disposal	31	154
Power marketing administrations	31	154
Bonneville Power Administration	31	155
Southeastern Power Administration	31	155
Southwestern Power Administration	32	156
Western Area Power Administration	33	156
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	34	157
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	34	157
General provisions	35	177
IV. Independent agencies:		
Appalachian Regional Commission	41	179
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	42	179
Delta Regional Authority	42	180
Denali Commission	42	180
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	43	181
Office of Inspector General	44	182
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	44	183
V. General provisions:		
House reporting requirements	44	187

Summary of Estimates and Recommendations

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in the Budget of the United States Government, 2006, The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 2005, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2006. Amounts shown include mandatory, discretionary and emergency appropriations.

[In thousands of dollars]

	2005	2006 estimate	2006 recommendation	2006 recommendation compared with—	
				2005 appropriation	2006 estimate
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	$5,039,948	$4,332,000	4,746,021	−$293,927	$414,021
Title II—Department of the Interior	1,017,546	951,055	1,011,486	−6,060	60,431
Title III—Department of Energy	24,419,197	24,213,307	24,317,857	−101,340	104,550
Title IV—Independent Agencies	289,336	234,238	207,266	−82,070	−26,972
Subtotal	30,727,429	29,730,600	30,539,630	−187,799	−809,030
Scorekeeping adjustments	−849,747	16,128	−793,630	56,117	−809,758
Grand Total of bill	29,877,682	29,746,728	29,746,000	−131,682	−728

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2006 totals $29,746,000,000 the same as the President's budget request, and $131,682,000 below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2005.

Title I of the bill provides $4,746,021,000 for the programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a decrease of $293,927,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and $414,021,000 over the budget request of $4,332,000. The fiscal year 2006 budget request for the Corps of Engineers totals $4,513,000,000, which is composed of $4,332,000,000 in new budget authority and $181,000,000 in new offsetting collections. A proposal to provide direct financing of the operation and maintenance of Corps of Engineers' hydropower facilities as offsetting collections from the Power Marketing Administrations' power sales revenues is rejected by the Committee.

The fiscal year 2006 budget request for the Corps' Civil Works program represents a significant departure from previous Administration requests for the Corps, as it applies a new performance-based system based on the ratio of remaining benefits-to-remaining costs. This performance-based system is intended to focus limited federal resources on the efficient completion of high economic-value projects while suspending or terminating work on other projects found not to be of as high an economic value and on Congressionally mandated projects that have been included in prior Administration requests. The Committee supports the concept of focusing limited resources on completing high-value projects already under construction, and the Committee recommendation is based in large part on the Administration's performance-based approach. The Committee bill and report also makes a number of changes to improve the Corps' project management and execution, particularly in the areas of reprogrammings, continuing contracts, and five-year budget planning.

Title II provides $1,011,486,000 for the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, an increase of $60,431,000 above the budget request of $951,055,000 and $6,060,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. The Committee recommends $977,136,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, an increase of $60,431,000 over the request and $6,060,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. A proposal to provide direct financing of operation and maintenance costs associated with the power functions of Reclamation facilities that generate the power sold by the Western Power Administration

is rejected by the Committee. The Committee recommends $34,350,000 for the Central Utah Project and $946,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account, both the same as the budget request.

Title III provides $24,574,857,000 for the Department of Energy (DOE), an increase of $278,103,000 over fiscal year 2005 and $361,550,000 over the budget request of $24,213,307,000. Consistent with the reorganization of the subcommittees within the House Committee on Appropriations, all Department of Energy programs are funded within this bill. The Committee funds new initiatives on the consolidation of special nuclear materials, the interim storage and integrated recycling of spent nuclear fuel, and on creating a sustainable nuclear stockpile and the DOE complex necessary to support that stockpile.

The Energy Supply and Conservation account, which funds renewable energy, energy efficiency, nuclear energy, non-defense environment, safety, and health programs, and energy conservation, is funded at $1,762,888,000, an increase of $13,442,000 over the request and $44,050,000 below the current year enacted level. The Committee recommends $3,666,055,000 for the Office of Science, an increase of $203,337,000 over the budget request and $66,184,000 over the current year. Additional funds are provided for priority work on advanced scientific computing, high energy physics, and operation of user facilities at fiscal year 2005 levels.

Environmental management activities (i.e., non-defense environmental cleanup, uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund, and defense environmental cleanup) are funded at $7,379,768,000, a decrease of $395,675,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and an increase of $423,292,000 over the budget request. A large portion of this increase results from the Committee retaining environmental cleanup responsibilities within Environmental Management for facilities under the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), rather than transferring such responsibilities to the NNSA as proposed in the budget. The Committee recommendation also restores $194,905,000 from the proposed reduction for cleanup of the Hanford site.

The Committee recommends a total of $661,447,000 for the Yucca Mountain repository, which includes $310,000,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal, an increase of $10,000,000 over the request, and $351,447,000 for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the same as the request. The additional funds are provided for the Department to begin to move spent nuclear fuel away from reactor sites to interim storage at one or more existing DOE sites.

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 $8,848,449,000, an increase of $23,990,000 over fiscal year 2005 and a decrease of $548,792,000 from the budget request. Within the weapons activities account, the Committee provides no funds for the robust nuclear earth penetrator study, but provides significant increases for the Sustainable Stockpile Initiative, including development of the Reliable Replacement Warhead. Additional funds are also provided to accelerate the consolidation of special nuclear materials into a small number of secure sites. The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,959,000 for De-

fense Nuclear Nonproliferation, an increase of $7,926,000 over the current year and a decrease of $136,280,000 from the request. Much of this reduction comes from the mixed oxide fuel facility at Savannah River, which has large uncosted balances and is delayed by the absence of a liability agreement with the Russian Federation.

Title IV provides $207,266,000 for several Independent Agencies, a decrease of $82,070,000 from fiscal year 2005 and $26,972,000 below the budget request of $234,238,000. The requested funding is provided for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, the Delta Regional Authority, the Denali Commission, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Inspector General, and the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. An additional $21,000,000 is provided to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for safety and security work. The request for the Appalachian Regional Commission is reduced by $26,972,000, and no funds are provided for the Office of Inspector General for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The United States Army Corps of Engineers traces its history to June 1775, when Congress established the Continental Army with a provision for a Chief Engineer to oversee the construction of fortifications for the Battle of Bunker Hill. An Act of Congress permanently established the Corps in 1802. The Corps' Civil Works role and mission is grounded in a series of laws enacted since 1824. A brief legislative history of the Corps follows:

• The General Survey Act of 1824 authorized the President to have surveys made of routes for roads and canals of national importance, from a commercial or military point of view, or necessary for the transportation of public mail. The President assigned responsibility for the surveys to the Corps of Engineers. A second Act, also signed in 1824, appropriated $75,000 to improve navigation on the Ohio and Mississippi rivers by removing sandbags, snags and other obstacles, and was subsequently amended to include other rivers such as the Missouri. This work was also given to the Corps of Engineers. Subsequent Acts of Congress expanded the Corps' responsibilities for navigation.

• The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1909 expanded the Corps' Civil Works authority by authorizing the consideration of hydroelectric power generation in the planning, design and construction of water resource development projects.

• The 1917 Flood Control Act established a role for the Corps in flood damage reduction, which became a national flood protection role for the Civil Works program in the 1936 Flood Control Act. The Flood Control Act of 1944 gave the Corps a recreation role that was added as part of flood control at Corps reservoirs. The 1962 River and Harbor Flood Act expanded that role by authorizing the Corps to build recreational facilities as part of all water resource development projects.

• The environmental role to protect, restore and manage the environment emanates from the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 that assigned the Corps the mission to prevent obstacles in navigable waterways. As concerns over the environment grew in the late 20th century, the Clean Water Act of 1972 broadened this responsibility by giving the Corps the authority and direction to regulate dredging and activities that result in fill being placed in the "waters of the United States," including many wetlands. The 1986 Water Re-

sources Development Act further expanded the Corps' environmental role to include enhancing and restoring natural resources at new and existing projects, and the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 made environmental protection one of the Corps' primary water resources development missions.

• The Water Supply Act of 1958 gave the Civil Works Program the authority to include water storage in new and existing reservoir projects for municipal and industrial uses.

• The Flood Control and Coastal Emergency Act (P.L. 84–99) and the Stafford Disaster and Emergency Assistance Act gave the Civil Works program direct authority to help the nation in times of national disaster. P.L. 84–99 directed the Corps to provide emergency assistance during or following flood events to protect lives, public facilities and infrastructure. The Stafford Act authorized the Corps to support the Federal Emergency Management Agency in carrying out the Federal Response Plan (now the National Response Plan), which requires 26 federal departments and agencies to provide coordinated disaster relief and recovery operations.

• Title 10 of the U.S. Code, (Navigation and Navigable Waterways), as further outlined in Title 33, enables the Civil Works program to provide services to other federal entities, states, or local governments on a reimbursable basis. This work includes flood control, the improvement of rivers and harbors, research, and support to private engineering and construction firms competing for, or performing, work outside the United States. The Support for Others program engages the Corps in reimbursable work that is determined to be in America's best interests.

Currently, the Corps accomplishes the Civil Works mission through the following major business programs:

Navigation.—The role of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers with respect to navigation is to provide safe, reliable, and efficient waterborne transportation systems, such as channels, harbors and waterways, for movement of commerce, national security needs and recreation. The Corps seeks to accomplish this mission through a combination of capital improvements and the operation and maintenance of existing projects. Capital improvement activities include the planning, design, and construction of new navigation projects and major rehabilitation of existing projects. In fiscal year 2004, the Corps operated and maintained 12,000 miles of commercial inland navigation channels; owned and/or operated 257 navigation lock chambers at 212 sites; and maintained 926 coastal, Great Lakes and inland harbors.

Flood damage reduction.—Section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1936 declared flood control to be a proper Federal activity since improvements for flood control purposes are in the interest of the general welfare of the public. The Act stipulated that, for Federal involvement to be justified, "* * * the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue (must be) in excess of the estimated costs, and * * * the lives and social security of people (must be) otherwise adversely affected." In fiscal year 2004, the Corps managed 383 major lakes and reservoirs; and constructed or controlled 8,500 miles of federal levees. Over the last ten years, the average annual damages prevented by Corps projects totaled $21.1 billion.

Ecosystem restoration.—The Corps of Engineers incorporated ecosystem restoration as a project purpose within the Civil Works program in response to increasing national emphasis on environmental restoration and preservation. Historically, Corps involvement in environmental issues focused on compliance with National Environmental Protection Act requirements related to flood protection, navigation, and other project purposes. More recent efforts have involved pro-active restoration measures to damaged ecosystems, and the provision of local environmental infrastructure.

Hurricane and storm damage reduction.—Congress authorized Federal participation in the cost of restoring and protecting the shores of the United States, its territories and its possessions. Under current policy, shore protection projects are designed to reduce damages caused by wind-generated and tide-generated waves and currents along the nation's ocean coasts, Gulf of Mexico, Great Lakes, and estuary shores. Hurricane protection was added to the erosion control mission in 1956 when Congress authorized cost-shared Federal participation in shore protection and restoration of publicly owned shore areas. Federal assistance for periodic nourishment was also authorized on the same basis as new construction, for a period to be specified for each project, when it is determined that it is the most suitable and economical remedial measure.

Water supply.—National policy regarding water supply states that the primary responsibility for water supply rests with states and local entities. The Corps may participate and cooperate in developing water supplies in connection with construction, operation and modification of Federal navigation, flood damage reduction, or multipurpose projects. Certain conditions of non-federal participation are required.

Hydroelectric power generation.—Congress, through various statutes, has directed the Corps to consider the development of hydroelectric power in conjunction with other water resources development plans. The Corps owns and operates nearly one-quarter of the United States' hydropower capacity, with 75 projects in operation.

Recreation.—The Corps is one of the nation's largest providers of outdoor recreation opportunities, and ranks first among federal providers of outdoor recreation. Although known primarily for the opportunities managed at its lake projects, the Corps also participates in the planning, design and construction of recreation facilities at a wide variety of other types of water resource projects. Such facilities may include hiking and biking trails associated with a stream channel or levee primarily designed for flood damage reduction, though there is no general authority for Corps participation in a single purpose recreation project.

FISCAL YEAR 2006 BUDGET OVERVIEW

The fiscal year 2006 budget request for the Corps of Engineers totals $4,513,000,000, which is composed of $4,332,000,000 in new budget authority and $181,000,000 in new offsetting collections. The Committee recommends a total of $4,746,021,000 for the Corps of Engineers, an increase of $78,473,000 from fiscal year 2005 enacted levels (adjusted for one-time emergency spending) and $414,021,000 above the request. A proposal to provide direct financing of the operation and maintenance of Corps of Engineers'

hydropower facilities as offsetting collections from the Power Marketing Administrations' power sales revenues is again included in the request, and again rejected by the Committee. The budget request represents, in part, a divergence from previous Administration's requests for the Corps, as it applies a new performance-based system based on the ratio of remaining benefits-to-remaining costs. This performance-based system is intended to focus limited federal resources on the efficient completion of high economic-value projects while suspending or terminating work on other projects found not to be of as high an economic value and on Congressionally mandated projects that have been included in prior Administration requests.

A summary table illustrating the fiscal year 2005 enacted appropriation, the fiscal year 2006 budget request and the Committee recommended levels is shown below:

[Dollars in 000s]

Account	Fiscal year 2005 enacted	Fiscal year 2006 request	Committee recommendation
General investigations	$143,344	$95,000	$100,000
Hurricane disasters assistance (emergency)	400	.....	.....
Construction, general	1,781,720	1,637,000	1,900,000
Hurricane disasters assistance (emergency)	62,600	.....	.....
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	321,904	270,000	290,000
Hurricane disasters assistance (emergency)	6,000	.....	.....
Operation and maintenance, general	1,943,428	1,979,000	2,000,000
Offsetting collections	.....	−181,000	.....
Hurricane disasters assistance (emergency)	145,400	.....	.....
Subtotal, operation and maintenance	2,098,828	1,798,000	2,000,000
Regulatory program	143,840	160,000	160,000
FUSRAP	163,680	140,000	140,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	.....	70,000	.....
Hurricane disasters assistance (emergency)	148,000	.....	.....
General expenses	165,664	162,000	152,021
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	3,968	(1)	4,000
Storm damage (emergency)	10,000	.....	.....
Total, Corps of Engineers	5,039,948	4,332,000	4,746,021

[1] The budget proposes to fund this office from funds appropriated to the Department of Defense, Army in the fiscal year 2006 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. For comparability purposes, the budget request includes $4,700,000 for these activities in fiscal year 2006.

Program Management and Execution

Over the past year, the Committee has embarked on a concerted effort to improve general budgeting and project execution by the Corps. This effort was precipitated, in part, by a progressively tighter fiscal environment, the enormous backlog of Civil Works projects, and the realization that the Civil Works program has become an agglomeration of individual projects of interest to the Congress and the Administration, with little or no systematic approach to the Nation's water and coastal infrastructure underlying the selection of which projects received funding. In the view of this Committee, the Civil Works program needs to be managed as a program and not as a collection of individual projects. The Corps needs to take a more sophisticated approach to project and contract management and must undertake immediate structural improvements and process changes to ensure that the Corps remains healthy and focused during a time of static or declining budgets. As part of the Committee's ongoing oversight activities, the Committee has identi-

fied a number of issues requiring immediate attention. These issues include, but are not limited to:

- the development of a five-year comprehensive budget plan;
- a re-evaluation of the emphasis on expenditures;
- a fully transparent accounting of all movement of funds in project execution through the conservative use of reprogramming authorities;
- the development of performance-based guidelines for funding Corps construction projects;
- a more limited use of continuing contracts authorities which have the effect of obligating the federal government in anticipation of future appropriations for which the Corps does not budget fully; and
- a more thorough justification and improvement in the Corps' annual budget submission to the Congress.

Each of these areas is addressed more fully below. Collectively, the Congress, the Administration and the Corps of Engineers must work together to ensure that constrained Federal resources are spent efficiently, commitments to local sponsors are honored, projects do not drag on forever, and taxpayers receive the greatest return on their investment.

Five-year comprehensive budget planning.—In response to growing concern that the Civil Works program lacks a clear set of priorities to guide either development of the annual budget request or annual appropriations bills, last year the Committee directed the Corps to prepare and submit with the fiscal year 2006 budget submission a comprehensive five-year plan for the Civil Works program. Such a plan, in the view of the Committee, would begin to allay the concern that the Civil Works program has become nothing more than an assortment of individual projects lacking a coherent focus. In its direction to the Corps, the Committee specifically identified the five-year development plan (FYDP) of the Department of Defense as the model for the Corps to emulate; however, the Committee received an inadequate and disappointing submission—a seven-page table delineating hundreds of projects and their costs. Given the structured approach used by the Department of the Army to develop its military five-year budget plan, the Civil Works plan is surprisingly poor. Additionally, such a plan must clearly reflect the thorough engagement of all stakeholders; the Corps submission showed no evidence of such engagement.

The Committee reiterates its strong belief in the value of developing five-year plans and longer-term strategic visions to help guide budget requests and Congressional spending decisions. Many Corps projects last longer than five years and affect whole regions of the country such as the coast or the Gulf of Mexico or the watershed of the Ohio River. Such plans force discipline and regional integration in making budgetary decisions and encourage stability from year to year. By providing the Congress and the executive branch a view of what lies ahead in the Civil Works program, a comprehensive five-year plan may alleviate some of the pressure to fund every project in each fiscal year. The development of a plan will also require the Corps to make the necessary tradeoffs to integrate individual projects into a coherent future-years Civil Works program. In the absence of a rational and articulate strategy, the

long-term vitality of the Corps is placed at risk and scarce federal resources will be squandered on projects of limited national benefit.

The Committee notes that the preparation of the FYDP at the Department of Defense is not a one-time or static report; rather, it is updated regularly to reflect changing policies, fiscal realities and other factors. Accordingly, the Corps is directed to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations concurrent with each annual budget submission hereafter, an updated five-year plan. The Committee further expects that the plan will be just one part of a larger submission that articulates a clear program of priorities and is a result of a deliberative process within the Corps and with its stakeholders. The submission shall include documents similar to the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) and the Defense Planning Guidance used by the Department of Defense in developing its FYDP. The plan is to be financially constrained in the budget year only and shall show the effects of the proposed budget in the out-years. In addition, the plan shall include the full annual costs of all continuing contracts for which the Corps has obligated the Federal government in advance of appropriations.

Misplaced emphasis on expenditures.—In managing its national program, the Corps has sought to ensure the efficient expenditure of annual appropriations and has implemented a formal strategy to maximize expenditures, based in part on past Congressional guidance. While this strategy sounds reasonable in theory, the Corps has become inordinately focused on a 99-percent expenditure goal, which requires that program and project managers expend 99 percent of funds allocated to each project and, if they are unable to do so, excess funds are diverted to other projects so as to approach a national 99 percent expenditure rate. Program and project managers are then rated on their performance relative to this expenditure goal. This strategy, while it seeks to minimize annual carryover, ignores project financial requirements in future years and Congressional project allocations for the current year. This internal performance measure has resulted in the massive movements of funds and, in the aggregate, created significant payback requirements that are currently not budgeted. Taken to its extreme, the Government Accountability Office has determined that the Corps reprogrammed $0.06 from one project to meet this performance measure. By the Corps' own admission, each year there may be as many as 20,000 transfers of funds among only 2,000 projects. (A more detailed discussion follows in the paragraphs below.) The Committee directs the Corps to abandon this internal directive and adopt a fiscal management practice that fully honors Congressional direction and accepts a higher level of carryover funds in order to achieve greatly increased transparency into project costs and multiyear funding commitments.

Reprogrammings.—The fiscal year 2005 conference report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act imposed new requirements on the Corps regarding the use of its reprogramming authorities. This action was deemed necessary as the Committee became more aware of a growing number of reprogrammings. This concern has not abated but intensified over the last several months as the Government Accountability Office (GAO) conducted an audit of the Corps' reprogramming actions and

compliance with the Committee's directives. The GAO has informed the Committee that the Corps has moved millions of dollars set aside for specific projects and has expended them on other activities, without the knowledge or approval of the Committee on Appropriations.

Based on a preliminary review by the GAO of the reprogramming procedures employed by the Corps, the Corps has generally followed its own and Congressional reprogramming guidelines. However, within those guidelines, the Corps has interpreted these guidelines so as to enable it to transfer funds between projects and programs without having to notify or receive approval from Congress. For example, the Corps does not consider most actions reprogramming funds into projects as reprogrammings. Instead, these actions are classified as restorations of current and prior years' revocations. Similarly, most actions reprogramming funds out of projects are classified as revocations. So, restorations and revocations are not counted as reprogrammings and therefore are not considered as counting toward the thresholds that trigger the need for Congressional notification or approval. The GAO further determined that the Corps uses different definitions of reprogramming depending on the appropriation account.

Reprogramming, although a useful and needed management tool, has become the Corps' routine way of doing business. However, the Corps manages funds using a "just-in-time" reprogramming strategy. This strategy has resulted in the Corps moving funds from projects that have currently available funds to projects with an immediate need, regardless of the donor project's future needs; placed an excessive administrative burden from processing and tracking thousands of transactions; and lacks a formal Corps-wide reprogramming prioritization and planning strategy. The GAO notes, "The Corps is using reprogramming as an ineffective substitute for a fiscally prudent financial planning and management system for its appropriations."

Reprogramming is defined in the GAO's *Principles of Federal Appropriations Law* as the "utilization of funds in an appropriation account for purposes other than those contemplated at the time of appropriation." It does not make distinctions for transfers of funds as defined as revocations, savings and slippage or restorations. Any movement of funds within an account for purposes other than for those purposes assumed at the time of the appropriation is a reprogramming.

The Committee believes the Corps' execution of Congressionally directed projects through its liberal use of reprogramming actions and its unbalanced emphasis on annual expenditures exhibit ongoing disregard of the specific program and project allocations provided by the Congress each year in report language. The Committee expects the Corps to honor Congressional directives contained in report language with the same reverence as those items contained in bill language. To ensure that the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 2006 is consistent with Congressional direction, to minimize the movement of funds and to improve overall budget execution, the bill incorporates by reference the projects identified in the report accompanying this Act into statute. In addition, the

bill includes a new section prohibiting the obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

(1) creates or initiates a new program, project or activity;

(2) eliminates a program, project or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by this Act;

(4) reduces funds that are directed to be used for a specific activity by this Act;

(5) increases funds for any existing program, project or activity by more than $2,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or

(6) reduces funds for any program, project or activity by more than $2,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less.

This provision shall not apply to the initiation of new projects or activities under the continuing authorities programs. However, it shall apply to the program levels for the individual continuing authorities programs. New projects under the continuing authorities program that are not identified in the conference agreement to accompany this Act must be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for approval. Reprogramming approvals shall also be required for changes in a project's scope and cost relative to what was submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in the justification sheets. The guidelines contained in this report supersede all other reprogramming guidance provided in previous appropriations Acts or their accompanying reports and shall be applied to all accounts and all no-year funds within the Corps of Engineers.

The Committee recognizes special circumstances may arise that require an exception to these guidelines. In such circumstances, the Corps must provide prior notice to and approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

When the Corps transfers funds from one project to another, it makes a promise to "repay" the borrowed amounts. These cumulative actions have created a significant financial obligation that the Corps has no way to honor except to continue the practice *ad infinitum* and to repay these borrowings from future appropriations. However, these repayments are not budgeted, nor can the Corps even provide an accurate accounting of these accumulated IOUs. This system may have worked well for the Corps in the past when budgets were rising and when the Corps carried over substantial unobligated balances from year to year. But, more recently, unobligated balances have all but disappeared, endangering the Corps' ability to honor its multitude of promises to "repay" borrowed funds to project sponsors except from new appropriations. The Committee is concerned that neither it nor the Corps knows the full extent of the payback required. Accordingly, the Corps is directed to submit a report to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations, within 30 days of enactment of this Act summarizing, by project, the cumulative amount of repayments owed to the donor projects. The Committee further directs that these repayments be fully budgeted in the fiscal year 2007 budget presented to Congress.

Continuing contracts.—The Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of 1890 first authorized the Corps to award continuation contracts. Later, section 10 of the Rivers and Harbor Act of 1922 provided general authority to award continuing contracts for any public work on canals, rivers, and harbors adopted by Congress. These contracts are exempt from the Anti-Deficiency Act. When entering such contracts, the Corps obligates the Federal government to pay certain costs from future appropriations. Contractors may perform more work than is budgeted in any fiscal year, but when available appropriations for the current fiscal year are exhausted, work continues at the contractors' risk, with an expectation that payment will be made from subsequent appropriations. Simple interest may be added to any delayed payment that the contracting officer determines was actually earned under the terms of the contract and would have been made but for exhaustion of funds.

Over the last two years, the Committee has grown increasingly concerned with the Corps' liberal use of and inadequate budgeting for continuing contracts. First, the Committee believes that the use of continuing contracts may be the rule and not the exception, as the Corps has executed continuing contracts for small-scale projects that extend only a few months beyond the current fiscal year. The Corps has not demonstrated to the Committee that the use of a continuing contract as the preferred means is established by a sound acquisition planning including an analysis of alternative contract vehicles. After executing continuing contracts, the Corps has failed to budget properly for the out-year costs of these projects. In fact, the Corps currently plans to execute continuing contracts for projects that do not meet the Administration's own criteria and are proposed for termination in the budget request to Congress. The costs of these contracts are not reflected anywhere in the budget, yet the Corps is poised to obligate the Federal government for millions of dollars in contravention of the Administration's proposed policies.

Secondly, the Committee has learned that when a contractor exhausts the amounts reserved in a contract, the Corps has chosen to reprogram funds each year to satisfy the contractual obligations incurred under these contracts, though the Corps is not required to do so. When making such payments, the Corps borrows funds from other projects, creating an IOU, as discussed above under "Reprogrammings." Congress determines how much funding is to be available for a particular project in any given fiscal year, and the Corps must ensure that it manages its program within the funds provided each year. The Corps abrogates its management responsibilities and improperly intrudes upon Congressional prerogatives in determining annual appropriations levels when the Corps reserves insufficient funds to cover the work performed each fiscal year through the duration of the contract or when it makes available funds, through reprogramming, in excess of the amounts reserved in such contracts or appropriated in any fiscal year because of unbudgeted accelerated contractor earnings. The Federal government, not the contractor, must determine how much will be spent on each project each year.

The budget request includes language repealing statutory authority for the Corps to execute new continuing contracts and pro-

poses new multi-year contract authority with better controls on spending. The Committee does not adopt this proposal. In lieu of the Administration's proposal, the bill includes a provision that prohibits the use of funds provided in title I of this Act to execute any new continuing contract (or modifications to any existing continuing contract) that reserves an amount for a project in excess of the amount appropriated for such project in this Act. In addition, the Committee directs the Corps to:

(1) discontinue the practice of reserving insufficient funds to cover the work to be performed each fiscal year through the duration of the contract;

(2) discontinue the practice of reprogramming funds to satisfy contractor earnings in excess of the amounts reserved in the contract for the current fiscal year;

(3) discontinue the practice of issuing continuing contracts for small-scale projects that are limited in scope, schedule, construction and funding requirements;

(4) issue continuing contracts only when it is determined that such a contract is the preferred means, demonstrated by an alternative analysis, and only after the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. Any new continuing contract shall be submitted by the Assistant Secretary for the Army (Civil Works) for approval to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations, consistent with the reprogramming guidelines contained in this Act;

(5) budget fully the out-year costs of all existing and new continuing contracts (or, if the budget year policy is to eliminate the authority to execute such contracts, fund fully the termination costs of such contracts in the budget year);

(6) provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 30 days of enactment of this Act a report identifying all existing continuing contracts and the amount, by project, of the out-year funding requirements of those contracts; and

(7) provide a quarterly update to the report identified above in item (6).

The bill also includes a provision that prohibits the execution of any new continuing contract (or modifications to any existing continuing contract) after February 6, 2006 that obligates the Federal government during fiscal year 2007 to make payment under such contract for any project that is proposed for deferral or suspension in the fiscal year 2007 budget materials prepared by the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) and submitted to Congress.

Congressional justification materials.—The congressional justifications submitted by the Corps in support of the annual budget request are woefully inadequate. To justify an appropriation of over $4,513,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, the Corps submitted a 113-page "press book", which included 11 brief paragraphs of narrative and 111 pages of project tables distributed by state. In addition, justification materials supporting each of the projects included in the budget request were supplied to the Committee. These materials, in their totality, are incomplete, do not provide a clearly articulated discussion of the policy proposals included in the annual budget request, and reflect program delivery rather than project execution.

The justification materials provide little, if any, transparency of program activity in the current year or a comparison of the budget request to the enacted levels. For example, the Corps does not submit to the Committee on Appropriations justification materials for those programs, projects or activities for which the request seeks no appropriation but for which funding was provided in the current year. Without such information, the Committee is unable to determine the extent to which the agency is carrying out current-year programs and directives for which appropriations have been made. Similarly, the project fact sheets in many instances fail to include projected completion dates, without which the Committee cannot determine whether the Corps is meeting a project's planned construction schedule or track cost increases relative to the initial cost estimate or to the authorized project cost ceiling.

The Committee directs the Corps to improve its annual congressional budget submission by expanding the information presented to Congress each year and to present its budget estimate by mission area. That information shall include, but not be limited to, an analysis of appropriations language provisions and changes; comparative amounts available for obligation; comparative amounts showing obligations by object class; summary of changes from the enacted level; a delineation of responses to significant items included in the reports accompanying annual appropriations Acts; appropriations and authorizing histories; explanations of how individual projects fit in the context of larger regional objectives, and narrative and tabular summaries of program requests. The Corps is directed to transmit with its annual budget submission project justifications for those projects that are funded in the current year but for which no funds are requested in the budget estimate. In addition, justifications are to be provided for all activities of the Corps including regulatory and research function. The Corps is encouraged to review the materials submitted by the departments of Education and Transportation, as they are models for emulation. The Committee recognizes that the improvements needed in the budget justifications will need to be developed over time; however, the Committee expects major changes in the fiscal year 2007 budget submission and pledges to work with the Corps to develop implementing instructions to its program offices.

Performance-based budget proposal.—Last year, the Committee challenged the Corps of Engineers and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to engage the Committee on Appropriations in a constructive dialog in an attempt to close the gap between the enormous backlog of Civil Works projects—estimated to be $50,000,000,000—and the limited financial resources available to address that backlog. This backlog has grown significantly in recent years and has resulted in some projects costing more than necessary and most projects being finished many months and sometimes years later than they could be. In response, the OMB proposed seven performance guidelines for funding Corps construction projects in order to generate greater benefits. The Committee appreciates the efforts of the Administration in developing a rationale for focusing limited federal resources on finishing the most important projects in a timely manner. The proposal is a performance-

based ranking system based primarily on the ratio of remaining benefits-to-remaining costs.

The Committee has several observations about the approach adopted by OMB. First, the budget proposes to fund fourteen dam safety projects at full capability, but one dam, Fern Ridge, categorized as aging infrastructure in active failure, was not funded at all. The second category of priority projects are those projects that have a remaining benefit-to-remaining cost ratio in excess of 6–to–1, which are nationally significant environmental restoration projects, or which can be completed in fiscal year 2006 with a final increment of funding. Those projects with an RBRC ratio in excess of 6 would receive 80 to 100 percent of the capability level of funding. The third category includes several projects with an RBRC ratio less than 5, and these projects receive something less than the capability level of funding, but the ratio of funding to capability is inconsistent across this set of projects. The budget proposes a fourth category of priority construction projects, or "special cases," which have RBRC ratios less than 3 but for which funding is requested. Lastly, for those 31 ongoing projects that received federal funding in fiscal year 2005 that did not meet the thresholds described above, the budget proposes to terminate or suspend them. With respect to beach nourishment, the budget proposes to undertake only that portion of renourishment that is attributable to the impacts of federal navigation structures.

Specifically, the ranking system appears to prejudice those projects that have completed initial segments where the benefits-to-costs ratios are greater than the remaining benefits-to-remaining costs on their unfinished segments. In addition, the RBRC ratio contains an inherent bias toward protecting expensive property as opposed to property that may be less valuable but involves the protection of more people; it does not consider how water resources infrastructure contributes to national economic development or multimodal transportation; and it ignores other related Federal investment in the project. The RBRC ratio is a good place to start, but the proposal has its limitations. It needs further refinement and consideration before the Committee can recommend that it be strictly applied. In determining the projects identified in this report, the Committee has used the ranking system as a guide but not as a final determinative factor in the allocation of funds. The Committee directs the Corps, working with the OMB, to refine further the performance measures to address the concerns outlined above as part of the fiscal year 2007 budget submission.

Savings and slippage.—Traditionally, savings and slippage referred to the amount of funds that were determined to be excess to project needs at a particular time during the project's development. Statistically, the Corps is unable to execute 100 percent of the appropriation for 100 percent of the projects, so a program appropriation would include a percentage reduction for savings and slippage to reflect this less-than-100-percent execution. The Congress has abused this historic average over the years, applying an inflated savings and slippage factor to squeeze more projects into programs with finite funding. The Corps, too, would abuse this average by taxing all projects to obtain funds to increase funding for particular programs and projects in excess of the levels included in

annual appropriations Acts. The Corps would subsequently restore these reductions through reprogramming actions.

The Committee has discontinued the practice of assuming an estimate for savings and slippage within the Corps of Engineers civil works program and has returned to the traditional definition of savings and slippage. As savings and slippage occurs on any project in the Corps civil works Construction and General Investigations programs and the general investigations and construction elements of the Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries account in fiscal year 2006, resources excess to a project's needs shall remain with that project and shall be available for two years after the date of enactment of the Act containing appropriations for that project, after which time the unobligated balances may be transferred to other ongoing projects, consistent with the reprogramming guidelines contained in this Act. In addition, the Corps shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a quarterly report detailing project execution relative to stated capability and enacted appropriations.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 2005	[1] $143,344,000
Budget estimate, 2006	95,000,000
Recommended, 2006	100,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−43,344,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+5,000,000

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

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $100,000,000, a decrease of $43,344,000 from the fiscal year 2005 enacted level, and $5,000,000 over the budget estimate. The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown in the following table:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(In thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request		House Recommended	
		Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
Yakutat Harbor, AK	AK	300			
Brewton and East Brewton, AL	AL	189			
Village Creek, Jefferson County (Birmingham watershed), AL	AL	253			
Hot Springs Creek, AR	AR	200			
White River basin comprehensive, AR & MO	AR	1,000		900	
Pima County, AZ	AZ	488		488	
Rillito River, Pima County, AZ	AZ		618		618
Santa Cruz River, Grant Road to Fort Lowell Road, AZ	AZ	400		400	
Va Shly-ay Akimel Salt River restoration, AZ	AZ		400		500
Aliso Creek mainstem, CA	CA	350		450	
Arana Gulch watershed, CA	CA	100			
Bolinas Lagoon, CA	CA			200	
California coastal sediment master plan, CA	CA	600		900	
Coyote Creek - Lower San Gabriel watershed, CA	CA	500		500	
Coyote, CA	CA	100			
Desert Hot Springs, California	CA			200	
Eastern Municipal Water District, California	CA			1,000	
Estudillo Canal, CA	CA	600		900	
Laguna de Santa Rosa, CA	CA	300		400	
Los Angeles County drainage area, Cornfields, CA	CA	600		1,300	
Los Angeles County, CA	CA	850		850	
Malibu Creek watershed, CA	CA	167			
Matilija Dam, CA	CA		800		1,100
Mugu Lagoon, CA	CA	82		82	
Napa River Salt Marsh restoration, CA	CA				250
Napa Valley watershed management, CA	CA	500		500	
Ocean Beach, San Francisco, California	CA			350	
Pajaro River, Watsonville, CA	CA		477		1,000
Peninsula Beach, CA	CA	308		308	
Russian River ecosystem restoration, CA	CA	400		600	
Sacramento - San Joaquin Delta, CA	CA	200			
San Bernardino lakes and streams, California	CA				250
San Clemente shoreline, CA	CA	188		188	200
San Francisquito Creek, CA	CA	200		300	
San Jacinto River, California	CA			50	
San Juan Creek, South Orange County, California	CA			350	
San Pablo Bay watershed, CA	CA	300		600	
Santa Ana River and tributaries, Big Bear Lake, CA	CA	900		1,400	
Santa Rosa Creek ecosystem restoration, CA	CA	400		400	
Solana - Encinitas shoreline, California	CA				750
Sonoma Creek and tributaries, CA	CA	300			
South San Francisco shoreline, CA	CA	600		600	
Sun Valley watershed, CA	CA			100	
Sutter County, CA	CA	361		361	
Upper Penitencia Creek, CA	CA	628		628	
West Stanislaus County, Orestimba Creek, CA	CA			200	
Westminster, East Garden Grove, CA	CA	650		650	
Wilson and Oak Glen Creeks, San Bernardino County, California	CA			400	
Adams County, CO	CO	300			
Cache La Poudre, CO	CO	316			
Chatfield, Cherry Creek and Bear Creek reservoirs, CO	CO	276			
Egmont Key shoreline stabilization, Florida	FL			200	
Mile Point, Florida	FL			500	
Port Everglades Harbor, FL	FL			125	
St. Petersburg Harbor, Florida	FL				500

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(In thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request		House Recommended	
		Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
Walton County, Florida	FL			200	500
Allatoona Lake, GA	GA	750			
Augusta, GA	GA	200		200	100
Indian, Sugar, Entrenchment and Federal Prison Creeks, GA	GA	680			
Long Island, Marsh and Johns Creeks, GA	GA	676			
North Beach, Georgia	GA			100	
Savannah Harbor ecosystem restoration, GA	GA	400			
Savannah Harbor expansion, GA	GA		800		800
Hagatna River flood control, Guam	GU	100			
Ala Wai Canal, Oahu, HI	HI	400		600	
Kahuku, HI	HI	250			
Clear Lake Watershed, IA	IA			400	
Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers, IA	IA				100
Des Plaines River, Illinois, phase 2	IL			200	
Illinois River basin restoration, IL	IL	1,160		1,160	
Illinois River ecosystem restoration, IL	IL	350		350	
Keith Creek, Rockford, IL	IL	2			
Upper Mississippi comprehensive, IL	IL			200	
Wood River levee, IL	IL				185
Indiana Harbor, IN	IN	1,000		300	
Topeka, KS	KS	100		100	
Walnut and Whitewater River watersheds, KS	KS	200		200	
Licking River, Kentucky	KY			200	
Metropolitan Louisville, Jefferson County, KY	KY	130		130	
Metropolitan Louisville, Southwest, KY	KY	132		132	
Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black, LA	LA	585			
Bayou Sorrel Lock, LA	LA		1,500		1,500
Calcasieu River basin, LA	LA	612			
Calcasieu River Pass ship channel enlargement, LA	LA	700		700	
Cross Lake water supply enhancement, Louisiana	LA			200	
Louisiana coastal area ecosystem restoration, LA	LA	15,000			
Louisiana coastal area ecosystem restoration, LA (science & tech prg)	LA	5,000			
St Bernard Parish urban flood control, LA	LA	656			
Blackstone River watershed restoration, MA & RI	MA	170			
Boston Harbor (45-foot channel), MA	MA	650			
Anacostia River and tributaries, MD and DC (comprehensive plan)	MD			400	
Anacostia River and tributaries, PG County levee, MD & DC	MD	180			
Chesapeake Bay shoreline, Maryland coastal management, MD	MD	525		1,000	
Eastern Shore, Mid Chesapeake Bay Island, MD	MD	500		500	
Detroit River seawall improvements, MI	MI			200	
Great Lakes navigational system study, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA & WI	MI	315		2,400	
Kansas Cities, MO & KS	MO	500		500	
Missouri River levee system, MO & KS	MO	350			
Springfield, MO	MO	250			500
St Louis flood protection, MO	MO		609		
St Louis Mississippi riverfront, MO & IL	MO	150			
St Louis, MO	MO	400			
Wears Creek, Jefferson City, MO	MO	150			
Hancock County seawall restoration, MS	MS	308			
Yellowstone River corridor, MT	MT	800			
Currituck Sound, NC	NC	300			
Neuse River basin, NC	NC	260			
Lower Platte River and tributaries, NE	NE	131			
Merrimack River watershed study, NH & MA	NH	200		200	
Hudson - Raritan estuary, Hackensack Meadowlands, NJ	NJ	300		800	

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(In thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request		House Recommended	
		Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
Hudson - Raritan estuary, Lower Passaic River, NJ	NJ	400		1,000	
New Jersey shore protection, Hereford to Cape May Inlet, NJ	NJ	400		400	
Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Leonardo, NJ	NJ	100		100	
Espanola Valley, Rio Grande and tributaries, NM	NM	250		250	
Middle Rio Grande Bosque, NM	NM	250		250	
Southwest Valley flood damage reduction, Albuquerque, NM	NM				180
Bronx River basin, NY	NY	250		500	
Buffalo River environmental dredging, NY	NY	200			
East River seawalls, NY	NY			175	
Flushing Bay and Creek, NY	NY				170
Hudson - Raritan estuary, Gowanus Canal, NY	NY	400		600	
Hudson - Raritan estuary, NY & NJ	NY	800		1,000	
North Shore of Long Island, Asharoken, NY	NY	30		30	
Onondaga Lake, NY	NY	200		1,500	
Columbus metropolitan area, OH	OH	53			
Ohio Riverfront, Cincinnati, Ohio	OH				500
Western Lake Erie basin, OH, IN, & MI	OH	560		650	
Oologah Lake watershed, OK & KS	OK	328		328	
Amazon Creek, OR	OR	264		264	
Lower Columbia River ecosystem restoration, OR & WA	OR	300			
Walla Walla River watershed, OR & WA	OR	500		600	
Willamette River environmental dredging, OR	OR	325			
Willamette River floodplain restoration, OR	OR	436		436	
Mahoning River environmental dredging, PA	PA	250			
Schuylkill River Basin estuarine, PA	PA	250			
Schuylkill River Basin, Wissahickon Creek Basin, PA	PA	200			
Susquehanna and Delaware River basins, PA	PA			170	
Edisto Island, SC	SC	100			
Reedy River, SC	SC	300			
Mill Creek watershed, Davidson County, TN	TN	450			
Brazos Island Harbor, Brownsville Channel, TX	TX	2,500		2,000	
Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	TX			100	
Freeport Harbor, TX	TX	500		750	
GIWW, High Island to Brazos River, TX	TX		500		500
Greens Bayou, TX	TX				150
Guadalupe and San Antonio river basins, TX	TX	300		1,000	
Lower Colorado River basin, TX	TX	300		400	
Middle Brazos River, TX	TX	300		400	
Neches River basin, TX	TX	500			
Nueces River and tributaries, TX	TX	500		575	
Raymondville drain, Texas	TX				300
Resacas, Brownsville, TX	TX	150			
Rio Grande basin, TX	TX	50		50	
Sabine - Neches Waterway, TX	TX	419		800	
Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay, TX	TX	788		788	
Sparks Arroyo Colonia, El Paso County, TX	TX	198		198	
Texas City channel (50-foot project), TX	TX		900		900
Upper Trinity River basin, TX	TX	700		1,000	
Chesapeake Bay shoreline erosion, Mathews County, VA	VA	40			
Dismal Swamp and Dismal Swamp Canal, VA	VA	150		150	
Elizabeth River Basin, environmental restoration, VA (phase II)	VA	200			
Elizabeth River, Hampton Roads, VA	VA		500		
Four Mile Run restoration, VA	VA			800	
John H Kerr Dam and Reservoir, VA & NC (section 216)	VA	600			
Lynnhaven River basin, VA	VA	400		400	

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(In thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request		House Recommended	
		Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
Middle Potomac River Basin, Cameron /Holmes Run	VA			800	
New River basin, Claytor Lake State Park, VA	VA	200			
Philpott Lake, Virginia	VA			200	
Powell River watershed, VA	VA	400			
Chehalis River basin, WA	WA	340			
Lake Washington ship canal, WA	WA	470		470	
Puget Sound nearshore marine habitat restoration, WA	WA	470		500	
Skokomish River, Washington	WA			200	
St. Croix River, Wisconsin	WI			120	
St. Croix River, Wisconsin relocation of endangered mussels	WI			500	
Little Kanawha River, WV	WV	110			
Parkersburg/Vienna riverfront park, WV	WV				400
NATIONAL PROGRAMS					
American Heritage Rivers	XX	150		150	
Automated Information Systems Support	XX	402		402	
CALFED	XX	94		94	
Chesapeake Bay program	XX	75		75	
Coastal field data collection	XX	1,875		1,875	
Coordination with other water resources agencies	XX	246		246	
Environmental data studies	XX	94		94	
FERC licensing	XX	150		150	
Flood damage data program	XX	248		248	
Flood plain management services	XX	5,625		5,625	
Gulf of Mexico	XX	131		131	
Hydrologic studies	XX	300		300	
Interagency and international support	XX	113		113	
Interagency water resource development	XX	750		750	
International water studies	XX	300		300	
Inventory of dams	XX	222		222	
Lake Tahoe	XX	94		94	
National estuary program	XX	75		75	
National shoreline	XX	375		375	
North American waterfowl management plan	XX	75		75	
Pacific northwest forest case	XX	75		75	
Planning assistance to states	XX	4,650		4,650	
Precipitation studies (national weather service)	XX	225		225	
Remote sensing	XX	152		152	
Research and development	XX	22,000		19,643	
Scientific and technical information centers	XX	78		78	
Special investigations and reports	XX	1,649		1,649	
Stream gaging (US Geological Survey)	XX	600		600	
Transportation system	XX	375		375	
Reduction for savings and slippage	XX	-20,911			
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		95,000		100,000	

Eastern Shore, Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island, Maryland.—The Committee has included $500,000 to continue the Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island environmental restoration feasibility study. These funds are to be expended to identify and study existing natural islands in need of restoration and not artificial islands.

Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction, Albuquerque, New Mexico.—The Committee recommendation includes $180,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design for the Southwest Valley flood damage reduction project in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Upper Trinity River Basin, Texas.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for Upper Trinity River Basin, Texas to facilitate the project component associated with improvements to the existing Dallas Floodway.

Remaining items, flood plain management services.—For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends $5,625,000 for flood management services, the same level as requested. Within the funds provided, the Corps is directed to undertake the following activity with the amount allocated below:

Jackson, Tennessee GIS system	$500,000

Remaining items, research and development.—For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends $19,643,000. Within the funds provided for research and development, the Committee directs the Corps to evaluate advanced polymer technologies in concert with the Construction Engineering Research Lab to establish compliance of these new material coatings to meet or exceed current performance of materials used by the Corps.

The Committee is frustrated by the lack of progress in the Corps' commitment to begin pilot testing of rapid deployment flood walls and reiterates its direction that, within available funds, the Corps begin pilot tests of these alternatives to sandbags within 90 days of enactment of this Act.

Remaining items, planning assistance to states.—For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends $4,650,000 for planning assistance to states, the same level as requested. Within the funds provided, the Corps is directed to undertake the following studies with the amounts allocated below:

Assabet River sediment remediation study, Massachusetts	$300,000
Bartlesville, Oklahoma water study	100,000
Lake Rogers, Creedmoor, North Carolina water quality study	60,000
Pike River, Wisconsin hydraulic and hydrological study	40,000
La Mirada, California flood control and drainage study	250,000
Memphis, Tennessee riverfront development	200,000
Lafayette Wabash River waterfront development, Indiana	100,000

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 2005	[1] $1,781,720,000
Budget estimate, 2006	1,637,000,000
Recommended, 2006	1,900,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+118,280,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+263,000,000

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

This appropriation funds construction, major rehabilitation, and related activities for water resources projects whose principal purpose is to provide commercial navigation, flood and storm damage

reduction, or aquatic ecosystem restoration benefits to the nation. Portions of this account are funded from the Harbor Maintenance Trust and the Inland Waterways Trust funds.

For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends an appropriation totaling $1,900,000,000, an increase of $118,280,000 over the fiscal year 2005 enacted appropriation and $263,000,000 over the budget estimate. The budget request and the Committee allowance are shown in the following table:

CONSTRUCTION
(In thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Chignik Harbor, Alaska	AK	2,000	1,900
Mobile Harbor, Alabama	AL		2,000
Walter F George powerplant, Alabama and Georgia (major rehab)	AL	4,121	3,915
Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, Arkansas	AR	20,000	20,000
Rio de Flag, Arizona	AZ		2,500
Rio Salado, Phoenix and Tempe reaches, Arizona	AZ		8,000
Tres Rios, Arizona	AZ		3,000
Tucson, Arizona drainage area	AZ		10,000
American River watershed, California (combined)	CA	28,960	28,960
Corte Madera Creek, California	CA		200
Guadalupe River, California	CA	5,600	5,600
Hamilton Airfield wetlands restoration, California	CA	13,000	13,000
Harbor/South Bay water recycling project, Los Angeles, California	CA		4,000
Kaweah River, California	CA	4,300	4,085
Los Angeles Harbor main channel deepening, California	CA	2,700	2,700
Lower Walnut Creek Basin Study, California	CA		250
Napa River, California	CA	6,000	6,000
Oakland Harbor (50 foot project), California	CA	48,000	48,000
Sacramento area, California	CA		6,000
Sacramento River bank protection project, California	CA		6,300
San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California	CA		250
Santa Ana River Mainstem, California	CA	50,000	61,650
South Sacramento County streams, California	CA	2,852	2,852
Stockton metropolitan flood control reimbursement, California	CA	5,000	5,000
Success Dam, Tule River, California	CA	8,000	8,000
Upper Newport Bay ecosystem restoration, California	CA		2,000
Yuba River Basin, CA	CA		200
Washington, DC and vicinity	DC	400	
Delaware Bay Coastline, Roosevelt Inlet to Lewes Beach, Delaware	DE	10	
Delaware Coast, Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Is, Delaware (initial nourishment)	DE		1,700
Brevard County, Florida shore protection	FL		500
Broward County, Florida reimbursement	FL		1,000
Canaveral Harbor, Florida	FL		1,500
Florida Keys water quality improvements, Florida	FL		1,300
Fort Pierce Beach, Florida	FL		200
Herbert Hoover Dike, Florida (major rehab)	FL	16,900	16,055
Lee County, Florida	FL		750
Nassau County, Florida shore protection	FL		3,000
Palm Beach County, Florida	FL		2,450
Port Everglades Harbor, Florida	FL		500
South Florida Everglades ecosystem restoration, Florida	FL	137,000	137,000
Tampa Harbor, Big Bend, Florida	FL	5,000	4,000
Tampa Harbor, Sutton Channel, Florida	FL		1,000
Brunswick, Georgia	GA		19,100
Buford powerhouse, Georgia (major rehab)	GA	5,812	

CONSTRUCTION
(In thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Hartwell Lake powerhouse, Georgia and South Carolina	GA	733	696
Richard B Russell Dam and Lake, Georgia and South Carolina	GA	1,300	1,300
Thurmond Lake powerhouse, Georgia and South Carolina (major rehab)	GA	5,700	5,415
Kikiaola small boat harbor, Kauai, Hawaii	HI	3,550	3,550
Des Moines recreational river and greenbelt, Iowa	IA		5,000
Lock and Dam 11, Mississippi River, Iowa	IA	7,580	7,202
Lock and Dam 19, Mississippi River, Iowa	IA	17,502	17,502
Missouri River fish and wildlife recovery, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND, SD	IA	82,800	72,627
Perry Creek, Iowa	IA	10,000	10,000
Rural Idaho environmental infrastructure	ID		2,000
Chain of Rocks Canal, Mississippi, IL	IL	5,495	
Chicago Shoreline, Illinois	IL	20,000	15,000
Cook County environmental infrastructure, Illinois	IL		500
Des Plaines River, Illinois	IL		5,000
East St, Louis, Illinois	IL	760	722
Lock and Dam 24, Mississippi River, IL & MO (major rehab)	IL	4,300	4,300
Madison and Clair Counties, Illinois environmental infrastructure	IL		1,000
McCook and Thorton Reservoirs, Illinois	IL		25,000
Olmsted Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Illinois and Kentucky	IL	90,000	90,000
Southeast Illinois shoreline project, Illinois	IL		200
Upper Miss Rvr system env mgmt program, IL, IA, MN, MO, WI	IL	33,500	33,500
Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Illinois	IL		590
Calumet region, Indiana - environmental infrastructure	IN		3,500
Indiana Harbor combined disposal facility, Indiana	IN	8,000	7,600
Indiana shoreline erosion, Indiana	IN		500
Indiana University, South Bend, Indiana pedestrian bridge	IN		715
Indianapolis combined sewer overflow, Indiana	IN		500
Indianapolis, White River (North), Indiana	IN	3,200	3,040
John T Meyers Lock and Dam, Indiana	IN		700
Little Calumet River, Indiana	IN		6,500
Little Calumet River Basin, Cady Marsh Ditch, Indiana	IN		4,000
Mississinewa Lake, Indiana	IN	4,481	4,257
Ohio River Greenway public access, Indiana	IN		3,100
Arkansas City, Kansas	KS	2,619	2,619
Tuttle Creek Lake, Kansas	KS	27,000	25,650
Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, Kentucky	KY		21,750
McAlpine Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Kentucky and Indiana	KY	70,000	70,000
Metropolitan Louisville, Pond Creek, Kentucky	KY	3,670	3,670
Rough River Lake, Kentucky dam safety assurance	KY	2,500	2,375
Comite River, Louisiana	LA	6,254	6,254
Inner Harbor navigation canal lock, Louisiana	LA		9,038
J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana	LA	1,500	1,500
Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity, Louisiana	LA	2,977	2,977
Southeast Louisiana, Louisiana	LA	10,491	10,491
West Bank and vicinity, New Orleans, Louisiana	LA	28,000	28,000

CONSTRUCTION
(In thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Muddy River ecosystem and flood damage, Massachusetts	MA		1,500
Chesapeake Bay oyster recovery, Maryland and Virginia	MD		1,000
Jennings Randolph Lake, Maryland and West Virginia	MD	400	380
Poplar Island, Maryland	MD	13,400	13,400
George W. Kuhn Drain Retention Facility, MI	MI		50
Sault St. Marie replacement lock, Michigan	MI		2,000
Mille Lacs Regional Sewage Treatment Plant, Minnesota	MN		1,500
Northeast Minnesota	MN		5,000
Blue River Basin, Kansas City, Missouri	MO		4,000
Blue River Channel, Kansas City, Missouri	MO	5,000	5,000
Cape Girardeau (floodwall), Missouri	MO		300
Clearwater Lake, Missouri (major rehab)	MO	22,000	22,000
Meramec River Basin, Valley Park levee, Missouri	MO	7,582	7,582
Mississippi River btw the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Missouri and Illinois	MO	4,000	3,800
DeSoto County, Mississippi wastewater treatment - Section 219	MS		3,000
Brunswick County beaches, North Carolina	NC		300
Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina	NC	19,900	19,900
Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina	NC	890	890
Buford-Trenton irrigation district land acquisition, North Dakota	ND		500
Garrison Dam and power plant, North Dakota (major rehab)	ND	3,582	3,403
Grand Forks, North Dakota - East Grand Forks, Minnesota	ND	40,000	35,000
Sheyenne River, North Dakota	ND	550	523
Antelope Creek, Lincoln, Nebraska	NE		1,000
Missouri national recreational river, Nebraska and South Dakota	NE		648
Otter Brook Dam, New Hampshire	NH	1,430	1,359
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey	NJ		5,000
Cape May Inlet to Lower Township, New Jersey	NJ	1,900	1,900
Hudson-Raritan estuary, Hackensack Meadowlands, New Jersey	NJ		1,500
Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, New Jersey	NJ	1,500	1,500
Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, New Jersey (initial nourishment)	NJ	5,500	5,500
Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey	NJ		400
Molly Ann's Brook, New Jersey	NJ		3,000
Passaic River preservation of natural storage, NJ	NJ		3,000
Raritan River Basin, Green Brook sub-basin, New Jersey	NJ		5,000
Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey (initial nourishment)	NJ	11,600	11,600
Acequias irrigation system, New Mexico	NM	1,800	
Alamagordo, New Mexico	NM	4,200	4,200
Tropicana and Flamingo washes, Nevada	NV	13,000	13,000
Atlantic Coast of Long Island, Long Beach Island, New York	NY		200
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York	NY	800	1,000
New York and New Jersey Harbor, New York and New Jersey	NY	101,000	101,000
Onondaga Lake, New York	NY		3,500
Orchard Beach, New York	NY		300
Ramapo River at Mahwah, New Jersey and Suffern, New York	NY		250
Metropolitan region of Cincinnati, Duck Creek, Ohio	OH	1,650	1,568

CONSTRUCTION
(In thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Ohio environmental infrastructure	OH		13,000
Canton Lake, Oklahoma	OK	6,000	6,000
Tenkiller Ferry Lake, Oklahoma	OK	5,200	5,200
Bonneville powerhouse phase II, Oregon and Washington (major rehab)	OR	5,000	4,750
Columbia River channel improvements, Oregon and Washington	OR	15,000	15,000
Columbia River treaty fishing access sites, Oregon and Washington	OR	4,000	
Elk Creek Lake, Oregon	OR	300	
Willamette River temperature control, Oregon	OR	1,000	950
Emsworth Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Pennsylvania	PA	15,000	15,000
Locks and Dams 2, 3 and 4, Monogahela River, Pennsylvania	PA	50,800	50,800
Northeastern Pennsylvania environmental infrastructure	PA		2,600
Prompton Lake, Pennsylvania	PA	8,480	8,056
Saw Mill River Run, Pennsylvania	PA		1,000
South Central Pennsylvania environmental infrastructure	PA		10,000
Southeastern Pennsylvania Cobbs Creek Park, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	PA		310
Southeastern Pennsylvania Tacony Creek, Pennsylvania	PA		500
Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania levee raising	PA	10,496	10,496
Arecibo River, Puerto Rico	PR	3,800	4,000
Portugues and Bucana Rivers, Puerto Rico	PR	14,000	14,000
Rio Puerto Nuevo, Puerto Rico	PR	20,000	20,000
Lake Marion, South Carolina regional water agency	SC		6,000
Chickamauga Lock, Tennessee	TN		10,000
Brays Bayou, Houston, Texas	TX	11,800	11,800
Clear Creek, Texas	TX		1,500
Dallas Floodway extension, Texas	TX		2,000
Houston - Galveston navigation channels, Texas	TX	24,800	26,000
Hunting Bayou, Texas	TX		500
Johnson Creek, Upper Trinity River, Arlington, Texas	TX	500	500
Lower San Antonio River Basin, Texas	TX		300
San Antonio, Texas river channel improvement	TX		3,640
Sims Bayou, Houston, Texas	TX	18,000	15,000
John H. Kerr Dam and reservoir, Virginia and North Carolina	VA	14,000	13,300
Richmond combined sewer overflow, Virginia	VA		1,000
Roanoke Upper River basin, Virginia	VA	5,000	5,000
Virginia Beach, Virginia hurricane protection (initial nourishment)	VA	4,000	4,000
Columbia River fish recovery, Washington, Oregon, Idaho	WA	102,000	90,000
Howard Hanson Dam ecosystem restoration. Washington	WA	14,100	14,100
Lower Snake River fish and wildlife compensation, WA, OR & ID	WA	900	
Mt. St. Helens, Washington	WA	360	360
Mud Mountain Dam, Washington	WA	4,400	4,400
Northern Wisconsin environmental infrastructure	WI		9,000
Bluestone Lake, West Virginia	WV	21,500	20,425
Central West Virginia	WV		750
Levisa and Tug Forks and Upper Cumberland River, WV, VA & KY	WV		20,000
Marmet Lock, Kanawha River, West Virginia	WV	68,830	68,830

CONSTRUCTION
(In thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Robert C Byrd Locks and Dam, West Virginia	WV	914	914
Southern West Virginia environmental infrastructure	WV		1,000
West Virginia and Pennsylvania flood control, West Virginia	WV		1,000
Winfield Locks and Dam, Kanawha River, West Virginia	WV	2,400	
Subtotal, Construction		1,533,831	1,776,690
MISCELLANEOUS			
Aquatic Plant Control Program		3,000	4,500
Continuing Authorities Program			
Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Projects, Section 206		15,000	18,000
Beneficial Use of Dredged Material (Sec. 204 and 207, sec. 933)		3,000	4,000
Mitigation of Shore Damages Attributable to Navigation Projects, Section 111		1,500	500
Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment, Section 1135		15,000	17,400
Shoreline Protection, Section 103		500	1,000
Small Flood Control Projects, Section 205		13,000	25,000
Small Navigation Projects, Section 107			4,000
Snagging and Clearing, Section 208		400	400
Streambank and Shoreline Protection for Public Facilities, Section 14		4,000	8,000
Dam Safety and Seepage/Stability Correction Program		11,000	10,500
Dredged Material Disposal Facilities Program, Section 101		12,000	8,800
Estuary restoration program (P.L. 106-457)		5,000	
Employees Compensation (Payments to Department of Labor)		21,000	21,000
Inland Waterways Users Board:			
Board Expenses		40	40
Corps Expenses		170	170
Construction suspension fund		80,000	
Reduction for Anticipated savings and slippage		-81,441	
Subtotal, remaining items		103,169	123,310
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		1,637,000	1,900,000

Deferrals and suspensions.—The Committee has chosen not to restore funding for nearly half of the 31 projects proposed for deferral or suspension in the budget request. For those projects that were proposed for deferral or suspension in the request and for which the Committee has recommended funds in this Act, funds are available only to complete elements currently under construction and are not be available to initiate new elements not presently underway unless such elements would result in a complete separable element of the project. The Committee directs the Corps to determine the costs to defer or suspend those projects for which the Committee has not provided appropriations in this Act and provide those estimates on a project-by-project basis to the House Committee on Appropriations by September 1, 2005.

Consistent with the budget request, the Committee recommendation assumes the deferral or suspension of the following projects:

Big Sioux River, Sioux Falls, South Dakota
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, South Dakota
Delaware Coast, Rehobeth Beach to Dewey Beach, Delaware
Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana
Missouri River levee system, IA NE, KS and MO
New Orleans to Venice, Louisiana
Nome Harbor improvements, Alaska
Oates Creek, Richmond County, Georgia
Sand Point Harbor, Alaska
St. Paul Harbor, Alaska
Upper St. John's River, Florida
Whitney Lake powerhouse, Texas

American River watershed, California.—The Committee has provided $28,960,000 for American River watershed activities. Within this amount, not less than $7,000,000 shall be available for the permanent bridge below Folsom Dam.

Broward County, Florida.—Funds provided for Broward County, Florida, are solely for reimbursement to the local sponsor for the federal share of segment 3 renourishment.

Elk Creek Lake, Oregon.—The Committee has not recommended funding for the Elk Creek Lake project in Oregon given limited fiscal resources. The Committee reiterates its previous directive that any funding allocated to the project by the Corps through reprogramming actions in fiscal year 2006 shall not be available to further work on the Corps' original proposal to remove a section of the dam for fish passage.

Folsom Dam, California.—The Committee notes that sections 128 and 134 of Public Law 108–137 authorize funds for the construction of a permanent bridge at Folsom Dam. These authorizations provide appropriate and ample authority for the Corps to construct the bridge, including the $30,000,000 authorization contained in section 134 of Public Law 108–137. The Committee further notes that the appropriations Acts since fiscal year 2004 have appropriated funds pursuant to these authorizations and the Corps has carried out projects under thse authorities. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Corps to budget for the permanent replacement at Folsom Dam.

Levisa and Tug Forks and Upper Cumberland River, WV, VA and KY.—For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends a total of $20,0000,000 for Levisa and Tug Forks and Upper Cumberland River, WV, VA and KY. Within the amounts provided, $17,500,000

shall be for elements of the project in the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the remaining $2,500,000 shall be available for the Grundy, Virginia element.

Miami Harbor Channel, Florida.—The Committee has not recommended any funding in fiscal year 2006 for the Miami Harbor Channel, Florida as the Committee has been informed by the Corps that it expects to reprogram sufficient funds to complete the project during fiscal year 2005.

Muddy River, Boston and Brookline, Massachusetts.—The Committee recommends $1,500,000 for the Muddy River, Boston and Brookline, Massachusetts project. Funds are provided to continue project design, including ecosystem restoration features.

New York and New Jersey Harbor, New York and New Jersey.—Within the funds provided for New York and New Jersey Harbor, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use up to $2,000,000 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.—The Committee directs the Corps to make available unexpended balances from previous allocations contained in Energy and Water Development Acts for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 to dredge the Federal channel in the vicinity of Hudson City Light to the north dock at Union Street, Athens, New York for New York City watershed projects in the Catskill/Delaware watershed in Delaware and Greene Counties, New York.

Ohio environmental infrastructure.—The bill provides $13,000,000 for Ohio environmental infrastructure for fiscal year 2006. These funds shall be distributed as follows:

Benton Ridge wastewater treatment	$500,000
Brookfield Center South santiary sewer	250,000
Cambridge sewer system east of I–77	425,000
Cuyahoga River environmental restoration	500,000
Elyria water treatment plant	200,000
Environmental infrastructure improvements to serve northern Pickaway County	1,000,000
Fulton County Elmira/Burlington wastewater collection and treatment	300,000
Gallia County water and sewer	300,000
Higginsport sanitary sewer	750,000
Lake County Madison Township Chapel Road Interceptor sewer	1,000,000
Licking County, Village of Alexandria sanitary sewer	1,000,000
Licking County, Village of Hanover wastewater collection	325,000
Marysville water treatment facility upgrades	1,000,000
Norwalk wastewater treatment plant	300,000
Rushsylvania wastewater treatment	500,000
Springfield Hospital water and sewer project	1,000,000
Springfield Nextedge Technology Park water and sewer	750,000
Toledo wastewater treatment plant	250,000
Trotwood storm drain and stream relocation	750,000
University of Dayton, Brown and Stewart Streets water and sewer	1,000,000
Village of Ottawa regional water line	300,000
Yellow Springs McGregor Center for Business and Education Park, water and sewer	435,000
Yellow Springs Morris Bean sanitary sewer	165,000

Ozark-Jeta Taylor powerhouse (major rehabilitation), Arkansas.—The Committee has not provided any funds for major rehabilitation of the Ozark-Jeta Taylor powerhouse in Arkansas. This project was proposed for termination in the budget request as the project did not meet the remaining benefits-to-remaining costs ratio threshold. The Committee is aware that, in correspondence from the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration to the Director of Civil Works of the Corps of Engineers dated April 1, 2005, the Southwestern Area Power Administration has committed to using the Jonesboro Memorandum of Agreement to fund the Ozark/Webbers Falls contract. The Committee expects the Corps to use these funds to pay the contractual obligations in fiscal year 2006 and not to reprogram any funds from any other project to meet such contractual obligations.

San Antonio channel improvement project, Texas.—The Committee has provided $3,640,000 for continuation of design and construction of the ecosystem restoration and recreation features for the project in accordance with the report of the Fort Worth District Engineer titled: San Antonio River, San Antonio, Texas Channel Improvement Project Ecosystem and Recreation, General Reevaluation Report and Integrated Environmental Assessment, dated September 2004 for Plan DC3BB.

Santa Ana River mainstem, California.—In total, the Committee provides $61,650,000 for Santa Ana River mainstem in California, of which $6,000,000 is available to complete the San Timoteo Creek project; $4,000,000 is available to repair damage caused by recent storms and to clean out debris basins; and $650,000 is available for the repair of erosion damage to the outlet tunnel in Seven Oaks Dam that occurred during high flow testing; and $1,000,000 is available for the Seven Oaks Dam water quality study.

South Florida Everglades Ecosystem Restoration.—The Committee recommendation includes $137,000,000 for South Florida Ecosystem Everglades Restoration program, which includes the Central and Southern Florida Project, the Kissimmee River Restoration project, and the Everglades and South Florida Restoration projects, which were previously budgeted separately. In addition, this program incorporates a share of the federal costs of the Modified Water Deliveries Project, for which the Committee has provided $35,000,000 in fiscal year 2006. Additional funds are budgeted and cost-shared by the Department of the Interior. The consolidated appropriation included herein includes the following separable elements: West Palm Beach Canal, South Dade County, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Manatee Pass Thru Gates, East Coast Canal Structures, Western C–111 Basin, Seminole Big Cypress, Ten Mile Creek, Tamiami Trail (Western Segment), Florida Keys Carrying Capacity, Lake Okeechobee Water Retention, Southern CREW, Lake Trafford, Kissimmee River Project and the Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park Project. The Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989 (16.U.S.C. 410–r–8 and section 601 of the Water Resource Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–541)) provide sufficient authorizations for the Corps to expend Civil Works funds and proceed with the construction of modifications to improve water deliveries to Everglades National Park.

The Committee is very concerned about schedule delays and cost increases on the South Florida Everglades Ecosystem restoration projects, particularly Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park. The Corps is directed to work with the Department of Interior, the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Management and Budget to improve oversight and project management; implement actions to achieve savings and develop an implementation schedule consistent with available funds, and to report to the Committee 60 days after the enactment of this Act on the project's revised cost, delivery schedule and actions planned to achieve savings. The Corps is further directed to work with the Department of Interior and the Department of Transportation to determine if the Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration is able to construct the most cost effective alternative to modify Tamiami Trail to ensure appropriate water flow between the park and the water conservation areas more cheaply than the Corps.

Stillwater, Minnesota (St. Croix River), Minnesota.—The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use previously appropriated funds to proceed with design and construction to complete the Stillwater, Minnesota, levee and flood control project.

Upper Newport Bay Ecosystem Restoration project, California.—The Committee notes that recently the Corps of Engineers executed an agreement with the California Department of Fish and Game and Orange County, California, to provide at their discretion, funds to construct certain key features of the Upper Newport Bay Ecosystem Restoration project. A significant portion of the non-Federal share would be provided by the California Coastal Conservancy to the non-Federal sponsors in the forms of grants. These funds would be in excess of those funds required to maintain a cost-shared balance in the project expenditures, but would not exceed the total non-Federal share. The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for this project in fiscal year 2006.

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM

The continuing authorities program (CAP) establishes a process by which the Corps of Engineers can respond to a variety of water resource problems without the need to obtain specific congressional authorization for each project. The CAP program is comprised of individual programs for nine different types of projects, each with its own program authority and strict limits on the Federal contribution, which are as follows:

Section 14 Emergency streambank and shoreline erosion.—Authorized by section 14 of the 1946 Flood Control Act, work under this authority allows emergency streambank and shoreline protection for public facilities, such as roads, bridges, hospitals, schools, and water/sewage treatment plants, that are in imminent danger of imminent danger of major damage. The cost share is 65% federal and 35% non-federal; and the federal share cannot exceed $1,000,000 per project.

Section 103 Hurricane and storm damage reduction.—Authorized by section 103 of the 1962 River and Harbor Act, work under this authority provides for protection or restoration of

public shorelines by the construction of revetments, groins, and jetties, and may also include periodic sand replenishment. The cost share is 65% federal and 35% non-federal; and the federal share cannot exceed $3,000,000 per project.

Section 107 Small navigation improvements.—Authorized by section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act, work under this authority is intended to provide improvements to navigation including dredging of channels, widening of turning basins, and construction of navigation aids. The cost share is 80% federal and 20% non-federal; and the federal share may not exceed $4,000,000 for each project.

Section 111 Storm damage attributable to Federal navigation works.—Authorized by section 111 of the 1968 River and Harbor Act, work under this authority provides for the prevention or mitigation of erosion damages to public or privately owned shores along the coastline of the United States when the damages are a result of a Federal navigation project. This authority cannot be used for shore damages caused by riverbank erosion or vessel-generated wave wash. It is not intended to restore shorelines to historic dimensions, but only to reduce erosion to the level that would have existed without the construction of a Federal navigation project. Cost sharing may not be required for this program. If the Federal cost limitation of $2,000,000 per project is exceeded, specific congressional authorization is required.

Section 204 Beneficial uses of dredged material.—Authorized by section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, work under this authority provides for the use of dredged material from new or existing federal projects to protect, restore, or create aquatic and ecologically related habitats, including wetlands. The cost sharing (25% non-federal, 75% Federal) would be applied to the incremental cost above the least cost method of dredged material disposal consistent with engineering and environmental criteria.

Section 205 Small flood control projects.—Authorized by section 205 of the 1948 Flood Control Act, work under this authority provides for local protection from flooding by the construction or improvement of flood control work such as levees, channels, and dams. Non-structural alternatives are also considered and may include measures such as installation of flood warning systems, raising and/or flood proofing of structures, and relocation of flood prone facilities. The cost share is 65% federal and 35% non-Federal; and the Federal share may not exceed $7,000,000 per project.

Section 206 Aquatic ecosystem restoration.—Authorized by section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, work under this authority may carry out aquatic ecosystem restoration projects that will improve the quality of the environment, are in the public interest, and are cost-effective. There is no requirement that a Corps project be involved. The cost share is 65% federal and 35% non-Federal; and the Federal share per project cannot exceed $5,000,000 including studies, plans and specifications, and construction.

Section 208 Snagging and clearing for flood control.—Authorized by section 208 of the 1954 Flood Control Act, work under this authority provides for local protection from flooding by channel clearing and excavation, with limited embankment construction by use of materials from the clearing operation only. The cost share is 65% federal and 35% non-Federal; and the Federal share may not exceed $500,000 for each project.

Section 1135 Project modifications for improvement of the environment.—Authorized by section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, work under this authority provides for modifications in the structures and operations of water resources projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers to improve the quality of the environment. Additionally, the Corps may undertake restoration projects at locations where a Corps project has contributed to the degradation. The primary goal of these projects is ecosystem restoration with an emphasis on projects benefiting fish and wildlife. The project must be consistent with the authorized purposes of the project being modified, environmentally acceptable, and complete within itself. A non-federal sponsor is required to provide 25% of the cost of the project; and the Federal share of each separate project may not exceed $5,000,000, including studies, plans and specifications, and construction.

The continuing authorities program (CAP) remains an effective way for the Corps to address the Nation's water resource challenges. The various authorities allow the Corps to assist local communities in addressing in a timely manner issues ranging from flood damage reduction and navigation to stream and riverbank protection and environmental restoration. The demand on the program continues to grow, particularly in the area of environmental restoration and flood damage reduction where significant out-year financial requirements exist for projects currently underway.

In the fiscal year 2006 budget request, the Corps took steps to move to a performance-based budget for projects in the specifically authorized Construction account. The Committee asserts that the need for a prioritization process exists for all projects, regardless of their size or scope. While the criteria may prove different for projects pursued under the continuing authorities than that for the larger, more complex water resource projects, the fundamental principle remains the same—providing the largest benefit for the expenditure of Federal resources in the most efficient manner practicable. A well-articulated prioritization process will ensure that CAP projects that are undertaken are the most viable and beneficial projects the Corps has the ability and authority to execute.

The Committee endeavored last year to provide sufficient appropriations for to continue various Corps initiated CAP projects while also allocating funds for Congressionally directed projects. The Committee remains concerned regarding the execution of projects detailed in this and past reports. The Committee is also troubled to learn that the Corps supplemented appropriated funds for the various CAP authorities by taxing other construction projects. While the Committee understands that the Corps has taken steps to address certain project execution issues, the Committee has not yet received a plan detailing the process by which the CAP pro-

gram is to be managed. Therefore, within 60 days of enactment of the Act and annually thereafter concurrent with the budget submission, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) is directed to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a program management plan detailing the specific actions the Corps will take to prioritize projects and to manage the program in the future. This management plan shall include at least a five-year time horizon consistent with the Five-Year Comprehensive Budget Plan and may, after the initial submission, be incorporated into the larger planning effort. Additionally, the Corps shall provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, concurrent with the annual budget submission, a status report delineating all ongoing projects, identifying on a project-by-project basis the annual out-year budgetary requirements to complete each project.

In last year's report, the Committee noted that many projects selected for funding in fiscal 2004 under the CAP program did not receive funding as directed in that report. Further, the report stipulated that those projects receive priority consideration for any available funds in fiscal 2005 and in the subsequent years. Again, the Committee notes the apparent disregard of report language identifying specific funding levels for CAP projects, and accordingly, has chosen to include, by reference, CAP projects in statutory language this year.

The following table includes the name of the project, the CAP authority under which the project is authorized and the amount of funding recommended by the Committee:

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

	House Recommended
SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	
Blytheville Harbor, AR	16
Knife River Harbor, Minnesota	54
Mackinac Isle, harbor breakwater, Michigan	50
Northwestern Michigan College, Traverse City, Michigan	55
Northwest Tennessee Regional Harbor	390
Olcott Harbor, New York	70
Ontonagon Harbor Channel extension, Ontonagon, Michigan	184
Oyster Point Marina Breakwater Reconfiguration, California	2,100
St. Jerome Creek, Maryland	200
Westport River and Harbor, Massachusetts	70
Woods Hole Great Harbor, Falmouth, Massachusetts	100
SMALL BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	
Philadelphia shipyard, Pennsylvania	200
Solana Beach, California (Fletcher Cove)	15
Whiting, Indiana	100
SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	
Bristol, Tennessee and Virginia, Beaver Creek	200
Cedar Run Flood Control Project, Pennsylvania	193
City of 29 Palms Pinto Cove flood control channel, California	1,000
Cosgrove Creek, California	250
East Peoria, Illinois flood control project	3,600
Eureka Creek Local Flood Protection Project, Kansas	300
Flomar Storm Drain, Whiittier, California	95
Fulmer Creek, New York	862
Haikey Creek, Oklahoma	100
Harbor Brook, Meriden, Connecticut	75
Huntsville Big Spring Branch debris removal, Alabama	100
Huntsville Dallas Branch bypass, Huntsville, Alabama	200
Jackson Brook, New Jersey	302
Lilbourn Outlet Ditch, Missouri	30
Little Fossil Creek, Haltom City, Texas	270
Little Mill Creek, Gravel Road, Pennsylvania	200

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

	House Recommended
Livingston Yellowstone river flood plain study, Montana	135
Lower Lycoming Creek, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania	360
Montoursville, Pennsylvania flood damage reduction program	360
Moyer Creek, New York	763
Oak Creek, Florence, Colorado (Oak Creek Reservoir, CO)	175
South suburban areas of Chicago, Illinois	100
St. Mary's and Maumee Rivers, Fort Wayne, Indiana	200
Upper Passaic River, Long Hill Township, New Jersey	1,000
Van Bibber Creek, Colorado drainage project	318
West Burnt Mountain flood control improvements, California	2,000
Whitewater and Walnut Rivers, Augusta, Kansas	2,500

STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION
FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES (SECTION 14)

Big Bend Cemetery, Minnesota	255
Fox River, Highway 61 bridge protection, Missouri	146
Lake Ontario, Albion water treatment plant, New York	250
Lee Drive, Lenoir City, Tennessee	170
Malapardis Brook Mountain, Pleasant Avenue, Hanover, New Jersey	175
Marquette, Michigan shoreline protection	139
Newton Creek, Newton Avenue, Bainbridge, Chenango County, New York	197
Ohio River, South First Street, Rockport, Indiana	715
Ottawa River Shoreland Avenue, Ohio	660
Rush Creek Bank Stabilization Project, Missouri	776
St Joseph Shoreline Protection, Michigan	175
St. John's Landfill Dike Stabilization	500
Thieme Dr., Fort Wayne, Indiana	120
Tonawanda Creek, Minnick Road, New York	800
Wastewater plant, Intake Channel, Seguin Texas	390
Windsor Reservoir, Dalton, Massachusetts	100

PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT
OF THE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 1135)

Bayou DeSaird, Louisiana	250
Big Cypress Bayou Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Texas	530
Boyd's Marsh Salt Marsh Portsmouth, Rhode Island	500
Bull Creek Channel Ecosystem Restoration, California	2,000

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

	House Recommended
Joe Creek ecosystem restoration, Oklahoma	100
Hoosic River, Adams, Massachusetts	500
Lake Jesup, Florida	533
O.C. Fisher Lake, Texas	250
Ocklawaha River prairie restoration, Florida	250
Prison Farm shoreline habitat, North Dakota	250
Rathbun Lake, South Fork wetland restoration, Iowa	550
Rillito River riparian and wetland development, Arizona	167
Sand Creek, Kansas	3,000
Shelbyville, Illinois	10
Smith Island/Union Slough Restoration Project, Washington	400
Spunky Bottoms Ecosystem Restoration, Illinois	350
Tujunga Wash Environmental Restoration, California	431

AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS
(SECTION 206)

Arkansas City ecosystem restoration, Kansas	180
Arkansas River Fisheries Habitat Restoration, Pueblo, Colorado	315
Big Fish Weir Creek, Florida	150
Bird Island habitat restoration, Massachusetts	100
Burgess Falls, Tennessee	116
Canonsburg Lake, Pennsylvania	250
Chattahoochee Fall Line ecosystem restoration, Georgia	250
Clear Lake Watershed/Clear Lake, Ventura Marsh, Iowa	165
Columbus, Ohio 5th Avenue dam removal Olentangy River	360
Concord, North Carolina stream bank restoration	350
Echo Bay, New Rochelle, New York	450
Efroymson, Indiana	200
English Creek Aquatic Restoration, California	380
Eugene Field, Illinois	125
Greenbury Point, Maryland	185
Grover's Mill Pond, New Jersey	250
Hofmann Dam, Cook County, Illinois	235
Indian Creek Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Idaho	500
Kankakee River aquatic ecosystem restoration, Illinois	100
Lake Anna, Virginia	175
Lake Sawgrass and Lake Hell'n Blazes, Florida	1,100
Little River Watershed Aquatic Habitat Restoration, Georgia	100

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

	House Recommended
Lockport prairie reserve, Illinois	300
Lynches River/Lake City Project, South Carolina	205
Malden River Ecosystem Restoration Project, Massachusetts	80
Milford Pond Restoration Project, Milford, Massachusetts	80
Mill River restoration, Stamford, Connecticut	153
Ninigret and Cross Mills Ponds, Charlestown, Rhode Island	750
North Hempstead, New York ecosystem restoration	500
Orland wetlands, Illinois	225
Pocotaligo Swamp Restoration	310
Port of Sunnyside wetland, Washington	100
Salt River restoration project, California	450
Soundview Park, Bronx, New York	400
South Park Lake Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, New York	275
Springwater/Johnson Creek Watershed Improvements, Oregon	220
Stephenville Wetland, Texas	165
Storm Lake, Iowa Water Quality Project	100
Sweetwater Reservoir Ecosystem Rest, California	90
Treats Pond, Cohasset, Massachusetts	200
Tsala Apopka Littoral Shelf Restoration, Florida	300
Western Cary Stream Restoration Cary, North Carolina	175
Wilson Branch, South Carolina	79
Wolf Lake, Indiana	300

BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL
(SECTION 204)

Jamaica Bay, Marsh Islands, New York	1,000

Funding provided for CAP projects in this Act shall not be available to initiate construction unless construction can be completed within the funds provided. Unobligated funds carried forward from previous years may not be used to initiate any new projects unless submitted and approved to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations.

MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMS

Estuary restoration program.—Due to limited funding and lack of justification, the Committee recommends no funding for the estuary restoration program.

Big Paint Creek, Iowa.—Within the funds provided for section 206, the Corps is directed to complete the planning and design analysis for the Big Paint Creek, Iowa project.

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

Appropriation, 2005	[1] $321,904,000
Budget estimate, 2006	270,000,000
Recommended, 2006	290,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−31,904,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+20,000,000

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

This appropriation funds planning, construction, and operation and maintenance activities associated with projects to reduce flood damage in the lower Mississippi River alluvial valley below Cape Giradeau, Missouri. The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES
(In thousands of dollars)

	STATE	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
BAYOU METO, AR	AR		1,640
ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA	LA	450	428
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	LA	100	
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	MS	500	475
MILLINGTON AND VICINITY, TN	TN	112	107
MORGANZA TO THE GULF, LOUISIANA	LA		1,000
COLLECTION-STUDY OF BASIC DATA		720	685
SUB-TOTAL GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		1,882	2,695
CONSTRUCTION			
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	AR	42,500	40,413
FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR	AR	3,446	3,277
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	AR	39,200	37,275
ST.FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	AR		6,800
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	LA	2,324	2,210
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	LA	21,000	19,969
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	LA	2,244	2,134
ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	MO		5,500
YAZOO BASIN / UPPER YAZOO PROJECT, MS	MS		5,600
NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS	TN	500	475
WOLF RIVER, TN	TN		3,500
CONSTRUCTION SUSPENSION ACTIVITIES		8,000	
SUB-TOTAL CONSTRUCTION		119,214	127,153
MAINTENANCE			
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	AR	70,609	67,142
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	AR	172	164
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	AR	611	581
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	AR	560	533
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	AR	310	295
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	AR	9,256	9,902
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	AR	6,600	8,800
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	AR	2,600	2,472
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	AR	1,400	1,331
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	IL	55	52
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	KY	37	35
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	LA	2,860	2,720
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	LA	13,400	12,742
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	LA	65	62
BONNET CARRE, LA	LA	2,713	2,580
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	LA	538	512
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	LA	66	63
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	LA	239	227
OLD RIVER, LA	LA	10,200	9,699
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	LA	3,950	3,756
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	MS	317	301
YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	MS	6,151	5,849

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES
(In thousands of dollars)

	STATE	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	MS	210	200
YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS	MS	5,232	4,975
YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS	MS	620	590
YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS	MS	5,674	5,395
YAZOO BASIN, MAINSTEM, MS	MS	1,080	1,027
YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS	MS	7,153	6,802
YAZOO BASIN TRIBUTARIES, MS	MS	1,130	1,075
YAZOO BASIN, WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	MS	430	409
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	MS	470	447
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS	MS	770	732
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	MO	182	173
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	MO	4,676	4,446
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	TN	110	105
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	TN	992	943
EMERGENCY REPAIR RESERVES			1,700
MAPPING		1,384	1,316
SUB-TOTAL MAINTENANCE		162,822	160,152
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE		-13,918	
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES		270,000	290,000

Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas.—The Committee recommends $1,640,000 to complete authorized preconstruction, engineering and design on this project.

Mississippi River levees, AE, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, and TN.—Within the funds provided for Mississippi River levees construction activities, the Committee has included $3,000,000 for St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid and box culverts in the State of Missouri. For maintenance, the Committee recommends $9,902,000, of which $1,100,000 shall be available for levee gravel placement at Commerce to Birds Point, Missouri.

St. Francis Basin, AR and MO.—The bill includes $6,800,000 for construction activities in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri project, which includes $4,160,000 to further 10/15 Mile Bayous; $570,000 to complete Buffalo Island Inlet, Arkansas; $390,000 for right of way acquisition for Piggott Seepage, Arkansas; and $500,000 for work within the State of Missouri. The Committee recommendation also includes $8,800,000 for St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri maintenance activities, of which $2,000,000 shall be available to complete work on the floodway in the State of Missouri.

St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid floodway, Missouri.—The Committee has included $5,500,000 for St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid floodway, Missouri project. These funds shall be available to further work on the New Madrid pumping station and shall not be available to initiate new construction on any remaining project elements.

Wolf River, Memphis, Tennessee.—The Committee provides $3,500,000 for the Wolf River ecosystem restoration project, which shall be available only to complete construction of the weirs and access roads and not to initiate construction of any remaining project elements.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 2005	[1] $1,943,428,000
Budget estimate, 2006	[2] 1,798,000,000
Recommended, 2006	2,000,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+56,572,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+21,000,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $145,000,000.

[2] The budget proposes certain receipts from the Power Marketing Administration totaling $181,000,000 be credited to this account as offsetting collections.

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

For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,000,000,000, an increase of $56,572,000 over the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and $21,000,000 over the budget estimate.

The Committee recommendation does not include the proposal included in the budget estimate to reclassify certain receipts collected by the Southwestern Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration.

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Anchorage Harbor, AK	AK	11,470	11,470
Chena River Lakes, AK	AK	3,051	3,051
Dillingham Harbor, AK	AK	622	622
Homer Harbor, AK	AK	299	299
Inspection of completed works, AK	AK	45	45
Ninilchik Harbor, AK	AK	248	248
Nome Harbor, AK	AK	2,496	2,496
Project condition surveys, AK	AK	588	588
Alabama - Coosa comp water study, AL	AL	180	180
Alabama - Coosa River, AL	AL	1,591	1,591
Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, AL	AL	22,117	22,117
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, AL	AL	4,050	4,050
Inspection of completed works, AL	AL	50	50
Millers Ferry lock and dam, William "Bill" Dannelly Lake, AL	AL	7,315	7,315
Mobile Harbor, AL	AL	20,248	20,248
Project condition surveys, AL	AL	100	100
Robert F Henry lock and dam, AL	AL	7,125	7,125
Scheduling reservoir operations, AL	AL	140	140
Tennessee - Tombigbee Waterway wildlife mitigation, AL & MS	AL	1,400	1,400
Tennessee - Tombigbee Waterway, AL & MS	AL	20,103	20,103
Walter F George lock and dam, AL & GA	AL	7,171	7,171
Beaver Lake, AR	AR	5,744	5,744
Blakely Mt Dam, Lake Ouachita, AR	AR	10,084	10,084
Blue Mountain Lake, AR	AR	1,292	1,292
Bull Shoals Lake, AR	AR	6,392	6,392
Dardanelle Lock and Dam, AR	AR	6,524	6,524
Degray Lake, AR	AR	6,828	6,828
Dequeen Lake, AR	AR	1,193	1,193
Dierks Lake, AR	AR	1,161	1,161
Gillham Lake, AR	AR	1,093	1,093
Greers Ferry Lake, AR	AR	5,608	5,550
Helena Harbor, Phillips County, AR	AR	30	30
Inspection of completed works, AR	AR	199	199
McClellan - Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, AR & OK	AR	35,065	34,230
Millwood Lake, AR	AR	1,782	1,782
Narrows Dam, Lake Greeson, AR	AR	4,342	4,342
Nimrod Lake, AR	AR	1,656	1,656
Norfork Lake, AR	AR	4,540	4,540
Osceola Harbor, AR	AR	29	299
Ouachita and Black Rivers, AR & LA	AR	8,500	10,400
Ozark - Jeta Taylor lock and dam, AR	AR	5,151	5,151
Project condition surveys, AR	AR	7	7
White River, AR	AR	215	215

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Ofu Harbor, American Samoa	AS	1,480	1,480
Tau Harbor, American Samoa	AS	1,372	1,372
Alamo Lake, AZ	AZ	1,280	1,280
Inspection of completed works, AZ	AZ	92	92
Painted Rock Dam, AZ	AZ	1,220	1,220
Scheduling reservoir operations, AZ	AZ	37	37
Whitlow Ranch Dam, AZ	AZ	190	190
Black Butte Lake, CA	CA	1,989	1,989
Buchanan Dam, HV Eastman Lake, CA	CA	1,781	1,781
Channel Islands Harbor, CA	CA	310	310
Coyote Valley Dam, Lake Mendocino, CA	CA	4,084	4,000
Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake and Channel, CA	CA	5,272	5,825
Farmington Dam, CA	CA	202	202
Hidden Dam, Hensley Lake, CA	CA	2,090	2,090
Humboldt Harbor and Bay, CA	CA	5,069	5,000
Inspection of completed works, CA	CA	1,396	1,396
Isabella Lake, CA	CA	2,291	2,291
Los Angeles County drainage area, CA	CA	4,287	4,287
Merced County streams, CA	CA	251	251
Mojave River Dam, CA	CA	290	290
Morro Bay Harbor, CA	CA	1,616	1,616
Moss Landing Harbor, CA	CA		1,475
New Hogan Lake, CA	CA	1,994	1,994
New Melones Lake, downstream channel, CA	CA	1,634	1,634
Noyo River & Harbor, CA	CA	28	28
Oakland Harbor, CA	CA	6,205	6,205
Oceanside Harbor, CA	CA	1,040	1,040
Pine Flat Lake, CA	CA	2,831	2,831
Pinole Shoal management study, CA	CA		250
Project condition surveys, CA	CA	1,891	1,891
Redwood City Harbor, CA	CA	4,967	4,967
Richmond Harbor, CA	CA	7,972	7,972
Sacramento River (30 foot project), CA	CA	2,790	2,790
Sacramento River and tributaries (debris control), CA	CA	1,299	1,299
Sacramento River shallow draft channel, CA	CA	119	119
San Francisco Bay long term mgmt strategy, CA	CA		1,600
San Francisco Bay, delta model structure, CA	CA	1,185	1,185
San Francisco Harbor and Bay, CA (drift removal)	CA	2,000	2,000
San Francisco Harbor, CA	CA	2,223	2,223
San Joaquin River, CA	CA	2,886	2,886
San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, CA	CA	3,320	3,320
Santa Ana River basin, CA	CA	3,321	3,321
Santa Barbara Harbor, CA	CA	1,408	1,408

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Scheduling reservoir operations, CA	CA	1,499	1,499
Success Lake, CA	CA	1,809	1,809
Suisun Bay channel, CA	CA	5,132	5,132
Terminus Dam, Lake Kaweah, CA	CA	1,692	1,692
Ventura Harbor, CA	CA	2,200	2,000
Yuba River, CA	CA	29	29
Bear Creek Lake, CO	CO	407	407
Chatfield Lake, CO	CO	1,233	1,233
Cherry Creek Lake, CO	CO	1,941	1,941
Inspection of completed works, CO	CO	107	107
John Martin Reservoir, CO	CO	2,926	2,926
Scheduling reservoir operations, CO	CO	590	590
Trinidad Lake, CO	CO	1,021	1,021
Black Rock Lake, CT	CT	592	592
Clinton Harbor, CT	CT		100
Colebrook River Lake, CT	CT	583	583
Hancock Brook Lake, CT	CT	599	599
Hop Brook Lake, CT	CT	1,005	1,005
Inspection of completed works, CT	CT	79	79
Mansfield Hollow Lake, CT	CT	535	535
Northfield Brook Lake, CT	CT	527	527
Norwalk federal navigation project, CT	CT		500
Project condition surveys, CT	CT	1,000	1,000
Stamford hurricane barrier, CT	CT	417	417
Thomaston Dam, CT	CT	951	951
West Thompson Lake, CT	CT	724	724
Inspection of completed works, DC	DC	9	9
Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, DC (drift removal)	DC	744	744
Project condition surveys, DC	DC	37	37
Washington Harbor, DC	DC	600	600
Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware R to Chesapeake bay, DE & MD	DE	11,475	11,475
Mispillion River, DE	DE	20	20
Murderkill River, DE	DE	20	20
Project condition surveys, DE	DE	86	86
Wilmington Harbor, DE	DE	3,860	3,800
Canaveral Harbor, FL	FL	3,828	6,000
Central and Southern Florida, FL	FL	14,213	14,213
Escambia and Conecuh Rivers, FL	FL	1,000	1,000
Fernandina Harbor, FL	FL	1,513	1,513
Inspection of completed works, FL	FL	300	300
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, FL	FL	250	250
Jacksonville Harbor, FL	FL	3,637	3,637
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Lake seminole, FL, AL & GA	FL	8,188	8,188

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Manatee Harbor, FL	FL	2,000	2,000
Miami Harbor, FL	FL	1,530	1,530
Miami River, FL	FL		1,000
Okeechobee Waterway, FL	FL	2,060	2,060
Palm Beach Harbor, FL	FL	1,183	1,183
Panama City Harbor, FL	FL	906	906
Pensacola Harbor, FL	FL	1,315	1,315
Project condition surveys, FL	FL	1,325	1,325
Removal of aquatic growth, FL	FL	2,306	2,306
Scheduling reservoir operations, FL	FL	30	30
Suwanee River, FL	FL		500
Tampa Harbor, FL	FL	4,500	10,000
Allatoona Lake, GA	GA	7,322	7,322
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, GA, AL & FL	GA	1,050	1,050
Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, GA	GA	286	286
Brunswick Harbor, GA	GA	2,396	2,396
Buford Dam and Lake Sidney Lanier, GA	GA	8,519	8,519
Carters Dam and Lake, GA	GA	10,637	10,637
Hartwell Lake, GA & SC	GA	16,619	16,619
Inspection of completed works, GA	GA	41	41
J Strom Thurmond Lake, GA & SC	GA	11,047	11,047
Project condition surveys, GA	GA	90	90
Richard B Russell Dam and Lake, GA & SC	GA	12,283	12,283
Savannah Harbor, GA	GA	13,521	13,521
West Point Dam and Lake, GA & AL	GA	11,449	11,449
Barbers Point Harbor, HI	HI	231	231
Inspection of completed works, HI	HI	189	189
Project condition surveys, HI	HI	200	200
Coralville Lake, IA	IA	2,537	2,537
Inspection of completed works, IA	IA	202	202
Missouri River - Kenslers Bend, NE to Sioux City, IA	IA	152	152
Missouri River - Rulo to Mouth, IA, NE, KS & MO	IA	6,475	6,475
Missouri River - Sioux City to Rulo, IA & NE	IA	2,417	2,417
Rathbun Lake, IA	IA	2,081	2,081
Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock, IA	IA	3,415	3,415
Saylorville Lake, IA	IA	3,952	4,202
Albeni Falls Dam, ID	ID	1,792	1,792
Dworshak Dam and Reservoir, ID	ID	2,464	2,464
Inspection of completed works, ID	ID	78	78
Lucky Peak Lake, ID	ID	2,567	2,567
Scheduling reservoir operations, ID	ID	430	430
Calumet Harbor and River, IL & IN	IL	2,900	2,900
Carlyle Lake, IL	IL	6,745	6,745

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Chicago Harbor, IL	IL	3,499	3,499
Chicago River, IL	IL	385	385
Farm Creek Reservoirs, IL	IL	214	214
Illinois Waterway, IL & IN	IL	25,767	25,767
Inspection of completed works, IL	IL	631	631
Kaskaskia River navigation, IL	IL	1,189	1,189
Lake Michigan Diversion, IL	IL	547	547
Lake Shelbyville, IL	IL	5,186	5,186
Miss River btwn Mo River and Minneapolis, IL	IL	67,030	67,030
Project condition surveys, IL	IL	33	33
Rend Lake, IL	IL	5,254	5,254
Surveillance of northern boundary waters, IL	IL	114	114
Waukegan Harbor, IL	IL	680	2,680
Brookville Lake, IN	IN	872	872
Burns Waterway Harbor, IN	IN		800
Cagles Mill Lake, IN	IN	600	600
Cecil M Harden Lake, IN	IN	687	687
Indiana Harbor, IN	IN		300
Inspection of completed works, IN	IN	370	370
J Edward Roush Lake, IN	IN	643	643
Mississinewa Lake, IN	IN	751	751
Monroe Lake, IN	IN	689	689
Patoka Lake, IN	IN	619	619
Project condition surveys, IN	IN	59	59
Salamonie Lake, IN	IN	637	637
Surveillance of northern boundary waters, IN	IN	111	111
Clinton Lake, KS	KS	1,987	1,987
Council Grove Lake, KS	KS	1,544	1,544
El Dorado Lake, KS	KS	339	339
Elk City Lake, KS	KS	692	692
Fall River Lake, KS	KS	2,154	2,154
Hillsdale Lake, KS	KS	703	703
Inspection of completed works, KS	KS	85	85
John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, KS	KS	1,081	1,081
Kanopolis Lake, KS	KS	1,634	1,634
Marion Lake, KS	KS	1,551	1,551
Melvern Lake, KS	KS	1,828	1,828
Milford Lake, KS	KS	2,903	2,903
Pearson - Skubitz Big Hill Lake, KS	KS	1,052	1,052
Perry Lake, KS	KS	2,211	2,211
Pomona Lake, KS	KS	1,810	1,810
Scheduling reservoir operations, KS	KS	32	32
Toronto Lake, KS	KS	402	402

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Tuttle Creek Lake, KS	KS	2,189	2,189
Wilson Lake, KS	KS	1,509	1,509
Barkley Dam and Lake Barkley, KY & TN	KY	9,507	9,507
Barren River Lake, KY	KY	2,102	2,102
Big Sandy Harbor, KY	KY	1,091	1,091
Buckhorn Lake, KY	KY	1,195	1,195
Carr Creek Lake, KY	KY	1,252	1,652
Cave Run Lake, KY	KY	733	733
Dewey Lake, KY	KY	1,245	1,245
Elvis Stahr (Hickman) Harbor, KY	KY	40	40
Fishtrap Lake, KY	KY	1,621	1,621
Grayson Lake, KY	KY	1,140	1,140
Green and Barren Rivers, KY	KY	1,178	1,178
Green River Lake, KY	KY	1,882	1,882
Inspection of completed works, KY	KY	98	98
Laurel River Lake, KY	KY	1,814	1,814
Martins Fork Lake, KY	KY	599	599
Middlesboro Cumberland River Basin, KY	KY	62	62
Nolin Lake, KY	KY	1,817	1,817
Ohio River Locks and Dams, KY, IL, IN & OH	KY	32,210	32,210
Ohio River open channel work, KY, IL, IN & OH	KY	3,928	3,928
Paintsville Lake, KY	KY	912	912
Project condition surveys, KY	KY	7	7
Rough River Lake, KY	KY	1,945	1,945
Taylorsville Lake, KY	KY	1,149	1,149
Wolf Creek Dam, Lake Cumberland, KY	KY	5,902	5,902
Yatesville Lake, KY	KY	1,070	1,070
Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black, LA	LA	15,948	15,948
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, LA	LA	1,402	1,402
Bayou Pierre, LA	LA	32	32
Caddo Lake, LA	LA	330	330
Calcasieu River and Pass, LA	LA	9,032	9,032
Freshwater Bayou, LA	LA	1,466	1,466
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, LA	LA	19,614	19,000
Houma navigation canal, LA	LA	253	253
Inspection of completed works, LA	LA	856	856
J Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA	LA	10,115	10,115
Mermentau River, LA	LA	2,538	2,538
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, LA	LA	54,053	54,053
Mississippi River, gulf outlet, LA	LA	14,111	13,500
Project condition surveys, LA	LA	60	60
Removal of aquatic growth, LA	LA	2,000	2,000
Wallace Lake, LA	LA	291	291

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Aunt Lydia's Cove, MA	MA		250
Barre Falls Dam, MA	MA	637	637
Birch Hill Dam, MA	MA	607	607
Buffumville Lake, MA	MA	592	592
Cape Cod Canal, MA	MA	8,896	8,750
Charles River natural valley storage area, MA	MA	312	312
Conant Brook Lake, MA	MA	362	362
East Brimfield Lake, MA	MA	458	458
Hodges Village Dam, MA	MA	591	591
Inspection of completed works, MA	MA	114	114
Knightville Dam, MA	MA	677	677
Littleville Lake, MA	MA	541	541
New Bedford Fairhaven and Acushnet hurricane barrier, MA	MA	337	337
Project condition surveys, MA	MA	1,300	1,300
Tully Lake, MA	MA	595	595
West Hill Dam, MA	MA	798	798
Westville Lake, MA	MA	579	579
Weymouth-Fore River, MA	MA	3,774	3,700
Baltimore Harbor and channels (50 foot), MD	MD	15,214	15,214
Baltimore Harbor, MD (drift removal)	MD	326	326
Cumberland, MD and Ridgeley, WV	MD	126	126
Inspection of completed works, MD	MD	36	36
Jennings Randolph Lake, MD & WV	MD	1,907	1,907
Nanticoke River Northwest Fork, MD	MD	240	240
Ocean City Harbor and inlet and Sinepuxent Bay, MD	MD	220	220
Project condition surveys, MD	MD	379	379
Scheduling reservoir operations, MD	MD	97	97
Wicomico River, MD	MD	500	500
Bass Harbor, ME	ME	95	95
Carvers Harbor, ME	ME	270	270
Disposal area monitoring, ME	ME	1,106	1,106
Inspection of completed works, ME	ME	21	21
International St Croix River board of control, ME	ME	17	17
Kennebunk River, ME	ME		700
Portland Harbor, ME	ME	520	520
Project condition surveys, ME	ME	866	866
Channels in Lake St Clair, MI	MI	183	183
Charlevoix Harbor, MI	MI	89	89
Detroit River, MI	MI	4,347	4,347
Frankfort Harbor, MI	MI	37	37
Grand Haven Harbor, MI	MI	1,879	1,879
Grand Marais Harbor, MI	MI	14	14
Harbor Beach Harbor, MI	MI		100

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Holland Harbor, MI	MI	1,354	1,354
Inspection of completed works, MI	MI	144	144
Keweenaw Waterway, MI	MI	370	370
Lac La Belle, MI	MI	92	92
Ludington Harbor, MI	MI	500	500
Menominee Harbor, MI & WI	MI		400
Monroe Harbor, MI	MI	550	550
Muskegon Harbor, MI	MI	525	525
Pentwater, MI	MI		100
Project condition surveys, MI	MI	178	178
Rouge River, MI	MI	1,161	1,161
Saginaw River, MI	MI	2,427	2,427
St Clair River, MI	MI	920	920
St Joseph Harbor, MI	MI	470	470
St Marys River, MI	MI	17,134	17,134
Surveillance of northern boundary waters, MI	MI	2,314	2,314
Bigstone Lake Whetstone River, MN & SD	MN	164	164
Duluth - Superior Harbor, MN & WI	MN	5,081	5,381
Inspection of completed works, MN	MN	129	129
Lac Qui Parle Lakes, Minnesota River, MN	MN	363	363
Miss River btwn Mo River and Minneapolis, MN	MN	58,073	58,073
Orwell Lake, MN	MN	261	261
Project condition surveys, MN	MN	67	67
Red Lake Reservoir, MN	MN	320	320
Reservoir plan operating evaluation, MN	MN		400
Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River, MN	MN	2,263	2,263
Surveillance of northern boundary waters, MN	MN	310	310
Caruthersville Harbor, MO	MO	23	23
Clarence Cannon Dam and Mark Twain Lake, MO	MO	6,107	6,107
Clearwater Lake, MO	MO	2,677	2,600
Harry S Truman Dam and Reservoir, MO	MO	9,140	9,140
Inspection of completed works, MO	MO	768	768
Little Blue River Lakes, MO	MO	730	730
Long Branch Lake, MO	MO	848	848
Miss River btwn the Ohio and Mo Rivers (reg works), MO & IL	MO	29,559	29,559
Pomme De Terre Lake, MO	MO	1,963	1,963
Project condition surveys, MO	MO	7	7
Scheduling reservoir operations, MO	MO	319	319
Smithville Lake, MO	MO	1,237	1,237
Stockton Lake, MO	MO	3,742	3,742
Table Rock Lake, MO	MO	7,556	7,556
Union Lake, MO	MO	6	6
Rota Harbor, CNMI	MP	260	260

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
East Fork, Tombigbee River, MS	MS	102	102
Gulfport Harbor, MS	MS	2,500	2,500
Inspection of completed works, MS	MS	57	57
Okatibbee Lake, MS	MS	1,680	1,680
Pascagoula Harbor, MS	MS	5,156	5,156
Pearl River, MS & LA	MS	276	276
Project condition surveys, MS	MS	181	181
Ft Peck Dam and Lake, MT	MT	4,154	4,154
Inspection of completed works, MT	MT	19	19
Libby Dam, Lake Koocanusa, MT	MT	2,189	2,189
Scheduling reservoir operations, MT	MT	87	87
Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, NC	NC	860	860
B Everett Jordan Dam and Lake, NC	NC	1,849	1,849
Cape Fear River above Wilmington, NC	NC	635	635
Falls Lake, NC	NC	2,097	2,097
Inspection of completed works, NC	NC	35	35
Manteo (shallowbag) Bay, NC	NC	7,855	7,855
Masonboro Inlet and connecting channels, NC	NC	3,700	3,700
Morehead City Harbor, NC	NC	3,575	3,575
Project condition surveys, NC	NC	226	226
Silver Lake Harbor, NC	NC	1,540	1,540
W Kerr Scott Dam and Reservoir, NC	NC	2,817	2,817
Wilmington Harbor, NC	NC	13,963	13,963
Bowman - Haley Lake, ND	ND	156	156
Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, ND	ND	13,266	13,516
Homme Lake, ND	ND	266	266
Inspection of completed works, ND	ND	85	85
Lake Ashtabula and Baldhill Dam, ND	ND	1,242	1,242
Pipestem Lake, ND	ND	459	459
Scheduling reservoir operations, ND	ND	117	117
Souris River, ND	ND	422	422
Surveillance of northern boundary waters, ND	ND	31	31
Gavins Point Dam, Lewis and Clark Lake, NE & SD	NE	8,231	8,231
Harlan County Lake dam safety study, NE	NE		355
Harlan County Lake, NE	NE	1,863	1,863
Inspection of completed works, NE	NE	102	102
Missouri R master wtr control manual, NE, IA, KS, MO, MT, ND	NE	203	203
Papillion Creek and tributaries lakes, NE	NE	625	625
Salt Creek and tributaries, NE	NE	845	845
Blackwater Dam, NH	NH	644	644
Edward Macdowell Lake, NH	NH	555	555
Franklin Falls Dam, NH	NH	768	768
Hopkinton - Everett Lakes, NH	NH	1,228	1,228

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Inspection of completed works, MH	NH	12	12
Otter Brook Lake, NH	NH	806	806
Project condition surveys, NH	NH	300	300
Surry Mountain Lake, NH	NH	736	736
Barnegat Inlet, NJ	NJ	95	95
Cold Spring Inlet, NJ	NJ	540	540
Delaware River at Camden, NJ	NJ	10	10
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, NJ, PA & DE	NJ	20,465	20,465
Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA to Trenton, NJ	NJ	720	720
Inspection of completed works, NJ	NJ	106	106
Manasquan River, NJ	NJ	510	510
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, NJ	NJ	8,120	8,120
Passaic River flood warning systems, NJ	NJ	450	450
Project condition surveys, NJ	NJ	1,675	1,675
Raritan River to Arthur Kill cut-off, NJ	NJ	150	150
Raritan River, NJ	NJ	2,500	2,400
Shark River, NJ	NJ	80	80
Abiquiu Dam, NM	NM	3,168	3,168
Cochiti Lake, NM	NM	3,726	3,726
Conchas Lake, NM	NM	1,579	1,579
Galisteo Dam, NM	NM	779	750
Inspection of completed works, NM	NM	221	221
Jemez Canyon Dam, NM	NM	3,561	3,561
Santa Rosa Dam and Lake, NM	NM	1,213	1,213
Scheduling reservoir operations, NM	NM	1,221	1,221
Two Rivers Dam, NM	NM	552	552
Inspection of completed works, NV	NV	46	46
Martis Creek Lake, NV & CA	NV	586	586
Pine and Mathews Canyons Lakes, NV	NV	214	214
Almond Lake, NY	NY	509	509
Arkport Dam, NY	NY	294	294
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, NY	NY	1,308	1,308
Browns Creek, NY	NY	100	100
Buffalo Harbor, NY	NY	1,030	1,030
Buttermilk Channel, NY	NY	60	60
East River, NY	NY	1,350	1,350
East Rockaway Inlet, NY	NY	140	140
East Sidney Lake, NY	NY	517	517
Eastchester Creek, NY	NY	100	100
Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, NY	NY	220	220
Flushing Bay and Creek, NY	NY	150	150
Great South Bay, NY	NY	200	200
Hudson River Channel, NY	NY	350	350

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Hudson River, NY (maint)	NY	1,794	1,794
Hudson River, NY (o&c)	NY	1,090	1,090
Inspection of completed works, NY	NY	659	659
Jamaica Bay, NY	NY	140	140
Long Island Intracoastal Waterway, NY	NY	200	200
Moriches Inlet, NY	NY	80	80
Mt Morris Lake, NY	NY	3,845	3,845
New York and New Jersey channels, NY	NY	7,200	7,200
New York Harbor, NY & NJ	NY	3,410	3,410
New York Harbor, NY & NJ (drift removal)	NY	4,400	4,400
Project condition surveys, NY	NY	1,310	1,310
Shinnecock Inlet, NY	NY	120	120
Southern New York flood control projects, NY	NY	662	662
Surveillance of northern boundary waters, NY	NY	710	710
Whitney Point Lake, NY	NY	678	678
Alum Creek Lake, OH	OH	948	948
Ashtabula Harbor, OH	OH	1,063	1,063
Berlin Lake, OH	OH	1,544	1,544
Caesar Creek Lake, OH	OH	1,222	1,222
Clarence J Brown Dam, OH	OH	1,358	1,358
Cleveland Harbor, OH	OH	3,305	3,305
Conneaut Harbor, OH	OH	2,315	2,315
Deer Creek Lake, OH	OH	815	815
Delaware Lake, OH	OH	794	794
Dillon Lake, OH	OH	1,790	1,790
Inspection of completed works, OH	OH	280	280
Lorain Harbor, OH	OH	600	600
Massillon local protection project, OH	OH	25	25
Michael J Kirwan Dam and Reservoir, OH	OH	718	718
Mosquito Creek Lake, OH	OH	717	717
Muskingum River Lakes, OH	OH	6,754	6,754
North Branch Kokosing River Lake, OH	OH	125	125
Paint Creek Lake, OH	OH	721	721
Project condition surveys, OH	OH	240	240
Roseville local protection project, OH	OH	30	30
Sandusky Harbor, OH	OH	890	850
Surveillance of northern boundary waters, OH	OH	170	170
Toledo Harbor, OH	OH	3,682	3,650
Tom Jenkins Dam, OH	OH	290	290
West Fork of Mill Creek Lake, OH	OH	403	403
William H Harsha Lake, OH	OH	710	710
Arcadia Lake, OK	OK	429	429
Birch Lake, OK	OK	475	475

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Broken Bow Lake, OK	OK	1,493	1,493
Canton Lake, OK	OK	1,723	1,723
Copan Lake, OK	OK	1,511	1,511
Eufaula Lake, OK	OK	5,312	5,312
Fort Gibson Lake, OK	OK	5,053	5,053
Fort Supply Lake, OK	OK	733	733
Great Salt Plains Lake, OK	OK	166	166
Heyburn Lake, OK	OK	529	529
Hugo Lake, OK	OK	1,451	1,451
Hulah Lake, OK	OK	626	626
Inspection of completed works, OK	OK	88	88
Kaw Lake, OK	OK	2,378	2,378
Keystone Lake, OK	OK	4,300	4,300
Oologah Lake, OK	OK	1,955	1,955
Optima Lake, OK	OK	61	61
Pensacola Reservoir, Lake of the Cherokees, OK	OK	57	57
Pine Creek Lake, OK	OK	857	857
Robert S Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoirs, OK	OK	4,517	4,517
Sardis Lake, OK	OK	1,192	1,192
Scheduling reservoir operations, OK	OK	508	508
Skiatook Lake, OK	OK	1,086	1,086
Tenkiller Ferry Lake, OK	OK	2,998	2,998
Waurika Lake, OK	OK	1,528	1,528
Webbers Falls Lock and Dam, OK	OK	4,815	4,815
Wister Lake, OK	OK	460	460
Applegate Lake, OR	OR	595	595
Blue River Lake, OR	OR	312	312
Bonneville Lock and Dam, OR & WA	OR	7,792	7,792
Chetco River, OR	OR	348	348
Columbia & Lwr Willamette R blw Vancouver, WA & Portland, OR	OR	16,829	16,829
Columbia River at the mouth, OR & WA	OR	10,186	10,186
Columbia River between Vancouver, WA and The Dalles, OR	OR	254	254
Coos Bay, OR	OR	4,594	4,594
Cottage Grove Lake, OR	OR	780	780
Cougar Lake, OR	OR	766	766
Detroit Lake, OR	OR	729	729
Dorena Lake, OR	OR	613	613
Fall Creek Lake, OR	OR	555	555
Fern Ridge Lake, OR	OR	966	966
Green Peter - Foster Lakes, OR	OR	1,186	1,186
Hills Creek Lake, OR	OR	3,807	3,807
Inspection of completed works, OR	OR	167	167
John Day Lock and Dam, OR & WA	OR	4,692	4,692

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Lookout Point Lake, OR	OR	1,272	1,272
Lost Creek Lake, OR	OR	5,096	5,096
McNary Lock and Dam, OR & WA	OR	7,129	7,129
Project condition surveys, OR	OR	177	177
Rogue River at Gold Beach, OR	OR	394	394
Scheduling reservoir operations, OR	OR	62	62
Siuslaw River, OR	OR	449	449
Surveillance of northern boundary waters, OR	OR	134	134
Umpqua River, OR	OR		225
Willamette River at Willamette Falls, OR	OR	72	72
Willamette River bank protection, OR	OR	80	80
Willow Creek Lake, OR	OR	538	538
Yaquina Bay and Harbor, OR	OR	1,006	1,006
Allegheny River, PA	PA	4,393	4,393
Alvin River Bush Dam, PA	PA	727	727
Aylesworth Creek Lake, PA	PA	251	251
Beltzville Lake, PA	PA	1,026	1,026
Blue Marsh Lake, PA	PA	2,662	2,662
Conemaugh River Lake, PA	PA	1,074	1,074
Cowanesque Lake, PA	PA	2,793	2,793
Crooked Creek Lake, PA	PA	1,033	1,033
Curwensville Lake, PA	PA	717	717
East Branch Clarion River Lake, PA	PA	799	799
Foster Joseph Sayers Dam, PA	PA	745	745
Francis E Walter Dam, PA	PA	731	731
General Edgar Jadwin Dam and Reservoir, PA	PA	249	249
Inspection of completed works, PA	PA	196	196
Johnstown, PA	PA	1,603	1,603
Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir, PA	PA	1,147	1,447
Loyalhanna Lake, PA	PA	785	785
Mahoning Creek Lake, PA	PA	946	946
Monongahela River, PA	PA	17,138	17,138
Ohio River Locks and Dams, PA, OH & WV	PA	18,362	18,362
Project Condition Surveys, PA	PA	30	30
Prompton Lake, PA	PA	483	483
Punxsutawney, PA	PA	13	13
Raystown Lake, PA	PA	5,449	5,849
Scheduling reservoir operations, PA	PA	66	66
Schuylkill River, PA	PA	70	70
Shenango River Lake, PA	PA	1,831	1,831
Stillwater Lake, PA	PA	386	386
Surveillance of northern boundary waters, PA	PA	80	80
Tioga - Hammond Lakes, PA	PA	3,365	3,365

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Tionesta Lake, PA	PA	1,331	1,331
Union City Lake, PA	PA	147	147
Woodcock Creek Lake, PA	PA	714	714
York Indian Rock Dam, PA	PA	556	556
Youghiogheny River Lake, PA & MD	PA	2,124	2,124
San Juan Harbor, PR	PR	1,800	1,800
Inspection of completed works, RI	RI	15	15
Project condition surveys, RI	RI	400	400
Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, SC	SC	467	467
Charleston Harbor, SC	SC	11,038	11,038
Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, SC	SC	2,905	2,905
Folly River, SC	SC	987	987
Georgetown Harbor, SC	SC	1,342	1,342
Inspection of completed works, SC	SC	30	30
Project condition surveys, SC	SC	349	349
Big Bend Dam, Lake Sharpe, SD	SD	7,577	7,577
Cold Brook Lake, SD	SD	275	275
Cottonwood Springs Lake, SD	SD	192	192
Fort Randall Dam, Lake Francis Case, SD	SD	9,635	9,635
Inspection of completed works, SD	SD	17	17
Lake Traverse, SD & MN	SD	434	434
Missouri R between Fort Peck Dam and Gavins Pt, SD, MT & ND	SD	350	350
Oahe Dam, Lake Oahe, SD & ND	SD	11,421	11,421
Scheduling reservoir operations, SD	SD	52	52
Center Hill Lake, TN	TN	6,397	6,397
Cheatham Lock and Dam, TN	TN	5,103	5,103
Chickamauga Lock, TN	TN	2,430	2,430
Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir, TN	TN	6,226	6,226
Dale Hollow Lake, TN	TN	5,531	5,531
Inspection of completed works, TN	TN	137	137
J Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir, TN	TN	3,738	3,738
Old Hickory Lock and Dam, TN	TN	6,385	6,385
Project condition surveys, TN	TN	7	7
Tennessee River, TN	TN	18,537	18,537
Wolf River Harbor, TN	TN	23	23
Aquilla Lake, TX	TX	1,108	1,108
Arkansas - Red River Basins chloride control - area VIII, TX	TX	1,051	1,051
Bardwell Lake, TX	TX	1,538	1,538
Bayport ship channel, TX	TX	2,875	2,875
Belton Lake, TX	TX	3,041	3,041
Benbrook Lake, TX	TX	2,097	2,097
Brazos Island Harbor, TX	TX	3,775	3,775
Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, TX	TX	2,875	2,875

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Canyon Lake, TX	TX	3,667	3,667
Corpus Christi ship channel, TX	TX	3,900	3,900
Denison Dam, Lake Texoma, TX	TX	5,569	5,569
Estelline Springs experimental project, TX	TX	5	5
Ferrells Bridge Dam, Lake O' the Pines, TX	TX	3,075	3,075
Freeport Harbor, TX	TX	3,610	3,610
Galveston Harbor and channel, TX	TX	4,800	4,800
GIWW, channel to Victoria, TX	TX	6,975	6,975
Granger Dam and Lake, TX	TX	2,004	2,004
Grapevine Lake, TX	TX	3,349	3,349
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, TX	TX	29,312	29,312
Hords Creek Lake, TX	TX	1,665	1,665
Houston ship channel, TX	TX	3,261	3,261
Inspection of completed works, TX	TX	557	557
Jim Chapman Lake, TX	TX	2,897	2,897
Joe Pool Lake, TX	TX	1,023	1,023
Lake Kemp, TX	TX	422	422
Lavon Lake, TX	TX	3,885	3,885
Lewisville Dam, TX	TX	4,290	4,290
Matagorda ship channel, TX	TX	8,700	8,700
Navarro Mills Lake, TX	TX	2,353	2,353
North San Gabriel Dam and Lake Georgetown, TX	TX	2,320	2,320
O C Fisher Dam and Lake, TX	TX	1,260	1,260
Pat Mayse Lake, TX	TX	1,266	1,266
Proctor Lake, TX	TX	2,221	2,221
Project condition surveys, TX	TX	50	50
Ray Roberts Lake, TX	TX	1,070	1,070
Sabine - Neches Waterway, TX	TX	13,478	13,478
Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir, TX	TX	11,578	11,578
Scheduling reservoir operations, TX	TX	84	84
Somerville Lake, TX	TX	3,068	3,068
Stillhouse Hollow Dam, TX	TX	1,951	1,951
Texas City ship channel, TX	TX	2,150	2,150
Texas water allocation assessment, TX	TX	500	500
Town Bluff Dam, B A Steinhagen Lake, TX	TX	3,995	3,995
Waco Lake, TX	TX	3,295	3,295
Wallisville Lake, TX	TX	1,662	1,662
Whitney Lake, TX	TX	5,603	6,803
Wright Patman Dam and Lake, TX	TX	3,416	3,416
Inspection of completed works, UT	UT	40	40
Scheduling reservoir operations, UT	UT	631	631
Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway - ACC, VA	VA	1,670	1,670
Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway - DSC, VA	VA	275	275

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
Chincoteague Inlet, VA	VA	900	900
Gathright Dam and Lake Moomaw, VA	VA	2,084	2,084
Hampton Rds, Norfolk & Newport News Hbr, VA (drift removal)	VA	825	825
Inspection of completed works, VA	VA	127	127
James River Channel, VA	VA	3,295	3,295
John H Kerr Lake, VA & NC	VA	11,513	11,513
John W Flannagan Dam and Reservoir, VA	VA	1,435	1,435
Norfolk Harbor, VA	VA	11,203	11,203
North Fork of Pound River Lake, VA	VA	346	346
Philpott Lake, VA	VA	5,391	5,391
Project condition surveys, VA	VA	793	793
Rudee Inlet, VA	VA	635	635
Tangier Channel, VA	VA	600	600
Waterway on the coast of Virginia, VA	VA	200	200
Ball Mountain Lake, VT	VT	801	801
Inspection of completed works, VT	VT	45	45
North Hartland Lake, VT	VT	706	706
North Springfield Lake, VT	VT	892	892
Townshend Lake, VT	VT	786	786
Union Village Dam, VT	VT	684	684
Chief Joseph Dam, WA	WA	2,419	2,419
Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, WA	WA	1,508	1,508
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, WA	WA	8,582	9,000
Howard Hanson Dam, WA	WA	2,481	2,481
Ice Harbor Lock and Dam, WA	WA	5,670	5,670
Inspection of completed works, WA	WA	311	311
Lake Crockett (Keystone Harbor), WA	WA	342	342
Lake Washington Ship Canal, WA	WA	4,387	4,387
Little Goose Lock and Dam, WA	WA	2,165	2,165
Lower Granite Lock and Dam, WA	WA	2,422	2,422
Lower Monumental Lock and Dam, WA	WA	1,996	1,996
Mill Creek Lake, WA	WA	1,041	1,041
Mt St Helens sediment control, WA	WA	257	257
Mud Mountain Dam, WA	WA	2,516	2,516
Olympia Harbor, WA	WA	400	400
Project condition surveys, WA	WA	403	403
Puget Sound and tributary waters, WA	WA	864	864
Quillayute River, WA	WA	58	58
Scheduling reservoir operations, WA	WA	485	485
Seattle Harbor, WA	WA	555	555
Stillaguamish River, WA	WA	226	226
Surveillance of northern boundary waters, WA	WA	66	66
Tacoma, Puyallup River, WA	WA	112	112

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
The Dalles Lock and Dam, WA & OR	WA	3,667	3,667
Willapa River and Harbor, WA	WA	158	158
Eau Galle River Lake, WI	WI	647	647
Fox River, WI	WI	1,748	1,748
Green Bay Harbor, WI	WI	2,476	2,476
Inspection of completed works, WI	WI	40	40
Milwaukee Harbor, WI	WI	844	844
Project condition surveys, WI	WI	105	105
Surveillance of northern boundary waters, WI	WI	472	472
Two Rivers Harbor, WI	WI		420
Beech Fork Lake, WV	WV	1,014	1,014
Bluestone Lake, WV	WV	3,828	3,828
Burnsville Lake, WV	WV	1,517	1,517
East Lynn Lake, WV	WV	1,799	1,799
Elk River Harbor, WV	WV	10	10
Elkins, WV	WV	16	16
Inspection of completed works, WV	WV	117	117
Kanawha River Locks and Dams, WV	WV	13,661	13,661
Ohio River Locks and Dams, WV, KY & OH	WV	19,530	19,530
Ohio River open channel work, WV, KY & OH	WV	2,019	2,019
R D Bailey Lake, WV	WV	1,515	1,515
Stonewall Jackson Lake, WV	WV	640	640
Summersville Lake, WV	WV	1,657	1,657
Sutton Lake, WV	WV	1,788	1,788
Tygart Lake, WV	WV	2,950	2,950
Inspection of completed works, WY	WY	11	11
Jackson Hole levees, WY	WY	1,094	1,094
Scheduling reservoir operations, WY	WY	86	86
Total, Operation and Maintenance Listed Under States		1,912,658	1,935,017

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	State	Budget Request	House Recommended
REMAINING ITEMS			
Aquatic nuisance control research	XX	690	690
Automated budget system (abs)	XX	250	250
Coastal inlet research program	XX	2,475	2,475
Cultural resources (nagpra/curation)	XX	1,391	1,391
Dredge wheeler ready reserve	XX	8,000	8,000
Dredging data and lock performance monitoring system	XX	1,062	1,000
Dredging operations and environmental research (doer)	XX	6,080	5,660
Dredging operations technical support program	XX	1,391	1,300
Earthquake hazards reduction program	XX	270	270
Key emergency maintenance/repair reserve	XX	20,000	10,000
Facility protection	XX	12,000	12,000
Great lakes sediment transport models	XX	900	900
Harbor maintenance fee data collection	XX	608	608
Inland waterway navigation charts	XX	3,708	3,708
Long term option assessment for low use navigation	XX	1,500	
Monitoring of completed navigation projects	XX	1,575	1,500
National dam safety program	XX	250	250
National dam security program	XX	31	31
National emergency preparedness program (nepp)	XX	5,000	5,000
National lewis and clark commemoration coordinator	XX	319	319
Performance based budgeting support program	XX	2,540	734
Protect, clear and straighten channels (sec 3)	XX	45	45
Recreation management support program (rmsp)	XX	1,600	1,500
Regional sediment management demonstration program	XX	1,391	1,391
Reliability models program for major rehabilitation	XX	608	608
Removal of sunken vessels	XX	500	500
Water operations technical support (wots)	XX	653	653
Waterborne commerce statistics	XX	4,271	4,200
Reduction for savings and slippage	XX	-12,766	
Total Remaining Items		66,342	64,983
TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		1,979,000	2,000,000

Burns Harbor, Indiana.—Within available funds, the Committee directs the Corps to give priority consideration to the Bailly intake pipe.

Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake and Channel, California.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $5,825,000 for operation and maintenance at Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake and Channel, California. The amounts provided in excess of the request shall be available to complete outlet channel riprap repairs, control tower elevator shaft seepage repair, and spillway inlet channel repair.

Duluth—Superior Harbor, MN and WI.—For Duluth—Superior Harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin, the Committee has provided $5,381,000, of which $300,000 shall be available for a freshwater corrosion study.

Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.—Funds in excess of the budget request shall be for the removal of noxious weeds.

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, WA.—The Committee has included $9,000,000 to maintain the navigation channel of Grays Harbor, including the maintenance and improvement of the north and south jetties. The Corps is directed to identify operation and maintenance practices for the south jetty that will keep the breach closed and the Half Moon Bay shoreline stable.

Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir, PA.—For Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir, Pennsylvania, the Committee has provided $1,447,000, of which $300,000 shall be available for recreational improvements to include visitor center and fishing access improvements.

Hudson River, New York (O&C).—Within the funds provided, the Committee directs the Corps to conduct a reconnaissance study under section 216 authority of the Flood Control Act of 1970, as amended, for review of the completed projects for the Hudson River, Troy Lock and Dam, Troy, New York.

Miami River, Florida.—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for operations and maintenance of Miami River, Florida. The Committee is aware of the ongoing economic analysis of the Miami River maintenance project, and expects the Corps to complete and approve this analysis.

Ohio River Locks and Dams, Kentucky, Ohio and West Virginia.—Within the funds provided, the Corps of Engineers is directed to utilize $2,500,000 in cooperation with Operation Respond, a non-profit organization, to implement a project collecting and integrating imagery of a selected segment of the Ohio Basin, gathering data from Federal and non-Federal interests, and developing and testing software primarily for the use of emergency responders.

Ouchita and Black Rivers, AR & LA.—In total, the Committee recommends $10,400,000, of which $1,900,000 shall be available to complete annual maintenance dredging.

Whitney Lake, Texas.—For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends $6,803,000, of which not less than $900,000 of the funds in excess of the budget request shall be for Ham Creek Park and not more than $300,000 of the funds in excess of the budget request shall be available for Kimball Bend Park.

Remaining items, coastal inlet research program (CIRP).—Within the funds provided for the coastal inlet research program, the Committee has included sufficient resources to use data from the Grays Harbor navigation study and the regional sediment management study at the mouth of the Columbia, in connection with the new CIRP models, to identify operation and maintenance changes to reduce maintenance costs.

Remaining items, long term option assessment for low use navigation.—Due to funding limitations, the Committee has not recommended funding for the long term option assessment for low use navigation study. No funds were provided for this activity in fiscal year 2005.

Remaining items, regional sediment management support program.—Within the funds provided for the regional sediment management support program, the Committee has included sufficient funds for the design of a sand retention structure at Fletcher Cove in the city of Solana Beach, California.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2005	$143,840,000
Budget estimate, 2006	160,000,000
Recommended, 2006	160,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+16,160,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

This appropriation provides funds to administer laws pertaining to regulation of activities affecting U.S. waters, including wetlands, in accordance with the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899, the Clean Water Act, and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972. Appropriated funds are used to review and process permit applications, ensure compliance on permitted sites, protect important aquatic resources, and support watershed planning efforts in sensitive environmental areas in cooperation with States and local communities.

For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $160,000,000, which is the same as the budget estimate and $16,160,000 over the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

The Committee is concerned with the growing backlog and the delay in approving various permits, particularly in the Jacksonville, Florida and Sacramento, California offices. Therefore, the Committee directs that not less than ten percent of the increase over the fiscal year 2005 enacted level be directed to each of these offices.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2005	$163,680,000
Budget estimate, 2006	140,000,000
Recommended, 2006	140,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−23.680,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

This appropriation funds the cleanup of certain low-level radioactive materials and mixed wastes, located mostly at sites contaminated as a result of the Nation's early efforts to develop atomic weapons. The Committee recommendation for the Formerly Uti-

lized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) is $140,000,000, the same level as the budget request, and $23,680,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

Congress transferred FUSRAP from the Department of Energy (DOE) to the 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 FUSRAP sites where DOE had not completed cleanup. The Committee did not 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.

In addition, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers during fiscal year 2006 to prepare design specifications for Luckey, Ohio, and Shallow Land Disposal Area, Parks Township, Pennsylvania, and to complete investigations and initiate cleanup expeditiously for the former Sylvania nuclear fuel site at Hicksville, New York.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 2005	.....
Budget estimate, 2006	$70,000,000
Recommended, 2006	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	.....
Budget estimate, 2006	−70,000,000

Funds needed to respond to floods, hurricanes, and other natural disasters, and to support emergency operations in response to flood and hurricane disasters, including advance measures, flood fighting, emergency operations, providing potable water on an emergency basis, and the repair of certain flood and storm damage reduction projects are provided in emergency appropriations Acts on an as needed basis. In addition, the Corps has the legislative authority to tap other appropriated program funds to meet emergency requirements. The budget proposes an appropriation of $70,000,000 in fiscal year 2006 to meet the emergency needs of a typical year without disrupting activities in other program areas. The Committee does not recommend an appropriation for this account in fiscal year 2006 and will address emergency funding requirements as the needs arise.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2005	$165,664,000
Budget estimate, 2006	162,000,000
Recommended, 2006	152,021,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−13,643,000
Budget estimate, 2006	−9,979,000

This appropriation funds the executive direction and management of the Office of Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $152,021,000, a decrease of $13,643,000 from the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and $9,979,000 less than the budget request.

The recommended level assumes the following adjustments to the budget request:

Executive direction and management:	
Headquarters baselevel operating expenses:	
Undistributed reduction due to budget constraints	−$10,479,000
Civil Works program accounts:	
Decrease in implementing competitive sourcing	−2,000,000
Decrease in e-government initiatives	−500,000
Undistributed reductions due to budget constraints	−2,000,000
Other activities	+5,000,000

Headquarters baselevel operating expenses.—The Committee recommendation includes an undistributed reduction of $10,479,000 due to budget constraints; this reduction is appropriate given the lack of detailed justification material accompanying the request. This reduction shall be taken from operating expenses at the headquarters level solely and not distributed to the divisions.

Civil works program accounts.—Reductions of $2,000,000 to implement competitive outsourcing measures and $500,000 for e-government initiatives are recommended by the Committee. The Committee recommendation includes sufficient funds to further these activities in fiscal year 2006. In addition, an undistributed reduction of $2,000,000 is recommended by the Committee due to budget constraints and a lack of detailed justification in support of the request.

Other activities.—The Committee has included $5,000,000 to conduct comprehensive analyses on water resource management on a watershed or regional scale. These analyses are needed to examine multi-jurisdictional use and management of water resources, which, in the view of the Committee, are not being addressed under current project analyses. With few exceptions, existing cost-sharing requirements have resulted inadvertently in narrowly focused water resource management studies that are limited to single jurisdictions. The funds provided in this account are to be available without cost-sharing requirements; however, the Corps shall work directly with state and local governments in the study areas. Individual study areas shall include multiple states, and multiple watersheds shall be studied.

District office closures or staff realignment.—The Committee is troubled to learn that the Corps is contemplating the closure of certain district offices in fiscal year 2005, largely because of the shifting workload among districts and divisions expected under the Civil Works program levels assumed in the budget request for fiscal year 2006. The Committee believes that it is premature to consider the closure or permanent relocation of staff from district and division offices until after the distribution of work is known with the enactment of appropriations for the civil works program for fiscal year 2006. District workloads in the Corps can vary significantly from year to year. Given current technology, the distributed engineering and other expertise of the Corps should be readily available to address Corps requirements wherever they occur. The issue of how many divisions and districts are needed to serve effectively the Nation and where they should be located is a larger issue that requires a comprehensive plan for the Corps and its civil works. In addition, the Corps shall re-evaluate the need to contract out to architect engineering firms thirty percent of planning and

design activities in an effort to avoid personnel disruptions and to maintain in-house technical capability.

CFO audit.—In fiscal year 2005, the Corps had planned to fund the CFO audit from funds appropriated for General Expenses, but has informed the Committee that the audit will not be performed in fiscal year 2005. For fiscal year 2006, the Corps proposes to fund the recurring costs of the CFO audit from the revolving fund. The Committee observes that the out-year costs associated with the CFO audit seem relatively high. Given the delay in award and the unknown out-year costs, the Committee directs that the initial and recurring costs associated with an annual CFO audit be paid and budgeted from amounts provided for the General Expenses appropriation.

Intermodal transportation and containerization.—Within the funds provided, the Institute of Water Resources (IWR) is directed to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, a study delineating ways to improve and expand inland waterway containerization. In conducting its review, the IWR shall develop its recommendations in consultation with private shippers and carriers and the Department of Transportation. The Committee notes that the energy costs per ton-mile for shipping by barge are the lowest of any means of transport and increased use of the water infrastructure of the country therefore contributes to energy conservation.

REVOLVING FUND

PLANT REPLACEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The revolving fund accounts for facilities, payroll and operations throughout the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at its divisions, districts, separate field offices and laboratories including its engineer research and development centers. The fund incurs expenses for acquisition, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance of multiple use structures such as warehouses, shops and garages, as well as general-purpose plant, such as dredges, tugs, launches, trucks, cranes, bulldozers, drill rigs and other construction equipment. It also provides for reimbursement of the general and administrative expenses of district, laboratory and field offices.

Dredge McFarland.—The Committee has deleted funds contained in the request for rehabilitation and asbestos and lead abatement of the Dredge *McFarland* in fiscal year 2006. Funds for these activities are premature as the Corps has yet to submit a final report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the benefits and effects of the current and proposed restrictions on the Corps' hopper dredge fleet, as required by the conference report accompanying the Energy and Water Appropriations Act of 2004. This report is to include recommendations on investment decisions regarding Corps hopper dredges, including the *McFarland*. Preliminary reports have included ten options for the Corps and Congress to consider, of which six include the retirement of the *McFarland*. Any expenditure to rehabilitate the dredges or to remove is premature asbestos and lead from the *McFarland* is premature until such time as the Corps makes a final decision on its preferred option with respect to the disposition of the *McFarland,* and until

such time as a final report has been submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for full consideration. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation deletes these funds in fiscal year 2006. The Corps is further directed not to expend any additional funds on *McFarland* rehabilitation or asbestos or lead abatement in fiscal year 2005.

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

Appropriation, 2005	$3,968,000
Budget estimate, 2006	(1)
Recommended, 2006	4,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+32,000
Budget estimate, 2006	(1)

[1] The budget proposes that this office be funded from amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense, Operation and maintenance, Army, and that within those amounts, $4,700,000 is assumed for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works).

The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) oversees Civil Works budget and policy whereas the Corps' executive direction and management of the Civil Works program are funded from the general expenses account. Congress had funded the Assistant Secretary's office from funds appropriated for the Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) account in the annual Department of Defense Appropriations Acts until fiscal year 2005. Last year, however, Congress chose to fund the Assistant Secretary's office within the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. Again, for fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends that a separate appropriation for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) be made in the annual Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, and has provided $4,000,000 for this account.

Roles and responsibilities of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works).—Army regulations and General Order No. 3 clearly stipulate that the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) (ASA(CW)) has the principal responsibility for overall policy direction and supervision of the Department of the Army functions relating to all aspects of the civil works program, including all reimbursable work performed on behalf of Federal and non-Federal entities. Among the responsibilities of the ASA(CW) are managing the Department of Army civil works program for conservation and development of the national water resources, including flood damage reduction, river and harbor navigation, environmental restoration and protection, water supply, shore protection, hydroelectric power, recreation, and related purposes. This includes the following:

(1) developing, defending, and directing the execution of the Army civil works policy, legislative, and financial programs and budget.

(2) developing policy and guidance for and administering the Department of the Army regulatory program to protect, restore, and maintain the waters of the United States in the interest of the environment, navigation, and national defense.

(3) serving as congressional liaison on civil works matters, including serving as the Department of the Army point of contact for House and Senate authorization and Appropriations

Committees charged with oversight of the Department of the Army civil works program.

The Committee is extremely disappointed that the Office of the ASA(CW) has not been more actively engaged in the most significant issues facing the Corps in years, namely reprogrammings, project paybacks and continuing contracts, and has effectively allowed the Corps to dictate the role of the ASA(CW). The Committee expects the Office of the ASA(CW) to fully exercise its roles and responsibilities as delineated in Army General Order No. 3. Should the office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works not involve itself in these and other pertinent issues, the Committee will reevaluate the need for such an office.

Indirect costs.—Budgeting for and tracking Army Headquarters costs is complex and involves many funding allocations, each with its own budgeting and management practices. While some of the Army Headquarters expenses are budgeted and directly attributed to specific offices, such as that of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), other expenses are centrally budgeted and managed within the Army Headquarters, even though the expenditures may be tracked to individual offices at the end of the accounting period. Examples of these expenses include information technology and ADP support, communications, long-term training, performance bonuses for Senior Executive Service employees, and use of Pentagon space. Moreover, for other costs—such as public affairs, contracting services, legal services, executive motor pool—attribution of costs to specific offices has not been a matter of practice and, as a result, there are no established charging procedures or algorithms for allocating these costs to date.

The fiscal year 2006 appropriation for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for the Army (Civil Works) is intended to cover expenses budgeted for and tracked to that office in the following general categories: civilian salaries and benefits, travel, supplies, equipment, contracts, communications, information technology, printing and postage, and rent. The Committee anticipates that OMA appropriations provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006, are to fund those expenses currently centrally—budgeted and managed within the Army Headquarters, as described above. This policy continues the practice in place for fiscal year 2005. For fiscal year 2007, the Office of the Assistant Secretary (Civil Works) is directed to separate out these costs from the OMA budget and include and fully justify them in the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) budget request to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The bill includes a provision that prohibits the obligation or expenditure of funds through a reprogramming of funds in this Act except in certain circumstances. This provision is discussed more fully under "Program Management and Execution."

The bill includes a provision prohibiting the Corps of Engineers from supporting activities related to the proposed Ridge Landfill in Tuscarawas County, Ohio.

The bill includes a provision prohibiting the Corps of Engineers from supporting activities related to the proposed Indian Rum Sanitary Landfill in Sandy Township, Stark County Ohio.

The bill includes a provision that requires the Secretary of the Army, when overseeing the use of multiyear contracts for water resource projects, to limit the duration of each multiyear contract to the term needed to achieve a substantial reduction of costs on the margin and limit the amount of work performed each on year on each project to the funding provided for that project during the fiscal year.

The bill includes a provision prohibiting the use of funds in this Act to carry out any continuing contract that reserves an amount for a project in excess of the amount appropriated for such project in this Act.

The bill includes a provision prohibiting the use of funds in this Act after February 6, 2006, to carry out any continuing contract (or modifications to any existing continuing contract) that obligates the Federal government during fiscal year 2007 to make payment under such contract for any project that is not contained in the fiscal year 2007 budget materials of the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers submitted by the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) to Congress.

The bill includes a provision that prohibits funds for the rehabilitation and lead and asbestos abatement activities of the dredge *McFarland.* A more detailed discussion of the dredge *McFarland* is contained under "Revolving Fund." In addition, the bill includes a provision that reduces funds contained in title I of this Act by $18,630,000.

The bill includes a provision prohibiting the use of funds in this Act for any fiscal year to carry out the construction of the Port Jersey element of the New York and New Jersey Harbor or reimbursement to the local sponsor for the construction of the Port Jersey element until commitments for construction of container handling facilities are obtained from the non-Federal sponsor for a second user along the Port Jersey element.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2005	$47,625,000
Budget estimate, 2006	34,350,000
Recommended, 2006	34,350,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−13,275,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

The Central Utah Project Completion Act (Titles II–VI of Public Law 102–575) provides for the completion of the Central Utah Project by the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. The Act also authorizes the appropriation of funds for fish, wildlife, 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 2006 to carry out the Central Utah Project is $34,350,000, the same as the budget request, and $13,275,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. Within the $34,350,000 provided by the Committee, the following amounts are provided for the Central Utah Valley Water Conservation District by activity, as recommended in the budget request:

Utah Lake drainage basin delivery system	$600,000
Diamond Fork system	14,600,000
Water conservation measures	2,889,000
Uinta Basin replacement project	12,182,000
Other Title II programs	1,000,000
Total, Central Utah water conservation district	31,271,000

The Committee recommendation includes the requested amount of $946,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission. These funds, as proposed in the budget request, are to be used to implement the fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation projects authorized in Title III; initiating fish and wildlife measures on section 203(a) Uinta Basin replacement projects; and in completing mitigation measures committed to in pre-1992 Bureau of Reclamation planning documents, as follows:

Provo River/Utah Lake fish and wildlife	$150,000
Duchesne/Strawberry Rivers fish and wildlife	30,000

CRSP/Statewide fish, wildlife and recreation	295,000
Section 201(a)(1) mitigation measures	261,000
Section 203(a) mitigation measures	210,000
Total, Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission	946,000

For program oversight and administration, the Committee has provided $1,736,000, the same level as the budget request, and $16,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. For fish and wildlife conservation programs, the Committee has provided $397,000, the same level as the budget request.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

FY 2006 BUDGET OVERVIEW

The mission of the Bureau of Reclamation is to manage, develop, and protect water and related resources in an environmentally and economically sound manner in the interest of the American public. Since its establishment by The Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), the Bureau of Reclamation has developed water supply facilities that have contributed to sustained economic growth and an enhanced quality of life in the western states. Lands and communities served by Reclamation projects have been developed to meet agricultural, tribal, urban, and industrial needs. The Bureau continues to develop authorized facilities to store and convey new water supplies. The Bureau is the largest supplier and manager of water in the 17 western states. The Bureau maintains 471 dams and 348 reservoirs with the capacity to store 245 million acre-feet of water. These facilities deliver water to one of every five western farmers for about 10 million acres of irrigated land, and to over 31 million people for municipal, rural, and industrial uses. The Bureau is also the Nation's second largest producer of hydroelectric power, generating 42 billion kilowatt hours of energy each year from 58 power plants. In addition, its facilities provide substantial flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits.

The fiscal year budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation totals $916,705,000, and includes $30,000,000 in new offsetting collections. The Committee recommendation totals $997,136,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, an increase of $60,431,000 over the budget request and $12,215,000 above the fiscal year enacted level (adjusted for one-time emergency spending). A proposal to provide direct financing of operation and maintenance costs associated with the power functions of Reclamation facilities that generate the power sold by the Western Power Administration is rejected by the Committee.

A summary table illustrating the fiscal year 2005 enacted appropriation, the fiscal year 2006 budget request and the Committee recommendation is shown below:

[Dollars in 000s]

Account	Fiscal year 2005 enacted	Fiscal year 2006 request	Committee recommendation
Water and related resources	$852,605	$801,569	$832,000
Offsetting collections	.....	−30,000	.....
Subtotal, water and related resources	852,605	771,569	832,000
Central Valley project restoration fund	54,628	52,219	52,219

[Dollars in 000s]

Account	Fiscal year 2005 enacted	Fiscal year 2006 request	Committee recommendation
California Bay-Delta restoration		35,000	35,000
Policy and administration	57,688	57,917	57,917
Drought conditions, Nevada (emergency)	5,000		
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	969,921	916,705	977,136

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS]

Appropriation, 2005	$852,605,000
Budget estimate, 2006	[1] 771,569,000
Recommended, 2006	832,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−20,605,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+60,431,000

[1] The budget proposes certain receipts from the Western Area Power Administration totaling $30,000,000 be credited to this account as offsetting collections.

The Water and Related Resources account supports the development, management, and restoration of water and related natural resources in the 17 western states. The account includes funds for operating and maintaining existing facilities to obtain the greatest overall levels of benefits, to protect public safety, and to conduct studies on ways to improve the use of water and related natural resources.

For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends $832,000,000, an increase of $60,431,000 from the budget request and $20,605,000 below the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. The Committee does not adopt the proposal included in the budget request to reclassify certain receipts from the Western Area Power Administration and to credit them as offsetting collections to this account. The budget request and the approved Committee allowance for specific projects are shown, by state, in the following table:

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	06 Budget Request		Committee Recommended	
	Resources Management	Facilities OM&R	Resources Management	Facilities OM&R
ARIZONA				
Ak Chin Water Rights Settlement Act project	0	7,200	0	7,200
Central Arizon project, Colorado River basin	22,128	95	22,128	95
Colorado Riverfront work and levee system	2,455	0	3,200	0
Fort McDowell Settlement Act	400	0	400	0
Northern Arizona investigations program	250	0	250	0
Phoenix metropolitan water reuse project	200	0	250	0
Salt River project	300	0	300	0
San Carolos Apache Tribe Water Settlement Act	100	0	100	0
Southern Arizon Water Rights Settlement Act project	4,725	0	4,725	0
South/Central Arizona investigations program	795	0	795	0
Tres Rios wetlands demonstration	300	0	300	0
Yuma area projects	1,722	20,378	1,722	20,878
CALIFORNIA				
Cachuma project	988	588	988	588
California investigations program	580	0	580	0
Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling plant	1,350	0	2,500	0
Central Valley project:				
American River division	2,060	7,437	2,060	7,437
Auburn-Folsom south unit	5,966	0	5,966	0
Delta division	10,441	5,752	10,441	5,752
East side division	1,907	2,297	1,907	2,297
Friant division	2,235	3,481	2,235	3,481
Miscellaneous project programs	12,511	1,114	12,511	1,114
Replacements, additions, and extraordinary maintenance	0	23,200	0	23,200
Sacramento River division	2,381	1,759	2,381	1,759
San Felipe division	846	0	846	0
San Joaquin division	300	0	300	0
Shasta division	1,050	7,606	1,050	7,606
Trinity River division	7,621	3,242	7,621	3,242
Water and power operations	1,707	10,211	1,707	10,211
West San Joaquin division, San Luis unit	5,191	7,146	5,191	7,146
Yield feasibility investigation	500	0	500	0
El Dorado temperature control device	0	0	1,000	0
Lake Tahoe regional wetlands development	100	0	100	0
Long Beach area water reclamation and reuse project	650	0	650	0
Long Beach desalination project	0	0	1,250	0
North San Diego County area water recycling project	1,250	0	2,500	0
Orange County regional water reclamation project, PHAS	1,250	0	2,250	0
Orland project	41	920	41	920
Sacramento River diversion study	0	0	1,000	0
Salton Sea research project	1,000	0	4,800	0
San Diego area water reclamation and reuse program	3,500	0	3,500	0
San Gabriel basin project	500	0	500	0
San Gabriel basin restoration project	0	0	10,000	0
San Jose water reclamation and reuse program	300	0	300	0
Santa Margarita River conjunctive use project	0	0	500	0

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	06 Budget Request		Committee Recommended	
	Resources Management	Facilities OM&R	Resources Management	Facilities OM&R
Solano project	1,502	2,863	1,502	2,863
Southern California investigations program	550	0	1,050	0
Ventura River project	596	0	596	0
Watsonville area water recycling project	0	0	2,000	0
COLORADO				
Animas-La Plata project, CRSP section 5 & 8	52,000	0	56,000	0
Collbran project	166	1,277	166	1,277
Colorado-Big Thompson project	438	16,151	438	16,151
Colorado investigations program	200	0	200	0
Fruitgrowers Dam project	20	128	20	128
Fryingpan-Arkansas project	173	8,579	173	8,579
Grand Valley Unit, CRBSCP, Title II	233	670	233	670
Leadville/Arkansas River recovery	72	2,250	72	2,250
Mancos project	86	88	86	88
Paradox Valley unit, CRBSCP, Title II	62	2,055	62	2,055
Pine River project	114	128	114	128
San Luis Valley project	279	5,490	279	5,490
Uncompahgre project	172	126	172	126
IDAHO				
Boise area projects	2,480	2,520	2,480	2,520
Columbia and Snake River salmon recovery project	17,500	0	17,500	0
Idaho investigations program	548	0	548	0
Minidoka area projects	3,169	2,639	3,169	2,639
Minidoka Northside drain water management program	200	0	200	0
Minidoka project, Grassy Lake SOD	0	310	0	310
KANSAS				
Kansas investigations program	150	0	150	0
Wichita project	261	334	261	334
MONTANA				
Fort Peck Dry Prairie rural water system	0	0	13,000	0
Hungry Horse project	0	331	0	331
Huntley project	26	125	26	125
Milk River project	455	852	455	852
Montana investigations	385	0	385	0
North Central Montana rural water project	0	0	7,500	0
Sun River project	0	241	0	241
NEBRASKA				
Mirage Flats project	12	71	12	71
Nebraska investigations program	128	0	128	0

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	06 Budget Request		Committee Recommended	
	Resources Management	Facilities OM&R	Resources Management	Facilities OM&R
NEVADA				
Halfway Wash project study	200	0	200	0
Lahontan Basin project	4,520	3,057	4,520	3,057
Lake Mead/Las Vegas Wash program	1,200	0	1,200	0
NEW MEXICO				
Carlsbad project	2,297	822	2,297	822
Eastern New Mexico investigations programs	70	0	70	0
Jicarilla Apache Reservation rural water system	0	0	500	0
Middle Rio Grande project	9,150	9,850	9,150	9,850
Navajo Gallup water supply	0	0	500	0
Navajo Nation investigations program	180	0	180	0
Pecos River Basin water salvage project	0	181	0	181
Rio Grande project	1,134	3,567	1,134	3,567
San Juan River Basin investigations program	150	0	150	0
Southern New Mexico/West Texas investigations program	230	0	230	0
Tucumari project	56	7	56	7
NORTH DAKOTA				
Dakotas investigations program	237	0	237	0
Dakotas Tribes investigations program	84	0	84	0
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program, Garrison Diversion	22,640	4,197	22,640	4,197
OKLAHOMA				
Arbuckle project	17	183	17	183
McGee Creek project	33	518	33	518
Mountain Park project	17	338	17	338
Norman project	17	384	17	384
Oklahoma investigations program	155	0	155	0
Washita Basin project	30	1,155	30	1,155
W.C. Austin project	137	389	137	389
OREGON				
Crooked River project	661	446	661	446
Deschutes project	301	147	301	147
Eastern Oregon projects	544	362	544	362
Klamath project	21,310	690	21,310	690
Oregon investigations program	450	0	450	0
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division	780	223	780	223
Savage Rapids dam removal	1,000	0	1,000	0
Tualatin project	475	147	475	147
Tualatin Valley water supply feasibility project	0	0	300	0
Umatilla Basin project, phase III study	200	0	200	0
Umatilla project	803	3,127	803	3,127

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	06 Budget Request		Committee Recommended	
	Resources Management	Facilities OM&R	Resources Management	Facilities OM&R
SOUTH DAKOTA				
Lewis and Clark rural water system	15,000	0	15,000	0
Mid-Dakota rural water project	0	15	0	300
Mni Wiconi project	22,447	7,053	14,947	7,053
Rapid Valley project, Deerfield Dam	0	50	0	50
TEXAS				
Balmorhea project	24	0	24	0
Canadian River project	69	97	69	97
El Paso water reclamation and reuse	0	0	100	0
Lower Rio Grande Valley water resources	50	0	2,900	0
Nueces River	36	503	36	503
San Angelo project	17	344	17	344
Texas investigations program	214	0	214	0
Trinity River wastewater study	0	0	200	0
UTAH				
Hyrum project	125	30	125	30
Moon Lake project	13	27	13	27
Newton project	43	23	43	23
Northern Utah investigations program	154	0	154	0
Ogden River project	228	35	228	35
Park City feasibility study	0	0	500	0
Provo River project	894	319	894	319
Provo River project, Deer Creek Dam	0	4,900	0	4,900
Scofield project	86	27	86	27
Strawberry Valley project	177	8	177	8
Weber Basin project	1,841	357	1,841	357
Weber River project	41	80	41	80
WASHINGTON				
Columbia Basin project	4,047	7,616	4,047	7,616
Makah Indian community water supply feasibility study	0	0	300	0
Storage dam fish feasibility study	780	0	780	0
Washington investigations program	300	0	550	0
Yakima project	1,524	6,398	1,524	6,398
Yakima River Basin water enhancement project	8,500	0	7,000	0
Yakima River Basin water storage feasibility study	0	0	1,500	0
WYOMING				
Kendrick project	50	4,010	50	4,010
North Platte project	79	1,817	79	1,817
Shoshone project	62	740	62	740
Wyoming investigation program	40	0	40	0

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	06 Budget Request		Committee Recommended	
	Resources Management	Facilities OM&R	Resources Management	Facilities OM&R
VARIOUS				
Colorado River Basin salinity control project, Title I	0	10,673	0	10,673
Colorado River Basin salinity control project, Title II	10,000	0	10,000	0
Colorado River storage project, section 5	6,293	3,403	6,293	3,403
Colorado River storage project, section 8	4,030	0	4,030	0
Colorado River water quality improvement program	465	0	465	0
Department dam safety program	0	1,500	0	1,500
Initiate SOD corrective action	0	44,578	0	44,578
Safety of dams corrective action studies	0	100	0	100
Safety of evaluation of existing dams	0	18,500	0	18,500
Drought emergency assistance	500	0	500	0
Emergency planning and disaster response program	0	1,360	0	1,360
Endangered species recovery implementation	9,734	0	9,734	0
Environmental and interagency coordination activities	1,790	0	1,790	0
Environmental program administration	965	0	965	0
Examination of existing structures	0	5,699	0	5,699
Federal building seimic safety program	0	1,575	0	1,575
General planning studies	2,006	0	2,006	0
Land resources management program	7,000	0	7,000	0
Lower Colorado River investigations program	300	0	300	0
Lower Colorado River operations program	17,894	0	17,894	0
Miscellaneous flood control operations	0	631	0	631
Native American affairs program	7,525	0	7,525	0
Natural resources damage assessment	300	0	300	0
Negotiation and administration of water marketing	1,745	0	1,745	0
Operation and maintenace program management	165	876	165	876
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin - other projects	3,537	38,553	3,537	38,553
Power program services	1,020	212	1,020	212
Public access and safety program	634	124	634	124
Reclamation law administration	2,368	0	2,368	0
Reclamation recreation management - Title XXVIII	582	0	582	0
Recreation and fish and wildlife program administration	1,570	0	1,570	0
Desalination research and development program	25	0	25	0
Sciece and technology program	9,684	0	9,684	0
Site security	0	50,000	0	40,000
Soil and moisture conservation	293	0	293	0
Technical assistance to states	1,884	0	1,884	0
Title XVI, water reclamation and reuse program	1,229	0	0	0
Unites States/Mexico border issues - technical support	80	0	80	0
Water conservation field service program	8,950	0	9,875	0
Water 2025	30,000	0	0	0
Subtotal	440,064	391,677	456,505	382,462
Undistributed reduction	-30,172	0	-6,967	0
TOTAL	409,892	391,677	449,538	382,462
GRAND TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	801,569		832,000	

Central Valley project, California, miscellaneous project programs.—Within the funds provided for Central Valley project, miscellaneous project programs, the Committee has provided the funds necessary to complete phase II of the Kaweah River Delta Corridor Enhancement Study.

Colorado River Front Work and Levee System, Arizona and California.—Within the funds provided, the Committee has included $750,000 to continue planning and design of regulating reservoirs near the All American Canal.

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 to work with the impacted communities and the State of Kansas on design and engineering of the full-scale project.

Salton Sea research project, California.—The Committee has provided $4,800,000 for the Salton Sea research project, including $1,500,000 to continue environmental restoration efforts at the Alamo and New Rivers, and for other authorized pilot projects. The Bureau is encouraged to work jointly with the Salton Sea Authority and assist the authority in running its own pilot projects.

Santa Margarita River conjunctive use project, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to complete the feasibility study for the project.

South/central Arizona investigations program.—The Committee recommends $795,000 for the south/central Arizona investigations program. Within the funds provided, $210,000 shall be available to complete the final report for phase II of the central Arizona salinity study and $250,000 for the West Salt River Management Study.

Southern California investigations program.—Within the funds provided for the Southern California Investigations Program, $150,000 has been included for the Los Angeles Basin Watershed Water Supply Augmentation Study, as requested in the budget; $100,000 to assist the Western Municipal Water District in general planning and associated environmental compliance activities related to the Riverside-Corona Feeder project; $300,000 to assist the Lake Arrowhead Community Services District to develop a groundwater management plan; and $100,000 to assist the City of Apple Valley, California to develop an appraisal study of the water reclamation portion of the City of Apple Valley's sewage treatment and reclamation project.

St. Mary Diversion Facilities to the Milk River Basin, Montana.—The Committee is supportive of efforts to rehabilitate or replace the St. Mary Diversion Facilities to the Milk River Basin, Montana project given the agricultural, municipal, recreational, cultural and economic benefits the project accrues to the people its serves in North Central Montana.

Washington investigations program.—The Committee recommendation provides $550,000 for Washington investigations program, of which $250,000 shall be available for technical assistance and studies for solutions to address the depletion of the Odessa Subaquifer.

Yuma area projects, Arizona and California.—The Committee has provided a total of $22,600,000 for Yuma area projects in Arizona and California, of which $500,000 is available for renovation

and refurbishment of the City of Needles, California Bureau Bay Reclamation Project site.

VARIOUS PROGRAMS

Site security.—After the terrorists attacks of September 11, 2001, the Bureau of Reclamation strengthened security at Federal dams and similar facilities and has undertaken—but not completed—extensive risk assessments for over 400 units throughout the west. The Bureau proposed to seek reimbursement for certain expenditures. The Committee expressed concern regarding reimbursability and directed the Bureau to provide to the Committee a report that included a breakout of planned reimbursable and non-reimbursable security costs by project and by region. The conference report went further to direct the Commissioner not to begin the reimbursement process until the Congress provides direct instruction to do so.

The Committee now recognizes that in accordance with Federal reclamation law, specifically the Reclamation Act of 1939, annual operation and maintenance (O&M) and replacement costs on Reclamation projects are allocated to a project's various authorized purposes. The ongoing costs of the additional security guards and patrols necessary to ensure the security of a project may be considered project O&M costs. Therefore, these costs are subject to reimbursement based on project cost reimbursable allocations beginning in fiscal year 2006. Recognizing that the Bureau would expect to receive approximately $10,000,000 in reimbursements in fiscal year 2006, the budget request for site security has been reduced by the Committee to $40,000,000.

Science and technology programs.—Within the appropriation of $9,684,000 for science and technology programs, the Committee has provided $1,000,000 to continue the successful alliance with the International Center for Water Resources Management at Central State University for 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 manage the current drought conditions, and to develop optimal strategies for managing water resources and with future constraining events.

Title XVI, water reclamation and reuse program.—The budget request included $1,229,000 for activities under the Title XVI, water reclamation and reuse program. This program is not authorized in fiscal year 2006, and accordingly the Committee does not recommend funding for this activity.

Water 2025.—The budget request includes $30,000,000 for Water 2025. This program is intended to reduce crises and conflict over water and is to set a framework to identify problems, solutions and plans to focus a needed dialog as the Department of the Interior works with states, tribes, local government and the private sector to meet water supply challenges. While the Committee remains supportive of the program, given its lack of authorization, the Committee has not provided funding for the Water 2025 program for fiscal year 2006.

Water conservation field service program.—The Committee has provided $9,875,000 for water conservation field service program, of

which $1,000,000 shall be allocated for the Many Farms Irrigation Water Conservation project.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 2005	$54,628,000
Budget estimate, 2006	52,219,000
Recommended, 2006	52,219,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−2,409,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

This fund was established to carry out the provisions of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act and to provide funding for habitat restoration, improvement and acquisition, and other fish and wildlife restoration activities in the Central Valley area of California. Resources are derived from donations, revenues from voluntary water transfers and tiered water pricing, and Friant Division surcharges. The account is also financed through additional mitigation and restoration payments collected on an annual basis from project beneficiaries.

For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends $52,219,000, the same level as the budget request and $2,409,000 below the fiscal year enacted level. Funds, as proposed in the budget request, are provided as follows:

Anadromous fish restoration program	$5,000,000
Other Central Valley project impacts	2,500,000
Dedicated project yield	900,000
Flow fluctuation study	50,000
Restoration of riparian habitat and spawning gravel	500,000
Central Valley comprehensive assessment/monitoring program	500,000
Anadromous fish screen program	3,500,000
Refugee wheeling conveyance	7,800,000
Refuge water supply, facility construction	3,500,000
Ecosystem/water systems operations model	6,434,000
Water acquisition program	9,952,000
San Joaquin Basin action plan	7,583,000
Land retirement program	1,500,000
Coleman fish hatchery	200,000
Clear Creek restoration	300,000
Trinity River restoration program	2,000,000
Total, Central Valley project restoration fund	52,219,000

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

[INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS]

Appropriation, 2005	(1)
Budget estimate, 2006	$35,000,000
Recommended, 2006	35,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+35,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

[1] Funds were appropriated in fiscal year 2005 within the Central Valley project to carry out activities now authorized from this account.

The purpose of the California Bay-Delta account is to fund the Federal share of water supply and reliability improvements, ecosystem improvements and other activities being developed for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and associated watersheds by a State and Federal partnership (CALFED). Federal participation in this program was initially authorized in the California Bay-Delta

Environmental and Water Security Act enacted in 1996. That Act authorized the appropriation of $143,300,000 for ecosystem restoration activities in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. Absent an explicit authorization, no funds were provided in this account for the CALFED effort between fiscal years 2001 and 2005. However, the Committee funded CALFED programs and activities within the general authorities of the Water and Related Resources account even though a specific programmatic authorization was lacking. Funding for fiscal year 2001 totaled $79,030,000; fiscal year 2002, $126,775,000; fiscal year 2003, $84,403,000; fiscal year 2004, $78,929,000; and fiscal year 2005, $74,571,000. Total Federal expenditures under this Act from fiscal year 1998 through 2005 amount to almost $830,000,000.

In 2005, the CALFED Bay-Delta Authorization Act was enacted (P.L. 108–361), authorizing $389,000,000 in Federal appropriations for fiscal year 2005 through fiscal year 2010. The authorizing legislation required an annual cross-cut budget in order to reflect the budget requests of all Federal agencies engaged in CALFED implementation. The Committee is pleased the CALFED Bay-Delta program was included in the fiscal year 2006 budget request and recommends the budget request of $35,000,000. However, the Committee notices a missing program element from the budget request, a "water quality" section, and has added funding for this element as shown below. The Committee has redirected the funding for higher priority projects that will support the implementation of the CALFED program. The funded projects will produce increased sources of water for the state of California, otherwise known as "firm yield" projects, improve drinking water quality, and improve water delivery flexibility.

In light of the new Federal authorization for CALFED Bay-Delta Program and the initial implementation phase of the CALFED program, the Committee expects the budget request for fiscal year 2007 to include funds for all program elements at the fully authorized level.

The funds provided are intended to support the following activities, as delineated below:

Environmental water account	$5,000,000
Storage program	12,700,000
San Joaquin River basin	(4,000,000)
Los Vaqueros	(3,200,000)
Shasta enlargement	(4,000,000)
Sites	(1,500,000)
Conveyance	6,300,000
San Luis Reservoir Low Point	(3,000,000)
Frank Tract	(1,000,000)
Planning and management activities	500,000
Water use efficiency	6,500,000
Westside regional drainage program	(2,300,000)
Butte County Groundwater Model	(200,000)
Inland Empire Utilities Agency regional water recycling project	(1,000,000)
Ecosystem restoration	1,000,000
Sacramento River small diversion fish screen program	(1,000,000)
Water Quality	3,000,000
Contra Costa Water District alternative intake project	(2,000,000)
South Delta temporary barriers	(1,000,000)
Total, California Bay-Delta Restoration	35,000,000

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2005	$57,688,000
Budget estimate, 2006	57,917,000
Recommended, 2006	57,917,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+229,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

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 five regional offices. The Denver 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 2006, the Committee recommends $57,917,000, the same as the budget request and $229,000 above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

Five-year budget planning.—Concurrent with the submission of the fiscal year 2007 budget request and for every fiscal year thereafter, the Department of the Interior shall submit to the Congress detailed five-year budget plans for each of the major components including Water and Related Resources, California Bay-Delta Restoration program, Central Valley Project Restoration Fund and Central Utah Project Completion. The program plans shall clearly state the assumptions and priorities behind the choices it will make between competing agency programs, and shall include a copy of the guidance provided to the program offices to guide their submissions into the five-year plan. The plan shall provide both fiscally constrained and unconstrained data.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

The bill includes a provision regarding the San Luis Unit and Kesterson Reservoir in California. This language has been included in annual Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts for several years.

The bill includes language 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.

The bill includes a provision relating to agreements with the city of Needles, California or the Imperial Irrigation District for the design and construction of stages of the Lower Colorado Water Supply Project.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Department of Energy (DOE) has requested $24,213,307,000 in fiscal year 2006 to fund programs in its four primary mission areas: science, energy, environment, and national security. The overall DOE budget would decline by 2.0 percent compared to the fiscal year 2005 enacted level, but the four mission areas fare quite differently under the Department's budget proposal. Science research would decline by 3.8 percent and Environment programs would decline by 6.4 percent, while National Security programs would increase by 2.5 percent and Energy programs by 3.0 percent. Total funding for the Department of Energy is $24,574,857,000, an increase of $278,103,000 over fiscal year 2005 and $361,550,000 over the budget request. The Committee makes a number of changes to the fiscal year 2006 budget request to reflect specific Congressional priorities and to fund several major new initiatives for the Department of Energy.

Material Consolidation Initiative.—The Department currently has weapons-usable special nuclear materials (i.e., plutonium and highly enriched uranium) stored at a number of sites around the DOE complex. Most of these sites are under the control of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), but special nuclear materials are also stored at sites under the control of the Office of Science, the Office of Nuclear Energy, and Environmental Management. Unfortunately, the Department has indicated that it will not be able to bring all of its facilities and operations into compliance with the latest Design Basis Threat until 2008. This delay is unacceptable. The Committee directs the Department to take prompt action to consolidate these materials into fewer locations to reduce security risks and costs. This initiative is discussed more fully under the NNSA and Other Defense Activities sections of this report.

Spent Fuel Recycling Initiative.—Commercial spent nuclear fuel, as well as government-owned spent fuel and high level radioactive waste, is stored at over one hundred sites around the country and poses an analogous security problem. While this material poses a very different security risk than the weapons-usable special nuclear materials, it still creates a costly and unnecessary security risk until these materials can be moved to the Yucca Mountain repository. The Department has estimated that it will cost the federal government approximately $1 billion per year for every year that the repository is delayed and these materials must remain in interim onsite storage. To maintain or expand the role of nuclear power in this country's energy portfolio will require DOE to propose expansion of the authorized capacity of the Yucca Mountain

repository, or begin the difficult process of siting a second repository. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to take action in fiscal year 2006 to begin accepting spent commercial fuel from the nuclear utilities and placing it in centralized interim storage at one or more DOE sites. In addition, the Committee directs the Department to prepare an integrated spent fuel recycling plan for implementation in fiscal year 2007, including selection of an advanced reprocessing technology and a competitive process to select one or more sites to develop integrated spent fuel recycling facilities (i.e., reprocessing, preparation of mixed oxide fuel, vitrification of high level waste products, and temporary process storage). This initiative is discussed more fully in the Nuclear Energy section of the Energy Supply and Conservation account, and in the Nuclear Waste Disposal account.

Sustainable Stockpile Initiative.—The Committee does not believe that the existing U.S. stockpile of nuclear weapons is sustainable in the long-term future. The United States relies on an arsenal of Cold War legacy designs with an average warhead age nearing twenty five years. These old weapons are expensive to maintain, hard to dismantle, and increasingly difficult to certify in the absence of nuclear testing. Because of uncertainties in the performance of these aging weapons, the U.S. is forced to retain absurdly large numbers of weapons in its nuclear stockpile to maintain a sufficient "hedge" against these uncertainties. Further, we also maintain a Cold War nuclear weapons complex to support this stockpile, maintaining antiquated facilities using antiquated processes to support antiquated weapons. In light of increased post–9/11 security concerns, this is neither a sound nor sustainable strategy. The Committee continues the Reliable Replacement Warhead effort, initiated in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005, to improve the reliability, longevity, and certifiability without testing of existing nuclear weapons and their components. The Committee does not view these as new weapons, but rather re-engineered versions of existing weapons, using modern materials and manufacturing methods, to serve the same military function as existing warheads. A shift to modern Reliable Replacement Warheads will allow two important changes in the near term, namely a phased reduction in the current Life Extension Program and a corresponding increase in the rate of dismantlement of these aging weapons. This reduction in the total stockpile size is consistent with Presidential guidance on the future size and composition of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. In addition, the Committee is looking forward to receiving the recommendations of the task force established under the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board to conduct a Nuclear Weapons Complex Infrastructure Study. As the U.S. shifts to a smaller stockpile with re-engineered warheads, the Committee anticipates that there will be major changes in the DOE nuclear weapons complex will be needed to support that stockpile. This initiative is discussed more fully in the NNSA section of this report.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

The Committee renews the direction provided in previous fiscal years requiring the Secretary to submit to the House and Senate

Committees on 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 bill and report, in the corresponding Senate bill and report, in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006, and in the statement of managers accompanying that Act. Any reports, transfers, or other actions directed in prior fiscal years that have not been completed as of the date of enactment of this Act should also be included in this quarterly report.

BUDGET STRUCTURE

Funds recommended in Title III provide for all Department of Energy (DOE) programs. In previous years, the DOE was funded in two separate appropriations Acts. The Energy and Water Development appropriations Act funded 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, Office of the Administrator); Defense Environmental Management (Defense Site Acceleration Completion, Defense Environmental Services); Other Defense Activities; Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal; the Power Marketing Administrations; and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act funded DOE programs relating to: Clean Coal Technology; Fossil Energy Research and Development; Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves; the Elk Hills School Lands Fund; Energy Conservation; the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve; and the Energy Information Administration.

With the reorganization in early 2005 of the subcommittee jurisdictions of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act now funds all DOE programs. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2006 proposes the following changes to the previous account structure: the merger of the previously separate Energy Supply and Energy Conservation accounts into a single Energy Supply and Conservation account; the merger of Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion and Non-Defense Environmental Services into a single Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup account; and the merger of Defense Site Acceleration Completion and Defense Environmental Services into a single Defense Environmental Cleanup account.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The fiscal year 2007 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 submitted 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 2007 budget request is delivered to Congress.

FIVE-YEAR BUDGET PLANNING

Concurrent with the submission of the fiscal year 2007 budget request and for every fiscal year thereafter, the Department should submit to Congress detailed five-year budget plans for all major programs, including Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; Electricity Transmission and Distribution; Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology; Fossil Energy R&D; Science; Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup; Defense Environmental Cleanup; Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning; Nuclear Waste Disposal (including Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal); Departmental Administration, Nuclear Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation; Naval Reactors; Other Defense Activities; the Power Marketing Administrations; and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission). Beginning with the submission of the fiscal year 2007 budget request and for every fiscal year thereafter, the Department shall also submit an integrated five-year budget plan for the entire Department. The program plans and the integrated Department-wide plan should state clearly the assumptions and priorities behind the choices the Secretary will make between competing Department programs, and shall include a copy of the guidance provided to the program offices to guide their submissions into the five-year plan.

Essential to producing five-year budget plans for the major programs and for the entire Department is the need to define the missions and activities, and therefore the future budget requirements, of the various laboratories in the Department. The five-year plans prepared by the major program offices, and the comprehensive five-year plan for the Department, should reflect the business plans for each of the Department's laboratories. These business plans, to be submitted concurrent with the fiscal year 2007 budget submission, shall 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. The laboratory business plans shall also include a longer-range vision statement to define where these laboratories are heading beyond the five-year budget horizon.

The Committee had previously directed the Department to submit, with its fiscal year 2006 budget request, five-year program plans for the Nuclear Weapons Activities of the NNSA, for the Office of Science, and for Environmental Management (including Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup, Uranium Enrichment D&D

Fund, and Defense Environmental Cleanup). The five-year plans submitted to date for these programs are of limited utility to Congress as real multiyear budget plans, but it is hoped these initial efforts for three programs will ease the task of preparing an integrated DOE five-year plan for the fiscal year 2007 submission.

The NNSA plan for Nuclear Weapons Activities is adequate, but needs to have an improved explanation of how the outyear funding levels were derived and the connection between specific DoD-imposed stockpile requirements and funding items in the NNSA five-year plan. Many of the funding lines appear to be flat-line projections from current funding levels, with no rationale provided on whether these funding levels are realistic for the mission at hand or consistent with the latest decisions and assumptions about the future of the U.S. nuclear stockpile and the supporting DOE weapons complex.

The five-year plan for Environmental Management fails to provide any meaningful detail on either how the specific funding levels were derived for each site or on the implications of those funding levels on project costs, closure dates, and compliance agreements. It also fails to include the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommission program as previously directed. For any sites to be closed in the five-year timeframe, the Environmental Management plan should clearly identify the responsibilities and liabilities being handed off to the Office of Legacy Management and should quantify the costs of those responsibilities and liabilities.

The five-year plan prepared by the Office of Science is the most useful of the five-year plans, largely because it provides information on alternative funding scenarios. Such information enables Congress to understand how different funding levels translate into specific actions such as the ability to support all existing Science laboratories into the future, to operate existing user facilities at or near optimum levels, and to initiate new research facilities and programs. The presentation by the Office of Science, and in particular the inclusion of constrained and unconstrained funding scenarios, is the most useful to Congress and should be adopted by the Department for its future five-year plans.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY IMPLEMENTATION

The Committee is disappointed by the findings of its Surveys and Investigations Staff that the Department of Energy (DOE) is not basing current and future costs to secure the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) nuclear weapons complex on quality intelligence. The Committee is particularly troubled by the calculation of safeguards and security requirements and attendant costs based on a dubious interagency Postulated Threat process that only feeds departmental apprehension, contributing to the perception that site security can only be assured by a Design Basis Threat (DBT) created to repel a worst-case assault. Each NNSA site has unique risk factors, a fact that DOE knows well, and the Committee will not appropriate scarce resources on the basis of worst-case suppositions. Augmenting site defenses to accommodate worst-case scenarios can seldom be funded at a level that will assure a risk-free environment; therefore, to sustain the highest level of site security, DOE must fully exploit all relevant Intelligence Commu-

nity (IC) products to assure NNSA's site defensive postures and all risk factors are carefully managed.

Because the October 2004 DBT is not anchored in contemporaneous intelligence focused on threats to this country's nuclear facilities, it is unknown whether the enormous cost to implement this DBT is truly necessary. The Committee believes that the failed Postulated Threat process must give way to a more comprehensive and reliable system of recurring intelligence estimates, the responsibility for which will rest with the Director of National Intelligence (DNI). The DNI will ensure that each member of the IC vigorously and continuously tasks its intelligence bases to develop the kind and quality of intelligence that has, heretofore, been unavailable to DOE in support of its DBT process. Although the Committee remains firmly committed to the defense of the nuclear weapons complex, the Committee will not mechanically fund every security funding increase request for the 2004 DBT, either through the regular budget process or through supplemental appropriations, until the DNI produces an intelligence estimate on which a fully justifiable DBT can be prepared. The first intelligence estimate should be available to DOE on or before September 15, 2005, with recurring estimates at intervals to be determined by the DNI.

Special Nuclear Material Consolidation Initiative.—In the absence of a reliable DBT, the Committee directs the Department to focus on common-sense security measures such as the Material Consolidation Initiative. Recognizing that increased security requirements are an inevitable outcome of the revised threat environment, the Committee has been unimpressed with the apparent lack of urgency with which the Department has pursued the consolidation of special nuclear material around the Department of Energy's complex. The Committee understands the historical legacy that results in the fact that special nuclear material is stored at multiple sites and multiple facilities within those sites across the DOE complex. However, nearly four years after the 9/11 attacks and nearly 15 years after the end of significant production activities, the Department has not accomplished any meaningful material consolidation. This indicates to the Committee that there is no institutional incentive in the Department to accomplish the material consolidation mission. The security and financial implications of continuing business as usual at the Department are unacceptable. The Department's programmatic stovepiping and the failure of past Departmental attempts to implement common sense directives across the entire organization concerns the Committee. The Committee, therefore, directs a number of specific actions in fiscal year 2006 to expedite the consolidation of special nuclear materials.

Lastly, the Committee finds the lack of oversight applied by Federal site officials within the nuclear weapons complex to be particularly disturbing. Federal oversight is diminished by the fact that too few Federal personnel are assigned to oversight responsibilities, and those few who do fulfill oversight roles are ill-trained to administer oversight and are denied professional development opportunities to advance their oversight knowledge, skills, and abilities. The lack of quality federal oversight, which DOE cannot assure, risks producing inaccurate budget estimates that receive only cursory review at critical junctures and are merely passed along to the next

authority level. If weakened oversight within DOE cannot determine when a contractor is providing inaccurate, incomplete or misleading information, it follows that Federal site officials are incapable of overseeing and assuring quality security. The Committee will not accept a weakened oversight capability and urges prompt corrective action.

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (LDRD)

Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) funding levels.—The Committee provides that not more than $250,000,000 of the funds provided in this Act for the Department of Energy national laboratories and production plants are available for Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD), Plant Directed Research and Development (PDRD), and Site Directed Research and Development (SDRD) activities. This limitation reflects the constrained budget realities that face the Committee generally and the DOE funding specifically in fiscal year 2006.

In a budget year when federal funding constraints have resulted in Congress being unable to fund many Congressional priorities and when the Department's overall budget is essentially flat, the Committee is unable to reconcile the Department's significant level of support provided to the DOE national laboratories under the authority of the LDRD program. In fiscal year 2004, the national laboratories generated nearly $400,000,000 in discretionary funding with an LDRD tax on mission direct activities. This discretionary research continued undiminished even though, in one highly publicized instance, the laboratory contractor performed so poorly that, for the first time in the laboratory's history, the Department levied a significant reduction in performance fee against the contractor. The Committee notes the Department's misplaced outrage demonstrated by the constant complaining against Congressionally-directed spending priorities while at the same time providing its government contractor executives nearly $400,000,000 of discretionary money for activities that are neither explicitly included in the President's budget request nor subject to Congressional review and approval. The Committee finds this arrangement not to be in the interest of the taxpayer or the Department of Energy and has ceased to continue the implicit LDRD earmark to the Department's national laboratories. The Committee feels it is time the Nation realize benefits from the LDRD spending. The Committee notes that the Office of Management and Budget apparently agrees, as it proposed a reduction of the maximum allowable LDRD tax in the President's fiscal year 2006 budget request.

By reducing the contractor-directed LDRD funding to an acceptable level, the Committee action will make available roughly $150,000,000 in additional fiscal year 2006 funding for actual program priorities at the laboratories and production plants, such as maintaining the reliability of the nation's nuclear stockpile and ensuring the safety and security of the Department's special nuclear materials. The Committee directs the Department to report to the Committee on additional reforms to the current LDRD program that would promote cutting edge discretionary research and development while opening up the LDRD funding to non-Laboratory entities to compete for research funds in support of the national de-

fense and science mission. The Committee notes that the authorizing language in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (P.L. 101–510) for Laboratory Directed R&D at DOE's national multipurpose laboratories, required the Secretary of Energy to provide a specific amount to be used by such laboratories for national security activities. The Committee directs the Secretary to follow the authorization language and provide a specific amount to each Department of Energy facility within the $250,000,000 made available for LDRD, PDRD, and SDRD in fiscal year 2006. The budget request for fiscal year 2007 should identify clearly the recommended LDRD amounts for each laboratory, plant, and site conducting LDRD, PDRD, and SDRD, respectively.

Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) Cost Accounting Practices.—In a March 4, 1996, memorandum signed by the DOE Comptroller, the Department included LDRD project costs as part of the General & Administrative (G&A) expense pool. That policy effectively increased the value of an LDRD research dollar by defining it as an indirect cost that is held harmless when allocating the G&A overhead burden on laboratory activities and, therefore, results in a disproportionate additional overhead burden on direct program activities. Such a policy undermines the intent of the Congress when it authorized the LDRD activity and limited the total funding to a percentage of operations and management funds. Because laboratory research and development activities are functionally identical whether or not the researcher is working on a project funded by LDRD funds or direct funded program budgets, the Committee does not support the favorable accounting treatment of LDRD project costs as indirect costs for the purposes of defining a contractor's reimbursable costs. LDRD activities are directly allocable costs that should not be accorded an accounting standard that inappropriately increases the actual value of LDRD R&D activities at the expense of the direct program mission work at the DOE facilities. The Committee directs the Secretary of Energy to implement cost accounting practices for the Major Facility Operating Contractors that define LDRD, PDRD, and SDRD as a Direct Cost element subject to all appropriate overhead burdens allowable under the respective contracts.

This direction will generate additional resources for the direct funded mission activities by eliminating the disproportional overhead burden on the basic mission work that results from waiving overhead costs on laboratory research activities funded with LDRD funds.

NON-NNSA WORK AT NNSA FACILITIES

In the statement of managers accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005 (P.L. 108–447), the conferees directed the Secretary of Energy, working with the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), to put in place within 90 days of enactment of the Act written procedures for work taskings originating from non-NNSA program offices in DOE to NNSA laboratories. These procedures must be consistent with the constraints of Section 3213 of Public Law 106–65, as subsequently modified by Section 3157 of Public Law 106–398, and must follow the chain of command (i.e., through

the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of the NNSA to the NNSA field elements) that is clearly specified in those statutes. To date, the Committee has seen no evidence that the Secretary has complied with this direction.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Committee repeats its prior guidance on the importance of improving the project management culture within the Department and on compliance with Project Management Order 413.3. It is important for the Department to maintain its focus on project management for all aspects of its work, but most especially to major capital projects.

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 2006 shall not exceed 220, the same as the fiscal year 2005 ceiling.

Report on M&O contractor employees.—The Department is to provide at the end of fiscal year 2005 a report to the Committee on the use of M&O contractor employees assigned to the Washington metropolitan area. The report is to identify all M&O contractor 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 employee, 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, 2004 through September 30, 2005, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2006.

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, 2004 through September 30, 2005, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2006.

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 shall not be employed to initiate new programs or to change program, project, or activity allocations specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in this Act or the accompanying report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require such changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations 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 2006, unless specifically identified in the House, Senate, or conference reports for particular programs, projects, or activities. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the Committees in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the House and Senate 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 AND CONSERVATION

Appropriation, 2005	$1,806,936,000
Budget estimate, 2006	1,749,446,000
Recommended, 2006	1,762,888,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−44,048,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+13,442,000

The Energy Supply and Conservation account includes the following programs: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Nuclear Energy, Electricity Transmission and Distribution, Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense), and Legacy Management. Energy Conservation programs previously funded by the Interior

and Related Agencies Appropriations Act are now funded by the Energy Supply and Conservation appropriation, and are combined with energy efficiency activities in the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy account. As in fiscal year 2005, the Committee recommends that the funds for Energy Supply and Conservation activities remain available until expended.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

The total Committee recommendation for energy efficiency and renewable energy resources is $1,235,816,000 an increase of $35,402,000 compared to the budget request. This increase is for additional research and development activities in biomass and biorefinery systems, building and industrial energy conservation, and weatherization.

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, with the establishment of the Project Management Center (PMC). With the success of the PMC, the Committee sees no need for third-party contracting agents, and discourages the Department from engaging in third-party arrangements for the award and distribution of federal funds.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Programs include biomass and biorefinery systems R&D, geothermal technology, hydrogen technology, hydropower, solar energy, and wind energy technologies. Energy conservation activities include improving the efficiency of vehicle, building, fuel cell, industrial, and distributed energy technologies.

Hydrogen Technology.—This account combines the Energy Supply Hydrogen Technology account and the Energy Conservation Fuel-Cell Technologies account, previously funded within the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations. The hydrogen technology program seeks to develop hydrogen production, storage, delivery, and fuel cell technologies for transportation and stationary applications. These technologies will be more energy efficient, cleaner, safer and less costly than those currently in use. The Committee recommendation for hydrogen technology is $182,694,000, the same as the budget request, of which $83,600,000 is designated for fuel cell technologies.

Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D.—This account combines the Energy Supply Biomass and Biorefinery systems R&D account and the Energy Conservation Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D account, previously funded by the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D will conduct research, development and technology validation on advanced technologies that will enable future biorefineries to convert cellulosic biomass to fuels, chemicals, heat and power. The program focuses on reducing processing energy requirements and production costs in biomass processing plants and future integrated industrial biorefineries. The Committee recommendation for integrated research and development on biomass and biorefinery systems is $86,164,000, an increase of $14,000,000 from the budget re-

quest. The increase is for additional thermochemical and bioconversion platform research and development.

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 2006 continues at the solar energy program account level. The total Committee recommendation for solar energy for fiscal year 2006 is $83,953,000, the same as the budget request.

Wind Energy Systems.—Wind energy systems are beginning to penetrate the electricity generation market in the United States. Given the technical maturity of high-capacity wind energy systems, the wind energy systems program will focus on development of wind turbines that can operate economically in areas with low wind speeds, small wind turbines that can serve a range of distributed power applications, and system technology in support of offshore wind resources, particularly beyond the viewshed of coastal communities. The Committee recommends $44,249,000 for wind energy systems, the same as the budget request.

Geothermal Technology.—This program develops enhanced geothermal systems that will allow the broader use of geothermal energy throughout the United States, through cooperative research with industry, universities, and other government agencies to reduce the cost of geothermal development and to identify new resources. The Committee provides $23,299,000 for geothermal technology development, the same as the budget request.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommends $500,000 for hydropower research, the same as the budget request. The Department should complete integration studies and close out outstanding contracts in advanced hydropower technology.

Vehicle Technologies.—This program was previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and now is funded within the Energy Supply and Conservation account of this Act. The Vehicle Technologies program seeks technology breakthroughs to reduce greatly petroleum use by automobiles and trucks of all sizes, including R&D on lightweight materials, electronic power control, high power storage and hybrid electric drive motors. The Committee recommends $167,943,000, an increase of $2,000,000 above the budget request. The increase provides $1,000,000 for the High Temperature Material Laboratory, and $1,000,000 for Advanced Combustion R&D, Combustion and Emission Control.

Building Technologies.—This program was previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and now is funded within the Energy Supply and Conservation account. In partnership with the buildings industry, this program develops, promotes, and integrates energy technologies and practices to make buildings more efficient and affordable. The Committee recommends $64,966,000, an increase of $7,000,000 over the budget request of $57,966,000. The recommendation provides $2,000,000 to restore funding at fiscal year 2005 levels for equipment standards and analysis at $10,256,000; and an increase of $5,000,000 for emerging technologies, which in-

cludes $2,000,000 for lighting R&D, and $3,000,000 for thermal insulation and building materials.

Report Requirement.—The appliance efficiency standards program, funded within the equipment standards and analysis subaccount, may be the most successful of all federal efficiency programs. The Committee understands that the Department is delayed in meeting legal deadlines for issuing approximately twenty new and updated programs, and that its three highest priority rulemakings will be delayed at least two years. The Committee notes that while the Department is behind in meeting legal deadlines for the issuance of certain rulemakings, its budget request reflects a reduction in resources needed to process such rulemakings. The goal of the Department's own "Process Improvement" rule (61 FR 36974) is to complete rulemakings within three years, including 18 months from Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to issuance of a final rule. The Committee strongly urges the Secretary to expedite the process, and requests that the Secretary report to the Committee by December 1, 2005 on plans to accelerate standards rulemakings, including:

—A timeline for work on issuing the three highest priority standards, with an explanation for the additional delays announced in December 2004;

—A plan for addressing the backlog of standards rulemakings that have missed legal or internal deadlines, including a list of the affected products and deadlines, timelines for action on each product, and funding requirements to complete each rulemaking; and

—A description of how the Department will meet the timeframe goals of the "Process Improvement" rule, or of how the process should be changed so that the Department can meet the goals.

Lighting R&D.—Improvements in energy efficiency that can result from development and deployment of solid-state lighting technologies show great promise. The goal is to have lighting systems that deliver 150 lumens per watt—roughly 50% better in terms of light per watt of electricity than most conventional systems—at costs that are competitive. Lighting constitutes about 30% of total energy use in US buildings, so increased investment in lighting technologies has the potential to reduce total building energy consumption by 10%.

Industrial Technologies.—This program was previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and now is funded within the Energy Supply and Conservation appropriation account within this Act. The Industrial technologies program cost shares research in critical technology areas identified in partnership with industry in order to realize significant energy benefits. The Committee recommends $58,891,000, an increase of $2,402,000 over the budget request, and a reduction of $16,458,000 below fiscal year 2005 levels. The recommendation provides the $2,402,000 increase for Industries of the Future to partially restore some of these programmatic reductions.

Distributed Energy and Electricity Reliability Program.—This program was previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and

now is funded within the Energy Supply and Conservation account within this Act. This program funds research and development to transform the current electrical generation sector to a smarter, more flexible and efficient energy system through the development and integration of distributed generation and combined heat and power technologies. The Committee recommends $56,629,000, the same as the budget request.

Federal Energy Management Programs.—The Federal Energy Management Program was previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. The Committee has combined it with the Energy Supply and Conservation Departmental Energy Management Program, so that energy efficiency programs for both the DOE and other Federal agencies are funded in one appropriations account. Federal Energy Management Programs reduce the cost and environmental impact of the Federal government by advancing energy efficiency and water conservation, promoting the use of renewable energy, and managing utility costs in Federal facilities and operations. The Committee recommendation for Federal Energy Management Programs is $19,166,000, the same as the budget request.

Facilities and Infrastructure.—The Committee recommendation for renewable energy Facilities and Infrastructure is $16,315,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $4,926,000 compared to fiscal year 2005. This amount includes $5,800,000 for operations and maintenance of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) in Golden, Colorado, and $10,515,000 to complete construction of the new Science and Technology facility at NREL (project 02–E–001).

Weatherization and Intergovernmental activities.—Weatherization assistance program grants, state energy program grants, state energy activities and gateway deployment were previously funded in the Energy Conservation account in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and are now funded within the Energy Supply and Conversation account within this Act. Intergovernmental activities within the Energy Supply and Conversation appropriation include the International Renewable Energy Program, Tribal energy activities and the Renewable Energy Production Incentive.

The Committee recommends $235,400,000 for weatherization assistance program grants, $4,600,000 for training and technical assistance, $41,000,000 for state energy program grants, $500,000 for state energy activities the same as the request, and $25,657,000 for gateway deployment, a reduction of $1,000,000 from the request. The Committee recommends that gateway deployment funds be distributed as follows: $2,807,000 for Rebuild America, $350,000 for energy efficiency information and outreach, $5,500,000 for building codes training and assistance, $7,000,000 for Clean Cities, $6,000,000 for Energy Star, and $4,000,000 for inventions and innovations. The Committee recommends $12,910,000 for Intergovernmental Activities, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request, to include $3,910,000 for the international renewable energy program, $4,000,000 for tribal energy activities, and $5,000,000 for the Renewable Energy Production Incentive (REPI).

Program Support.—This account reflects a consolidation of the Energy Conservation Program Management activities, such as planning, analysis and evaluation and, information, communications and outreach, which were funded previously in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, with the Energy Supply Renewable Program Support. The Committee recommendation for Program Support is $9,456,000 the same as the budget request.

Program Direction.—This account reflects a consolidation of the Energy Conservation Program Direction account, which was funded previously in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, with the Energy Supply Renewable Program Direction account. The Committee recommendation for Program Direction is $101,524,000, the same as the budget request.

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

Congressionally Directed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects

Sub-Accounts	Project	Committee Recommended
Biomass	Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research (multi state)	$2,500,000
Biomass	Univ. of Georgia biomass pyrolysis biorefinery project (GA)	500,000
Biomass	National Biofuel Energy Laboratory, NextEnergy Center (MI)	2,000,000
Biomass	Biomass Research Agricultural Development Ctr. (OH)	1,000,000
Biomass	Renewable energy animal waste project at Texas A&M (TX)	1,000,000
Biomass	Wood debris bioenergy project (CO)	750,000
Biomass	Clarkson Univ. dairy waste public/private partnership (NY)	250,000
Biomass	Madison County landfill gas to energy project (NY)	500,000
Biomass	Asphalt Roofing Shingles into Energy project, Xenia (OH)	1,000,000
Biomass	Ohio State University 4-H "Green" Building project (OH)	1,000,000
Biomass	University of Iowa National Ag-Based Industrial program (IA)	250,000
Biomass	Solid Waste Authority Pyramid Resource Center (OH)	500,000
Biomass	City of Stamford waste-to-energy project (CT)	400,000
Biomass	Iroquois Bio-Energy Consortium Ethanol Project (IN)	3,000,000
Biomass	Biotech to Ethanol Project (CO)	1,000,000
Biomass	New York Biomass/Methane Gas Power Fuel Cell Project (NY)	2,000,000
Biomass	Western Massachusetts Biomass Project (MA)	500,000
Biomass	Greenville Composite Biomass Project (ME)	500,000
Biomass	Research Triangle Institute Biomass Project (NC)	500,000
Biomass	Chariton Biomass Project (IA)	500,000
Biomass	Laurentian Bio-Energy Project (MN)	1,000,000
Clean Cities	E-85 Ethanol vehicle refueling expansion (multi state)	500,000
Geothermal	Wesleyan University geothermal demonstration project (OH)	750,000
Geothermal	Springfield Equestrian Center energy efficiency project (OH)	600,000
Geothermal	Lipscomb University Geothermal System (TN)	500,000
Hydrogen	University of South Carolina Fuel Cell Design Project (SC)	2,000,000
Hydrogen	Fuel cell freeze/cold start program (CT)	1,000,000
Hydrogen	Center for Intelligent Fuel Cell materials design (OH)	1,000,000
Hydrogen	Hydrogen fuel cell project Edison Materials Technology (OH)	1,000,000
Hydrogen	Indigenous Energy Development Center (PA)	1,000,000
Hydrogen	Center for Hydrogen Storage Delaware State University (DE)	500,000
Hydrogen	Florida Int'l Univ.Cntr for energy & tech.of the Americas (FL)	1,000,000
Hydrogen	Hydrogen Fleet Infrastructure Demonstration Project (MI)	2,000,000
Hydrogen	Purdue Hydrogen Technologies Program (IN)	1,000,000
Hydrogen	Detroit Commuter Hydrogen Project (MI)	1,300,000
Hydrogen	Ethanol to Hydrogen, Northeastern University (IL)	2,000,000
Hydrogen	California Hydrogen Storage and Systems Technologies (CA)	800,000
Hydrogen	Univ. of Arkansas at Little Rock hydrogen storage project (AR)	400,000
Solar Energy	Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.Syracuse Univ."Green Building"(NY)	1,000,000
Solar Energy	Alternative Renewable Energy Center, Crowder College (MO)	1,000,000
Solar Energy	Oregon Nanoscience and Microtechnologies Institute (OR)	1,500,000
Solar Energy	Conductive Coating Solar Cell Research Project (MA)	1,500,000
Solar Energy	Ultra Thin Film Photo Voltaic Charging System (FL)	1,000,000
Solar Energy	Brightfield Solar Energy (MA)	250,000
Solar Energy	National Orange Photovoltaic Demonstration (CA)	250,000
Vehicle Tech.	Phase II heavy vehicle hybrid propulsion (WI)	2,000,000
Vehicle Tech.	GEDAC Packaged Gas Engine-Driven Heat Pump (multi state)	1,200,000
Vehicle Tech.	National Hybrid Truck Manufacturing Program (CA)	1,000,000
Inter-Govt.	International Utility Electricity Partnership (multi state)	3,500,000
Wind Energy	Mt. Wachusett Community College wind project (MA)	1,000,000
Wind Energy	Wyandotte wind energy on brownfields initiative (MI)	1,000,000
Wind Energy	Wind energy resources at Illinois State University (IL)	1,000,000
Wind Energy	TowerPower Wind Project (MD)	750,000
Wind Energy	White Earth Tribal Nation Wind Project (MN)	500,000
Wind Energy	Coastal Ohio Wind Project (OH)	500,000

ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION

The Committee recommendation for Electricity Transmission and Distribution is $99,849,000, an increase of $4,245,000 from the budget request. The Committee does not support the entire requested increase for program direction. Instead, the Committee recommends $10,447,000 for program direction activities, an increase of $2,312,000 over the fiscal year 2005 level. Detailed subprogram allocations are shown in the table at the end of Title III.

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

Congressionally Directed Electricity Transmission & Distribution

Project	Committee Recommended
Iowa Stored Energy Plant Project (IA)	$1,500,000
University of Louisville Electric Grid Monitoring (KY)	1,000,000
Gonzaga University electric utility transformation program (WA)	750,000
Emerson Network Power,Columbus Ohio (OH)	1,000,000
Energy Security and diversification at Savannah River National Lab (SC)	500,000
City of Nome power generation replacement project (AK)	1,000,000
Idaho National Laboratory National SCADA testbed (ID)	7,000,000
Gridwise Northwest Demonstration Project (WA)	1,500,000
Juneau-Green Creek-Hoonah intertie for Juneau area power system (AK)	1,000,000
Complete of bi-polar wafer cell Ni-MH electric energy storage system (CT)	1,000,000
Connecticut Demand Response Technologies Project (CT)	1,000,000
Notre Dame University Ionic Liquids Research collaboration (IN)	1,500,000
Advanced Grid Application Consortium (PA)	2,000,000
Pilot Energy Cost Control Evaluation Project at NETL (WV)	2,000,000
Green Island Authority, Advanced Transmission Project (NY)	1,000,000
Cleveland State Ctr. for Research in Electric and Aerospace Tech. (OH)	500,000
Advanced Energy Storage (MA)	500,000

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy programs under the Energy Supply and Conservation appropriation is $377,701,000, a decrease of $12,205,000 below the budget request. This net decrease reflects the Committee's recommendation to shift the responsibility for U–233 disposition at Oak Ridge from Nuclear Energy Programs to NNSA, a reduction of $18,705,000, and a reduction of $10,000,000 to Nuclear Power 2010. The Committee has provided an additional $16,500,000 for increased programmatic activities for the Office of Nuclear Energy, as described below.

Of the total funding of $515,074,000 provided for Nuclear Energy programs and facilities, $137,373,000 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, and are funded under the Other Defense Activities and Naval Reactors accounts. Within the total amount provided, $3,000,000 is for the transfer and implementation of nuclear safety technologies in Lithuania.

UNIVERSITY REACTOR FUEL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT

The Committee recommends $24,000,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee continues to support DOE's programs to sustain existing university reactors and provide grants and fellowships that support nuclear science and engineering education.

NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Nuclear Power 2010.—The Committee provides $46,000,000 for Nuclear Power 2010, a decrease of $10,000,000 from the budget request.

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. The Committee recommends a total of $45,000,000 for Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems, the same as the budget request and an increase of $5,320,000 over the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. Within available funds, $1,000,000 is made available for work on high temperature fuel fabrication techniques in support of the Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems under the direction of Idaho National Laboratory (INL).

Nuclear hydrogen initiative.—The Committee provides $20,000,000 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.

Spent Fuel Recycling Initiative.—As mentioned previously in this report, the Committee directs the Department to conduct a new Spent Fuel Recycling Initiative, which has linked elements in both the Nuclear Energy and Nuclear Waste Disposal accounts. One

part of this initiative requires the Department to begin to move existing spent nuclear fuel away from commercial reactor sites to centralized interim storage at one or more DOE sites. This task is the responsibility of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, and funding and direction are provided under the Nuclear Waste Disposal account. The other part of this initiative deals with developing a new strategy for managing future spent fuel, which is the responsibility of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology within the Energy Supply and Conservation account.

Up until the mid-1970s, the Federal government encouraged the reprocessing of commercial spent fuel in the United States, and commercial reprocessing facilities were developed at Morris (IL), West Valley (NY), and Barnwell (SC). Only the West Valley facility was ever operated, and it reprocessed both commercial and defense spent fuel. In the late 1970s, the United States decided to suspend commercial reprocessing efforts, primarily due to non-proliferation concerns that separated plutonium could be diverted to produce illicit nuclear weapons. Spent nuclear fuel, which contains a small percentage of plutonium created during the fission reaction, was considered to be inherently self-protecting because its high radiation levels would prevent its diversion to other purposes. Therefore, as long as it was not reprocessed, spent nuclear fuel was not considered to pose a significant proliferation risk. The U.S. ban on reprocessing was lifted in the 1980s, but economics did not support the reprocessing of commercial spent nuclear fuel at that time, especially in light of the lack of new nuclear plant orders and cancellation of existing orders after the Three Mile Island accident in 1979.

Since the 1970s, U.S. policy on spent nuclear fuel has been to utilize the once-through fuel cycle and to store the spent fuel at reactor sites until it can be sent to the repository for permanent geologic disposal, without recycling the spent fuel. By the year 2005, however, several key conditions have changed significantly. A number of European countries are using existing reprocessing capabilities to recycle spent fuel in a safe and secure manner using the chemical reprocessing technology known as PUREX. There is no evidence that these reprocessing operations pose a significant proliferation risk. In part, the proliferation risk is manageable and acceptable because these countries recycle as they go, so that spent fuel is reprocessed and then promptly made into new mixed oxide fuel. These countries also vitrify the high-level waste promptly, avoiding the problems that the U.S. has encountered with storing large volumes of liquid high-level radioactive waste. New reprocessing technologies are becoming available that reduce the volume, toxicity, and fissile material content of the material requiring disposal in a permanent repository. New separation and reprocessing technologies may avoid the problems caused by separated plutonium and will produce smaller waste streams of high-level radioactive waste. Lastly, the theft or diversion of weapons-grade nuclear materials (i.e., plutonium and highly-enriched uranium) is no longer the only nuclear-related security concern. After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, there are serious concerns about the potential for using spent nuclear fuel to create a "dirty bomb" to spread radioactive contamination over a large area. Spent nuclear

fuel is currently stored at 72 commercial reactor sites in 33 States, as well as at a number of other DOE and commercial storage sites. The utilities and the Federal government spend a significant amount of money securing this spent fuel. While some onsite storage of spent fuel is necessary while the spent fuel cools, and more extensive onsite storage may be a manageable security risk, the large-scale and long-term storage of spent fuel at reactor sites is nevertheless an expensive and unnecessary risk. These security costs are making the once-through fuel cycle progressively more expensive. Common sense dictates that these materials would be better stored in fewer, centralized interim storage facilities in remote locations, away from population centers and water supplies. Although reprocessed mixed oxide reactor fuel is presently more costly than fresh uranium oxide fuel, the price of uranium has been rising in recent years. Also, there is not a life-cycle comparison that reflects the added costs for onsite storage of once-through spent fuel, the extended life of the repository up to 300,000 years (in accordance with the court-ordered review of the radiation standard), and the estimated $1 billion per year cost for delay in opening the Yucca Mountain repository.

Shifting away from a once-through fuel cycle to a recycling approach does not eliminate the need for a geologic repository for future spent fuel disposal, because significant quantities of high-level waste that will require long-term geologic isolation will remain. However, recycling via advanced reprocessing technologies can reduce the volume of such high-level waste substantially. Such a volume reduction could obviate the need to expand Yucca or site a second repository in the near future. Reprocessing can also reduce the radiotoxicity of the waste products, making a repository a simpler proposition to license. Also, by vitrifying the high-level waste into glass cylinders, the long-term protection comes from the properties of the glass itself, lessening the reliance on metal containers for long-term isolation of spent fuel. A shift to recycling our nuclear reactor fuel will reduce the Nation's dependence on foreign sources of fuel for present and planned future reactors, and the construction of new reactors can reduce the Nation's dependence on imported fossil fuels.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology to focus its research under the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative to develop advanced reprocessing and transmutation technologies that will improve upon the existing PUREX process. The Department shall accelerate this research in order to make a specific technology recommendation, not later than the end of fiscal year 2007, to the President and Congress on a particular reprocessing technology that should be implemented in the United States. In addition, the Department shall prepare an integrated spent fuel recycling plan for implementation beginning in fiscal year 2007, including recommendation of an advanced reprocessing technology and a competitive process to select one or more sites to develop integrated spent fuel recycling facilities (i.e., reprocessing, preparation of mixed oxide fuel, vitrification of high level waste products, and temporary process storage). Some of the DOE sites would seem obvious candidates for such facilities, but there may

also be interest from some States and other entities to host such facilities.

Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative.—The Committee recommendation for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative (AFCI) is $75,500,000, an increase of $8,044,000 over the current year and $5,500,000 more than the budget request. The additional funds are to be used to accelerate the development and selection of a separations technology no later than the end of fiscal year 2007 that can address the current inventories of commercial spent nuclear fuel, and prepare an integrated spent nuclear fuel recycling plan. The Committee directs the Department to submit the integrated spent nuclear fuel recycling plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by January 31, 2007.

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 users fund DOE's actual operational, production, and research activities on a reimbursable basis.

Space and defense infrastructure.—The Committee recommendation is $39,700,000, an increase of $8,500,000 over the budget request. This includes the requested amounts to operate radioisotope power systems at the Idaho National Laboratory (INL), maintain iridium capabilities at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and maintain and operate the Pu–238 mission at Los Alamos.

The Committee recognizes the need to make available additional floor space in TA–55 for pit production, and directs the Department to develop a strategy to relocate expeditiously the mission for Pu–238 processing from Los Alamos to Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee provides an increase of $8,500,000 for INL to plan and build the capability to assume the Pu–238 mission, avoiding a gap in capability during the mission transfer. The Committee directs the Department to provide a mid-year report by January 31, 2006, on the transfer strategy and associated costs.

Medical isotopes infrastructure.—The Committee recommendation is $14,395,000, a reduction of $18,705,000 from the budget request. The recommendation provides the requested amounts for Oak Ridge buildings 3047, 5500, 9204–3, the Calutron building at Y–12, isotope business management information, and for various facility costs at Brookhaven, Los Alamos, and Sandia national laboratories.

The Committee provides no funding for the Medical Isotope Production and Building 3019 Complex Shutdown project. The Committee has been skeptical since the onset of this project, skepticism which has been confirmed when the fiscal year 2006 budget justification data sheet reveals that the costs for this project have increased by 3.5 times over the previous cost estimate. The Department acknowledges that this new increased estimate does not even include funding necessary to meet the latest security requirements for this facility. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to terminate promptly the Medical Isotope Production and Building 3019 Complex Shutdown project, and directs the NNSA to retrieve the U–233 material and put it into secure storage at a NNSA site.

One of the highest priorities for the Committee is to ensure the swift and safe consolidation of special nuclear materials at DOE sites. The Committee expects the Office of Nuclear Energy to work cooperatively and effectively with the Office of Security and Performance Assurance to expeditiously achieve consolidation goals, thereby limiting the number of sites where the DOE holds and protects category I and II special nuclear materials.

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 $113,862,000 for Idaho Facilities Management, an increase of $16,000,000 over the budget request. Of this total, $82,600,000 is allotted to the 270 budget function and the balance, $31,262,000, is allotted to the 050 function and funded under Other Defense Activities and Naval Reactors.

INL operations.—The Committee recommendation provides the requested amount of funding, $69,145,000 from function 270 Energy Supply, $17,762,000 from Other Defense Activities, and an increase of $13,500,000 from the Office of Naval Reactors to support the Idaho National Laboratory's Advanced Test Reactor (ATR). The increase is provided to maintain the current level of operations, make improvements, and implement the Long Range Operating Plan at the ATR. The Committee also provides an additional $2,500,000 for the utility corridor extension project at the Idaho National Laboratory.

INL Construction.—The Committee recommends $10,955,000 for Idaho facilities construction, the same as the budget request. This includes the requested amounts for the Gas Test Loop in the Advanced Test Reactor.

Idaho Site-wide Safeguards and Security

Consistent with the budget request, this activity is funded at the requested level of $75,008,000 as an 050 defense activity under the Other Defense Activities account.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends a total funding level for program direction of $61,109,000, the same as the budget request and $1,033,000 more than the current fiscal year. Of this amount, $30,006,000 is funded in the Energy Supply appropriation under budget function 270, and $31,103,000 is funded in the Other Defense Activities appropriation under budget function 050.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation is $26,000,000, a reduction of $4,000,000 from the budget request due to overall funding constraints. The Committee recommendation includes $20,900,000 for

program direction, the same as the budget request. Like fiscal year 2005, no funds are provided in this Act for the Department to finalize or implement a new worker safety rule in fiscal year 2006.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation includes $23,522,000 for the Office of Legacy Management, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request. Committee directs the Department to reassess the proportional split between non-defense and defense funding for Legacy Management activities in anticipation of the defense closure sites transitioning to Legacy Management responsibility. Funding from the Energy Supply account 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.

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(DEFERRAL)

The Committee recommends the deferral of $257,000,000 in clean coal technology funding until fiscal year 2007. These balances are not needed to complete active projects in this program. Funds are to be used for costs associated with the FutureGen program in fiscal 2007 and beyond, to develop a coal-fired, nearly emissions-free electricity and hydrogen generation plant.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Fossil energy research and development programs are intended to make prudent investments in long-range research and development that help protect the environment through higher efficiency power generation, advanced technologies and improved compliance and stewardship operations. These activities safeguard our domestic energy security. This country will continue to rely on traditional fossil fuels for the majority of its energy requirements for the foreseeable future, and the activities funded through this account ensure that energy technologies continue to improve with respect to emissions reductions and control and energy efficiency.

Fossil fuels, especially coal, are this country's most abundant and lowest cost fuels for electric power generation. The power generation technology research funded under this account has the goal of developing virtually pollution-free coal power plants within the next 15 or 20 years and doubling the amount of electricity produced from the same amount of fuel.

The Committee recommendation is $502,467,000, an increase of $11,011,000 over the request, and a decrease of $69,387,000 from fiscal year 2005 enacted levels.

Appropriation, 2005	$571,854,000
Budget estimate, 2006	491,456,000
Recommended, 2006	502,467,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−69,387,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+11,011,000

Clean coal power initiative.—This program researches, develops, and demonstrates commercial readiness to implement advanced clean coal-based technologies that enhance electricity reliability, increase generation capacity, and reduce emissions. The Committee recommends $50,000,000 for the clean coal power initiative, the same as the budget request. This funding will support the third round of demonstration projects, incorporating the latest advances in clean coal technologies.

FutureGen.—FutureGen is a $1 billion project, cost-shared with the private sector, to create the world's first fossil fuel-fired, zero emissions, electricity and hydrogen-producing power plant. The Committee recommends $18,000,000, the same as the request, for FutureGen. This funding will support the continuation of site characterization, technology assessments and preliminary design.

Fuels and Power Systems.—The Committee recommends a total of $265,800,000 for fuels and power systems, a decrease of $17,200,000 from the budget request. The recommendation provides $23,850,000 for innovations for existing plants, $56,450,000 for advanced Integrated Gas Combined Cycle, and $18,000,000 for advanced turbines, the same as the request. The Committee recommends $50,000,000 for carbon sequestration, a reduction of $17,200,000 from the request, and an increase of $4,639,000 over last year's level. The Committee believes that this level of funding is sufficient to accomplish numerous pilot-scale capture tests. The program cannot absorb the scale of resources proposed in the request, and these resources are better utilized for other nearer-term technologies within the Fossil Energy R&D portfolio. The Committee recommends $22,000,000 for fuels, $65,000,000 for fuel cells, and $30,500,000 for advanced research, the same as the request.

Natural Gas Technologies.—The Committee recommends $33,000,000 for natural gas technologies, an increase of $23,000,000 over the budget request and $11,389,000 below the fiscal year 2005 level. The budget request is $10,000,000 for natural gas technologies, to terminate the program and close-out existing contracts. The Committee is concerned that with U.S. over-reliance on foreign oil imports and the pressures to increase greatly imports of natural gas, the budget proposes to terminate the federal research and development programs that seek to promote enhanced oil and gas recovery from existing domestic sources through new technology.

Within the $33,000,000 provided, the Committee recommends $9,000,000 for advance drilling, completion and stimulation, including Deep Trek; $4,000,000 to continue work aimed at expanding the recoverability of natural gas from low-permeability formations; $2,000,000 for stripper wells and technology transfer; $1,000,000 to improve the reliability and efficiency of gas storage system; and $2,000,000 for liquid natural gas technologies.

Methane hydrates hold tremendous potential to provide abundant supplies of natural gas. Globally, more energy potential is stored in methane hydrates than in all other known fossil fuel reserves combined. It appears that the United States may be endowed with over 25 percent of total worldwide methane hydrate deposits. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommends $12,000,000 for gas hydrates, an increase of $12,000,000 over the

request, and an increase of $2,632,000 over fiscal year 2005 enacted levels. The Committee recommends $3,000,000 to continue research to develop treatment technologies that will allow water from conventional gas wells or coal bed methane wells to be put to beneficial use or to be safely discharged to the surface.

Petroleum-Oil Technologies.—The Committee recommends $29,000,000 for petroleum-oil technologies, an increase of $19,000,000 over the budget request and $4,921,000 below the fiscal year 2005 level. The budget request of $10,000,000 for petroleum-oil technologies is to terminate the program and close-out existing contracts. The Committee supports the continuance of these important research and development programs that are targeted at maximizing domestic oil production for the smaller producer, and decreasing reliance on foreign oil imports. Small independent businesses account for 50 percent of domestic petroleum production in the lower 48 states. Even when new technology is available, independent producers often lack the investment capital to cope with the increased technical risks associated with hard-to-recover resources. As a result, anywhere from 30 to 70 percent of oil is not recovered in field development. It is estimated that enhanced oil recovery projects, including development of new recovery techniques, could add about 60 billion barrels of oil nationwide from existing fields.

Within the funds provided, the Committee recommends $4,000,000 for enhancing utilization of industrial carbon dioxide; $4,000,000 for drilling and completion enhancements that support Microhole exploration; $4,000,000 for reservoir imaging; $3,000,000 for improved gas flooding recovery methods; $6,000,000 for reservoir life extension; and $8,000,000 for environmental protection.

Strategic Plans.—In light of the criticism launched at the natural gas and petroleum/oil research and development programs, illustrated by the poor score achieved in the Administration's PART tool, the Department needs a better mechanism to articulate its achievements in these areas. The Department is encouraged to develop a strategic planning process that demonstrates a clear path of investment that will yield demonstrable results, and better reflect the successes of these programs. The Department is directed to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by December 15, 2005, on the progress of implementing its strategic planning process for the natural gas and petroleum-oil research and development programs.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $105,152,000 for program direction, an increase of $6,211,000 over the budget request. The Committee seeks to maintain the personnel that otherwise would be lost as the result of the proposed gas and petroleum-oil program terminations.

Other programs.—The Committee recommendation includes the requested amounts of $8,060,000 for fossil energy environmental restoration; $1,799,000 for import/export authorization; $8,000,000 for advanced metallurgical research; $656,000 for special recruitment programs and $3,000,000 for cooperative research and development.

Prior year balances.—The Committee recommends a reduction of $20,000,000 of prior year uncommitted balances from excess contingency estimates in demonstration projects.

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

Fuels & Power:	
Center for Zero Emissions Research & Technology (MT)	$4,000,000
Jupiter Oxy Fuel Technology (multi state)	5,000,000
Solid Oxide fuel cell tech. stat. power applications project (NC)	1,000,000
MW-scale oxide fuel cell gas turbine hybrid system (multi state)	2,500,000
MW-scale solid oxide fuel cell stat. power generation (OH)	3,000,000
Ramgen engine development (multi state)	2,500,000
Center for Advanced Separation Technologies (VA)	1,000,000
Power Plant Flue Gas Cleaning/Pill Elimination Project (VA)	2,000,000

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

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

Appropriation, 2005	$17,750,000
Budget estimate, 2006	18,500,000
Recommended, 2006	18,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+750,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

The Committee recommends $18,500,000, the same as the budget request for the operation of the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves and an increase of $750,000 above the fiscal year 2005 level.

ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND

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

Appropriation, 2005	[1] $36,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	48,000,000
Recommended, 2006	48,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+48,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

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

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

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

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

Appropriation, 2005	$169,710,000
Budget estimate, 2006	166,000,000
Recommended, 2006	166,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−3,710,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

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

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

The acquisition and storage of heating oil for the Northeast states began in August 2000 when the Department of Energy, through the Strategic Petroleum Reserve account, awarded contracts for the lease of commercial storage facilities and acquisition of heating oil. The purpose of the reserve is to assure home heating oil supplies for the Northeast States during times of very low inventories and significant threats to immediate supply of heating oil. The Northeast Heating Oil Reserve was established as a separate entity from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve on March 6, 2001. The 2,000,000 barrel reserve is stored in commercial facilities in New York Harbor, New Haven, Connecticut, and the Providence, Rhode Island area.

Appropriation, 2005	$4,960,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....
Recommended, 2006	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−4,960,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

The Committee recommends no new appropriation, the same as the budget request, for the Northeast Home Heating Oil reserve,

a decrease of $4,960,000 from the fiscal 2005 level. All activities in fiscal year 2006 are funded from carryover balances.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

The Energy Information Administration (EIA) is a quasi-independent agency within the Department of Energy established to provide timely, objective, and accurate energy-related information to the Congress, executive branch, State governments, industry, and the public. The information and analysis prepared by the EIA is widely disseminated and the agency is recognized as an unbiased source of energy information by government organizations, industry, professional statistical organizations, and the public.

Appropriation, 2005	$83,819,000
Budget estimate, 2006	85,926,000
Recommended, 2006	86,426,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+2,607,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+500,000

The Committee recommends $86,426,000, $500,000 above the request, for the Energy Information Administration, an increase of $2,607,000 above fiscal year 2005 level. The Committee's increase of $500,000 above the request is to fund increased requirements for cybersecurity measures to safeguard computer systems and data integrity.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

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

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

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

Milestone report.—While the budget structure has changed, the Committee remains interested in whether the Department has met

its goals for completion for years 2006, 2012, and 2035. Beginning December 31, 2005, the Committee requests a quarterly report, by site, that tracks accelerated clean-up milestones, whether they are being met or not, and includes annual budget estimates and life-cycle costs.

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

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

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriation, 2005	$439,601,000
Budget Estimate, 2006	259,934,000
Recommended, 2006	319,934,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−119,667,000
Budget Estimate, 2006	−30,000,000

The Committee recommendation for Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup is $319,934,000, a reduction of $30,000,000 from the budget request.

The recommendation provides $77,100,000 for solid waste stabilization and disposition, and nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning at the West Valley Demonstration Project, and $45,528,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of the gaseous diffusion plants, the same as the budget request. The recommendation provides $41,113,000 for the decontamination and decommissioning of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), a decrease of $5,000,000 from the budget request. Given the delay in the contract award for the FFTF in fiscal year 2005, the Committee expects sufficient carryover funds in fiscal year 2006 will be available for this project.

The recommendation provides $70,803,000 for depleted uranium hexafluoride conversion at Portsmouth and Paducah, a reduction of $15,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee understands there are large prior year balances that have not been expended for this project, and therefore recommends the reduction in new resources. The recommendation provides $18,006,000, for soil and water remediation measures at the former Atlas uranium mill tailings site at Moab, Utah, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the re-

quest, and an increase of $10,295,000 over fiscal year 2005 enacted levels. The final Environmental Impact Statement will be issued late in fiscal year 2005 for this site, and the Committee believes that the $18,006,000 will be sufficient to begin the recommended remediation alternative in fiscal year 2006.

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

Consolidated Business Center.—The Consolidated Business Center, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, provides administrative support and contractual assistance for the Environmental Management program, including the aforementioned Small Sites. The Committee recommendation provides $3,900,000 for soil and water remediation at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; $3,500,000 for soil and water remediation at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center; $9,000,000 for nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning for the Energy Technology Engineering Center; $490,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of the Tritium System Test Assembly Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory; $305,000 for soil and water remediation at Inhalation Toxicology Laboratory; and $100,000 for cleanup work at various sites in California.

Uranium assets.—The Committee reaffirms last year's directive to use uranium assets to self-finance cost effective operation of the Portsmouth S&T Facility to remove Technetium-99 contamination from DOE and USEC inventories.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriation, 2005	$495,015,000
Budget estimate, 2006	591,498,000
Recommended, 2006	591,498,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+96,483,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

Congress created the Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation account in fiscal year 2001 to consolidate two previously separate programs. The consolidated Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation account was managed by the Office of Environmental Management and included two sub-accounts, the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, and Other Uranium Activities. Beginning in fiscal year 2004, the activities previously funded under the Other Uranium Activities sub-account were transferred into the new Non-Defense Environmental Services account.

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 $591,498,000 for activities funded from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, the same as the budget request. This amount includes $571,498,000 for decontamination and decommissioning activities at the gaseous diffusion plants and $20,000,000 for Title X uranium and thorium reimbursements.

RCRA closure.—The Committee expects the Department to complete the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act closure of building X-7725 by September 30, 2006, by any means feasible, within available funds.

SCIENCE

Appropriation, 2005	$3,599,871,000
Budget estimate, 2006	3,462,718,000
Recommended, 2006	3,666,055,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+66,184,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+203,337,000

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 Department of Energy is the largest financial supporter of research in the physical sciences. The essential role of DOE is often neglected in discussions of government science, yet DOE funding and facilities have supported major discoveries, including many that have resulted in Nobel prizes. Its initial work with nuclear reactors and particle accelerators has led DOE to support a wide range of government, academic, and industrial research by providing light sources and neutron sources for use in studying the structure of materials and processes at the atomic and subatomic scale. Researchers from diverse fields and backgrounds rely increasingly on the advanced capabilities provided by the DOE user facilities. Existing and planned new facilities will offer researchers the revolutionary ability to observe chemical reactions as they happen, including those that take place within living cells.

While DOE Science laboratories and researchers possess many multidisciplinary research capabilities, the unique niche that DOE fills is in the area of large research instruments ("big iron") such as accelerators, colliders, and most recently the Spallation Neutron Source. These projects are of such a scale, complexity, and cost that they exceed the capabilities of universities, private companies, and even other government agencies. The DOE Office of Science takes on these challenging, high-risk research projects, and while it does not always achieve its schedule and budget targets, this experience in managing high-risk science projects has helped shape its science activities. In many ways, the work of the DOE Office of Science complements the funding strengths of the National Science Foun-

dation and National Institutes of Health with their focus on providing grants to individual researchers and research teams. While DOE also makes grants and has committed to increasing use of agency-wide research announcements inviting open competition among universities, government labs, industry and others, often DOE is the provider of state-of-the-art user facilities—both research machines and computers—that are used by NSF and NIH grantees. The health and success of science programs at DOE is critical to the overall health of research and development in the United States. National security, both from an economic and a defense perspective, rests on a foundation grounded in the physical sciences, and depends on DOE's continued leadership in these fields.

The Committee was disappointed in the Department's budget request for the Office of Science in fiscal year 2006. The Committee recommendation is $3,666,055,000, an increase of $203,337,000 compared to the budget request and $66,184,000 over the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. The Committee has provided additional funding for the Office of Science to address the following Committee priorities: high performance computing; additional operating time at Office of Science user facilities; and redirection of fusion funding to restore domestic fusion research that was displaced by the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER).

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The Committee recommends a total of $735,933,000 for high energy physics, an increase of $22,000,000 over the budget request. With the proposed transfer of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) to the Basic Energy Sciences account, the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory will become the only remaining high energy physics national laboratory in the country. High energy physics is the cornerstone of our understanding of the physical universe, and the Department of Energy maintains unique capabilities that cannot be duplicated in the academic or private sector, or by any other federal agency. The Committee provides an additional $22,000,000 to maintain high energy physics at the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. Of the additional funds, $11,000,000 is provided for research on the next-generation international linear collider and $11,000,000 is provided for upgrades to the neutrino research program. The Committee supports the Department's decision to maximize the operating time of its high energy physics user facilities during fiscal year 2006. The control level is at the High Energy Physics level.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee recommendation for nuclear physics is $408,341,000, an increase of $37,600,000 over the budget request. An additional $6,000,000 is provided to initiate a competitive down-select process for design and operations concepts for the Rare Isotope Accelerator, and an additional $31,600,000 is provided to restore operating time of the user facilities in the Nuclear Physics program (i.e., RHIC, TJNAF, HRIBF, and ATLAS) to fiscal year 2005 levels.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation for biological and environmental research (BER) is $525,688,000, an increase of $70,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee approves the Department's decision to maintain the operation of BER user facilities at fiscal year 2005 levels. Within available funds, the Department shall continue to fund the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory until the expiration of the current contract. The Committee recommendation provides an additional $70,000,000, with $35,000,000 for Congressionally-directed university and hospital earmarks and $35,000,000 for Medical Applications and Measurement Science. Congressionally-directed projects are shown in the table below.

Congressionally Directed Office of Science Projects

Project	Committee Recommended
Science building at Waubonsee Community College (IL)	$2,000,000
Univ. of Oklahoma Center Applications Single-Walled Nanotubes (OK)	1,000,000
Michigan Research Institute Life Science Research Center (MI)	850,000
Univ. of Arizona Environmental and Natural Resources Phase II (AZ)	750,000
Children's Hospital of Illinois (IL)	500,000
Cleveland Clinic Brain Mapping (OH)	1,000,000
Hampton University Canter Treatment Center (VA)	500,000
Saratoga Hospital Radiation Therapy Center (NY)	750,000
Environmental System Center at Syracuse University (NY)	700,000
Northern Virginia Comm. College training biotechnology workers (VA)	500,000
University of South Alabama Center Research Institute (AL)	500,000
Virginia Commonwealth University Massey Cancer Center (VA)	1,000,000
Alvernia College for a Science and Health Building (PA)	500,000
Burpee Museum of Natural History (IL)	500,000
Rockford Health Council (IL)	700,000
Roswell Park Cancer Center (NY)	250,000
National Polymer Center at the University of Akron (OH)	500,000
George Mason University research against Biological Agents (VA)	1,000,000
Biological and Environmental Center at Mystic Aquarium (CT)	500,000
Kern Medical Center to purchase and install MRI machine (CA)	500,000
Western Michigan University Geosciences Initiative (MI)	100,000
ORNL Supercomputer Connectivity NextEdge Technology Park (TN)	900,000
AVETeC data mamt.electronics and comm. NextEdge Tech.Park (OH)	2,100,000
Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy research Univ. of Washington School (WA)	200,000
Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy research Children's National Medical Ctr. (DC)	200,000
Ohio State University for Earth University (OH)	250,000
Loma Linda University Medical Center (CA)	1,250,000
SUNY IT Nano-Bio-Molecular Technical Incubator (NY)	500,000
Baylor University Lake Whitney Assessment (TX)	500,000
Centenary College laboratory space (NJ)	500,000
Notre Dame Ecological Genomics Research Institute (IN)	1,750,000
Inland Water Environmental Institute (ID,WA,UT)	500,000
St. Francis Science Center (IN)	250,000
Medical Research and Robotics, University of Southern California (CA)	1,000,000
Hampshire College National Center for Science Education (MA)	500,000
Pioneer Valley Life Science Initiative Univ. of Massachusetts (MA)	500,000
MidAmerica Nazarene Univ. nursing biological science program (KS)	500,000
Westminster College Science Center (UT)	500,000
City College of San Francisco-Health Related Equipment (CA)	500,000
Science South Development (SC)	500,000
St. Joseph Science Center (PA)	500,000
University North Carolina Biomedical Imaging (NC)	500,000
Augsburg College (MN)	750,000
Morehouse School of Medicine (GA)	750,000
Jersey City Medical Center (NJ)	750,000
University of Rochester James P. Wilmot Cancer Center (NY)	750,000
Bronx Community College Center for Sustainable Energy (NY)	500,000
University of Chicago Comer Children's Hospital (IL)	500,000
Martha's Vineyard Hospital (MA)	500,000
Joint Environmental Stewardship SUNY New Paltz and Ulster Comm.College (NY)	500,000
Central Arkansas Radiation Therapy Institute/Mountain Home (AR)	500,000
Children Hospital of LA Proteomics Core and Combinational Chemistry (CA)	500,000
Wake Forest University Institute for Regenerative Medicine (VA)	500,000

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for Basic Energy Sciences is $1,173,149,000, an increase of $27,132,000 over the budget request. For purposes of reprogramming during fiscal year 2006, the Department may allocate funding among all operating accounts within Basic Energy Sciences, consistent with the reprogramming guidelines outlined earlier in this report.

Research.—The Committee recommendation includes $772,025,000 for materials sciences and engineering, and $223,051,000 for chemical sciences, geosciences, and energy biosciences. An additional $19,737,000 is provided to maintain operating time on the Basic Energy Sciences user facilities at fiscal year 2005 levels, and an additional $7,395,000 is provided to restore university grants for core research in the basic energy sciences. The Committee recommendation funds nanoscale science research and the science research portion of the hydrogen initiative at the requested levels. Also included within this account is $7,280,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR), the same as the budget request.

Construction.—The Committee recommendation includes $178,073,000 for Basic Energy Sciences construction projects, the same as the requested amount. The Committee recommendation provides the requested funding of: $41,744,000 for the Spallation Neutron Source (99–E–334) at Oak Ridge National Laboratory; $2,544,000 for Title I and Title II design work (03–SC–002) and $83,000,000 to initiate construction (05–R–320) for the Linac Coherent Light Source at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center; $36,553,000 for the Center for Functional Nanomaterials (05–R–321) at Brookhaven National Laboratory; $9,606,000 for the Molecular Foundry (04–R–313) at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; and $4,626,000 for the Center for Integrated Nanotechnologies (03–R–313) at Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation is $246,055,000, an increase of $39,000,000 over the budget request. The additional $39,000,000 is provided 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; not more than $25,000,000 of this increase should be dedicated to hardware, and $9,000,000 of the total increase should be dedicated to competitive university research grants. The Committee is disappointed that the Department's fiscal year 2006 budget request did not preserve the increases that Congress provided for this purpose during the past two fiscal years. Consistent with guidance provided in prior years, the Committee has chosen not to earmark these additional funds for a particular laboratory or a particular technology. However, the Committee expects the Department to make full use of the laboratory-industry capabilities that have already been selected competitively in previous years and not "reinvent the wheel" each fiscal year.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is $296,155,000, an increase of $5,605,000 over the budget request but with a significant redirection of funds as outlined below. The Committee is concerned that two-thirds of the proposed increase for the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) would be achieved by reducing domestic fusion research and operating time on domestic user facilities. Under the proposed fiscal year 2006 budget, operating time at the three major fusion research facilities (DIII–D, Alcator C–Mod, and NSTX) would be reduced from 48 weeks in fiscal year 2005 to a total of only 17 weeks in fiscal year 2006. If the United States expects to be a serious contributor to international fusion research in general and to ITER in particular, the Nation needs to maintain strong domestic research programs and user facilities to train the next generation of fusion scientists and engineers. The Department's proposal to increase support for ITER at the expense of domestic fusion research is unwise and unacceptable. Such an approach is not only short-sighted, but inconsistent with prior Congressional guidance. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to utilize $29,900,000 of funding proposed for ITER and the additional $5,605,000 to restore U.S.-based fusion funding to fiscal year 2005 levels as follows: $7,300,000 for high performance materials for fusion; $14,305,000 to restore operation of the three major user facilities to fiscal year 2005 operating levels; $7,200,000 for intense heavy ion beams and fast ignition studies; $5,100,000 for compact stellarators and small-scale experiments; and $1,600,000 for theory. As in previous years, the Committee directs the Department to fund the U.S. share of ITER through additional resources rather than through reductions to domestic fusion research or to other Office of Science programs. If the Department does not follow this guidance in its fiscal year 2007 budget submission, the Committee is prepared to eliminate all U.S. funding for the ITER project in the future.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $42,105,000 for Science Laboratories Infrastructure, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request. The additional funds are provided to complete PED and initiate construction for project 04–05 MEL 001–046, the capability replacement laboratory at PNNL. The Committee expects the Department to request sufficient funds in fiscal year 2007 to have this replacement facility available for occupancy by 2009. Within available funds, the Committee directs the Department to continue to make PILT payments associated with Argonne National Laboratory at the fiscal year 2005 level.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $74,317,000, the same as the budget request, to meet additional safeguards and security requirements at Office of Science facilities.

SCIENCE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

The Committee provides $7,192,000 for Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists in fiscal year 2006, the same as the requested amount.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation is $162,725,000 for Science program direction, the same as the budget request. This amount includes: $92,593,000 for program direction at DOE field offices and $70,132,000 for program direction at DOE headquarters. The control level for fiscal year 2006 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, 2005	$343,232,000
Budget estimate, 2006	300,000,000
Recommended, 2006	310,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−33,232,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+10,000,000

The Department of Energy requested a total of $651,447,000 for work on the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository in fiscal year 2006, $300,000,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal and $351,447,000 for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal. According to the Department's budget justification, these requested funds will be sufficient to maintain the schedule for the December 2005 submission of a repository license application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and to continue the scientific and engineering work to defend that license application and to prepare for design and construction of the repository.

At this time last year, the Department was still on track to open the repository in 2010. However, several events have combined to push that date out to 2012, at the earliest. In July 2004, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit vacated the 10,000-year radiation standard for the repository promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency. Also during the summer of 2004, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission invalidated the Department's initial certification of documentation for the Licensing Support Network (LSN). Most recently, the Department discovered that certain documents related to the quality assurance of water modeling for the repository may have been falsified by employees of the U.S. Geological Survey. Underlying these technical and policy challenges, Congress has consistently underfunded the repository program in recent years. In fiscal year 2005, the budget request was for $880,000,000, but Congress ultimately provided only $572,384,000 for the program.

The net result is that the date for opening the Yucca Mountain repository continues to recede into the future. Indications suggest

that the Department will not be able to open the repository by 2012, and actual initial operations might be delayed into the latter half of the next decade. This means that spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive waste, both destined for final disposal in the repository, will remain in interim storage at 129 private and governmental sites scattered across the country. While such onsite interim storage is a manageable risk, it is an unnecessary risk. It is also becoming a very expensive proposition, as DOE has estimated that every year of delay in opening the Yucca Mountain repository will cost the federal government an additional $1 billion per year, with a conservative estimate of $500 million in legal liability for failure to take title to commercial spent fuel, and another $500 million to monitor and guard defense spent fuel and high level radioactive waste at DOE sites.

In addition to the challenges facing the Department in opening the first repository at Yucca Mountain, there are questions about spent fuel disposal once that repository is full. The authorized inventory capacity for the Yucca Mountain repository is 70,000 metric tons of heavy metal from spent fuel or solidified high level waste resulting from reprocessing, of which 63,000 tons are commercial spent fuel and 7,000 tons are defense spent fuel and high-level waste. DOE estimates that this capacity will be fully utilized by the year 2010. In other words, spent fuel generated after 2010 cannot be disposed in Yucca Mountain as that repository is presently authorized. Section 161 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, outlines a process for siting a second repository. Absent an effort to increase the authorized capacity at Yucca Mountain, the Secretary is required to report to Congress on or after January 1, 2007, on the need for a second repository.

As discussed earlier in this report, the Committee believes the Department should embark on a concerted initiative to begin recycling our spent nuclear fuel, starting with the preparation of an integrated spent fuel recycling plan for implementation in fiscal year 2007, including selection of an advanced reprocessing technology and a competitive process to select one or more sites to develop integrated spent fuel recycling facilities (i.e., reprocessing, preparation of mixed oxide fuel, vitrification of high level waste products, and temporary process storage).

Until such an integrated recycling approach becomes operational, the Committee believes the Department should move aggressively to take title to commercial spent fuel and consolidate such fuel in a smaller number of more secure, above-ground interim storage facilities located at existing DOE facilities. Such interim storage at DOE sites is not a new concept. In the interests of nonproliferation, the United States is bringing back spent fuel from various foreign research reactors and storing such fuel on DOE sites, at Federal expense. Rather than create one or more new and separate interim storage sites for this foreign fuel, it is clearly more cost-effective to store this fuel at a centralized DOE site that is already secure because of the requirement to protect other DOE facilities and materials at the site. Given the sunk cost of protecting the DOE site for national and homeland security reasons, the incremental costs of storing additional foreign spent fuel at a DOE site are modest. The

same logic should be applied to interim storage of domestic spent fuel.

The Federal government should establish one or more centralized interim storage sites for commercial spent nuclear fuel. Interim storage would make the most sense co-located with the permanent repository at Yucca Mountain, but the Nuclear Waste Policy Act specifically prohibits siting an interim storage facility or a Monitored Retrievable Storage facility at the same location as the permanent repository. Other possible alternative DOE sites include Hanford, Idaho, and Savannah River, all of which presently store government-owned spent fuel and high level waste and both of which already have extensive site security measures in place. Should these or other DOE sites prove impractical, the Department should investigate other alternatives for centralized interim storage, including other federally-owned sites, closed military bases, and non-federal fuel storage facilities. The Committee encourages the Department to maximize use of existing NRC-approved designs for storage casks and independent spent fuel storage installations. The Committee also encourages DOE to consider making use of existing European capabilities for reprocessing, vitrification, MOX fuel fabrication, and interim storage.

DOE should take prompt action to take title to some commercial spent fuel and begin to move that fuel from the reactor sites to one or more centralized interim storage sites. There is an established queue that defines the order in which DOE is to take title to commercial spent fuel. However, there can be legitimate arguments to move fuel other than that with priority in the queue, such as spent fuel from reactors that are already decontaminated and decommissioned, or fuel from a utility which agrees to settle, drop, or otherwise limit its claim against the Federal government. The Committee defers to the Secretary's judgment on which fuel can and should be moved first.

For Nuclear Waste Disposal in fiscal year 2006, the Committee provides $310,000,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. When coupled with the $10,000,000 included within the budget request for the acquisition of transportation casks, this provides a total of $20,000,000 to support this early acceptance of commercial spent fuel. If the process for licensing the repository is delayed further in fiscal year 2006, the Committee would support a reprogramming request to reallocate additional funds to this Spent Fuel Initiative. The Committee directs the Secretary to provide to Congress, within 120 days of enactment of this Act, an implementation plan for such early acceptance of commercial spent fuel, transportation to a DOE site, and centralized interim storage at one or more DOE sites. Although the Committee believes that the Department already has authority for these actions under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the implementation plan should propose any changes to legislative language necessary to execute this plan. Further, the Committee directs the Department to begin the movement of spent fuel to centralized interim storage at one or more DOE sites within fiscal year 2006.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2005	$238,503,000
Budget estimate, 2006	279,976,000
Recommended, 2006	253,909,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+15,406,000
Budget estimate, 2006	−26,067,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 2005	$−122,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	−123,000,000
Recommended, 2006	−123,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−1,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

The Committee recommendation for Departmental Administration is $253,909,000, a decrease of $26,067,000 from the budget request of $279,976,000. 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 $279,976,000 requested for Departmental Administration, roughly half ($139,651,000) represents salaries and benefits for the Federal employees at DOE headquarters. When the salary increase proposed for civilian federal employees is only 2.3 percent in fiscal year 2006, and when the overall DOE budget would decline by 2.0 percent in fiscal year 2006 compared to fiscal year 2005, the Committee does not support the requested 17.4 percent increase for the overall Departmental Administration account. Three accounts (i.e., Chief Information Officer, Policy and International Affairs, and Public Affairs) show increases for salaries and expenses in excess of 20 percent, and several other accounts (i.e., Office of the Secretary, and General Counsel) show increases in excess of 10 percent. The Committee considers such proposed increases to be excessive in light of the modest Federal pay raise and the overall reduction proposed for the Department's total budget for fiscal year 2006. Therefore, the Committee limits the increase for the various salaries and expenses subaccounts within Departmental Administration to no more than 5 percent in fiscal year 2006, and maintains the program support subaccounts at the lesser of the fiscal year 2005 enacted level or the fiscal year 2006 request level.

Office of Engineering and Construction Management.—The Committee continues to support the Office of Engineering and Construction Management as the focal point for improving project management within the Department. 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 External Independent Reviews, 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 $123,000,000, consistent with the estimate of revenues provided by the Congressional Budget Office.

Transfer from Other Defense Activities.—For fiscal year 2006, the Department requested $87,575,000 as the defense contribution to the Departmental Administration account. The Committee provides the requested amount and expects the Department to continue to request a proportional defense contribution to Departmental Administration in future fiscal years.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 2005	$41,176,000
Budget estimate, 2006	43,000,000
Recommended, 2006	43,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+1,824,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

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 $43,000,000, 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; 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 (Public Law 106–65), the 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 $8,848,449,000 a decrease of $548,792,000 from the budget request of $9,397,241,000, but an increase of $23,990,000 over fiscal year 2005 when adjusted for the one-time transfer from Department of Defense.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2005	[1] $6,331,590,000
Budget estimate, 2006	6,630,133,000
Recommended, 2006	6,181,121,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−295,518,000
Budget estimate, 2006	−449,012,000

[1] Does not include $300,000,000 transferred from the Department of Defense

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 $6,181,121,000, a decrease of $449,012,000 from the budget request of $6,630,133,000. The Committee recommendation did not include the proposed cleanup transfer from Environmental Management to the NNSA and the Committee recommendation returns the $221,386,000 back to the cleanup program. The net reduction to the Weapons Activities budget request is $227,626,000 from the budget request.

Nuclear Weapons Complex Wide Review.—The Committee tasked the previous Secretary of Energy with conducting an independent assessment of the Department of Energy's infrastructure requirements for the nuclear weapons complex over the next twenty-five years. The Secretary established a Task Force within the Secretary of Energy's Advisory Board (SEAB) to conduct the Nuclear Weapons Complex Infrastructure Study. The Committee is encouraged by the preliminary work of the Task Force but will not act on any recommendations until the final report is finished this summer. The Committee will consider the Task Force recommendations in the fiscal year 2006 Conference Report this fall. The Committee notes the timeliness of the Task Force study based on the distribution of funds requested in the fiscal year 2006 budget request. The budget request for direct stockpile support by weapon tail number is only ten percent of the total Weapons Activities request. Too much of the remaining 90 percent of the budget request supports a residual Cold War capacity within the weapons complex which is not needed for the long term sustainable stockpile.

Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW).—Congress initiated the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447), to focus DOE and DOD on implementing a program for improving the long-term safe-

ty, reliability, and security of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The Committee is supportive of the Administration taking an accelerated approach to implement a new nuclear weapons paradigm that ensures the continued moratorium on nuclear testing and results in a dramatically smaller nuclear weapons stockpile in the near future. The RRW weapon will be designed for ease of manufacturing, maintenance, dismantlement, and certification without nuclear testing, allowing the NNSA to transition the weapons complex away from a large, expensive Cold War relic into a smaller, more efficient modern complex. A more reliable replacement warhead will allow long-term savings by phasing out the multiple redundant Cold War warhead designs that require maintaining multiple obsolete production technologies to maintain the older warheads. The Committee's qualified endorsement of the RRW initiative is based on the assumption that a replacement weapon will be designed only as a re-engineered and remanufactured warhead for an existing weapon system in the stockpile. The Committee does not endorse the RRW concept as the beginning of a new production program intended to produce new warhead designs or produce new weapons for any military mission beyond the current deterrent requirements. The Committee's support of the RRW concept is contingent on the intent of the program being solely to meet the current military characteristics and requirements of the existing stockpile.

Sustainable Stockpile Initiative.—The Committee views the RRW initiative as part of a larger Sustainable Stockpile Initiative. The end of the Cold War left the DOE production complex awash in special nuclear material and excess weapons and weapons parts with no additional mission requirement. The post-9/11 threat environment has made providing safeguards and security for these old warheads and excess materials a serious security liability and a seemingly unlimited budget liability. The Committee expects the Department to develop an integrated RRW implementation plan that challenges the complex to produce a RRW certifiable design while implementing an accelerated warhead dismantlement program and an infrastructure reconfiguration proposal that maximizes special nuclear material consolidation. The Committee recognizes all of these program initiatives implemented together with the SEAB Infrastructure Task Force recommendations as the beginning of a responsive infrastructure for maintaining the future nuclear stockpile. The Committee directs the Secretary of Energy to establish a Federal Advisory Committee on the Reliable Replacement Warhead initiative and to advise on implementation of recommendations stemming from the Nuclear Weapons Complex Infrastructure Study.

Proposed Cleanup Transfer to NNSA.—The Committee recommendation does not include the proposed transfer of Environmental Management cleanup activities at the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) weapons sites to the NNSA. The Committee believes that this proposal was not sufficiently justified by the Department, and has concerns that the mission orientation and experience in the Environmental Management organization is not resident in the NNSA.

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: subprograms within Directed Stockpile Work; Life Extension Programs, Stockpile Systems, Reliable Replacement Warhead, Warhead Dismantlement, and Stockpile Services. Additional reprogramming control levels will be as follows: Science Campaigns, Engineering Campaigns, Advanced Simulation and Computing, Pit Manufacturing and Certification, Readiness Campaigns, and Operations of Facilities for readiness in technical base and facilities. 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; and funds may not be used for an item for which Congress has specifically denied funds or for a new program or project that has not been authorized by Congress.

The Department must notify Congress 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 exceed the limitations outlined in the previous paragraph require prior notification of and approval by 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 DSW account provides all the direct funding for the Department's life extension activities, which are designed to extend the service life of the existing nuclear weapons stockpile, by providing new subsystems and components for each warhead thereby extending the operational service life. The Committee notes that the Directed Stockpile Work Life Extension activities are being reduced in anticipation of a revised out-year baseline plan from the NNSA that integrates all the elements of a long-term sustainable stockpile plan that supports the ability to maintain a safe secure and reliable nuclear deterrent with a much smaller stockpile. The Committee expects a rebaselined life extension program plan by weapon type, a Reliable Replacement Warhead program plan, and a Warhead Dismantlement plan that, taken together, will provide reliable nuclear deterrence with a post-2025 stockpile significantly smaller that the 2012 Nuclear Stockpile levels committed to in the Moscow Treaty and specified in the revised Nuclear Stockpile Plan. The current Life Extension Plans will be scoped back to lower levels and the resources will be redeployed to support the Sustainable Stockpile Initiative.

The Committee's recommendation for Directed Stockpile Activities is $1,283,682,000 a decrease of $137,349,000 from the budget request.

Life Extension Programs.—The Committee recommendation includes $313,318,000 for the DSW Life Extension Programs, a reduction of $35,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee directs the reduction to be taken against the W80 LEP activity.

Stockpile Systems.—The Committee provides $301,804,000 for the DSW Stockpile Systems activities, a decrease of $10,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee directs the reduction to be taken against the W80 activity.

Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW).—The Committee recommendation includes $25,000,000 for the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) initiative, an increase of $15,649,000 from the budget request. The additional funds are provided to accelerate the planning effort to initiate a competition between the NNSA weapons laboratories to develop the design for the RRW re-engineered and remanufactured warhead. The Committee expects the initial design approved by the Department will be selected based a combination of considerations including the ability to certify the warhead without underground nuclear testing, cost of production, and ease of maintenance and dismantlement.

Warhead Dismantlement.—The Committee recommendation includes $110,245,000 for the Warhead Dismantlement subprogram, an increase of $75,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee expects the NNSA to implement a robust warhead dismantlement program as part of the Sustainable Stockpile Initiative with aggressive near-term dismantlement milestones. Each year, the Committee notes with disappointment the funding levels for warhead dismantlement both in the request year and in the out-years of the NNSA Five Year National Security Plan (FYNSP). The fiscal year 2006 budget request of $35,245,000 would drop to less than $30,000,000 in fiscal year 2008 and remain flat through fiscal year 2010. The cumulative FYNSP total for warhead dismantlement is only two percent of the total Directed Stockpile Work resources through fiscal year 2010. As part of a concerted effort to relieve the weapons complex of excess Cold War era warheads and continue the development of a responsive infrastructure, the Committee expects to see significant program effort directed at the dismantlement of the existing Cold War stockpile.

Stockpile Services.—The Committee recommendation includes $533,315,000 for the DSW Stockpile Services activities, a reduction of $182,998,000 from the request. The Committee notes the fiscal year 2006 budget justification references a "Responsive Infrastructure" initiative that was to be started in fiscal year 2005 and funded out of DSW/Stockpile Services/ Research and Development Certification and Safety subprogram and the DSW/Stockpile Services/ Management, Technology, and Production subprogram. The fiscal year 2005 budget justification included no reference to a Responsive Infrastructure initiative within the Directed Stockpile Work request and, as such, the Committee did not approve funding in the fiscal year 2005 Conference agreement within the specified subprograms for a Responsive Infrastructure initiative. Further, for the "Responsive Infrastructure" initiative in the fiscal year 2006 budget request justification is inadequate and the Committee recommendation includes no funding for any related activity within the DSW Stockpile Services appropriation. The Committee sup-

ports the development of a responsive infrastructure in the context of a larger transformation of the weapons complex, and will review a request submitted by the Department that provides an integrated program description and justification and associated budget requirements in the fiscal year 2007 request.

Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP).—The Committee recommendation provides no funding for RNEP. The Committee continues to oppose the diversion of resources and intellectual capital away from the more serious issues that confront the management of the nation's nuclear deterrent, primarily the transformation of the Cold War nuclear weapons complex and existing stockpile into a sustainable enterprise. The Committee has been disappointed at the bureaucracy's adherence to an initiative that threatens Congressional and public support for sustainable stockpile initiatives that will actually provide long-term security and deterrent value for the Nation. It is the understanding of the Committee that, instead of conducting an RNEP study at a DOE national laboratory, the Department of Defense will conduct a non-nuclear penetrator study at a Department of Defense facility.

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 $1,911,686,000, a decrease of $168,758,000 below the budget request of $2,080,444,000. The Committee's recommendation takes into consideration the reduced scope of the Life Extension activities and the existing Science-based Stockpile Stewardship program to restructure the weapons program to transition to a Sustainable Stockpile configuration.

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 description 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 deliverables for individual project activities as part of the fiscal year 2007 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 at the fiscal year 2005 funding level.

Science campaigns.—The Committee recommendation for science campaigns is $216,905,000, a reduction of $45,020,000 from the budget request. The Committee's recommendation takes into consideration the reduced scope of the Life Extension activities and the existing Science-based Stockpile Stewardship program to restructure the weapons program to transition to a Sustainable Stockpile configuration.

The Committee provides $35,179,000 for the primary assessment technology subprogram, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the request. The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000 for the Test Readiness subprogram, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee continues to oppose the 18-month test readiness posture and refers the Department to the unambiguous language provided in the reports accompanying the fiscal year 2004 and 2005 Appropriation Acts requiring the Department to maintain the current 24-month test readiness posture. The initiation of the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program designed to provide for the continuance of the existing moratorium on underground nuclear testing by insuring the long-term reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile obviates any reason to move to a provocative 18-month test readiness posture. The Committee recommendation includes $70,894,000 for the dynamic materials properties subprogram, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $40,500,000 for the advanced radiography subprogram, a reduction of $9,020,000 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 subprogram recommendation is $55,332,000, a reduction of $6,000,000 from the budget request.

Engineering campaigns.—The Committee recommendation for engineering campaigns is $192,704,000, a decrease of $37,052,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommendation for the enhanced surety subprogram is $22,000,000, a reduction of $7,845,000 from the budget request to maintain current year funding levels. The Committee provides $15,040,000 for the Weapons Systems Engineering Assessment Technology subprogram, a decrease of $9,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee provides $9,386,000 for the Nuclear Survivability subprogram, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation for enhanced surveillance subprogram is $76,000,000, a reduction of $20,207,000 from the budget request.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommends $65,564,000 the same as the budget request, for Project 01–D–108, Microsystems and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, New Mexico.

Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) Ignition and High Yield.—The Committee recommends $541,418,000 for the inertial confinement fusion and high yield program, which maintains the program at the current year level and is an increase of $81,000,000 over the budget request.

The Committee supports the Department's response to the Congressional concern expressed last year regarding the fiscal year 2005 budget request proposed schedule slip to the program goal of ignition demonstration in 2010 for the National Ignition Facility (NIF). The Committee continues to view ignition demonstration as the primary benchmark for success in this program. The Committee commends the Department's effort to projectize the ICF program consistent with DOE Order 413.3, and to manage the ignition, diagnostic, cryogenic and experimental programs as projects

incorporating a work breakdown structure to track scope, cost, and schedule milestones, within a project management control system. The Committee directs the NNSA to report quarterly on the milestone cost and schedule variance within the respective experimental programs on progress toward the NIF 2000 rebaselined program.

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $69,623,000 for Facility Operations and Target Production, of which $15,000,000 shall be available to accelerate target fabrication. The Committee believes that a target that meets all the NIF ignition criteria should be produced and characterized in a cryogenic environment. NNSA should provide the Committee with a detailed schedule by March 2006 to accomplish this requirement. Should fabrication of the new beryllium target prove too high risk to ensure meeting the NIF milestones, NNSA is required to provide the Committee with the alternative that will be pursued in order to keep to the 2010 ignition schedule. 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 program line; within that amount, the Committee includes $2,000,000 for the high density matter laser at the Ohio State University Technology Park. The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory, and $71,558,000 for the University of Rochester's Laboratory for Laser Energetics (LLE), an increase of $26,000,000 over the budget request. The LLE is the principal research and experimentation laser facility for NNSA Science-based Stockpile stewardship activities. The Committee increase includes an additional $4,000,000 for OMEGA operations to provide additional shots to support the ICF campaign goal of an ignition demonstration in 2010 and an additional $22,000,000 to accelerate the OMEGA Extended Performance capability project, a four beam super-high-intensity, high-energy laser facility to support the nation's stockpile stewardship program. The Committee notes that the University of Rochester is providing $21 million for the building to house the OMEGA EP.

The Committee recommendation provides $141,913,000 for construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF), the same as the budget request.

Advanced simulation and computing (ASCI).—The Committee recommendation for Advanced Simulation and Computing is $500,830,000, a reduction of $160,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee has consistently supported ASCI funding based on the assumption that spending three quarters of a billion dollars every year on high-end computing power at the three weapons laboratories; Los Alamos, Sandia, and Livermore was required to maintain the safety and reliability of the nuclear stockpile without underground testing. However, Congressional testimony by NNSA officials is beginning to erode the confidence of the Committee that the Science-based Stockpile Stewardship is performing as advertised. The Department continues to argue for an 18 month test readiness posture because of the possibility of unanticipated problems in the existing stockpile due to aging that ultimately will impact confidence in the reliability of the nuclear deterrent. The De-

partment's argument for building a "responsive infrastructure" is also based on the need to respond to unforeseen problems in the existing stockpile. The Committee recommendation recognizes the Department's inability to achieve the promises of the Stockpile Stewardship effort and redirects ASCI funding to maintain current life extension production capabilities pending the initiation of the Reliable Replacement Warhead program. The Committee recommendation includes the following projects from within available funds: Nonprofit AVETeC for Nextedge Technical Park, Springfield (OH), $9,725,000; Wittenberg University supercomputer (OH), $1,000,000; Notre Dame/Purdue Supercomputer Grid (IL, IN), $5,000,000; and $6,000,000 provided to continue the demonstration at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory of advanced electronics packaging and thermal engineering for thermally-efficient electronics related to high performance data servers using three dimensional chip scale packaging integrated with spray cooling (WA).

Pit Manufacturing and Pit Certification.—The Committee recommendation for pit manufacturing and certification campaign is $241,074,000, a reduction of $7,686,000 from the budget request. 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 $120,926,000 for W88 Pit Manufacturing and $61,895,000, for W88 Certification, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation for pit manufacturing capability is $23,071,000 the same as the budget request.

The Committee does not provide the requested $7,686,000 for the modern pit facility (MPF) pending the outcome of the Nuclear Weapons Complex Infrastructure Study and the accelerated plutonium aging experiments. The Committee recommends the NNSA focus its efforts on how best to lengthen the life of the stockpile and minimize the need for an enormously expensive infrastructure facility until the long-term strategy for the physical infrastructure of the weapons complex has incorporated the Reliable Replacement Warhead strategy, and the potential for a significantly reduced out-year stockpile requirement, and the expanding TA–55 pit production capacity at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. The post-2025 stockpile size and the evolving responsive infrastructure strategy for the weapons complex should dictate the timing and location of a pit production facility. The Committee will consider a modern pit facility site and design only when the detailed analysis of the pit aging experiments and the concomitant capacity requirements tied to the long-term stockpile size 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 $218,755,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommends $31,400,000, for Stockpile Readiness, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommends $17,097,000 for High Explosives Manufacturing & Weap-

ons Assembly/Disassembly, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommends $28,630,000 for Nonnuclear Readiness. The Committee recommendation includes $54,040,000 for Advanced Design and Production Technologies, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommends $87,588,000 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 $1,610,870,000, a reduction of $20,516,000 below the budget request.

Operations of facilities.—The Committee recommendation for Operations of Facilities is $1,204,786,000, an increase of $44,003,000 over the budget request. The comparison to the budget request includes a transfer of $46,997,000 from the RTBF account back to the Environmental Management appropriation. Additional funding of $51,000,000 has been provided for the Pantex plant in Texas and $40,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant in Tennessee to address chronic under-funding in the maintenance of production plant facilities. The Committee recognizes the efforts made by the NNSA to accelerate the reduction of the facility footprint at the Y–12 plant to modernize operations and reduce security costs and encourages additional aggressive efforts. The Committee recommendation includes the following projects from within available funds: $1,150,000 for risk based data management in Oklahoma (OK); $2,000,000 for Robotics repetitive system technology (OH); $3,750,000 for Plasma Separation Process High Energy Storage Isotope research (TN); $1,500,000 for Multi-Platform dosimeter radiation detection devices (WA); $2,000,000 for Secure Wireless Technologies at Y–12 (TN); $2,000,000 for Airborne Particulate Threat Assessment (PA); $2,000,000 for comand and control of Vulnerable Materials Security System (PA, NJ); $1,000,000 for Advanced Engineering Environment at Sandia National Laboratory (NM).

Program Readiness.—The Committee recommendation for Program Readiness is $105,738,000, the same as budget request.

Material Recycle and Recovery.—The Committee recommendation for material recycle and recovery is $72,730,000, the same as the budget request.

Containers.—The Committee recommendation for containers is $17,247,000, the same as the budget request.

Storage.—The Committee recommendation for storage is $25,322,000.

Special Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes no funding for Special Projects, a reduction of $6,619,000 from the budget request. The Committee directs future budget requests include all necessary activities within the RTBF Operations of Facilities account.

Construction projects.—

Project 06–D–140, Project engineering and design (PED)—RTBF, various locations. The Committee recommends $14,113,000 the same as the budget request.

Project 06–D–402, Nevada Test Site Replace Fire Stations No. 1 and No. 2, Nevada Site Office, NV. The Committee recommends $8,284,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 06–D–403, Tritium Facility Modernization, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, CA. The Committee recommends $2,600,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 06–D–404, Building remediation, restoration, and upgrade, Nevada Site Office, NV. The Committee recommends $16,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 04–D–125, Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Facility Replacement (CMRR), LANL. The Committee recommends no funding for the CMRR project, a decrease of $55,000,000 from the budget request. Construction at the CMRR facility should be delayed until the Department determines the long-term plan for developing the responsive infrastructure required to maintain the nation's existing nuclear stockpile and support replacement production anticipated for the RRW initiative. The Committee's recommendation does not prejudge the outcome of the Secretary's SEAB subcommittee's assessment of the NNSA weapons complex. However, the production capabilities proposed in the CMRR will be best located at whatever future production complex configuration the Department determines necessary to support the long term stockpile program.

Project 01–D–124, Highly Enriched Uranium Materials Facility, Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN. The Committee recommends $81,350,000, an increase of $11,000,000 over the budget request. Consistent with the Committee's priority to address special nuclear material consolidation requirements across the DOE complex, the Committee directs the Department to accelerate the construction and operational start of the HEU Materials Facility to the extent practicable to provide for consolidated storage of HEU at the Y–12 plant.

Project 03–D–103, Project engineering and design (PED)—various locations. The Committee recommends $15,000,000 a reduction of $14,000,000 from the budget request. The reduction supports current year funding levels consistent with a reduction in the accelerated CMRR design activities pending the outcome of the SEAB Infrastructure Task Force assessment.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION

The Committee recommendation for Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP) is $250,509,000, a reduction of $33,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee directs the NNSA to reassess its out-year planning for FIRP projects to ensure coordination between the highly allocated FIRP funds and the reduced facility requirements consistent with the consolidation of the complex under the long-term Responsive Infrastructure planning.

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 the 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 the NNSA to reas-

sess its outyear planning for FIRP projects to ensure coordination between the highly allocated FIRP funds and the reduced facility requirements consistent with the consolidation of the complex under the long term responsive infrastructure planning.

The Committee directs that not less than $30,000,000 of the facilities and infrastructure funding in fiscal year 2006 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 disposal of excess facilities.

The Committee recommendation provides $50,025,000 for FIRP construction projects, the same as the budget request.

Facility Infrastructure and Recapitalization Construction Projects.—

06–D–160 FIRP project engineering design (PED), various locations. The Committee recommends $5,811,000, the same as the budget request.

06–D–601 Electrical Distribution System Upgrade, Pantex Plant, TX. The Committee recommends $4,000,000, the same as the budget request.

06–D–602 Gas Main & Distribution System upgrade, Pantex Plant, TX. The Committee recommends $3,700,000, the same as the budget request.

06–D–603 Steam Plant Life Extension project, Y–12 National Security Complex. The Committee recommends $729,000, 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 $212,100,000, the same as the budget request.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS INCIDENT RESPONSE

The Committee recommendation for nuclear weapons incident response is $118,796,000, the same as the budget request.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

This program provides for all safeguards and security requirements at NNSA landlord sites. The Committee recommendation is $825,478,000, an increase of $85,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee increase includes $60,000,000 for the Y–12 National Security Complex to accelerate security infrastructure upgrades and consolidate the facility footprint, and $25,000,000 for the Pantex Plant to cover a shortfall in security personnel, enhanced weapons and vehicle procurements to meet critical security requirements. The Committee urges the Department to review its

DBT implementation strategy 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 if the Department hopes to have any resources remaining to execute the program. 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 necessary security improvements.

Construction Projects.—

05–D–170 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations. The Committee recommends $41,000,000, the same as the budget request.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The budget request included an offset of $32,000,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriation, 2005	$1,493,033,000
Budget estimate, 2006	1,637,239,000
Recommended, 2006	1,500,959,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+7,926,000
Budget estimate, 2006	– 136,280,000

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; Fissile Materials Disposition; and Global Threat Reduction Initiative and Program Direction funding. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation is $1,500,959,000, a decrease of $136,280,000 from the budget request of $1,637,239,000, but an increase of $7,926,000 over fiscal year 2005.

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 $335,218,000, an increase of $63,000,000 over the budget request, and includes $177,471,000 for proliferation detection, an increase of $25,000,000 over the budget request for high priority research requirements; $138,642,000 for nuclear explosion monitoring, an increase of $30,000,000 over the

request, of which $25,000,000 is for ground-based systems for treaty monitoring; and $6,105,000 for supporting activities. The Committee provides $13,000,000 for Project 06–D–180, National Security Laboratory at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), an increase of $8,000,000 from the budget request. The additional $8,000,000 is provided as construction funds to maintain the aggressive schedule in fiscal year 2006 for 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 Department's cleanup goal for 300 Area and the timely development of replacement infrastructure to maintain the national security capabilities resident at PNNL. From within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for portable high purity germanium detectors for incident response and radiation detection applications. The Committee recommendation includes the following projects from within available funds: $1,000,000 for the National Center for Biodefense at George Mason University (VA); $1,000,000 for the Offshore Detection Integrated System (OH); $750,000 for developing neutron dosimeter and Gamma-Beta Survey meter (OH); and $300,000 for the Texas A&M Moscow Physics Institute-Nonproliferation and International Security Program (TX).

The Committee expects the Department to provide significantly greater opportunities for open competition where appropriate for nonproliferation and verification research and development activities and directs the Department to conduct a free and open competitive process for at least $20,000,000 of its research and development activities during fiscal year 2006 for ground-based systems treaty monitoring. The Committee is concerned with the potential for systematic bias against non-Federal entities in the conduct of competitive procurements if non-Federal entities are required to team with DOE national laboratories. The competitive process should be open to all Federal and non-Federal entities on an equal basis.

Annual Reporting Requirement.—The Committee directs the Department to prepare an annual report on 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 2007 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 $75,836,000, a reduction of $4,337,000 from the budget request. The Committee does not support the increase over current year level for the International Emergency Management activities. The Committee recommendation includes $25,321,000 for Nonproliferation Policy, $26,045,000 for International Safeguards, $19,970,000 for Export

Control activities, $2,000,000 for Treaties and Agreements, and $2,500,000 for International Emergency Management and Cooperation.

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 help downsize the Russian nuclear weapons complex.

Limitation on Russian Program Funds.—The Committee remains concerned that the Department is not placing a high management priority on ensuring that as much of the funds appropriated for the Russian programs as practical be spent in Russia, rather than at the Department's own national laboratories in the United States. The Department's contracting mechanisms are resulting in excessive funds paying 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 United States.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS PROTECTION AND COOPERATION

The International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation (MPC&A) program 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 $428,435,000, in increase of $85,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee's increase to the MPC&A program recognizes the expanded opportunities for high priority work at the 12th Main Directorate sites in Russia. The Committee supports the Department's efforts to continue to negotiate greater access to the Russian serial production enterprise and accelerate aggressively opportunities to secure material as site access is granted. Given budget constraints, 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 weapons-usable nuclear material diversion. Within funds provided for MPC&A, the Committee provides an additional $40,000,000 for Strategic Rocket Forces activities to accelerate securing nuclear warhead sites in Russia. The Committee recommendation includes $86,185,000 for the Rosatom Weapons Complex, the same as the budget request. The Committee provides $142,929,000 for the Second Line of Defense program, an increase of $45,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation provides an additional $25,000,000 for the core

Second Line of Defense program to accelerate installation of radiation detection equipment in the Baltic and Caucasus regions and other critical border areas. The Committee provides $93,929,000 for the MegaPorts initiative, a $20,000,000 increase over the budget request, to accelerate this work at additional high-risk ports.

RUSSIAN TRANSITION INITIATIVES

The Committee recommendation for the Russian Transition Initiative (RTI) program is $30,312,000, a reduction of $7,578,000 from 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 is disappointed that the Department chose to lower the RTI Annual Performance Targets in the fiscal 2006 budget request compared to the fiscal 2005 budget request. The program performance target is defined as the annual percentage of non-US Government project funding contributions obtained. The fiscal year 2005 budget request included a goal of reaching 80% matching contributions of non-US Government contributions in fiscal year 2006 and 100% by fiscal year 2008. Instead of improving performance to achieve the goal, the Department lowered the fiscal year 2006 goal to 70% and abandoned the 100% goal altogether. The Committee expects the RTI program will be able to meet the Annual Performance Target in the fiscal year 2005 budget request at the revised fiscal year 2006 budget level. The Committee does not agree with the requested name change for the Russian Transition Initiatives program.

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 $20,483,000, the same as the budget request.

ELIMINATION OF WEAPONS-GRADE PLUTONIUM PRODUCTION

The Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production Program (EWGPP) is a cooperative effort with the Federation of Russia to halt 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 for the surrounding communities. The current approach is to shut down these three reactors within six years by providing two alternative fossil-fueled energy plants to supply heat and electricity to the surrounding communities generated by the nuclear plants.

The Committee recommendation is $197,000,000, a $65,000,000 increase to the budget request. The Committee is concerned that the Department's plan for funding the Zheleznogorsk reactor shutdown by soliciting contributions from international partners will not succeed given the recent setbacks in receiving commitments from the G–8 partners. The Committee provides $65,000,000 in additional funding to maintain the Zheleznogorsk reactor shutdown schedule. The Committee acknowledges the management improvements implemented by NNSA since the program transfer from the Defense Department and supports the program goal of halting plutonium production at all three Russian reactors.

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 concludes that the continued impasse between the United States and Russia over liability protections for U.S. companies and personnel conducting nonproliferation work in Russia has created a programmatic environment incompatible with the efficient execution of the Fissile Materials Disposition program. The latest financial data from the Department shows an available prior year balance of over $650,000,000 in the Mixed Oxide (MOX) construction project. The fiscal year 2006 budget request would increase those balances to over $1,000,000,000, yet no nuclear nonproliferation or national security benefits have been realized due to continued program delays. Faced with severe budget constraints, the Committee cannot support the continued inefficient use of these nonproliferation funds. To restate the Committee's position from last year, there is no reason to proceed with the fiscal year 2006 budget request under the assumption that the liability dispute is nearing resolution. The Department assured the Committee during fiscal year 2006 budget hearings that a resolution was imminent, as it did last year at this time, and the year before that. While the Committee supports successful implementation of the Department's nuclear nonproliferation activities, it is troubled by the inability of the Department to maintain the continuity of the government-to-government implementing agreements for Plutonium Disposition activities. The Committee's severe budget constraints in other high priority areas of Congressional interest make it an irresponsible act to allocate hundreds of millions for a program that is currently prohibited from spending the funds. The Committee will recommend a General Accounting Office (GAO) report on the realistic expenditure rates for the MOX construction project if the liability impasse is resolved to assess the most efficient use of the large uncosted balances that exist on this project.

The Committee recommendation is $301,700,000, a reduction of $351,365,000 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. The Committee includes $35,000,000 in the MOX construction project to fund site preparation activities if resolution of the liability provi-

sion allows construction activities to proceed in fiscal year 2006. Funding of $52,300,000 is provided for U.S. surplus materials disposition and $64,000,000 for the Russian plutonium disposition program. The Committee recommendation maintains O&M program activities at roughly current year levels.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommendation includes $35,000,000 in fiscal year 2006 for Project 99–D–143, the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication facility project, a reduction of $303,565,000 from the budget request. Funding of $24,000,000 is provided for Project 99–D–141, the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility project. The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for conceptual design activities for the plutonium immobilization facility requested under the Environmental Management program. The Committee determines that the Fissile Materials program more suitably manages the plutonium disposition activities for the Department.

GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

The Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI) mission is to identify, secure, remove and facilitate the disposition of high-risk, vulnerable nuclear and radiological materials and equipment around the world. The Committee recommendation is $111,975,000, a $14,000,000 increase to the President's request. The Committee provides an additional $20,000,000 for the Reduced Enrichment for Research and Test Reactors (RERTR) program to accelerate the conversion of domestic research reactors fuel from highly enriched uranium to low enriched uranium. The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the Kazakhstan Spent Fuel Disposition initiative, a reduction of $6,000,000 from the request. The Committee is concerned the baseline plan for the BN–350 reactor spent fuel does not reflect the post-9/11 threat environment of the region and requires additional review. None of the funds provided for this activity in fiscal year 2006, or previous fiscal years, may be obligated for transportation equipment or activities without first notifying the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriation, 2005	$801,437,000
Budget estimate, 2006	786,000,000
Recommended, 2006	799,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−1,034,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+13,500,000

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 $799,500,000, an increase of $13,500,000 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).

The Committee's increase is provided to maintain the current level of operations and implement the Long Range Operating Plan at the ATR.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriation, 2005	$353,350,000
Budget estimate, 2006	343,869,000
Recommended, 2006	366,869,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+13,019,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+23,000,000

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 $366,369,000, an increase of $22,500,000 above the budget request. The increase is provided as the NNSA contribution to the Department's support for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). 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 recommendation provides funds to support two additional Federal employees for the NNSA counterintelligence program. The additional staff is needed to support NNSA counterintelligence (CI) initiatives, integration with national level counterintelligence objectives and NNSA CI program management.

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 appreciates the serious effort of the NNSA to follow last year's Congressional direction to implement an aggressive program to take advantage of 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 is again providing $22,500,000 of additional funding to expand the support to the HBCUs scientific and technical programs in fiscal year 2006. The Committee expects the Department to provide financial support in rough parity to both HBCUs and the Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI). The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 each for Wilberforce University and Central State University in Wilberforce, Ohio; $2,000,000 for Claflin College in Orangeburg, SC; $4,000,000 for Allen University in Columbia, SC; and $1,000,000 each for Voorhees College in Denmark, SC and South Carolina State University in Orangeburg, SC, and Florida Memorial University for the Carrie Meek Health and Science Complex in Miami Gardens, FL. The Committee directs the Department to provide funds to HBCU institutions to allow for infrastructure improvements and technical programs. The Committee expects the Department to ensure the Dr. Samuel P. Massie Chairs of Excellence are fully supported within the HBCU program.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

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.

The Defense Environmental Management activities were previously funded in two separate accounts, Defense Site Acceleration Completion and Defense Environmental Services, and are now combined into one account, Defense Environmental Cleanup.

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

Milestone report.—While the budget structure has changed, the Committee remains interested in whether the Department has met its goals for completion for years 2006, 2012, and 2035. Beginning December 31, 2005, the Committee requests a quarterly report by site that tracks accelerated clean-up milestones, whether they are being met or not, and includes annual budget estimates and life-cycle costs.

NNSA Transfer.—The Committee does not support the transfer of environmental cleanup responsibilities to the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The Committee believes that this proposal was not sufficiently justified by the Department, and has concerns that the mission orientation and experience in environmental cleanup is not resident in NNSA. As currently proposed, the transfer has the potential for unintentional adverse outcomes for both the weapons mission and cleanup programs. The Committee will consider future transfer requests when the Department has provided a more extensive, thoughtful justification.

Low-level radioactive waste disposal costs.—The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002, directed the Department to prepare analysis of life-cycle costs of disposing of low-level radioactive waste and mixed low-level radioactive waste (LLW/MLLW). The conference committee was concerned with DOE's practices for disposal of LLW. These concerns centered on DOE's use of federal versus commercial disposal facilities and the life-cycle costs of each option. The House Committee on Appropriations noted that (1) DOE's was relying too heavily on its on-site and off-site disposal facilities, inhibiting development of a viable and competi-

tive commercial disposal industry, and (2) commercial disposal facilities may offer DOE the lowest life-cycle cost for waste disposal. DOE responded with a July 2002 life-cycle cost report to Congress, which specified actions it would take to ensure that sites use life-cycle cost analyses, including justification for expansion or new construction of on-site disposal facilities. DOE issued guidance in July 2002 directing its field offices to use full "cradle to grave" life cycle costs and analysis of options in making LLW disposal decisions. The Committee requested that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) review the Department's implementation of using life-cycle analyses to evaluate LLW/MLLW disposal options. GAO found that DOE sites do not consistently use life-cycle analyses to evaluate LLW/MLLW disposal options, which may be caused by DOE's ineffective communication and implementation of life cycle cost analysis guidance, and lack of oversight. GAO found that sites may conduct cost analyses of disposal options for major waste streams or projects, but most analyses did not include all life-cycle cost elements; some sites pursue waste disposal without fully considering alternatives; and DOE sites do not always use life-cycle analyses to evaluate on-site versus off-site disposal options. The Committee is most concerned with the Department's response to GAO that, rather than relying on life-cycle cost analyses, DOE is relying increasingly on incentive-based contracts to ensure cost-effective decisionmaking. The Committee could not disagree more.

Report Requirement.—The lack of implementing life-cycle cost analyses when considering LLW/MLW disposal options is a blatant disregard for Congressional direction. While contractors should pursue cost-effective clean-up activities at a site, it is up to the Federal management responsible for those contractors to provide guidance and make decisions that benefit the whole DOE complex. Relying on incentive-based contracts to "take care of it all" is an abrogation of duty by the federal managers. As such, the Secretary is directed to report to the Committee, within 30 days of enactment, on the specific steps the Department will take to ensure that life-cycle cost guidance is implemented in the consideration of LLW/MLW options by DOE contractors, and that a robust federal cadre of employees will oversee the implementation of such guidance.

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. In fiscal year 2006, the Department may transfer up to $5,000,000 between control points, as noted in the table below, to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increased or decreased by more than $5,000,000 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 of the House and Senate must be notified within thirty days of the use of this reprogramming authority.

CONTROL LEVELS FOR REPROGRAMMING

Savannah River site, 2012 accelerations	Closure sites
Savannah River site, 2035 accelerations	Program direction
Savannah River Tank Form	
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	Program support
Idaho National Laboratory	UE D&D fund contribution
Oak Ridge Reservation	Technology development
Hanford site, 2012 accelerated completions	All construction line items
Hanford site, 2035 accelerated completions	NNSA sites & Nevada off-sites
Office of River Protection, waste treatment & immobilization	Safeguards and Security
Office of River Protection, tank farm activities	

Details of the recommended funding levels follow below for the Defense Environmental Cleanup account.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriation, 2005	$6,808,319,000
Budget estimate, 2006	6,015,044,000
Recommended, 2006	6,468,336,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−339,953,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+453,292,000

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Cleanup totals $6,468,336,000, an increase of $453,292,000 to the budget request of $6,015,044,000. Within the amounts provided, the Department is directed to fund hazardous waste worker training at $10,000,000.

Closure Sites.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,038,589,000, an increase of $30,000,000 over the budget request. Cleanup of this category of sites is expected to be complete in fiscal year 2006. The recommendation provides $579,950,000 for Rocky Flats, Colorado; $327,609,000 for Fernald, Ohio; $16,000,000 for Ashtabula, Ohio; and $9,500,000 for West Jefferson site, Columbus, Ohio. The Committee provides $105,530,000, an increase of $30,000,000 for the Miamisburg Closure Project. The increase over the request is to address the remaining hazardous wastes serving as the source term for Operable Unit 1 (OU–1).

The Committee directs the Department to work with the Miamisburg Mound Community Improvement Corporation (MMCIC) to establish a remedy for OU–1 that is protective of human health and the environment, complies with regulatory requirements, is permanent, reduces contaminants, demonstrates an efficient use of the Government's resources, and permits reuse as provided in the MMCIC Comprehensive Reuse Plan. The Committee directs the Department to report back to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the path forward for remediating OU–1 not later than December 1, 2005.

Savannah River Site.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,219,082,000 for cleanup at the Savannah River Site, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee does not support the request of $10,000,000 for the melt and dilute technology for excess weapons-grade plutonium, because it is more appropriately funded within the National Nuclear Security Administration, as it addresses the disposition of fissile material, not cleanup responsibilities.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).—The Committee recommendation provides $212,629,000 for the Waste Isolation Pilot

Project, the same as the budget request, and a decrease of $12,743,000 from fiscal year 2005.

Idaho National Laboratory.—The Committee recommendation provides $531,725,000, the same as the budget request.

Oak Ridge Reservation.—The Committee recommendation provides $202,652,000, an increase of $16,100,000 over the budget request. The recommendation includes an increase of $3,600,000 for the design of an upgraded waste treatment system; an increase of $6,000,000 to accelerate nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning at Oak Ridge National Laboratory; and, an increase of $6,500,000 to accelerate the nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning at East Tennessee Technology Park.

Hanford Site.—The Committee recommendation provides $821,010,000 for the Hanford Site, an increase of $71,293,000 over the budget request. The recommendation provides $206,565,000 for nuclear material stabilization and disposition, an increase of $15,793,000 over the budget request, and $188,501,000 for nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning River Corridor, an increase of $20,000,000 over the budget request. These increases are provided to maintain 2012 completion. The Committee recommendation provides $7,500,000 for the Volpentest Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) training and education center, and $1,000,000 for preservation of the B Reactor as a historic landmark. The recommendation provides $58,479,000 for spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition, the same as the budget request.

The recommendation includes $173,113,000 for solid waste stabilization and disposition in the 200 Area, an increase of $8,000,000 over the budget request, $86,955,000 for soil and water remediation, an increase of $14,000,000 over the budget request, and $75,812,000 for nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning for the remainder of Hanford, an increase of $5,000,000 over the request. The Committee recommendation provides $5,861,000 to operate the waste disposal facility, $1,813,000 for spent fuel stabilization and storage, and $15,411,000 for Richland community and regulatory support, the same as the budget request.

Office of River Protection.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,051,918,000 for the Office of River Protection, an increase of $123,612,000 over the request, and an increase of $59,505,000 over fiscal year 2005 enacted levels. The recommendation includes $690,000,000 for the waste treatment and immobilization plant, an increase of $64,107,000 over the request of $625,000,000, and an increase of $5,520,000 over fiscal year 2005 enacted levels. The increase is to maintain the project on a pace consistent with contractual agreements and completion dates. The recommendation includes $361,447,000 for radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition, an increase of $67,000,000 over the request of $294,447,000, to continue tank retrievals and closure demonstrations. The Committee supports the expeditious removal of high-level liquid waste from the tanks, and immobilization, and is concerned the Administration does not share these same priorities, as reflected in the budget request. The Committee recommends no funding for the immobilized high level waste interim storage facil-

ity, a $7,495,000 reduction from the budget request. Construction of the storage facility for vitrified waste is premature in light of the timetable for the immobilization facility. The recommendation provides $471,000, the same as the budget request, for community and regulatory support.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation provides $248,816,000, an increase of $17,885,000 over the request of $230,931,000. The increase reflects the return of program direction funds to the Environmental Management program that otherwise would have gone to the NNSA. Of the total amount of $248,816,000, $82,924,000 is available for obligation only after the report delivery to the Committee by the Secretary on the specific steps the Department will take to ensure that life-cycle cost guidance is implemented in the consideration of LLW/MLW options by DOE contractors.

Program Support.—The Committee recommendation provides $32,846,000 for program support, the same as the budget request.

Federal Contribution to Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.—The Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–486) created the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund to pay for the cost of cleanup of the gaseous diffusion facilities located in Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Paducah, Kentucky; and Portsmouth, Ohio. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $451,000,000 for the Federal contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund as authorized in Public Law 102–486.

Technology Development and Deployment.—The Committee recommendation provides $21,389,000, the same as the budget request. Within the amounts provided, the Department is directed to fund the real-time identification warning system at $250,000, the Hanford Tank Waste Operations Simulator at $2,000,000, and the Mid-Atlantic Recycling Center for End of Life Electronics at $1,000,000.

NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites.—The Committee recommendation provides $349,457,000, an increase of $204,402,000 over the budget request. The increase reflects the return of cleanup activities to the Environmental Management program that otherwise would have transferred to the NNSA.

Safeguards and Security.—The Committee recommendation provides $287,223,000, the same as the budget request.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2005	$687,149,000
Budget estimate, 2006	635,998,000
Recommended, 2006	702,498,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+15,349,000
Budget estimate, 2005	+66,500,000

This account provides funding for the Office of Security and Performance Assurance; Intelligence; Counterintelligence; Environment, Safety and Health (Defense); Legacy Management; Funding for Defense Activities in Idaho; Defense Related Administrative Support; and the Office of Hearings and Appeals. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

OFFICE OF SECURITY AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Office of Security and Performance Assurance (SSA) provides domestic safeguards and security for nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, nuclear facilities, and classified and unclassified information 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 $357,595,000, an increase of $56,500,000 over the budget request. The Committee's increase is provided to support design and construction activities to upgrade CPP–651 and CPP–691 at the Idaho National Laboratory for complex-wide material consolidation of special nuclear material. The Department is directed to provide an implementation plan for consolidation to the Committee, due September 30, 2005, on the total cost, schedule, and consolidation capacity of the Idaho facilities and the candidate material inventories available for consolidation. The Committee also provides $20,000,000 to begin the immediate transfer of the excess uranium-233 stored in Building 3019 at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory to the Y–12 National Security Complex for safe, secure interim storage. As a legacy weapons material, the Committee recognizes that the program owner of the excess uranium-233 material is the National Nuclear Security Administration and program responsibility transfers to the NNSA with the termination of Medical Isotope Production and Building 3019 Complex Shutdown project. The Committee provides funding within SSA to coordinate the shutdown activities and the transfer of this material to secure storage on an NNSA site. The Committee directs the Department to evaluate other existing blend down/reprocessing capability within the complex to complete the material stabilization for long-term interim safe storage. The Secretary is directed to submit the report to the Committee on alternative disposition options for excess uranium-233 in Building 3019 that includes all options meeting the 2004 DBT requirements, maintaining all worker health and safety requirements, and cost estimates based on total life cycle costs including long term disposition. This report is due to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees by September 30, 2005.

In fiscal year 2006, the Department of Energy will spend $1.45 billion on safeguards and security activities at Headquarters and field locations. Funding for safeguards and security activities at Departmental facilities and laboratories for programmatic activities 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.

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 $77,029,000, the same as the budget request.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $78,598,000 for the Office of Legacy Management to manage the long-term stewardship responsibilities at the Department of Energy clean up sites. The Committee recommendation provides $55,076,000 in Other Defense Activities and the balance of $23,522,000 is provided in the non-defense Energy Supply account. The Department is directed to provide a report to the Committee, due September 30, 2005, on the Department's management plan and five-year cost estimates associated with procuring the services of a national stewardship contractor to administer the pension and benefit payments to former Environmental Management closure site contractor employees. The report should include detailed cost estimates of the pension and benefit liability by site and contract at the former cleanup sites. The Committee recommendation provides no funds for the worker and community transition activities.

FUNDING FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES IN IDAHO

The Committee recommendation includes $123,873,000 to fund the defense-related (050 budget function) activities at the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) and associated Idaho cleanup sites. This amount includes $17,762,000 for INL infrastructure, the same as the budget request, 75,008,000 for Idaho site-wide safeguards and security, the same as the budget request; and $31,103,000 for program direction to support Headquarters and Idaho Field Office personnel.

DEFENSE RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $87,575,000, the same as the budget request, 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 $4,353,000, the same as the budget request.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation for funding adjustments includes 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, 2005	$229,152,000
Budget estimate, 2006	351,447,000
Recommended, 2006	351,447,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+122,295,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

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. The total amount due from defense contributions is estimated at $5.8 billion, of which only $2.6 billion has been appropriated through the end of fiscal year 2005, with a balance owed of approximately $3.2 billion. An estimated defense contribution of $2.8 billion will be required after fiscal year 2006 to fulfill the remaining defense obligation.

The Committee recommendation is $351,447,000, the same as the budget request. Coupled with the $310,000,000 provided under the Nuclear Waste Disposal account, the Committee provides a total of $661,447,000 for the Yucca Mountain repository.

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.

The Committee rejects the Administration proposal to recover expenses related to operations and maintenance activities and program direction expenditures using offsetting collections and the proposal to increase the power marketing administration rates to reflect market based rates.

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 2006 does not support the Administration proposal to continue the phase-out of Federal financing 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 2006 maintains purchase power and wheeling activities at approximately the fiscal year 2005 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 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 recommendation provides no new borrowing authority during fiscal year 2006.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2005	$5,158,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....
Recommended, 2006	5,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+442,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+5,600,000

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 $5,600,000, an increase of $5,600,000 from the budget request. The total program level for Southeastern in fiscal year 2006 is $38,313,000, with $32,713,000 for purchase power and wheeling and $5,600,000 for program direction. The purchase power and wheeling costs will be offset by collections of $32,713,000 provided in this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2005	$29,117,000
Budget estimate, 2006	3,166,000
Recommended, 2006	30,166,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+1,049,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+$27,000,000

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 $30,166,000, an increase of $27,000,000. The Committee's restoration of $27,000,000 to the fiscal year 2006 budget reflects the Committee's rejection of the Administration's proposal to recover expenses related to operations and maintenance activities and program direction expenditures using offsetting collections. The total program level for Southwestern in fiscal year 2006 is $30,166,000, including $7,042,000 for operating expenses, $1,235,000 for purchase power and wheeling, $19,958,000 for program direction, and $3,166,000 for construction. The offset of $1,235,000 from collections for purchase power and wheeling yields a net appropriation of $30,166,000. The offsetting collections total $1,235,000 provided in this Act.

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

Appropriation, 2005	$171,715,000
Budget estimate, 2006	53,957,000
Recommended, 2006	226,992,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+55,277,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+173,035,000

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 $226,992,000, an increase of $173,035,000 from the budget request. The total O&M program level for Western in fiscal

year 2006 is $379,654,000, which includes $40,192,000 for construction and rehabilitation, $47,295,000 for system operation and maintenance, $148,500,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and $143,667,000 for program direction. Offsetting collections total $152,662,000; with the use of $4,162,000 of offsetting collections from the Colorado River Dam Fund (as authorized in P.L. 98–381), this requires a net appropriation of $226,992,000.

The Committee continues to keep a keen interest in the on-going implementation and operation of the Sierra-Nevada Region's Post-2004 Power Marketing Plan and Transmission Operations. The Committee is supportive of the newly created sub-control area and plan; however it reiterates its concern to WAPA that is must follow the five criteria laid out in the Federal Register to maintain and enhance flexibility, certainty, durability, operating transparency, and most importantly, cost effectiveness to its customers. Therefore, the Committee directs WAPA to submit a report to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Resources by January 1, 2006 regarding the implementation of the Post-2004 Power Marketing Plan and Transmission Operations, and specifically identify the difference, if any, in the cost effectiveness, operating transparency, durability, certainty and flexibility of the current plan versus the Federal Register notice of December 3, 2003.

Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 to complete the Topock-Davis segment of the Topock-Davis-Mead line to provide additional transmission capacity by using aluminum matrix composite conductor technology.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriation, 2005	$2,804,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....
Recommended, 2006	2,692,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−112
Budget estimate, 2006	+2,692,000

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 $2,692,000.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2005	$208,320,000
Budget estimate, 2006	220,400,000
Recommended, 2006	220,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+12,080,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 2004	$ – 208,320,000
Budget estimate, 2005	– 220,400,000
Recommended, 2005	– 220,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2004	– 12,080,000
Budget estimate, 2005	.....

The Committee recommendation for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is $220,400,000, 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 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION			
ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY			
Hydrogen Technology:			
Hydrogen technology	94,562	99,094	99,094
Fuel cell technologies	74,944	83,600	83,600
Subtotal, hydrogen technology	169,506	182,694	182,694
Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D	89,063	72,164	86,164
Solar energy	85,841	83,953	83,953
Wind energy systems	41,267	44,249	44,249
Geothermal technology	25,594	23,299	23,299
Hydropower	4,960	500	500
Vehicle technologies	166,905	165,943	167,943
Building technologies	67,138	57,966	64,966
Industrial technologies	75,349	56,489	58,891
Distributed energy and electricity reliability	60,626	56,629	56,629
Federal Energy Management Program:			
Departmental energy management program	1,951	2,019	2,019
Federal energy management program	18,144	17,147	17,147
Subtotal, Federal Energy Management Program	20,095	19,166	19,166
Facilities and infrastructure:			
National Renewable Energy Laboratory	4,762	5,800	5,800
Construction			
02-E-001 Science and technology facility, NREL	6,627	10,515	10,515
Total, Facilities and infrastructure	11,389	16,315	16,315
Weatherization and Intergovernmental program:			
Weatherization assistance	224,738	225,400	235,400
Training and technical assistance	3,422	4,600	4,600
State energy program grants	44,176	41,000	41,000
State energy activities	2,320	500	500
Gateway deployment	34,973	26,657	25,657
International renewable energy program	6,449	2,910	3,910
Tribal energy activities	5,457	4,000	4,000
Renewable energy production incentive	4,960	5,000	5,000
Subtotal, Weatherization and Intergovernmental program	326,495	310,067	320,067
Program Direction	93,129	101,524	101,524
Program Support	16,837	9,456	9,456
Use of prior year balances	-5,318	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	1,248,876	1,200,414	1,235,816
ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION			
High temperature superconductivity R&D	54,560	45,000	45,000
Transmission reliability R&D	15,594	9,220	13,220
Electricity distribution transformation R&D	5,415	4,037	4,037
Energy storage R&D	3,968	3,000	3,000
Gridwise	6,448	5,500	6,745
Gridworks	5,456	5,000	5,000
Total, Research and development	91,441	71,757	77,002
Electricity restructuring	19,840	12,400	12,400
Program direction	8,135	11,447	10,447

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
Construction			
04-E-001 Project engineering and design (PED), energy reliability and efficiency laboratory	769	---	---
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION	120,185	95,604	99,849
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
University reactor infrastructure and education assist	23,808	24,000	24,000
Research and development			
Nuclear energy plant optimization	2,480	---	---
Nuclear energy research initiative	2,480	---	---
Nuclear power 2010	49,600	56,000	46,000
Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative	39,680	45,000	45,000
Nuclear hydrogen initiative	8,928	20,000	20,000
Advanced fuel cycle initiative	67,456	70,000	75,500
Total, Research and development	170,624	191,000	186,500
Infrastructure			
Radiological facilities management			
Space and defense infrastructure	33,530	31,200	39,700
Medical isotopes infrastructure	21,024	14,395	14,395
Construction			
05-E-203 Facility modifications for U-233 di disposition, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN	13,507	18,705	---
Subtotal, Medical isotopes infrastructure	34,531	33,100	14,395
Enrichment facility and uranium management	496	500	500
Subtotal, Radiological facilities management	68,557	64,800	54,595
Idaho facilities management			
INL Operations and infrastructure	120,555	86,907	102,907
Construction			
06-E-200 Project engineering and design (PED), INL, ID	---	7,870	7,870
06-E-201 Gas test loop in the ATR, INL, ID	---	3,085	3,085
99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Lab, ID	1,511	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	1,511	10,955	10,955
Subtotal, Idaho facilities management	122,066	97,862	113,862
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	58,103	75,008	75,008
Total, Infrastructure	248,726	237,670	243,465
Spent nuclear fuel management	6,681	---	---
Program direction	60,076	61,109	61,109
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy	509,915	513,779	515,074
Funding from other defense activities	-114,347	-123,873	-123,873
Funding from Naval Reactors	-10,000	---	-13,500
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	385,568	389,906	377,701

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)	7,936	9,100	5,100
Program direction	19,842	20,900	20,900
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	27,778	30,000	26,000
OFFICE OF LEGACY MANAGEMENT			
Legacy management	30,881	33,522	23,522
Subtotal, Energy supply and conservation	1,813,288	1,749,446	1,762,888
Use of prior year balances	-6,352	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION	1,806,936	1,749,446	1,762,888
CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY			
Deferral of unobligated balances, FY 2005	-257,000	257,000	257,000
Deferral of unobligated balances, FY 2007	---	---	-257,000
Rescission	---	-257,000	---
Total, Clean Coal Technology	-257,000	---	---
FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			
Clean coal power initiative	49,305	50,000	50,000
FutureGen	17,750	18,000	18,000
Advance appropriation, FY 2007	---	257,000	---
Fuels and Power Systems:			
Innovations for existing plants	19,081	23,850	23,850
Advanced integrated gasification combined cycle	45,805	56,450	56,450
Advanced turbines	15,383	18,000	18,000
Carbon sequestration	45,361	67,200	50,000
Fuels	32,147	22,000	22,000
Fuel cells	77,386	65,000	65,000
Advanced research	42,699	30,500	30,500
Combustion systems	5,227	---	---
U.S./China Energy and environmental center	986	---	---
Subtotal, Fuels and power systems	284,075	283,000	265,800
Subtotal, Coal	351,130	608,000	333,800
Natural Gas Technologies	44,839	10,000	33,000
Petroleum - Oil Technologies	33,921	10,000	29,000
Program direction	104,528	98,941	105,152
Plant and Capital Equipment	6,902	---	---
Fossil energy environmental restoration	9,467	8,060	8,060
Import/export authorization	1,774	1,799	1,799
Advanced metallurgical research	9,861	8,000	8,000
National academy of sciences program review	493	---	---
Special recruitment programs	656	656	656
Cooperative research and development	8,283	3,000	3,000
Use of prior year balances	---	---	-20,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
Subtotal, FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	571,854	491,456	502,467
Advance appropriations	---	257,000	---
Total, FOSSIL ENERGY R&D INCLUDING ADVANCES	571,854	748,456	502,467
NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES	17,750	18,500	18,500
ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUNDS	72,000	84,000	84,000
STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE	169,710	166,000	166,000
NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE	4,930	---	---
ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION	83,819	85,926	86,426
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP			
West Valley Demonstration Project	73,628	77,100	77,100
Gaseous Diffusion Plants	143,962	45,528	45,528
Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion, 02-U-101	99,200	85,803	70,803
Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility (WA)	45,715	46,113	41,113
Small Sites:			
Argonne National Lab	785	10,487	10,487
Brookhaven National Lab	42,316	34,328	34,328
Idaho National Lab	---	5,274	5,274
Consolidated Business Center:			
California Site support	98	100	100
Inhalation Toxicology Lab	487	305	305
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab	4,038	3,900	3,900
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center	2,480	3,500	3,500
Energy Technology Engineering Center	18,238	9,000	9,000
Los Alamos National Lab	447	490	490
Lab for Energy-Related Health Research	496	---	---
Moab	7,711	28,006	18,006
Subtotal, small sites	77,096	95,390	85,390
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	439,601	349,934	319,934
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and decommissioning	415,655	571,498	571,498
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	79,360	20,000	20,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT D&D FUND	495,015	591,498	591,498
SCIENCE			
High energy physics			
Proton accelerator-based physics	401,120	387,093	398,093
Electron accelerator-based physics	143,929	132,822	132,822
Non-accelerator physics	46,934	38,589	38,589
Theoretical physics	48,995	49,103	49,103
Advanced technology R&D	94,721	106,326	117,326
Subtotal,	735,699	713,933	735,933
Construction			
98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	745	---	---
Total, High energy physics	736,444	713,933	735,933
Nuclear physics	404,778	368,741	406,341
Construction			
06-SC-02 Project engineering and design (PED),			

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
Electron beam ion source, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY	---	2,000	2,000
Total, Nuclear physics	404,778	370,741	408,341
Biological and environmental research	571,992	455,688	525,688
Construction			
05-SC-004 Project engineering and design (PED), facility for the production and characterization of proteins and molecular tags	9,920	---	---
Basic energy sciences			
Research			
Materials sciences and engineering research	635,132	746,143	772,025
Chemical sciences, geosciences and energy biosciences	239,475	221,801	223,051
Subtotal, Research	874,607	967,944	995,076
Construction			
05-R-320 LINAC coherent light source (LCLS)	29,760	83,000	83,000
05-R-321 Center for functional nanomaterials (BNL)	18,317	36,553	36,553
04-R-313 The molecular foundry (LBNL)	31,828	9,606	9,606
03-SC-002 Project engineering & design (PED) SLAC	19,914	2,544	2,544
03-R-312 Center for nanophase materials sciences, ORNL	17,669	---	---
03-R-313 Center for Integrated Nanotechnology	30,650	4,626	4,626
02-SC-002 Project engineering and design (VL)	1,996	---	---
99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	79,891	41,744	41,744
Subtotal, Construction	230,025	178,073	178,073
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,104,632	1,146,017	1,173,149
Advanced scientific computing research	232,468	207,055	246,055
Science laboratories infrastructure			
Laboratories facilities support			
Infrastructure support	1,752	1,520	1,520
General plant projects	---	3,000	3,000
Construction			
04-SC-001 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	4,960	3,000	3,000
03-SC-001 Science laboratories infrastructure MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	19,236	12,869	14,869
Subtotal, Construction	24,196	15,869	17,869
Subtotal, Laboratories facilities support	25,948	20,389	22,389
Oak Ridge landlord	5,039	5,079	5,079
Excess facilities disposal	6,051	14,637	14,637
Safety-related corrective actions	4,960	---	---
Total, Science laboratories infrastructure	41,998	40,105	42,105

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
Fusion energy sciences program	273,903	290,550	296,155
Safeguards and security	72,773	74,317	74,317
Workforce development for teachers and scientists	7,599	7,192	7,192
Science program direction			
Field offices	88,809	92,593	92,593
Headquarters	65,222	70,132	70,132
Total, Science program direction	154,031	162,725	162,725
Subtotal, Science	3,610,538	3,468,323	3,671,660
Use of prior year balances	-5,062	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-5,605	-5,605	-5,605
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,599,871	3,462,718	3,666,055
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Repository program	263,872	218,536	228,536
Program direction	79,360	81,464	81,464
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	343,232	300,000	310,000
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations			
Salaries and expenses			
Office of the Secretary	4,644	5,399	4,843
Board of contract appeals	648	648	680
Chief information officer	37,967	51,122	39,865
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,826	5,089	5,067
Economic impact and diversity	5,099	5,352	5,352
General counsel	21,774	24,217	22,780
Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation	106,850	111,806	110,300
Policy and international affairs	14,993	18,844	15,743
Public affairs	2,459	4,504	3,566
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	199,260	226,981	208,196
Program support			
Minority economic impact	823	830	823
Policy analysis and system studies	392	395	392
Environmental policy studies	562	567	562
Cybersecurity and secure communications	24,733	32,000	24,733
Corporate management information program	31,881	23,055	23,055
Subtotal, Program support	58,391	56,847	49,565
Competitive sourcing initiative (A-76)	2,480	3,000	3,000
Total, Administrative operations	260,131	286,828	260,761
Cost of work for others	71,048	80,723	80,723
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	331,179	367,551	341,484
Funding from other defense activities	-91,700	-87,575	-87,575
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	239,479	279,976	253,909

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
Miscellaneous revenues	-122,000	-123,000	-123,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	117,479	156,976	130,909
Office of Inspector General	41,176	43,000	43,000
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Directed stockpile work			
Life extension program			
B61	116,984	50,810	50,810
W76	234,536	162,268	162,268
W80	145,239	135,240	100,240
Subtotal, Life extension program	496,759	348,318	313,318
Stockpile systems			
B61	90,526	66,050	66,050
W62	18,254	8,967	8,967
W76	136,427	63,538	63,538
W78	43,958	32,632	32,632
W80	39,191	26,315	16,315
B83	44,635	26,391	26,391
W84	6,070	4,402	4,402
W87	79,245	50,678	50,678
W88	48,700	32,831	32,831
Subtotal, Stockpile systems	507,006	311,804	301,804
Reliable replacement warhead	8,928	9,351	25,000
Warheads Dismantlement	74,400	35,245	110,245
Stockpile services			
Production support	---	267,246	200,246
Research and development	---	66,753	50,753
Research and development certification and safety	146,802	211,727	150,727
Management, technology, and production	112,196	166,587	131,589
Robust nuclear earth penetrator	---	4,000	---
Subtotal, Stockpile services	258,998	716,313	533,315
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,346,091	1,421,031	1,283,682
Campaigns			
Science campaigns			
Primary assessment technologies	73,381	45,179	35,179
Test readiness	---	25,000	15,000
Dynamic materials properties	85,829	80,894	70,894
Advanced radiography	54,928	49,520	40,500
Secondary assessment technologies	63,088	61,332	55,332
Subtotal, Science campaigns	277,226	261,925	216,905
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	32,856	29,845	22,000
Weapons system engineering assessment technology	27,052	24,040	15,040

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
Nuclear survivability	9,384	9,386	9,386
Enhanced surveillance	99,080	96,207	76,000
Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), other project costs	4,563	4,714	4,714
Construction			
01-D-108 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM	85,808	65,564	65,564
Subtotal, MESA	90,371	70,278	70,278
Subtotal, Engineering campaign	258,743	229,756	192,704
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign:			
Ignition	68,882	75,615	75,615
Support of stockpile program	38,675	9,872	9,872
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experiment support	48,631	43,008	43,008
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	10,991	10,111	10,111
University grants/other support	7,714	9,946	9,946
Facility operations and target production	62,552	54,623	69,623
Inertial fusion technology	33,728	---	40,000
NIF demonstration program	94,934	112,330	112,330
High-energy petawatt laser development	41,639	3,000	29,000
Subtotal	407,746	318,505	399,505
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL	128,960	141,913	141,913
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	536,706	460,418	541,418
Advanced simulation and computing	694,928	660,830	500,830
Construction			
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	3,202	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	3,202	---	---
Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing	698,130	660,830	500,830
Pit manufacturing and certification			
W88 pit manufacturing	130,949	120,926	120,926
W88 pit certification	60,472	61,895	61,895
Pit manufacturing capability	13,392	23,071	23,071
Modern pit facility	6,944	7,686	---
Pit campaign support activities at NTS	51,788	35,182	35,182
Subtotal, Pit manufacturing and certification	263,545	248,760	241,074
Readiness campaign			
Stockpile readiness	45,446	31,400	31,400
High explosives readiness/assembly campaign	33,946	17,097	17,097
Non-nuclear readiness	32,693	28,630	28,630
Advanced design and production technologies	79,150	54,040	54,040
Tritium readiness	58,379	62,694	62,694
Construction			
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	20,832	24,894	24,894
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	79,211	87,588	87,588
Subtotal, Readiness campaign	270,446	218,755	218,755

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
Total, Campaigns	2,304,796	2,080,444	1,911,686
Readiness in technical base and facilities			
Operations of facilities	1,112,585	1,160,783	1,204,786
Program readiness	105,354	105,738	105,738
Special projects	41,168	6,619	---
Material recycle and recovery	86,269	72,730	72,730
Containers	17,767	17,247	17,247
Storage	18,830	25,222	25,322
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,381,973	1,388,339	1,425,823
Construction			
06-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	---	14,113	14,113
06-D-402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV	---	8,284	8,284
06-D-403 Tritium facility modernization Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA	---	2,600	2,600
06-D-404 Building remediation, restoration, and upgrade, Nevada Test Site, NV	---	16,000	16,000
05-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	16,467	5,000	5,000
05-D-401 Building 12-64 production bays upgrades, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	24,899	11,000	11,000
05-D-402 Berylium capability (BEC) project, Y-12 National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN	3,598	7,700	7,700
04-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	1,488	2,000	2,000
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	39,680	55,000	---
04-D-126 Building 12-44 production cells upgrade, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	2,579	---	---
04-D-128 TA-18 mission relocation project, Los Alamos Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	---	13,000	13,000
03-D-102, National Security Sciences building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	37,049	---	---
03-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	15,153	29,000	15,000
03-D-123 Special nuclear materials requalification, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	4,565	---	---
02-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	5,208	---	---
02-D-105 Engineering technology complex upgrade, LLNL, CA	5,357	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	5,952	9,000	9,000
01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	113,088	70,350	81,350
Subtotal, Construction	275,083	243,047	185,047
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,657,056	1,631,386	1,610,870
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	289,239	233,484	200,484
Construction			
06-D-160 Project engioneering and design (PED), various locations	---	5,811	5,811
06-D-601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	4,000	4,000
06-D-602 Gas main and distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	3,700	3,700
06-D-603 Steam plant life extension project (SLEP), Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN	---	729	729
05-D-160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program project engineering design (PED), various locations	8,630	10,644	10,644
05-D-601 Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y-12, National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN	4,365	9,741	9,741
05-D-602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	9,920	8,500	8,500
05-D-603 New master substation (NMSU), SNL	595	6,900	6,900
04-D-203 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), project engineering design (PED), various locations	973	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	24,483	50,025	50,025
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	313,722	283,509	250,509
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	142,722	143,766	143,766
Program direction	56,968	68,334	68,334
Total, Secure transportation asset	199,690	212,100	212,100
Nuclear weapons incident response	98,415	118,796	118,796
Environmental projects and operations			
Environmental projects and operations program	---	156,504	---
Program direction	---	17,885	---
Subtotal, Environmental projects and operations	---	174,389	---
Safeguards and security	714,913	699,478	784,478
Construction			
05-D-170 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	16,864	41,000	41,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
05-D-701 Security perimeter project, Los Alamos, National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	19,840	---	---
Total, Safeguards and security	751,617	740,478	825,478
Subtotal, Weapons activities	6,671,387	6,662,133	6,213,121
Use of prior year balances	-14,039	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-29,760	-32,000	-32,000
Undistributed miscellaneous adjustment	4,002	---	---
Excluding transfer of DOD ppropriations	-300,000	---	---
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	6,331,590	6,630,133	6,181,121
Transfer from Department of Defense appropriations	(300,000)	---	---
Total, Weapons Activities (program level)	(6,631,590)	(6,630,133)	(6,181,121)
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	223,944	267,218	322,218
Construction			
06-D-180 Project engineering and design (PED), National Security Laboratory, PNNL	---	5,000	13,000
Subtotal, Nonproliferation & verification R & D	223,944	272,218	335,218
Nonproliferation and international security	152,768	80,173	75,836
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	319,424	343,435	428,435
Russian transition initiative	40,672	37,890	30,312
HEU transparency implementation	20,782	20,483	20,483
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	39,776	132,000	197,000
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus materials disposition	158,422	226,500	168,700
Russian surplus materials disposition	63,488	64,000	64,000
Construction			
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	32,042	24,000	24,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	365,056	338,565	35,000
Subtotal, Construction	397,098	362,565	59,000
Melt and dilute immobilization project	---	---	10,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	619,008	653,065	301,700
Offsite source recovery project	7,539	---	---
Global threat reduction initiative	---	97,975	111,975
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,423,913	1,637,239	1,500,959
Use of prior year balances	-14,880	---	---
Emergency appropriations (H.R.1268)	84,000	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,493,033	1,637,239	1,500,959

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
NAVAL REACTORS			
Naval reactors development	755,121	738,800	738,800
Construction			
06-D-901 Central office building II	---	7,000	7,000
Transfer to Nuclear Energy	9,920	---	13,500
05-N-900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY	6,151	9,900	9,900
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	981	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	17,052	16,900	30,400
Total, Naval reactors development	772,173	755,700	769,200
Program direction	29,264	30,300	30,300
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	801,437	786,000	799,500
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR			
Office of the Administrator	353,350	350,765	373,765
Use of prior year balances	---	-6,896	-6,896
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	353,350	343,869	366,869
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	8,979,410	9,397,241	8,848,449
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP			
Closure Sites:			
Ashtabula	15,752	16,000	16,000
Columbus	19,690	9,500	9,500
Fernald	317,725	327,609	327,609
Miamisburg	110,905	75,530	105,530
Rocky Flats	641,700	579,950	579,950
Total, closure sites	1,105,772	1,008,589	1,038,589
Savannah River site:			
04-D-423 Container surveillance capability in 235F	20,475	---	---
04-D-414 Container surveillance capability in 235F PED	2,976	---	---
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition 2012	355,111	250,303	250,303
Subtotal, 2012 accelerated completions	378,562	250,303	250,303
SNF stabilization, disposition/storage	11,240	13,889	13,889
SR community and regulatory support	11,592	13,046	13,046
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	43,218	75,105	65,105
Spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition	22,767	11,273	11,273
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	88,313	112,993	112,993
Soil and water remediation	100,896	103,665	103,665
Nuclear facility D&D	68,198	66,516	66,516
Subtotal, 2035 accelerated completions	346,224	396,487	386,487
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabil. & disposition	381,858	500,975	500,975
HLW legislative proposal	112,039	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
03-D-414, Salt waste processing facility PED SR	23,469	4,342	4,342
04-D-408, Glass waste storage building #2	43,476	6,975	6,975
05-D-405, Salt waste processing facility	25,792	70,000	70,000
Subtotal, Tank farm activities	586,634	582,292	582,292
Total, Savannah River site	1,311,420	1,229,082	1,219,082
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant:			
Operate WIPP	146,430	111,948	111,948
Central Characterization Project	26,242	38,502	38,502
Transportation	29,248	37,631	37,631
Community and regulatory support	23,452	24,548	24,548
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	225,372	212,629	212,629
Idaho National Laboratory:			
SNF stabilization and disposition/storage	32,419	12,666	12,666
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	1,889	1,555	1,555
SNF stabilization and disposition - 2012	10,224	19,158	19,158
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	109,472	140,015	140,015
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	127,635	124,965	124,965
06-D-401, Sodium bearing waste treatment project, ID	---	15,000	15,000
04-D-414, Sodium bearing waste treatment facility, PED ID	---	9,200	9,200
Soil and water remediation - 2012	124,994	161,489	161,489
Nuclear facility D&D	5,425	5,026	5,026
Non-nuclear facility D&D	26,993	39,105	39,105
Soil and water remediation - 2035	1,984	---	---
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,088	3,546	3,546
HLW legislative proposal	96,522	---	---
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	540,645	531,725	531,725
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
Solid waste stabilization and completion - 2006	39,775	---	---
Soil and water remediation - Melton Valley	71,099	15,146	15,146
Solid waste stabilization and disposition - 2012	46,744	68,360	68,360
Soil and water remediation - offsites	12,753	16,483	16,483
Nuclear facility D&D, E. Tenn. Technology Park	6,540	6,034	12,534
Nuclear facility D&D Y-12	27,323	40,558	40,558
Nuclear facility D&D ORNL	19,626	16,034	25,634
Solid waste stabilization & disp. - science current gen	18,220	18,267	18,267
Solid waste stabilization & disp - NNSA current gen	19,619	---	---
OR contract/post closure liabilites/admin	14,583	---	---
OR reservation community & regulatory support	3,592	5,670	5,670
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	279,874	186,552	202,652
Hanford Site:			
Nuclear material stabilization & disposition PFP	179,097	190,772	206,565
SNF stabilization and disposition	122,885	58,479	58,479
Nuclear facility D&D, river corridor closure project	212,033	168,501	188,501
HAMMER facility	---	---	7,500
B-reactor museum	---	---	1,000
Subtotal, 2012 accelerated completions	514,015	417,752	462,045
Solid waste stabilization & disposition 200 Area	219,139	165,113	173,113
Soil & water remediation - groundwater/vadose zone	50,231	72,955	86,955
Nuclear facility D&D - remainder of Hanford	118,182	70,812	75,812
Operate waste disposal facility	6,103	5,861	5,861

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
SNF stabilization and disposition/storage	991	1,813	1,813
Richland community and regulatory support	13,124	15,411	15,411
Subtotal, 2035 accelerated completions	407,770	331,965	358,965
Total, Hanford Site	921,785	749,717	821,010
Office of River Protection:			
01-D-416 Waste treatment & immobilization plant	684,480	625,893	690,000
Tank Farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabil. and disposition	332,878	294,447	361,447
HLW rad liquid tank waste stabil & disp leg prop.	31,793	---	---
03-D-403 Immobilized HLW interim storage facility.	---	7,495	---
River protection community and regulatory support.	---	471	471
Subtotal, Tank Farm activities	364,671	302,413	361,918
Total, Office of River Protection	1,049,151	928,306	1,051,918
Program direction	270,016	230,931	248,816
Program support	32,707	32,846	32,846
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	459,296	451,000	451,000
Technology development	59,726	21,389	21,389
NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites:			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	57,948	---	54,578
NNSA Service Center	9,002	---	8,304
Nevada	90,095	---	85,024
Kansas City Plant	3,478	---	4,526
California site support	746	---	550
Pantex	24,016	---	19,654
Sandia National Laboratories	20,084	---	9,769
Y-12 newly generated waste	---	---	21,997
Nevada off-sites	---	2,846	2,846
Los Alamos National Laboratory	116,752	142,209	142,209
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	322,121	145,055	349,457
Safeguards and Security:			
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,072	4,223	4,223
Oak Ridge Reservation	21,850	28,855	28,855
Fernald	1,157	1,391	1,391
Miamisburg	524	---	---
West Valley	2,648	1,800	1,800
Paducah	7,760	11,014	11,014
Portsmouth	16,009	17,842	17,842
Richland/Hanford Site	56,276	82,155	82,155
Rocky Flats	16,455	3,200	3,200
Savannah River Site	136,191	136,743	136,743
Total, Safeguards and Security	262,942	287,223	287,223
Use of prior year balances	-32,508	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP	6,808,319	6,015,044	6,468,336

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Office of Security			
Nuclear safeguards and security	193,794	---	---
Security investigations	44,561	---	---
Program direction	57,763	---	---
Subtotal, Office of Security	296,118	---	---
Office of Security and safety performance assurance			
Nuclear safeguards and security	---	176,878	233,378
Security investigations	---	48,725	48,725
Program direction	---	75,492	75,492
Subtotal, Office of Security and safety performa	---	301,095	357,595
Independent oversight and performance assurance	24,472	---	---
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	108,352	56,483	56,483
Program direction - EH	20,251	20,546	20,546
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	128,603	77,029	77,029
Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	33,425	31,421	41,421
Program direction	13,095	13,655	13,655
Subtotal, Office of Legacy Management	46,520	45,076	55,076
Nuclear energy			
Infrastructure			
Idaho facilities management	---	17,762	17,762
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	---	75,008	75,008
Subtotal, Infrastruture	---	92,770	92,770
Program direction	---	31,103	31,103
Subtotal, Nuclear energy	---	123,873	123,873
Defense related administrative support	91,700	87,575	87,575
Defense activities at INEEL	113,456	---	---
Office of hearings and appeals	4,283	4,353	4,353
Subtotal, Other Defense Activities	705,152	639,001	705,501
Use of prior year balances	-15,000	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-3,003	-3,003	-3,003
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	687,149	635,998	702,498
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	229,152	351,447	351,447
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	16,704,030	16,399,730	16,370,730
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Purchase power and wheeling	34,000	32,713	32,713
Program direction	5,158	5,600	5,600

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	39,158	38,313	38,313
Offsetting collections	-34,000	-38,313	-32,713
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	5,158	---	5,600
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	4,639	7,042	7,042
Purchase power and wheeling	2,900	1,235	1,235
Program direction	19,169	19,958	19,958
Construction	5,309	3,166	3,166
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	32,017	31,401	31,401
Offsetting collections	-2,900	-28,235	-1,235
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	29,117	3,166	30,166
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction and rehabilitation	20,029	53,957	40,192
Operation and maintenance	39,510	47,295	47,295
Purchase power and wheeling	227,600	148,500	148,500
Program direction	115,844	143,667	143,667
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	402,983	393,419	379,654
Offsetting collections	-227,600	-335,300	-148,500
Offsetting collections (P.L. 98-381)	-3,668	-4,162	-4,162
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	171,715	53,957	226,992
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	2,804	2,692	2,692
Offsetting collections	---	-2,692	---
TOTAL, FALCON AND AMISTAD O&M FUND	2,804	---	2,692
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	208,794	57,123	265,450
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	210,000	220,400	220,400
FERC revenues	-210,000	-220,400	-220,400
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	24,419,197	24,213,307	24,317,857
(Total amount appropriated)	(24,263,197)	(23,920,307)	(24,281,857)
(Advance appropriations from previous years)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)
(Advance appropriations, FY 2007)	(36,000)	(257,000)	---
(Emergency appropriations)	(84,000)	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS			
Energy supply and conservation	1,806,936	1,749,446	1,762,888
Non-defense environmental clean up	439,601	349,934	319,934
Uranium enrichment D&D fund	495,015	591,498	591,498
Science	3,599,871	3,462,718	3,666,055
Nuclear waste disposal	343,232	300,000	310,000
Departmental administration	239,479	279,976	253,909
Revenues	-122,000	-123,000	-123,000
Total, Departmental administration	117,479	156,976	130,909
Office of the Inspector General	41,176	43,000	43,000
Atomic energy defense activities:			
National Nuclear Security Administration:			
Weapons activities	6,331,590	6,630,133	6,181,121
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,493,033	1,637,239	1,500,959
Naval reactors	801,437	786,000	799,500
Office of the Administrator	353,350	343,869	366,869
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Admin	8,979,410	9,397,241	8,848,449
Defense environmental cleanup	6,808,319	6,015,044	6,468,336
Other defense activities	687,149	635,998	702,498
Defense nuclear waste disposal	229,152	351,447	351,447
Total, Atomic energy defense activities	16,704,030	16,399,730	16,370,730
Power marketing administrations:			
Southeastern Power Administration	5,158	---	5,600
Southwestern Power Administration	29,117	3,166	30,166
Western Area Power Administration	171,715	53,957	226,992
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,804	---	2,692
Total, Power marketing administrations	208,794	57,123	265,450
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:			
Salaries and expenses	210,000	220,400	220,400
Revenues	-210,000	-220,400	-220,400
Energy Information Administration	83,819	85,926	86,426
Fossil energy program			
Clean coal technology	-257,000	---	---
Fossil Energy Research and Development	571,854	748,456	502,467
Strategic petroleum reserves	169,710	166,000	166,000
Naval Petroleum & Oil Shale Reserves	17,750	18,500	18,500
Northeast home heating oil reserve	4,930	---	---
Elk Hills School Lands Fund	72,000	84,000	84,000
Subtotal, fossil energy program	579,244	1,016,956	770,967
TOTAL, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS	24,419,197	24,213,307	24,317,857
FUNCTION RECAP:			
NON-DEFENSE	7,935,471	8,941,522	8,919,452
DEFENSE	16,483,726	15,271,785	15,398,405
Environmental restoration and waste management:			
Defense function	(6,808,319)	(6,015,044)	(6,468,336)
Non-defense function	(636,531)	(713,629)	(698,629)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House Recommended
Total, Environmental restoration and waste mgmt...	(7,444,850)	(6,728,673)	(7,166,965)
Nuclear waste disposal:			
Defense function.....	(229,152)	(351,447)	(351,447)
Non-defense function.....	(343,232)	(300,000)	(310,000)
Total, Nuclear waste disposal.....	(572,384)	(651,447)	(661,447)

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Contract Competition.—Section 301 modifies language carried in the conference report for the Energy and Water Development Act, 2005 (P.L. 108–447), 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 renews the statutory requirement to compete these five contracts to be sure the Department follows through on the commitments made by the present Secretary.

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 award 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. A similar provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005.

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. A similar provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005.

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. A similar provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005.

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. A similar provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005.

User Facilities.—Section 307 establishes certain notice and competition requirements with respect to the involvement of universities in Department of Energy user facilities. A similar provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005. 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. A similar provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005.

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 2006 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 2006. 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.—Section 311 provides that none of the funds made available in title III of this Act shall be available for the Department of Energy national laboratories and production plants for Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) and Plant Directed Research and Development (PDRD) and Site Directed Research and Development (SDRD) activities in excess of $250,000,000.

Laboratory Directed Research and Development.—Section 312 provides that none of the funds made available in title III of this

Act shall be available for Department of Energy LDRD and PDRD and SDRD activities for project costs incurred as Indirect Costs by Major Facility Operating Contractors under OMB's Federal Cost Accounting Standards (FAR Part 9900) or the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles issued by the Financial Accounting Standards Board.

Laboratory Directed Research and Development.—Section 313 provides that none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to finance LDRD, PDRD, and SDRD activities at Department of Energy laboratories on behalf of other Federal agencies.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2005	$65,472,000
Budget estimate, 2006	65,472,000
Recommended, 2006	38,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−26,972,000
Budget estimate, 2006	−26,972,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is comprised of the Governors of the thirteen Appalachian States and has a Federal co chairman, who is appointed by the President. For fiscal year 2006, the budget includes $65,472,000, of which $53,954,000 is for program development; $6,228,000 is local development districts and technical assistance; and $5,290,000 is for salaries and expenses. In addition, $450,000,000 is available to the ARC to construct approximately 25 additional miles of highway.

The ARC budget justification indicates that it targets fifty percent of its funds to distressed counties or distressed areas in 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, nearly $27,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the budget estimate. The reduction is to be taken from the area development activities that serve other than distressed counties and distressed areas.

Within the funds provided, the Committee has included the following activities:

Central West Virginia public water and wastewater facilities	$2,000,000
Southern West Virginia public water and wastewater treatment facilities	2,000,000
Scioto County, Ohio sanitary sewer pump station renovations and improvements	750,000
Copeland low water bridge, Breathitt County, Kentucky	1,800,000
Watershed coordination activities, Athens, Meigs, Gallia, Lawrence and Scioto counties, Ohio	500,000
Logan County, West Virginia flood warning system	305,000

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2005	$20,106,000
Budget estimate, 2006	22,032,000
Recommended, 2006	22,032,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+1,926,000
Budget estimate, 2006	---

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 facilities of the Department of Energy. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2006 is $22,032,000, the same as the budget request.

DELTA REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2005	$6,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	6,000,000
Recommended, 2006	6,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	---
Budget estimate, 2006	---

The Delta Regional Authority (DRA) is a federal-state partnership serving a 240-county/parish area in an eight-state region. Led by a Federal Co-Chairman and the governors of each participating state, the DRA is designed to remedy severe and chronic economic distress by stimulating economic development and fostering partnerships that will have a positive impact on the region's economy. The DRA seeks to help economically distressed communities leverage other federal and state programs, which are focused on basic infrastructure development and transportation improvements, business development, and job training services. Under federal law, at least 75 percent of funds must be invested in distressed counties and parishes and pockets of poverty, with 50 percent of the funds earmarked for transportation and basic infrastructure improvements.

For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends $6,000,000, the same as the enacted level and the budget estimate.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2005	$66,464,000
Budget estimate, 2006	2,562,000
Recommended, 2006	2,562,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	63,902,000
Budget estimate, 2006	---

Introduced by Congress in 1998, the Denali Commission is a federal-state partnership designed to provide critical utilities, infrastructure, and economic support throughout Alaska. For fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommends $2,562,000 for the costs of the Commission's operations, the same level as the budget estimate. In addition to these funds, the Commission plans to expend other funds totaling $4,000,000 in fiscal year 2006 on renovating or building bulk fuel storage facilities in two Alaskan communities.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2005	$657,475,000
Budget estimate, 2006	693,376,000
Recommended, 2006	714,376,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+56,901,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+21,000,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2005	−$530,079,000
Budget estimate, 2006	−559,643,000
Recommended, 2006	−580,643,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−50,564,000
Budget estimate, 2006	−21,000,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2005	$127,396,000
Budget estimate, 2006	133,733,000
Recommended, 2006	133,733,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+6,337,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) salaries and expenses is $714,376,000, an increase of $21,000,000 over the budget request. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $580,643,000, resulting in a net appropriation of $133,733,000. The recommendation includes $66,717,000 to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund to support the Department of Energy's effort to develop a permanent geologic repository at Yucca Mountain for spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste.

Fee recovery.—The Committee recommendation includes bill language providing for a one-year extension of the authority to continue the fee recovery percentage used in fiscal year 2005, namely, that the NRC is required in fiscal year 2006 to recover 90 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund and the amount necessary to implement Section 3116 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (P.L. 108–375), by assessing license and annual fees. Of the $717,376,000 gross appropriation for fiscal year 2006, $66,717,000 is drawn from the Nuclear Waste Fund, $2,500,000 is drawn from the General Fund of the Treasury to execute NRC's responsibilities to provide oversight of certain Department of Energy activities under Section 3116 of Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (P.L 108–375), 90 percent of the balance of $645,159,000 (i.e., $580,643,000) is funded by fees collected from NRC licensees, and the remaining 10 percent (i.e., $64,516,000) is funded from the General Fund of the Treasury.

Safety and Security of Spent Nuclear Fuel.—In its fiscal year 2004 conference report on Energy and Water Development Appropriations, the conferees directed the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to conduct a study on the safety and security of spent nu-

clear fuel storage at commercial reactor sites. The NAS completed the classified version of this study in the summer of 2004 and released an unclassified summary of the study in early 2005. In its fiacal year 2005 conference report on Energy and Water Development Appropriations, the conferees provides the following direction to the NRC: "The National Academy completed this study and found a number of areas in which the NRC could improve its modeling of the risks to spent fuel storage and the mitigation of such risks. The conferees expect the NRC to take the necessary steps to improve its analyses, including the preparation of site-specific models, and to work with the utilities to ensure timely application of this information to mitigate risks."

From the Committee's perspective, the NAS identified a number of risks that, while significant, are manageable risks given prompt and appropriate action by the NRC. However, the Committee has been disappointed by the NRC's response to date to the NAS recommendations. The Committee notes deficiencies in the following areas: (a) slow response by the NRC to post-9/11 changes and to the NAS recommendations; (b) analysis of only worst-case vulnerabilities, with little or no attention to alternative scenarios; (c) focus on site-specific consequence assessments to the exclusion of site-specific vulnerability assessments; (d) delegation of the site-specific consequence assessments to the trade association, the Nuclear Energy Institute, rather than placing that contract under NRC control; and (e) willingness to allow industry to determine what measures are appropriate and "readily available" to mitigate against pool incidents. The Committee does not believe the NRC has taken the necessary steps to resolve fully the concerns identified by the NAS. The Committee expects the NRC to redouble its efforts to address the NAS-identified deficiencies, and to direct, not request, industry to take prompt corrective actions.

Public confidence in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission requires that the NRC be perceived to be an independent regulator of the nuclear industry. Steps such as asking industry to identify "readily available" mitigation measures and allowing the industry trade association to manage the contracts for force-on-force security assessments and site-specific consequence assessments do not inspire such confidence. The Committee provides an additional $21,000,000 for the NRC to perform the necessary technical analyses and award the contracts to respond to the NAS safety and security 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, 2005	$7,458,000
Budget estimate, 2006	8,316,000
Recommended, 2006	8,316,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+858,000
Budget estimate, 2006	– – –

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2005	−$6,712,000
Budget estimate, 2006	−7,485,000
Recommended, 2006	−7,485,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−773,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2005	$746,000
Budget estimate, 2006	831,000
Recommended, 2006	831,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+85,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $8,316,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes bill language providing for a one-year extension of the authority to continue the fee recovery percentage used in fiscal year through the assessment of license and annual fees, as proposed by the Administration. Therefore, the revenue estimate is $7,485,000, resulting in a net appropriation for the NRC Inspector General of $831,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriation, 2005	$3,152,000
Budget estimate, 2006	3,608,000
Recommended, 2006	3,608,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+456,000
Budget estimate, 2006	.....

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 $3,608,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board in fiscal year 2006, the same as the budget request and an increase of $456,000 over fiscal year 2005 funding.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2005	.....
Budget estimate, 2006	$9,000,000
Recommended, 2006	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	+9,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	−9,000,000

OFFSET FROM TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriation, 2005	.....
Budget estimate, 2006	−$9,000,000
Recommended, 2006	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2005	−9,000,000
Budget estimate, 2006	+9,000,000

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

Reports.—The Committee directs the Inspector General to forward copies of all audit and inspection reports to the Committee immediately after they are issued, and immediately make the Committee aware of any review that recommends cancellation of, or modification to, any major acquisition project or grant, or which recommends significant budgetary savings. The Inspector General is also directed to withhold from public distribution for a period of 15 days any final audit or investigation report that was requested by the House Committee on Appropriations.

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 Act.

Prohibition on lobbying.—The bill includes a provision that none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of Title 18, United States Code.

Transfers.—The bill 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 ru1e 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	29,746	30,273	29,746	30,264
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 933–44), as amended, the following table contains five-year projections associated with the budget authority in the accompanying bill:

	Millions
Budget Authority	$29,746
Outlays:	
2006	19,208
2007	8,707
2008	1,683
2009	87
2010 and beyond	118

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 933–44), as amended, the financial assistance to State and local governments is as follows:

	Millions
Budget authority	$301
Fiscal year 2006 outlays resulting therefrom	134

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 an Related Resources:

> * * * of which $55,544,000 shall be available or transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund $21,998,000 and 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 been included under Corps of Engineers, General Investigations, providing that amounts made available under this paragraph shall be provided in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the report accompanying this Act.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Construction, to provide appropriations that remain available until expended for South Florida Everglades Restoration projects.

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

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Construction, providing that amounts made available under this paragraph shall be provided in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the report accompanying this Act.

Language has been included under the Corps of Engineers, Operation and Maintenance, stating that funds can 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 Corps of Engineers, Operation and Maintenance, permitting the use of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund; providing for the 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 Corps of Engineers, Operations and Maintenance, providing that amounts made available under this paragraph shall be provided in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the report accompanying this Act.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, 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 Corps of Engineers, General Expenses, prohibiting the use of funds other funds in this Act for the Office of the Chief of Engineers and the division offices.

Language has been included to provide for funding for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works).

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, 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 Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, pertaining to the reprogramming of funds contained in title I of this Act.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds provided in this Act to support activities related to the proposed Ridge Landfill in Tuscarawas County, Ohio.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds provided in this Act to support activities related to the proposed Indian Run Sanitary Landfill in Sandy Township, Stark County, Ohio.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, pertaining to the oversight and execution of multiyear contracts.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, prohibiting after February 6, 2006, the execution of any continuing contract that obligates the United States Government during fiscal year 2007 to make payment under such contract for any project that is not contained in the fiscal year 2007 budget materials of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers submitted by the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) to the Congress.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, prohibiting the execution of any continuing contract that reserves an amount for a project in excess of the amount appropriated for such project in this Act.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, prohibiting the expenditure of funds on rehabilitation and lead and asbestos abatement of the dredge *McFarland*.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, reducing funds otherwise provided in title I of this Act by $18,630,000.

Language has been included prohibiting the use of funds in this Act to carry out the construction of the Port Jersey element of the New York and New Jersey Harbor or reimbursement to the local sponsor for the construction of the Port Jersey element until commitments for construction of container handling facilities are obtained from the non-Federal sponsor for a second user along the Port Jersey element.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, 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 Bureau of Reclamation, 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 Bureau of Reclamation, 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. 4601–6a(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 Bureau of Reclamation, 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 Bureau of Reclamation, 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 Bureau of Reclamation, Central Valley Project Restoration Fund providing that none of the funds under the heading 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 order adopted by consent or decree.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, California Bay-Delta Restoration permitting the transfer of funds to appropriate accounts of other participating Federal agencies to carry out authorized programs; providing that funds made available under this heading may be used for the Federal share of the costs of the CALFED Program management; providing that use of any funds provided to the California Bay-Delta Authority for program-wide management and oversight activities shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior; providing that CALFED implementation shall be carried out with clear performance measures demonstrating concurrent progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the program.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, 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.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Administrative Provisions providing for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Title II, General Provisions, 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 Title II, General Provisions, 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.

Language has been included under Title II, General Provisions, relating to agreements with the city of Needles, California or the Imperial Irrigation District for the design and construction of stages of the Lower Colorado Water Supply Project.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Language has been included under Energy Supply and Conservation for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment.

Language has been included under Clean Coal Technology deferring certain funding for one year.

Language has been included under Fossil Energy Research and Development providing for vehicle and guard services, and uniform allowances; providing funding and limitations for the FutureGen program; permitting the use of funds from other program accounts for the National Energy Technology Laboratory; specifying certain conditions for the Clean Coal Power Initiative; and, prohibiting the field-testing of nuclear explosives for the recovery of oil and gas.

Language has been included under the Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves, permitting the use of unobligated balances, and the hire of passenger vehicles.

Language has been included under the Elk Hills School Lands Fund specifying the amount that can be derived from the Fund.

Language has been included under the Strategic Petroleum Reserve providing for vehicle, aircraft, and guard services, and uniform allowances.

Language has been included under Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup 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 Nuclear Waste Disposal limiting the use of external oversight funds.

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, 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 Cleanup for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment.

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

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 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 that 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 ofthe 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 2006.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 311, prohibiting the use of funds in this act to finance laboratory directed research and development activities in excess of $250,000,000.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 312, prohibiting the use of funds in this act to finance laboratory directed research and development activities

for project costs incurred as Indirect Costs by Major Facility Operating Contractors.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 313, prohibiting the use of funds in this act in fiscal year 2006 to finance laboratory directed research and development activities on behalf of other Federal agencies.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 314 limiting programs for price supports and loan guarantees to what is provided in appropriations Acts.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Language has been included under Title IV, General Provisions, continuing the fee arrangement used in fiscal year 2005 through fiscal year 2006 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Language has been included under General Provisions, 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, 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):

ACT OF NOVEMBER 14, 1986

AN ACT Entitled the "Lower Colorado Water Supply Act".

(Public Law 99–655)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION.

(a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Lower Colorado Water Supply Project, California, in order to supply water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and recreational purposes only: *Provided*, That, the Secretary is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to contract with non-Federal interests for the care, operation, and maintenance of all or any part of the project works, subject to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. Such project shall be constructed in stages as increases in demand warrant and substantially in accordance with the plans set forth in the document entitled "Lower Colorado Water Supply Study, California" (December 1985): *Provided*, That the Secretary is prohibited from constructing facilities with a total capacity in excess of ten thousand acre-feet per annum under authority

of this Act. *The Secretary is authorized to enter into an agreement or agreements with the city of Needles or the Imperial Irrigation District for the design and construction of the remaining stages of the Lower Colorado Water Supply Project on or after November 1, 2004, and the Secretary shall ensure that any such agreement or agreements include provisions setting forth (1) the responsibilities of the parties to the agreement for design and construction; (2) the locations of the remaining wells, discharge pipelines, and power transmission lines; (3) the remaining design capacity of up to 5,000 acre-feet per year which is the authorized capacity less the design capacity of the first stage constructed; (4) the procedures and requirements for approval and acceptance by the Secretary of the remaining stages, including approval of the quality of construction, measures to protect the public health and safety, and procedures for protection of such stages; (5) the rights, responsibilities, and liabilities of each party to the agreement; and (6) the term of the agreement.*

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2. REPAYMENT OF COSTS.

(a) * * *

(b) Any contracts executed by the Secretary to fulfill the requirements of subsections (a)(2) and (a)(3) of this section must be with persons, or Federal or non-Federal governmental entities whose lands or interests in lands are located adjacent to the Colorado River in the State of California who do not hold rights to Colorado River water or whose rights are insufficient to meet their present or anticipated future needs, as determined by the Secretary. Such persons, or Federal or non-Federal governmental entities shall include the city of Needles, the town of Winterhaven, and other domestic, municipal, industrial, and recreational water users along the Colorado River in the State of California. *Subject to the demand of such users along or adjacent to the Colorado River for Project water, the Secretary is further authorized to contract with additional persons or entities who hold Boulder Canyon Project Act section 5 contracts for municipal and industrial uses within the State of California for the use or benefit of Project water under such terms as the Secretary determines will benefit the interest of Project users along the Colorado River.*

* * * * * * *

SECTION 6101 OF OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1990

SEC. 6101. NRC USER FEES AND ANNUAL CHARGES.

(a) ANNUAL ASSESSMENT.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(3) LAST ASSESSMENT OF ANNUAL CHARGES.—The last assessment of annual charges under subsection (c) shall be made not later than September 20, 2005.**]**

* * * * * * *

(c) ANNUAL CHARGES.—

(1) * * *

(2) AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF CHARGES.—

(A) * * *

(B) PERCENTAGES.—The percentages referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

(v) 90 percent for fiscal year 2005 *and fiscal year 2006.*

* * * * * * *

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f) 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:

[Thousand dollars]

Agency/Program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Approrpiation in last year of authorization
Corps of Engineers:			
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action programs	(1)	(1)	140,000
Energy Supply:			
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy:			
Hydrogen Technology	2001	40,000	26,594
Solar Energy	1993	150,000	161,394
Wind Energy	1993	55,000	23,841
Hydropower	1980	100,000	20,939
Geothermal Technology	1993	23,000	23,252
Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D	1994	50,000	55,830
Intergovernmental Activities	1997	10,000	4,000
Departmental Energy Management Program	1979	10,000	15,055
Program Direction	1977	(2)	(2)
Facilities and Infrastructure	1977	(2)	(2)
Nuclear Energy:			
Advanced Nuclear Reactor Technology	1994	(3)	95,235
Fast Flux Test Facility	1993	70,000	60,656
Environment, Safety and Health	1977	(2)	(2)
Non-Defense Environmental Management:			
Commercial Waste Management/Operating Expenses	1984	300,000	(2)
Commercial Waste Management/Plant and Capital Equipment	1982	975	(2)
UMTRA Groundwater and Long-Term Surveillance and Maintenance	1998	(2)	5,052
West Valley Demonstration	1981	5,000	5,000
Uranium Activities:			
DUF6 Conversion	2004	(3)	98,800
Science:			
General Science and Research Activities	1984	50,000	635,417
High Energy Physics	1984	(3)	477,947
Nuclear Physics	1984	(3)	155,220
Biological and Environmental Research	1994	(3)	388,298
Basic Energy Sciences	1994	(3)	743,590
Advanced Scientific Computing Research	1996	169,000	111,068
Science Laboratories Infrastructure	1994	(3)	39,327
Fusion Energy Sources	1994	380,000	322,277
Program Direction	1994	(2)	(2)
Science Education	1991	40,000	42,667
Federal Laboratory Consortium	1995	(2)	(2)
Departmental Administration	1984	246,963	185,682
Office of Economic Impact and Diversity	1981	6,000	583
Office of Inspector General	1984	(2)	14,670

[Thousand dollars]

Agency/Program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Approrpiation in last year of authorization
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:			
National Nuclear Security Administration:			
Weapons Activities	2005	6,592,053	6,583,350
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2005	1,348,647	1,422,103
Naval Reactors	2005	797,900	801,437
Office of Administrator	2005	343,700	343,869
Defense Environmental Management:			
Defense Site Acceleration Completion	2005	5,970,837	5,725,935
Defense Environmental Services	2005	986,470	845,704
Other Defense Activities	2005	636,036	672,590
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	2005	120,000	229,152
Power Marketing Administration:			
Southeastern	1984	24,240	20,594
Southwestern	1984	40,254	36,229
Western Area	1984	259,700	194,630
WAPA Emergency Fund	1984	(2)	500
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	1984	275,000	(2)
Fossil Energy:			
Fossil Energy Research and Development	1997	(3)	(3)
Clean Coal	1998	(3)	−101,000
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	2005	20,000	18,000
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy:			
Energy Conservation			
Vehicle Technologies—Fuels	2000	(3)	21,600
Vehicle Technologies—Electric Motor Vehicle	2001	50,000	(2)
Fuel Cell Technologies	1997	40,000	50,117
Weatherization	1994	5,000	200,000
Building Technologies	1997	(2)	81,198
Energy Information Administration	1992	(2)	83,819

[1] Program was initiated in 1972 and has never received a separate authorization.
[2] No amount specified.
[3] Such sums as necessary.

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

There were no roll call votes.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2005
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2006
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	143,344	95,000	100,000	-43,344	+5,000
Hurricane Disasters Assistance (emergency)	400	---	---	-400	---
Construction	1,781,720	1,637,000	1,900,000	+118,280	+263,000
Hurricane Disasters Assistance (emergency)	62,600	---	---	-62,600	---
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	321,904	270,000	290,000	-31,904	+20,000
Hurricane Disasters Assistance (emergency)	6,000	---	---	-6,000	---
Operation and maintenance	1,943,428	1,979,000	2,000,000	+56,572	+21,000
Offsetting collection	---	-181,000	---	---	+181,000
Hurricane Disasters Assistance (emergency)	145,400	---	---	-145,400	---
Storm damage - (P.L. 108-324 - Sec. 401) (emergency)	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Subtotal, Operation and mantenance	2,098,828	1,798,000	2,000,000	-98,828	+202,000
Regulatory program	143,840	160,000	160,000	+16,160	---
FUSRAP	163,680	140,000	140,000	-23,680	---
Flood control and coastal emergencies	---	70,000	---	---	-70,000
Hurricane Disasters Assistance (emergency)	148,000	---	---	-148,000	---
General expenses	165,664	162,000	152,021	-13,643	-9,979
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	3,968	---	4,000	+32	+4,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2005
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2006
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil...	5,039,948	4,332,000	4,746,021	-293,927	+414,021
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction.....	30,560	31,668	31,668	+1,108	---
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation.....	15,345	946	946	-14,399	---
Subtotal.....	45,905	32,614	32,614	-13,291	---
Program oversight and administration.....	1,720	1,736	1,736	+16	---
Total, Central Utah project completion account..	47,625	34,350	34,350	-13,275	---
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources.....	852,605	801,569	832,000	-20,605	+30,431
Offsetting collection.....	---	-30,000	---	---	+30,000
Subtotal, water and related resources.....	852,605	771,569	832,000	-20,605	+60,431
Central Valley project restoration fund.....	54,628	52,219	52,219	-2,409	---
California Bay-Delta restoration.....	---	35,000	35,000	+35,000	---
Policy and administration.....	57,688	57,917	57,917	+229	---
Drought conditions Nevada (P.L. 108-324) (emergency)..	5,000	---	---	-5,000	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2005
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2006
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	969,921	916,705	977,136	+7,215	+60,431
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	1,017,546	951,055	1,011,486	-6,060	+60,431
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply and conservation	1,806,936	1,749,446	1,762,888	-44,048	+13,442
Clean coal technology:					
Deferral of unobligated balances, FY 2005	-257,000	257,000	257,000	+514,000	---
Deferral of unobligated balances, FY 2007	---	---	-257,000	-257,000	-257,000
Rescission	---	-257,000	---	---	+257,000
Total, Clean coal technology	-257,000	---	---	+257,000	---
Fossil Energy Research and Development	571,854	491,456	502,467	-69,387	+11,011
Advance appropriations, FY 2007	---	257,000	---	---	-257,000
Total, Fossil Energy Research and Development	571,854	748,456	502,467	-69,387	-245,989
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	17,750	18,500	18,500	+750	---
Elk Hills school lands fund	72,000	84,000	84,000	+12,000	---
Strategic petroleum reserve	169,710	166,000	166,000	-3,710	---
Northeast home heating oil reserve	4,930	---	---	-4,930	---
Energy Information Administration	83,819	85,926	86,426	+2,607	+500

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2005
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2006
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Non-defense site environmental clean up	439,601	349,934	319,934	-119,667	-30,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	495,015	591,498	591,498	+96,483	---
Science	3,599,871	3,462,718	3,666,055	+66,184	+203,337
Nuclear Waste Disposal	343,232	300,000	310,000	-33,232	+10,000
Departmental administration	238,503	279,976	253,909	+15,406	-26,067
Miscellaneous revenues	-121,024	-123,000	-123,000	-1,976	---
Net appropriation	117,479	156,976	130,909	+13,430	-26,067
Office of the Inspector General	41,176	43,000	43,000	+1,824	---
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	6,331,590	6,630,133	6,181,121	-150,469	-449,012
Transfer from Department of Defense approps	(300,000)	---	---	(-300,000)	---
Total, Weapons activities (program level)	(6,631,590)	(6,630,133)	(6,181,121)	(-450,469)	(-449,012)
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,409,033	1,637,239	1,500,959	+91,926	-136,280
Emergency appropriations (H.R.1268)	84,000	---	---	-84,000	---
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,493,033	1,637,239	1,500,959	+7,926	-136,280
Naval reactors	801,437	786,000	799,500	-1,937	+13,500
Office of the Administrator	353,350	343,869	366,869	+13,519	+23,000
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security					

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2005
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2006
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Administration	8,979,410	9,397,241	8,848,449	-130,961	-548,792
Defense site environmental cleanup	6,808,319	6,015,044	6,468,336	-339,983	+453,292
Other defense activities	687,149	635,998	702,498	+15,349	+66,500
Defense nuclear waste disposal	229,152	351,447	351,447	+122,295	---
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	16,704,030	16,399,730	16,370,730	-333,300	-29,000
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	5,158	38,313	38,313	+33,155	---
Offsetting collection	---	-38,313	-32,713	-32,713	+5,600
Subtotal, O&M, Southeastern Power Administration	5,158	---	5,600	+442	+5,600
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	29,117	31,401	31,401	+2,284	---
Offsetting collection	---	-28,235	-1,235	-1,235	+27,000
Subtotal, O&M, Southwestern Power Administration	29,117	3,166	30,166	+1,049	+27,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	171,715	393,419	379,654	+207,939	-13,765
Offsetting collection	---	-339,462	-148,500	-148,500	+190,962
Offsetting collection (P.L. 98-381)	---	---	-4,162	-4,162	-4,162
Subtotal, O&M, Western Area Power Administration	171,715	53,957	226,992	+55,277	+173,035

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2005
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2006
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund.....	2,804	2,692	2,692	-112	---
Offsetting collection.....	---	-2,692	---	---	+2,692
Subtotal, Falcon and Amistad O&M fund.....	2,804	---	2,692	-112	+2,692
Total, Power Marketing Administrations.....	208,794	57,123	265,450	+56,656	+208,327
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	210,000	220,400	220,400	+10,400	---
Revenues applied.....	-210,000	-220,400	-220,400	-10,400	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy.....	24,419,197	24,213,307	24,317,857	-101,340	+104,550
Appropriations.....	(24,263,197)	(23,920,307)	(24,281,857)	(+18,660)	(+361,550)
Advance appropriations from previous years..	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	---	---
Advance appropriations, FY 2007.....	(36,000)	(257,000)	---	(-36,000)	(-257,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(84,000)	---	---	(-84,000)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2005
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2006
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	65,472	65,472	38,500	-26,972	-26,972
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	20,106	22,032	22,032	+1,926	---
Delta Regional Authority	6,000	6,000	6,000	---	---
Denali Commission	66,464	2,562	2,562	-63,902	---
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	657,475	693,376	714,376	+56,901	+21,000
Revenues	-530,079	-559,643	-580,643	-50,564	-21,000
Subtotal	127,396	133,733	133,733	+6,337	---
Office of Inspector General	7,458	8,316	8,316	+858	---
Revenues	-6,712	-7,485	-7,485	-773	---
Subtotal	746	831	831	+85	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	128,142	134,564	134,564	+6,422	---
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,152	3,608	3,608	+456	---
Tennessee Valley Authority: Office of Inspector General	---	9,000	---	---	-9,000
Offset	---	-9,000	---	---	+9,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	289,336	234,238	207,266	-82,070	-26,972

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2005
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2006
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grand total	30,766,027	29,730,600	30,282,630	-483,397	+552,030
Appropriations	(30,489,627)	(29,437,600)	(30,246,630)	(-242,997)	(+809,030)
Emergency appropriations	(461,400)	---	---	(-461,400)	---
Advance appropriations from previous years	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	---	---
Advance appropriations, FY 2006 and 2007	(36,000)	(257,000)	---	(-36,000)	(-257,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2005
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2006
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Decontamination and Decommiss. Fund	-463,000	-451,000	-451,000	+12,000	---
Central Valley project collections	-46,000	-44,000	-44,000	+2,000	---
Power marketing fund (Colorado river basin)	-23,000	-23,000	-23,000	---	---
PMA reclassification cost (proposed legislation)	---	433,000	---	---	-433,000
Plant replacement & improvement program reduction	---	---	-18,630	-18,630	-18,630
Emergency appropriations	-461,400	---	---	+461,400	---
Clean coal (advance appropriation)	95,653	---	---	-95,653	---
Nuclear Regulatory Commission revenue adjustment	---	358,128	---	---	-358,128
Advance appropriations:					
Elk Hills School	-36,000	---	---	+36,000	---
Fossil energy R&D	---	-257,000	---	---	+257,000
Total, adjustments	-933,747	16,128	-536,630	+397,117	-552,758
Total (including adjustments)	29,832,280	29,746,728	29,746,000	-86,280	-728
Amounts in this bill	(30,766,027)	(29,730,600)	(30,282,630)	(-483,397)	(+552,030)
Scorekeeping adjustments	(-933,747)	(16,128)	(-536,630)	(+397,117)	(-552,758)
Total mandatory and discretionary	29,832,280	29,746,728	29,746,000	-86,280	-728
Discretionary	29,832,280	29,746,728	29,746,000	-86,280	-728
Discretionary (total)	29,832,280	29,746,728	29,746,000	-86,280	-728