AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

107TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 107–112

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002

JUNE 26, 2001.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 2311]

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, 2002, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page Number Bill	Page Number Report
Introduction	1	3
I. Department of Defense—Civil:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
Introduction	2	5
General investigations	2	6
Construction, general	3	33
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	6	50
Operation and maintenance, general	7	55
Regulatory program	8	76
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	8	76
General expenses	9	77
Administrative provisions	9	.....
General provisions	10	78
II. Department of the Interior:		
Central Utah Project completion account	12	79
Bureau of Reclamation:		

	Page Number Bill	Report
Water and related resources	13	79
Bureau of Reclamation loan program account	14	90
Central Valley Project restoration fund	15	92
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	.....	92
Policy and administration	15	93
Administrative provision	16	.....
General provisions	16	93
III. Department of Energy:		
Introduction	17	95
Energy supply	17	101
Non-defense environmental management	18	109
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation	18	111
Science	19	112
Nuclear waste disposal	19	117
Departmental administration	21	120
Office of Inspector General	22	122
Atomic energy defense activities:		
National Nuclear Security Administration:		
Weapons activities	22	123
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	23	127
Naval reactors	23	133
Office of the administrator	24	134
Environmental and Other Defense Activities:		
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	24	134
Defense facilities closure projects	25	140
Defense environmental management privatization	25	142
Other defense activities	25	142
Defense nuclear waste disposal	26	147
Power marketing administrations:		
Bonneville Power Administration	26	148
Southeastern Power Administration	26	149
Southwestern Power Administration	27	149
Western Area Power Administration	28	150
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	29	150
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	29	151
General provisions	30	164
IV. Independent agencies:		
Appalachian Regional Commission	34	169
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	35	169
Delta Regional Authority	.....	169
Denali Commission	.....	170
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	35	170
Office of Inspector General	36	171
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	37	172
V. General provisions	37	173
House reporting requirements	.....	175

Summary of Estimates and Recommendations

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in the Budget of the United States Government, 2002. The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 2001 the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2002.

[Dollars in thousands]

	2001	2002 estimate	2002 recommendation compared with—		
			2002 recommendation	2001 appropriation	2002 estimate
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	$4,541,065	$3,900,000	$4,468,233	($72,832)	$568,233
Title II—Department of the Interior	816,637	819,727	842,890	26,253	23,163
Title III—Department of Energy	18,475,148	18,106,554	18,747,360	272,212	640,806
Title IV—Independent Agencies	171,474	181,721	136,517	(34,957)	(45,204)
Title V—Rescissions	(172,000)	.....	.....	172,000	.....
Title VI—Emergency Supplemental	213,988	.....	.....	(213,988)	.....
Subtotal	24,046,312	23,008,002	24,195,000	148,688	1,186,998
Scorekeeping adjustments	(489,982)	(491,000)	(491,000)	(1,018)	.....
Grand Total of bill	23,556,330	22,517,002	23,704,000	147,670	1,186,998

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002 totals $23,704,000,000, which is $147,670,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2001, and $1,186,998,000 above the President's budget request. Under constrained funding conditions, the Committee has given priority to maintaining the existing inventory of Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation water resources projects; continuing construction of ongoing water resources projects to avoid increased costs from stretching out project schedules; protecting basic science programs at the Department of Energy; investing in new energy technologies; providing sufficient funds for the Secretary of Energy to make a recommendation on the suitability of Yucca Mountain as a repository for the nation's nuclear waste; maintaining the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile; and providing for cleanup of contaminated Department of Energy sites.

There has been much interest in how this bill would address the Nation's energy shortages. The Committee wishes to emphasize that the Department of Energy's energy technology programs are not designed to provide immediate relief for the energy crisis. Instead, the energy technology programs consist primarily of research and development into technologies such as renewable energy which are intended to provide long-term solutions to the nation's energy needs. Near-term deployment of available energy technologies is best accomplished through incentives other than appropriations.

The National Energy Policy directed the appropriate Federal agencies to take actions to remove constraints on the interstate transmission grid and to allow our nation's electricity supply to meet the growing needs of the economy. The Secretary of Energy was directed to examine the benefits of establishing a national

grid, identify transmission bottlenecks, and identify measures to remove transmission bottlenecks. The Committee expects to address these issues throughout the appropriations process as information becomes available on possible remedies requiring Congressional appropriations action.

Title I of the bill provides $4,468,233,000 for the programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a decrease of $72,832,000 from fiscal year 2001 and $568,233,000 over the budget request of $3,900,000,000. The Committee has maintained nearly level funding for the civil works program despite budgetary constraints. By concentrating resources on traditional missions such as flood control and navigation which yield the greatest economic benefits for the nation, the Committee seeks to ensure the highest possible payback on taxpayer investment. The Committee has generally been unable to provide funds for new construction projects within the water resources programs of the Corps of Engineers.

Title II provides $842,890,000 for the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, an increase of $26,253,000 over fiscal year 2001 and $23,163,000 over the budget request of $819,727,000. The Committee has not provided funding for the California Bay-Delta Restoration program in California pending the enactment of authorizing legislation.

Title III provides $18,747,360,000 for the Department of Energy, an increase of $272,212,000 over fiscal year 2001 and $640,806,000 over the budget request of $18,106,554,000. The Committee has provided additional funding for energy technology, environmental cleanup, and nuclear nonproliferation programs. Basic research and science programs are supported at a level consistent with fiscal year 2001. In addition, $7 billion is provided for environmental cleanup programs to remediate contaminated defense and non-defense sites throughout the nation, and $443 million is provided for the nuclear waste fund program in support of a final geologic repository for spent fuel high-level nuclear waste.

Funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration, which includes nuclear weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation, naval reactors, and the office of the administrator is $6,667,274,000, an increase of $90,225,000 over fiscal year 2001 and a decrease of $109,496,000 from the budget request.

Title IV provides $136,517,000 for several Independent Agencies, a decrease of $34,957,000 from fiscal year 2001 and a decrease of $45,204,000 below the budget request of $181,720,000. Funding is provided for the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Board, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and its Inspector General, and the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The Committee is very concerned about the level of funding requested by the Administration for the water resources programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The amount requested by the Administration is about $640 million below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2001. At the level of funding recommended by the Administration, ongoing construction projects would have been funded at an average of only 57% of their capability, with the result being that $5.8 billion in benefits would be forgone due to delayed completion dates. In addition, $500 million in increased costs would be incurred for these projects due to stretched out completion schedules.

The Committee understands that the new Administration did not have time to fully analyze the importance of the Corps of Engineers' missions to the economic well-being of the Nation. Here are some examples of that importance. The Corps of Engineers is responsible for constructing and maintaining the Nation's ports and waterways. In 1999, about 2.3 billion tons of commerce moved through and on those ports and waterways. The value of the foreign commerce handled at ports is about $672 billion. The Federal taxes generated by waterborne commerce at ports is $150 billion per year. Those ports also generate about 13 million jobs. In the area of flood control, Corps projects have prevented an annual average of over $20 billion in damages between 1991 and 2000. Since 1928, Corps of Engineers flood control projects have prevented almost $6.00 for each dollar expended. The Corps of Engineers operates 75 hydroelectric power projects, which have an installed generating capacity of 20,720 megawatts. These plants provide 24% of the Nation's hydropower output and 3% of total U.S. generating capacity. Even though the Corps does not construct projects for the sole purpose of recreation, recreation at Corps projects also contributes significantly to the Nation's economy. About 10% of the U.S. population visits at least one Corps project each year and those visitors spend $15 billion per year. That visitation supports about 600,000 full- and part-time jobs.

For fiscal year 2002, the Committee has recommended $4,328,233,000 for the Civil Works functions of the Corps of Engineers, $568,233,000 over the amount requested by the Administration (the total amount of $4,468,233,000 recommended for the Corps of Engineers includes $140,000,000 for the Formerly Utilized

Sites Remedial Action Program). Even at this level, the Committee's recommendation includes no new construction starts, and many ongoing projects are funded well below their optimum levels.

In the last year, the Corps of Engineers has received a significant amount of external criticism, most of it centered around an ongoing study, for which the Corps has never made a recommendation, of the need to expand the navigation capacity of the upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway. The Committee believes that that study was poorly managed by the Corps of Engineers; however, the National Academy of Sciences has found that the Corps' officers who questioned the preliminary results of the study were completely justified in doing so since those preliminary results were based on a seriously flawed model. It is unfortunate that the Army Inspector General did not have the benefit of the National Academy's work before it issued a report critical of those officers. The other major area of criticism leveled at the Corps was that it was secretly trying to grow its program. The Committee finds this criticism to be somewhat absurd. The Corps currently has a backlog on active projects of $40 billion. The Corps has plenty of work to keep it busy for years to come even if Congress enacts no new project authorizations, which is highly unlikely. The Committee believes that it is the American people, who have recognized the need for increased investment in water resources, who have been attempting to expand the Corps' programs.

Some have also criticized the Corps for not being "green" enough when, in fact, the Corps has requested over $300 million for construction of projects it categorizes as "environmental" and 36% of its ongoing studies have environmental restoration as their primary purpose. Some think the Corps has become too "green." The Committee fully supports the environmental restoration efforts being undertaken by the Corps, but urges it to maintain a balance in its work and not lose sight of its traditional missions of navigation and flood control, which are so important to the Nation's economy.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 2001	$160,584,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	130,000,000
Recommended, 2002	163,260,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+2,676,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+33,260,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ALABAMA				
(N)	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL.....	300	---	300	---
(SP)	BALDWIN COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, AL.....	100	---	100	---
(FDP)	BALDWIN COUNTY WATERSHEDS, AL.....	50	---	50	---
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL.....	50	---	50	---
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL.....	300	---	---	---
(FDP)	BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL.....	50	---	50	---
(SPE)	CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL.....	160	---	160	---
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL.....	250	---	250	---
(SPE)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	250	---	250	---
	ALASKA				
(N)	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK.....	---	100	---	100
(N)	ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	50	---
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK.....	100	---	100	---
(FDP)	BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK.....	100	---	100	---
(E)	CHANDALAR RIVER WATERSHED, VENETIE INDIAN, AK.....	50	---	50	---
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK.....	100	---	100	---
(N)	CRAIG HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	50	---
(N)	DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK.....	200	---	200	---
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK.....	---	100	---	100
(N)	FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK.....	---	100	---	313
(N)	HAINES HARBOR, AK.....	150	---	150	---
(E)	HARDING LAKE WATERSHED, AK.....	50	---	50	---
(N)	KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	50	---
(N)	KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	50	---
(N)	LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	50	---
(N)	MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	50	---

(N)	PERRYVILLE HARBOR, AK	40	---	40	---
(N)	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	96	---	96	---
(N)	QUINHAGAK HARBOR, AK	50	---	50	---
(N)	SAINT GEORGE NAVIGATION IMPROVEMETS, AK	50	---	50	---
(E)	SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK	50	---	50	---
(N)	SITKA HARBOR, AK	50	---	50	---
(N)	SKAGWAY HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK	138	---	138	---
(N)	UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK	50	---	50	---
(N)	UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	---	226	---	226
(N)	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	---	150	---	150
(N)	WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK	150	---	150	---
	AMERICAN SAMOA				
(N)	TUTUILA HARBOR, AS	124	---	124	---
	ARIZONA				
	COLONIAS ALONG THE US - MEXICO BORDER, AZ	---	---	---	100
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, NORTHEAST PHOENIX DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	143	---	143	---
(SPE)	LITTLE COLORADO RIVER, AZ	100	---	100	---
(E)	PIMA COUNTY, AZ	400	---	400	---
(E)	RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	200	---	410	---
(FC)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	---	230	---	750
(E)	RIO SALADO ESTE, AZ	100	---	100	---
(E)	RIO SALADO OESTE, SALT RIVER, AZ	300	---	300	---
(FDP)	SANTA CRUZ RIVER, GRANT RD TO FT LOWELL RD, AZ	100	---	300	---
(E)	SANTA CRUZ RIVER, PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS, AZ	300	---	400	---
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ	---	270	---	1,500
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	---	208	---	410
(E)	VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT, AZ	100	---	400	---
	ARKANSAS				
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEES, AR	---	187	---	187
(N)	ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, AR & OK	1,200	---	1,200	---
(FC)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	---	200	---	200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(FC)	NORTH LITTLE ROCK, DARK HOLLOW, AR	---	400	---	500
	PINE MOUNTAIN DAM, AR	---	---	---	200
(N)	RED RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS, AR	450	---	450	---
(COM)	WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO	581	---	581	---
(E)	WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOWS, AR	213	---	363	---
	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION, AR	---	---	169	---
	CALIFORNIA				
(E)	ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA	50	---	200	---
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	2,000	---	2,500
(FC)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	---	20	---	20
(FDP)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	318	---	480	---
	ARROYO SECO WATERSHED, CA	---	---	100	---
(E)	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	---	300	---	750
	CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CA	---	---	250	---
	CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	CITY OF WESTMINSTER FLOOD CONTROL DRAINAGE STUDY, CA	100	---	100	---
	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	---	---	400	---
	HUNTINGTON BEACH COASTAL BLUFF EROSION, CA	---	---	---	400
(E)	LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	200	---	200	---
(FC)	LLAGAS CREEK, CA	---	250	---	500
(SPE)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	200	---	350	---
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA	---	600	---	2,600
(SPE)	LOS ANGELES RIVER WATERCOURSE IMPROVEMENT, CA	100	---	100	---
(FC)	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	---	150	---	150
(E)	MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	200	---	200	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	50	---	50	---
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	169	---	400	---
(SPE)	MATILIJA DAM, CA	400	---	523	---

(E)	MIDDLE CREEK, CA.....	---	300	---	300
(SPE)	MOJAVE RIVER FORKS DAM, CA.....	200	---	200	---
(E)	MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA.....	150	---	400	---
(E)	MUGU LAGOON, CA.....	250	---	250	---
(FC)	MURRIETA CREEK, CA.....	---	250	---	1,000
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA.....	150	---	150	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER CACHE CRK, YOLO CNTY, WOODLAND & V	568	---	568	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	100	---	100	---
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA.....	300	---	300	---
(E)	NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA.....	250	---	250	---
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA.....	---	280	---	600
	NEWPORT BAY (LA - 3 SITE DESIGNATION STUDY), CA.....	---	---	300	---
(E)	NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA.....	300	---	450	---
(E)	ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	200	---	200	---
	ORANGE COUNTY COAST BEACH EROSION, CA.....	---	---	400	---
	ORANGE COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA.....	---	---	139	---
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA.....	---	750	---	1,000
(E)	PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA.....	50	---	50	---
	PENINSULA BEACH CITY OF LONG BEACH), CA.....	---	---	200	---
(E)	PINE FLAT DAM, FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION,.	---	400	---	400
	PORT OF STOCKTON, CA.....	---	---	200	---
(FDP)	POSO CREEK, CA.....	200	---	200	---
(FC)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA.....	---	100	---	100
	REGIONAL CONSERVATION/CONJUNCTIVE USE PROJECT, CA.....	---	---	200	---
	RIVERSIDE COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA.....	---	---	2,000	---
	ROCK CREEK - KEEFER SLOUGH, CA.....	---	---	---	200
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA.....	300	---	300	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA.....	300	---	300	---
(E)	SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY,.	4,479	---	5,500	---
(FDP)	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA.....	200	---	200	---
(SP)	SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA.....	100	---	400	---
	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA.....	---	---	1,000	---
	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA.....	---	---	750	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA.....	300	---	300	---
	SAN GABRIEL RIVER TO NEWPORT BAY, CA.....	---	---	400	---
(FDP)	SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA.....	300	---	300	---
(FC)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	---	200	---	200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES & MOKELUMNE RIVERS,	350	---	350	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA.....	25	---	100	---
(FC)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	---	100	---	100
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	50	---	50	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA.....	200	---	350	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA...	160	---	500	---
(FDP)	SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA.....	100	---	100	---
(FDP)	SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA.....	100	---	100	---
(E)	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA.....	300	---	300	---
	SANTA ANA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BIG BEAR LAKE, CA....	---	---	100	---
	SANTA BARBARA AND VENTURA COUNTY SHORELINE, CA.....	---	---	100	---
(E)	SANTA ROSA CREEK WATERSHED, CA.....	300	---	300	---
(E)	SANTA YNEZ RIVER, CA.....	100	---	100	---
	SOLONO BEACH - ENCINITAS, CA.....	---	---	400	---
(E)	SONOMA CREEK & TRIBUTARIES, CA.....	300	---	300	---
(FC)	SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA.....	---	100	---	100
(FDP)	STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA.....	75	---	75	---
(FDP)	SUTTER COUNTY, CA.....	300	---	300	---
(SPE)	TIJUANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA.....	200	---	200	---
(FC)	TULE RIVER, CA.....	---	400	---	770
(FC)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA.....	---	300	---	300
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA.....	300	---	400	---
(E)	UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA.....	200	---	200	---
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA.....	250	---	400	---
	WESTMINSTER, CA.....	---	---	300	---
(FC)	WESTSIDE TRIBUTARIES TO YOLO BYPASS, CA.....	---	50	---	50
(FDP)	WHITE RIVER AND DEER CREEK, CA.....	25	---	25	---
	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA.....	---	---	---	1,000
(FC)	YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	---	780	---	780

	COLORADO				
(RCP)	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO.	250	---	250	---
	FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO.....	---	---	175	---
(E)	ZUNI AND SUN VALLEY REACHES, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER, CO...	200	---	400	---
	COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS				
(N)	ROTA HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI.....	25	---	25	---
(N)	TINIAN HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI.....	25	---	25	---
	DELAWARE				
	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND...	---	---	---	200
	FLORIDA				
(FDP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL.....	240	---	240	---
	EGMONT KEY SHORELINE, FL.....	---	---	500	---
(FDP)	HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL.....	300	---	375	---
(N)	LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL.....	100	---	100	---
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL.....	---	300	---	300
(FDP)	WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FL.....	300	---	300	---
	GEORGIA				
(E)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA.....	300	---	300	---
(E)	ARABIA MOUNTAIN, GA.....	60	---	60	---
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, GA.....	252	---	252	---
(E)	INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS,	100	---	100	---
(E)	LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA.....	100	---	100	---
(FDP)	LUBBUB CREEK, GA.....	50	---	50	---
(E)	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA.....	175	---	175	---
	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA.....	---	---	---	800
(E)	SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA.....	350	---	350	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA.....	---	400	---	400

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(COM)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA & SC.....	230	---	230	---
(E)	UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA.....	150	---	150	---
	HAWAII				
(E)	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI.....	350	---	350	---
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI.....	---	100	---	100
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI.....	101	---	101	---
(E)	KAHUKU, HI.....	50	---	50	---
(N)	KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI..	225	---	225	---
(SP)	KIHEI AREA EROSION, HI.....	50	---	160	---
(SP)	WAIKIKI EROSION CONTROL, HI.....	---	50	---	250
	IDAHO				
(FDP)	BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID.....	50	---	50	---
(FDP)	GOOSE CREEK, OAKLEY, ID.....	150	---	150	---
(FDP)	KOOTENAI RIVER AT BONNERS FERRY, ID.....	50	---	50	---
(FDP)	LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, ID.....	256	---	256	---
(FDP)	PAYETTE AND SNAKE RIVER, ID.....	150	---	150	---
	ILLINOIS				
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL.....	130	---	130	---
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II).....	400	---	400	---
	ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK (INTERIM 1), IL.....	---	---	---	250
	ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL.....	---	---	2,000	---
(E)	ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL.....	825	---	825	---
(FDP)	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL & IN.....	177	---	177	---
(SPE)	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL.....	311	---	311	---

(E)	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL.....	---	415	---	415
(E)	ROCK RIVER, IL & WI.....	300	---	300	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISS & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI..	3,724	---	3,724	---
	UPPER MISS RIVER COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, IL.....	---	---	1,000	---
(SPE)	UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	1,200	---	1,200	---
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL.....	---	160	---	160
(FC)	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL.....	---	341	---	341
	INDIANA				
(SPE)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN.....	250	---	500	---
(N)	JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY.....	---	2,100	---	2,100
	LONG LAKE, IN.....	---	---	100	---
(E)	WOLF LAKE, IN & IL.....	100	---	---	---
	IOWA				
(FDP)	DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA.....	450	---	450	---
	FORT DODGE, IA.....	---	---	100	---
	KANSAS				
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS.....	133	---	133	---
(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO.....	---	122	---	400
(FDP)	UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS.....	150	---	250	---
(E)	WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS.....	200	---	200	---
	KENTUCKY				
(N)	GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & OH.....	---	2,372	---	2,372
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY.....	252	---	252	---
(E)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY.....	325	---	325	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY.....	264	---	264	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY.....	200	---	200	---
	NORTH FORK LICKING RIVER, KY.....	---	---	100	---
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	1,500	---	1,500	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	LOUISIANA				
(E)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.	300	---	300	---
(FDP)	ASCENSION PARISH, LA.....	100	---	300	---
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	100	---	300	---
(N)	BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA.....	---	300	---	300
(N)	CALCASIEU LOCK, LA.....	400	---	500	---
(FDP)	CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA.....	200	---	300	---
(FDP)	HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA.....	100	---	300	---
(FC)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA.....	---	50	---	300
(FC)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA.....	---	400	---	400
(E)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.....	1,072	---	1,072	---
(FC)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA.....	---	50	---	50
(FDP)	PLAQUEMINES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA.....	100	---	300	---
(FDP)	ST BERNARD PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA.....	300	---	400	---
(FDP)	ST CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA.....	100	---	300	---
	WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA.....	---	---	500	---
(FDP)	WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA.....	197	---	197	---
	MARYLAND				
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	458	---	458	---
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD & DC.....	240	---	240	---
(E)	BALTIMORE METRO, GWYNNS FALLS, MD.....	---	50	---	50
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD.....	---	175	---	175
(E)	EASTERN SHORE, MD.....	250	---	250	---
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, MATTAWOMAN, MD.....	87	---	87	---
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S, MD.....	190	---	190	---
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD.....	---	300	---	300

	MASSACHUSETTS				
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI.....	100	---	100	---
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA (45-FOOT CHANNEL).....	300	---	300	---
(E)	COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA.....	100	---	100	---
(FC)	MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MA.....	---	330	---	600
(E)	SOMERSET AND SEARSBURG DAMS, DEERFIELD RIVER, MA & VT.	100	---	100	---
	MICHIGAN				
	BELLE ISLAND SHORELINE, DETROIT, MI.....	---	---	150	---
	CASS RIVER, VASSAR, MI.....	---	---	100	---
	DETROIT RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI.....	---	---	200	---
	DETROIT RIVER MASTER PLAN, MI.....	---	---	100	---
(N)	GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	501	---	501	---
	ROUGE RIVER WATERSHED, MI.....	---	---	200	---
(N)	SAULT STE MARIE (REPLACEMENT LOCK), MI.....	---	1,530	---	1,530
	ST CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST CLAIR, MI.....	---	---	200	---
	MINNESOTA				
(E)	LOWER ST ANTHONY FALLS RAPIDS RESTORATION, MN.....	---	100	---	100
(E)	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD & MANITOBA, C	500	---	500	---
(E)	UPPER MISS RIVER WATERSHED MGMT, LAKE ITASCA TO L/D 2,	200	---	200	---
	MISSISSIPPI				
	HANCOCK COUNTY, MS.....	---	---	100	---
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	CHESTERFIELD, MO.....	---	605	---	605
(N)	HANNIBAL HARBOR, MO.....	175	---	175	---
(FDP)	KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS.....	580	---	580	---
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, MO	180	---	180	---
	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO.....	---	---	50	---
(FC)	RIVER DES PERES, MO.....	---	242	---	242
(FC)	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO.....	---	98	---	98

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL	---	284	---	284
	ST LOUIS RIVERFRONT, MO & IL	---	---	500	---
(FC)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	150	---	150
	MONTANA				
(FC)	LOWER YELLOWSTONE RIVER DIVERSION DAM, MT	---	25	---	25
(COM)	YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	325	---	325	---
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	---	400	---	400
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	350	---	350	---
	LOWER PLATTE RIVER WATERSHED, NE	---	---	200	---
	SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NE	---	656	---	656
(FC)	WESTERN SARPY AND CLEAR CREEK, NE	---	90	---	90
	NEVADA				
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	50	---	400	---
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	---	500	---	500
(E)	WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	200	---	200	---
	NEW HAMPSHIRE				
(COM)	MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN, NH	300	---	500	---

	NEW JERSEY				
(E)	BARNEGAT BAY, NJ.....	---	300	---	300
(SP)	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR, NJ.....	---	263	---	263
	GOFFLE BROOK, BOROUGH OF HAWTHORNE, NJ.....	---	---	100	---
(SP)	GREAT EGG INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ.....	---	69	---	200
(E)	HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ.....	200	---	200	---
(E)	LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ.....	75	---	400	---
(SP)	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	---	68	---	400
(E)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ.	---	150	---	150
	NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HERFORD/CAPE MAY INLET...	---	---	200	---
	NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT	---	---	250	---
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ.....	---	100	---	400
(FDP)	RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	100	---	230	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ.....	50	---	300	---
	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, KEYPORT, NJ.....	---	---	350	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ.....	250	---	450	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, PORT MONMOUTH, NJ.....	---	100	---	500
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ.....	44	---	44	150
(FDP)	SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ.....	50	---	250	---
(FC)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	---	100	---	400
(E)	STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	100	---	250	---
(FDP)	UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ.....	169	---	169	---
(FDP)	UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, NJ.....	200	---	200	---
(FDP)	WOODBRIDGE RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	100	---	250	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(COM)	RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX.....	300	---	300	---
	SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, NM.....	---	---	475	---
	NEW YORK				
(FDP)	AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY...	50	---	50	---
(FDP)	BOQUET RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY.....	50	---	50	---
(FDP)	BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY.....	50	---	300	---
	DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, NY,NJ,DE,PA.....	---	---	500	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(E)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	409	---	409	---
(N)	FREEPORT CREEK, VILLAGE OF FREEPORT, NY	75	---	75	---
(E)	HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, GOWANUS CANAL, NY & NJ	400	---	400	---
(E)	HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	1,369	---	2,000	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY.	50	---	50	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	400	---	400	---
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR,NY	100	---	200	---
(FDP)	LINDENHURST, NY	50	---	50	---
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	---	2,500	---	3,500
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	200	---	200	---
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY	50	---	400	---
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	100	---	400	---
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	350	---	350	---
(E)	SAW MILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	50	---	50	---
(E)	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	50	---	50	---
(SP)	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	209	---	209	---
(E)	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	160	---	160	---
	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, NY	---	---	250	---
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(SP)	BOGUE BANKS, NC	400	---	400	---
(E)	CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	200	---	200	---
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	100	---	600	---
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC (BODIE ISLAND PORTION)	---	500	---	1,000
(E)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	83	---	83	---
(FDP)	NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	100	---	100	---
(SP)	SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC	100	---	300	---
(E)	TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBS, FRANKLIN, MACON COUNTY, NC.	155	---	155	---

	NORTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	DEVILS LAKE, ND.....	---	1,700	---	1,700
(FC)	GRAFTON, PARK RIVER, ND.....	---	60	---	60
	OHIO				
(E)	ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH.....	---	583	---	583
(FDP)	BUTLER COUNTY, OH.....	100	---	100	---
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH.	178	---	178	---
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH.	200	---	200	---
(E)	LOWER BIG DARBY CREEK BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION,	370	---	370	---
	MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, HOH.....	---	---	300	---
(E)	MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH.....	400	---	400	---
(FDP)	RICHLAND COUNTY, OH.....	200	---	200	---
(E)	UPPER BIG DARBY CREEK BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION,	65	---	65	---
	WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH.....	---	---	300	---
	OKLAHOMA				
(E)	CIMARRON RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, OK, KS, NM & CO.....	226	---	226	---
	MIAMI AND VICINITY, OK.....	---	---	300	---
(E)	SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK.....	200	---	250	---
(FDP)	WARR ACRES, OK.....	174	---	174	---
	WISTER LAKE WATERSHED, OK.....	---	---	375	---
	OREGON				
(E)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA...	135	---	135	---
(E)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR...	500	---	500	---
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR.....	130	---	130	---
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR.....	369	---	369	---
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR.....	170	---	170	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FDP)	BLOOMSBURG, PA	250	---	250	---
	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, WISSAHICKON, PA	---	---	100	---
	RHODE ISLAND				
(N)	QUONSET DAVISVILLE PORT, RI	150	---	150	---
(E)	RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	50	---	50	---
(E)	RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST & STRM DMG REDU	---	160	---	160
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(RCP)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	655	---	655	---
(COM)	BROAD RIVER BASIN, SC	125	---	125	---
(E)	CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC	50	---	50	---
	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	---	---	500	---
(SP)	PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	100	---	100	---
(SP)	PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	---	25	---	25
	REEDY RIVER, SC	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	WACCAMAW RIVER, SC	195	---	195	---
(E)	YADKIN - PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC & NC	---	50	---	50
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(FDP)	NIOBRARA RIVER AND MISSOURI RIVER, SD	25	---	25	---

	TENNESSEE				
	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	---	---	---	500
(FDP)	DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	105	---	105	---
(E)	FRENCH BROAD WATERSHED, TN	280	---	280	---
	TEXAS				
(FDP)	BOIS D'ARC CREEK, BONHAM, TX	200	---	200	---
	BRAZORIA COUNTY, TX	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	150	---	1,100	---
	CEDAR BAYOU, TX	---	---	---	400
(E)	COLONIAS-LWR RIO GRANDE BASIN ALONG TX & MEXICO BORDER	---	100	---	400
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, LAQUINTA CHANNEL, TX	378	---	378	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	572	---	572	---
(FDP)	FREEPORT HURRICANE PROTECTION LEVEE, TX	100	---	100	---
(N)	GIWW MODIFICATIONS, TX	400	---	400	---
(RCP)	GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	810	---	810	---
(N)	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	---	540	---	540
(N)	GIWW, MATAGORDA BAY, TX	---	200	---	800
(RCP)	GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	600	---	600	---
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	190	---	377
(E)	GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	200	---	500	---
(E)	LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	950	---	950	---
(E)	MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	100	---	100	---
(E)	NORTH BOSQUE RIVER, TX	---	100	---	100
(E)	NORTH PADRE ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI, TX	---	130	---	130
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	250	---	250	---
(FC)	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	---	50	---	750
(E)	RESACAS AT BROWNSVILLE, TX	100	---	325	---
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	650	---	650	---
(E)	SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	450	---	700	---
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	380	---	600
	SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX	---	---	200	---
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	650	---	1,200	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	UTAH				
(FDP)	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	100	---	100	---
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	---	475	---	475
(SP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, HAMPTON, VA	100	---	100	---
(N)	ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA	---	284	---	284
	FOURMILE RUN, VA	---	---	100	---
	GOSHEN DAM, VA	---	---	---	500
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	---	295	---	295
(FDP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216)	400	---	400	---
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	946	---	946	---
(E)	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	100	---	100	---
	WASHINGTON				
(E)	BELLINGHAM BAY, WA	200	---	300	---
(FC)	CENTRALIA, WA	---	500	---	1,000
(E)	CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	250	---	250	---
	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WA	---	---	100	---
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	---	250	---	300
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	---	500	---	1,000
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	254	---	1,050	---
(SP)	OCEAN SHORES, WA	50	---	50	---
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	225	---	225	---
(E)	PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	200	---	200	---
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	200	---	200	---
(E)	SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	50	---	50	---

(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	---	50	---	50
	WALLA WALLA WATERSHED, WA	---	---	1,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
	ERICKSON/WOOD COUNTY PUBLIC PORT, WV	---	---	---	600
(FC)	ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV	---	483	---	483
(FC)	MERCER COUNTY, WV	---	100	---	100
(E)	NEW RIVER BASIN, WV, NC & VA	200	---	200	---
	PARKERSBURG/VIENNA, WV	---	---	---	300
	WEIRTON PORT, WV	---	---	---	400
	WISCONSIN				
(E)	BARABOO RIVER, WI	240	---	240	---
	WYOMING				
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	---	175	---	175
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	2,200	---	3,200	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	100	---	100	---
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	400	---	400	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	8,200	---	8,200	---
	GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	---	---	200	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SEC. 401)	---	---	1,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	500	---	500	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	500	---	500	---
	JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN PROGRAM	---	---	500	---
	NATIONAL SHORELINE	300	---	300	---
	OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	7,200	---	7,200	---
	PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	6,500	---	6,500	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	400	---	400	---
	PROJECT MONITORING	100	---	---	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	300	---	300	---

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	24,000	---	27,300	---
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS.....	100	---	100	---
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY).....	700	---	700	---
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.....	700	---	700	---
TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER.....	650	---	650	---
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-24,050	---	-49,700	---
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....	96,274	33,726	109,361	53,899

False Pass Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee has provided $313,000 for the Corps of Engineers to accelerate completion of plans and specifications for the False Pass Harbor, Alaska, project.

Colonias Along the U.S.-Mexico Border, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate detailed design and plans and specifications for a wastewater treatment facility and distribution system in the City of Marana, Pima County, Arizona.

Tucson Drainage Area, Arizona.—The bill includes $410,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering and design for the Tucson Drainage Area, Arizona, project.

Va Shly-Ah Akimel Salt River Restoration Project, Arizona.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 for the Va Shly-Ah Akimel Salt River Restoration Project in Arizona to advance completion of the study by one year.

Pine Mountain Dam, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to update the design for the Pine Mountain Dam project in Arkansas.

White River Navigation, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $169,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the ongoing studies for the White River Navigation to Newport, Arkansas, project.

Arroyo Seco Watershed, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to evaluate non-structural flood control management, opportunities for water quality improvement, and habitat restoration in the Arroyo Seco Watershed.

City of San Bernardino, California.—The bill includes $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a feasibility study of flooding problems and environmental restoration opportunities in the City of San Bernardino, California.

City of Santa Clarita, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of flood control improvements and environmental restoration opportunities in the City of Santa Clarita, California.

Coast of California, Los Angeles, County, California.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility phase of the study of long-term shoreline changes, as well as coastal processes information needed to plan and design future shore protection projects.

Huntington Beach, Coastal Bluff Erosion, California.—The bill includes $400,000 for preconstruction engineering and design for a project to correct a serious erosion problem of the coastal bluff adjacent to the Pacific Coast Highway in Huntington Beach, California.

Murrieta Creek, California.—The Committee has included language in the bill which directs the Secretary of the Army to proceed with the Murrieta Creek, California, project in accordance with the cost sharing established for the project in Public Law 106–377.

Newport Bay (LA–3 Site Designation Study), California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete monitoring studies to secure a permanent designation of the LA–3 Ocean Disposal Site.

Regional Conservation/Conjunctive Use Project, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to

complete the reconnaissance and feasibility studies for the regional water conservation and recycling project within Placer County, El Dorado County, and the service area of the San Juan Water District.

Riverside County Special Area Management Plan, California.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on Special Area Management Plans for the San Jacinto and Santa Margarita watersheds.

Rock Creek-Keefer Slough Flood Control Project, California.—The Committee has included language in the bill which directs the Corps of Engineers to use the feasibility report prepared under the authority of section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended, as the basis for the Rock Creek-Keefer Slough Flood Control Project in Butte County, California, and has provided $200,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the project.

San Diego County Special Area Management Plan, California.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for completion of the Otay River Watershed Special Area Management Plan and initiation of the San Luis Rey River Watershed plan.

San Diego County Shoreline, California.—The Committee has provided $750,000 to continue the study of the erosion of the City of Oceanside's beaches.

Santa Ana River and Tributaries, Big Bear Lake, California.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of environmental restoration, water quality, and related issues at Big Bear Lake, California.

Santa Barbara and Ventura County Shoreline, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of shoreline erosion problems in Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.

Fountain Creek and Tributaries, Colorado.—The Committee has provided $175,000 to initiate the feasibility phase of the Fountain Creek and Tributaries study. The Committee recommends that the Corps of Engineers include erosion and sedimentation as a project purpose equal in priority to that of flood damage reduction and environmental restoration along Fountain Creek north of Pueblo, Colorado.

Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Fenwick Island, Delaware.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Fenwick Island, Delaware, project.

Egmont Key Shoreline, Florida.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to study alternatives for shoreline stabilization at Egmont Key. Florida.

Hillsborough River, Florida.—The bill includes $375,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the study of water conservation, water supply, environmental restoration, and other related problems in the Hillsborough and Withlacoochee River Basins.

New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam, Georgia.—The Committee has provided $800,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the project to rehabilitate the New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam in preparation for transferring the project to the City of North Augusta and Aiken County, South Carolina.

Illinois Beach State Park, Illinois.—The bill includes $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete plans and specifications for the Illinois Beach State Park between Waukegan and Zion, Illinois.

Illinois River Basin Restoration, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps Engineers to initiate development of a comprehensive plan for the restoration of the Illinois River Basin.

Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Study, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to prepare the Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan in accordance with section 459 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

Indiana Harbor, Indiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $250,000 to accelerate work on the Indiana Harbor, Indiana, feasibility study.

Fort Dodge, Iowa.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of enhancement of the Des Moines River at Fort Dodge, Iowa.

North Fork Licking River, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of flood control, water supply, and recreation at North Fork Lake in Bracken, Robertson, and Mason Counties, Kentucky.

West Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake an expedited study of waterfront and riverine preservation, restoration, and enhancements of the Mississippi River, West Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana, project, and, if justified, proceed directly to preconstruction engineering and design, as authorized by section 517(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

West Shore, Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana.—The Committee is aware of concerns expressed by St. John the Baptist Parish regarding proposed levee alignments north of Interstate 10. The Committee included report language on this issue last year, but understands that it remains unresolved. The Committee understands that the delay in resolving this issue could result in the delay of flood protection for citizens in St. John the Baptist Parish and directs the Crops of Engineers to make immediate resolution of this issue a top priority.

Muddy River, Brookline, and Boston, Massachusetts.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the feasibility study and initiate and complete preconstruction engineering and design for the Muddy River, Brookline, and Boston, Massachusetts, project.

Cass River, Vassar, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of flooding problems at Vassar, Michigan.

Belle Island Shoreline, Michigan.—The bill includes $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies for the Belle Island Shoreline project which will identify areas in need of stabilization and also identify where to employ innovative techniques for bank stabilization.

Detroit River Master Plan, Michigan.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to develop a master plan for the riverfront and historic trails along the Detroit River, Detroit, Michigan.

Rouge River Watershed, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for a basin-wide watershed management study to address flood hazard reduction, riverine ecosystem restoration, and recreation needs in the Rouge River Watershed.

New Madrid Harbor, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $50,000 for the Corps of Engineers to determine if federal maintenance of New Madrid Harbor is economically and environmentally feasible.

St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete a comprehensive water management reconnaissance study for ecosystem restoration and related purposes in the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair watershed in Michigan pursuant to section 426 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

Hancock County, Mississippi.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of the seawall in Hancock County, Mississippi.

Lower Platte River Watershed, Nebraska.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to assess and plan for water quality improvements in the Lower Platte River watershed.

Lower Las Vegas Wash Wetlands, Nevada.—The Committee has provided an additional $350,000 to accelerate completion of the Lower Las Vegas Wash Wetlands feasibility study.

Goffle Brook, Borough of Hawthorne, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of flooding problems along Goffle Brook in the Borough of Hawthorne, New Jersey.

New Jersey Shoreline Protection, Alternative Long-Term Nourishment Study, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for feasibility phase studies to develop comprehensive beach inlet and borrow area management strategies to efficiently manage New Jersey sand resources.

Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Keyport, New Jersey.—The bill includes $350,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies for the Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Keyport, project.

Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction Study, Albuquerque, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $475,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue, on an expedited basis, the feasibility phase for the Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction, Albuquerque, New Mexico, study. The Committee has included language in the bill which directs the Secretary of the Army to include in the study an evaluation of flood reduction measures that would otherwise be excluded based on policies regarding the frequency of flooding, the drainage areas, and the amount of runoff.

Bronx River, New York.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the ongoing Bronx River ecosystem restoration study.

Hudson–Raritan Estuary, New York and New Jersey.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to direct sufficient resources from the Hudson–Raritan Estuary project to include in its study area the habitat restoration opportunities in the entirety of the Hackensack Meadowlands ecosystem located in northern New Jersey.

Lake Montauk Harbor, New York.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Lake Montauk Harbor study. In conducting this study, the Corps of Engineers should determine if improvements for storm damage reduction for the eastern and western shores adjacent to Lake Montauk Inlet, in conjunction with possible improvements for navigation, are advisable at this time. Beneficial use of dredged material and sand bypassing should also be considered.

Upper Susquehanna River Basin Study, New York.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Upper Susquehanna River Basin study.

Surfside and North Topsail Beach, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility phase of the Surf City and North Topsail Beach, North Carolina, study.

Mahoning River Environmental Dredging, Ohio.—The bill includes $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies for the project to remove contaminated sediments from the Mahoning River.

Western Lake Erie Basin Study, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the reconnaissance level studies for the Western Lake Erie Basin watershed study.

Miami and Vicinity, Oklahoma.—The bill includes $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies for the Miami and Vicinity, Oklahoma, flood control study.

Wister Lake Watershed, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided $375,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility phase of the study for watershed management at Wister Lake, Oklahoma.

Schuylkill River, Wissahickon, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for reconnaissance study of environmental restoration opportunities along the Schuylkill River at Wissahickon, Pennsylvania.

Charleston Harbor, South Carolina.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of the deepening of Charleston Harbor, South Carolina.

Reedy River, South Carolina.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of ecosystem restoration, flood damage reduction, and streambank stabilization in the Reedy River basin in South Carolina.

Chickamauga Lock, Tennessee.—The bill includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Chickamauga Lock project in Tennessee.

Brazoria County, Texas.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of flooding problems along Mustang Bayou in Brazoria County, Texas.

Sulpher River Environmental Restoration, Texas.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies for the Sulpher River environmental restoration and flood reduction study.

Upper Trinity River Basin, Texas.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Corps of Engineers to evaluate existing

flood control improvements and identify additional measures needed to protect the urban center of Fort Worth, Texas at the confluence of the West and Clear Forks of the Trinity River.

Fourmile Run, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of flood control needs and environmental restoration opportunities in Fourmile Run, Virginia.

Goshen Dam, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete plans and specifications for the dam safety improvements at Goshen Dam, Lake Merriweather, Virginia.

Commencement Bay Environmental Dredging, Washington.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for reconnaissance study of environmental dredging needs in Commencement Bay, Washington.

Walla Walla River Watershed, Washington.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility study to restore instream flows in the Walla Walla River in Washington and Oregon.

Erickson/Wood County Public Port, West Virginia.—The bill includes $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design at the Erickson/Wood County public port site.

Parkersburg/Vienna, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the feasibility report and initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Parkersburg/Vienna, West Virginia, project.

Weirton Public Port, West Virginia.—The bill includes $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design at the Weirton public port site.

Coastal Field Data Collection.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Southern California Beach Process Study.

Great Lakes Remedial Action Program.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to continue work on the Great Lakes Remedial Action Program.

Planning Assistance to States.—Within the amount provided for the Planning Assistance to States Program, $50,000 is for the preparation of a Comprehensive Drainage Basin Plan for Francis Bland Floodway Ditch (Eight Mile Creek) and tributaries in the vicinity of Paragould, Arkansas, and $100,000 is for the Corps of Engineers to provide planning assistance to develop a master plan for Elk Creek Lake in Fleming County, Kentucky.

Flood Plain Management Services.—Within the amount provided for Flood Plain Management Services, $100,000 is to update a flood plain study for Tripps Run in the City of Falls Church, Virginia. In addition, the amount provided for Flood Plain Management Services includes $1,300,000 for the development of a Foundational Floodplain Management Geographic Information System for East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana, containing essential graphic and non-graphic detailed databases. The system will facilitate the wisest use and planning within the floodplain, as well as improving the response to emergency situations and watershed planning requirements.

Research and Development.—The Committee has provided $27,300,000 for the Corps of Engineers Research and Development program. Within the amount provided, $3,300,000 is to continue the National Shoreline Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program authorized by section 227 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. This program allows the Corps of Engineers to fund the demonstration of innovative techniques for promoting shoreline protection and preventing coastal erosion. Within the funds provided, the Committee has provided $1,300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to demonstrate the effectiveness of erosion control systems consisting of permeable groins installed perpendicular to the shoreline which reduce wave and current energy allowing a portion of the sediment load to fall out of suspension at Gulf State Park in Gulf Shores, Alabama. The Committee also expects the Corps to continue the research program being undertaken along the Lake Michigan shoreline which have revealed the significance of groundwater, rather than waves, as a primary cause of slumps and landslides.

In addition, the Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to fully investigate the use of electro-osmotic-pulse technologies at facilities where chronic water seepage and floods are problematic.

Within the funds provided for the Research and Development Program, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to test the effectiveness of the Aqua Levee emergency flood control system, and report back to the Committee on the feasibility of deploying this emergency flood control system for use in fighting floods.

Cooperation With Institutions of Higher Learning.—The Committee recognizes the ongoing problems associated with severe weather phenomena in coastal regions and encourages the Corps of Engineers, whenever possible, to collaborate with the engineering departments of post secondary institutions in the development of environmental, geotechnical, structural, and hydraulic systems to address and prevent damage caused by severe weather.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 2001	$1,716,165,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	1,324,000,000
Recommended, 2002	1,671,854,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−44,311,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+347,854,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA			
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	326,605	2,300	2,300
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REH	43,700	12,325	12,325
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB)	36,000	3,000	3,000
	ALASKA			
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	6,500	3,300	3,300
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	20,192	2,200	2,200
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	23,125	700	700
	ARIZONA			
(E)	RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ	62,730	13,200	22,000
	ARKANSAS			
	FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, AR	---	---	180
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	651,000	3,000	3,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	242,000	18,000	23,000
	RED RIVER WATERWAY, INDEX, AR TO DENISON DAM, TX	---	---	3,000
	CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	87,000	13,000	15,000
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS	97,500	4,500	8,000
	CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	---	---	2,000
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	21,900	250	250
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	43,300	600	750
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	128,700	4,000	10,000
(E)	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	47,400	1,000	5,000
	HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING, CA	---	---	5,500
(SP)	IMPERIAL BEACH, SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, CA	15,300	500	929
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	19,700	3,000	5,000
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	5,100	1,431	1,431
	LOWER WALNUT CREEK, CA	---	---	250
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	34,700	4,075	4,075
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	91,800	500	500
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	14,700	2,263	2,263
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	91,000	5,500	8,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA (50 FOOT PROJECT)	144,000	2,000	10,000
	PETALUMA RIVER, CA	---	---	8,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	179,900	2,326	2,326
	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	---	---	300
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	20,000	2,284	4,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	173,000	250	250
	SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION, CA	---	---	15,000
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	19,440	3,490	3,490
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	924,000	26,800	36,800
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	5,450	100	100
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	36,000	1,700	1,700
(FC)	STOCKTON METROPOLITIAN FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSEMENT, CA	35,700	1,000	8,000
(FC)	SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	30,900	1,000	1,000
(SP)	SURFSIDE - SUNSET - NEWPORT BEACH, CA	8,300	300	3,800
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	5,810	1,463	1,463
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	17,700	1,368	1,368
	DELAWARE			
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	12,600	270	501
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST, REHOBOTH BEACH TO DEWEY BEACH, DE	64,900	100	3,717
	FLORIDA			
(SP)	BREVARD COUNTY, FL	136,600	200	8,500
(SP)	BROWARD COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSABLE)	90,200	200	2,500
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	133,740	5,701	5,701
(E)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	2,219,000	95,278	95,278
(SP)	DADE COUNTY, FL	182,400	8,000	14,857
	DUVAL COUNTY, FL	---	---	3,000
(E)	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	75,000	19,876	19,876
	FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL	---	---	500
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	11,000	1,457	5,300
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	29,800	4,300	4,300
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	265,600	25,846	25,846
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	26,485	1,000	1,000
	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	---	---	3,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	50,255	5,274	5,274
(SP)	PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT)	85,000	200	4,500
(N)	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	19,000	7,299	7,299

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	25,747	1,215	1,215
	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	---	---	2,000
	PORT EVERGLADES, FL	---	---	4,000
(SP)	ST JOHN'S COUNTY, FL	184,700	300	4,000
	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	---	---	6,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	751	500	500
	GEORGIA			
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	41,461	4,084	7,400
(MP)	BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	27,200	3,000	3,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	31,000	4,500	4,500
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC	3,167	1,300	1,300
(FC)	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA (DEF CORR)	11,208	632	632
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	619,570	3,000	3,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700	6,500	6,500
	HAWAII			
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	15,004	400	400
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	5,620	1,275	1,275
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	11,883	325	325
	ILLINOIS			
(N)	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	24,756	3,617	3,617
(SP)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	174,188	24,000	26,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	37,861	1,000	1,000
	EAST ST LOUIS INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL, IL	---	---	688
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	68,592	8,038	8,038
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	21,000	1,600	1,600
(FC)	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	501,100	10,000	15,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	740,636	500	500
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	1,052,000	34,000	40,000
(E)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO	766,195	21,000	21,000
	INDIANA			
	CALUMET REGION, IN	---	---	3,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY)	61,100	5,000	5,000
	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	---	1,000
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	---	---	9,000
(FC)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	12,806	3,600	3,600
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	139,000	4,000	4,500
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	46,619	8,500	8,500
(FC)	OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	17,500	2,400	2,400
	IOWA			
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 12, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	15,000	4,906	4,906
(E)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	85,400	11,000	11,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	152,394	8,500	9,200
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	46,540	4,000	4,000
	KANSAS			
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	20,850	3,050	5,100
	KENTUCKY			
	CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	---	---	1,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	17,000	2,900	4,500
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	533,000	14,400	20,400
	LOUISVILLE WATERFRONT, KY	---	---	500
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	278,000	13,632	18,632
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	7,951	2,575	2,575
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	13,524	1,400	1,400
	POND CREEK, KY	---	---	425
	SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY	---	---	4,000
	LOUISIANA			
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	106,000	500	8,000
	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	---	---	200
(N)	INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	652,000	10,000	13,000
(N)	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	1,895,807	16,555	20,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	527,000	7,500	13,500
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	81,000	1,500	1,500
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	179,800	575	575
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	92,189	500	500
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	173,000	2,000	2,000
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	450,000	51,908	56,908
(FC)	WEST BANK AND VICINITY, NEW ORLEANS, LA	200,000	12,000	12,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	MARYLAND			
	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD	---	---	2,000
(SP)	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	25,800	10,000	10,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	189,000	2,300	4,271
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD & VA	21,000	8,000	8,000
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	27,000	1,500	3,000
(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	320,000	18,200	18,200
	MASSACHUSETTS			
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	31,800	12,500	12,500
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	13,200	9,000	9,000
	MINNESOTA			
(FC)	CROOKSTON, MN	7,020	2,000	2,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	18,800	800	800
	NORTHEASTERN, MN	---	---	5,000
(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	10,200	630	630
	STILLWATER, MN	---	---	3,300
	MISSISSIPPI			
	DESOTO COUNTY, MS	---	---	5,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	32,948	100	100
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	47,789	1,930	1,930
	MISSOURI			
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	13,500	675	675
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	220,000	8,400	10,400
	BOIS BRULE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, MO	---	---	1,200
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU, JACKSON, MO	37,128	1,717	1,717
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	29,056	1,200	1,200
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	269,273	4,000	4,000
	ST LOUIS, MO	---	---	4,000
(FC)	STE GENEVIEVE, MO	34,710	850	850
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY)	60,200	5,900	5,900
	NEBRASKA			
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	21,000	1,800	1,800
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	10,698	4,000	4,000
	NEVADA			
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	214,800	22,000	25,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE			
	ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, LEBANON, NH	---	---	2,000
	NEW JERSEY			
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET, NJ (ABSECON ISLAN	290,000	100	1,000
(SP)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	53,400	780	2,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	231,000	10,000	10,000
(SP)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	241,500	130	250
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	84,300	22,000	22,000
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	19,700	5,400	5,400
	PASSAIC RIVDR STREAMBANK RESTORATION, NJ	---	---	3,000
(FC)	RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, MAHWAH, NJ AND SUFFERN, NY	8,400	100	100
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	11,800	4,949	4,949
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	343,000	100	400
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	314,400	10,000	10,000
(SP)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	698,200	5,000	5,000
(SP)	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	163,000	2,000	2,000
	NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	66,000	2,000	2,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	41,400	3,500	3,500
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	46,800	600	600
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	62,300	300	300
	NEW YORK			
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	230,400	15,000	20,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	76,500	300	900
(SP)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	55,000	1,230	2,284
(SP)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	119,300	4,700	8,729
(SP)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	403,400	2,275	2,275

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ.....	580,200	44,000	44,000
	NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY.....	---	---	3,000
	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY.....	---	---	8,000
	NORTH CAROLINA			
(SP)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, OCEAN ISLE BEACH PORTION, NC	96,600	300	800
	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC.....	---	---	300
(SP)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET, NC.....	112,300	300	700
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC.....	248,100	43,159	48,159
(SP)	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC.....	26,500	550	550
	NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	BUFORD - TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION,	34,000	3,000	4,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB).....	44,318	7,000	7,000
(FC)	GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN.....	178,800	25,954	30,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY).....	12,400	2,400	2,400
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND.....	55,807	2,000	2,000
	OHIO			
	LOWER GIRARD LAKE DAM, OH.....	---	---	1,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH.....	32,123	2,700	2,700
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH.....	163,000	2,000	3,000
	OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, OH.....	---	---	4,000
	OTTAWA RIVER, OH.....	---	---	300
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH.....	97,000	7,200	11,000
	OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY).....	10,000	1,800	1,800
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY).....	39,300	3,700	3,700
	OREGON			
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB).	110,800	10,000	10,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA...	79,760	5,000	5,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR.....	179,400	2,000	2,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA...	28,000	100	100
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR.....	72,000	8,000	8,000
	PENNSYLVANIA			
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB).....	32,500	3,082	3,082
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.....	705,000	34,470	39,470
	NANTY GLO, PA.....	---	---	1,670
	NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA, PA.....	---	---	3,000
(SP)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT).....	64,785	392	728
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA.....	13,374	4,138	4,138
	SCHUYLKILL RIVER PARK, PA.....	---	---	2,000
	SOUTH CENTRAL PENN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM..	---	---	10,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING).....	131,000	19,000	19,000
	PUERTO RICO			
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR.....	14,400	500	500
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR.....	430,300	5,409	5,409
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR.....	66,700	500	500
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR.....	155,300	500	500
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE MANATI, PR.....	1,500	1,500	1,500
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR.....	331,000	9,000	9,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA			
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING & WIDENING).....	98,444	6,365	10,865
	FOLLY BEACH, SC.....	---	---	200
(MP)	HARTWELL LK,CLEMSON UPPER & LOWER DIVERSION, SC (DAM S	8,741	2,500	2,500
	LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC.....	---	---	11,648
	SOUTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD.....	30,450	6,000	6,000
(E)	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD.....	107,000	3,000	3,000
(MP)	PIERRE, SD.....	35,000	6,000	6,000
	TENNESSEE			
	BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLANDS SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN..	---	---	2,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	TEXAS			
	BOSQUE AND LEON RIVERS, TX	---	---	2,500
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	312,485	4,066	5,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	28,391	5,565	5,565
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	94,115	1,200	1,200
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX	95,826	2,000	10,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	116,300	3,400	3,400
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	475,468	28,785	30,785
(FC)	JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	13,630	2,900	6,000
	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX	---	---	1,800
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	45,375	8,068	12,000
	RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX & OK	---	---	2,100
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, TX,AR,LA	---	---	2,500
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	155,300	866	1,400
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	225,752	9,000	9,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	---	---	2,617
	UTAH			
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	9,660	500	500
	VIRGINIA			
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	24,054	7,000	7,000
(MP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (MAJOR REHAB)	61,800	4,800	4,800
	LYNCHBURG COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, VA	---	---	1,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	137,400	486	486
	RICHMOND COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, VA	---	---	1,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	31,000	3,000	3,000
(SP)	SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VA	193,050	3,380	3,380
(SP)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	273,624	9,000	9,000
	WASHINGTON			
(E)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	1,506,330	81,000	81,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR, WA	28,170	325	325
(E)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	261,000	2,555	2,555
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	199,500	545	545
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	93,720	3,300	3,300
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA & OR (MAJOR REH	102,960	7,000	7,000
	WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	112,300	8,000	8,000
	CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA, WV	---	---	3,000
	GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	---	---	1,200
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,931,287	16,700	35,200
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB)	22,200	4,300	4,300
	LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	---	---	750
(N)	MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	313,000	6,200	6,200
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	369,474	1,300	1,300
	SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA, WV	---	---	3,000
(FC)	TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	9,500	1,461	1,461
	WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV & PA.	---	---	2,300
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	235,500	600	600
	WISCONSIN			
(FC)	LAFARGE LAKE, WI	17,000	5,150	5,150
	MISCELLANEOUS			
	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	---	15,000	20,000
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	---	3,000	3,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	---	1,500	1,500
	DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	---	5,000	7,000
	DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM	---	9,000	5,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	---	7,000	9,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	---	20,000	20,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	---	30,000	40,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE	---	45	45
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE	---	185	185
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)	---	500	900
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	---	7,000	15,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	---	21,000	25,000
	SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	---	5,000	5,000
	SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECT (SECTION 208)	---	1,000	1,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-156,580	-244,184
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL		1,324,000	1,671,854

Rio Salado, Phoenix and Tempe Reaches, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $22,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Rio Salado project in Arizona.

Fourche Bayou Basin, Arkansas.—The bill includes $180,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the Limited Reevaluation Report for the Fourche Bayou Basin, Arkansas, project.

Red River Waterway, Index, Arkansas to Denison Dam, Texas.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to construct a bendway weir bank stabilization project along the Red River in the vicinity of the Oklahoma State Highway 271 bridge. This project will demonstrate the effectiveness of bendway weirs in preventing the severe bank erosion that is occurring on the Red River between Index, Arkansas and Denison Dam, Texas.

City of Santa Clarita, California.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the study of perchlorate contamination and the planning for its removal within the Eastern Santa Clara River Basin in the City of Santa Clarita.

Kaweah River, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 for the Kaweah River, California, project. The Committee is aware that the project sponsors have appropriated all their required funds for the entire project.

Lower Walnut Creek, California.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a General Reevaluation Report which will detail a new project alternative that incorporates riparian restoration goals with flood control objectives.

Petaluma River, California.—The bill includes $8,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Petaluma River, California, project, and reimburse the local sponsor for expenses in excess of the required cost sharing.

Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the Limited Reevaluation Report for the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel project.

Santa Ana River Mainstem, California.—The bill includes $10,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of Reach 3B of the San Timoteo Creek feature of the Santa Ana River Mainstem project in California.

San Lorezo River, California.—The Committee has provided $3,490,000 to continue work on the San Lorenzo River project. When the project authorization was modified in the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, it was the intent of Congress that the Corps of Engineers treat the modification as a seamless part of the original project, and that the bank erosion control portion of the project not be treated as a separate project subject to a separate new start decision.

Surfside-Sunset and Newport Beach, California.—The bill includes $3,800,000 to continue the stage 11 nourishment at Surfside-Sunset beach.

Brevard County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $8,500,000 for renourishment of the South Reach of the Brevard County, Florida, project.

Broward County, Florida.—The bill includes $2,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to reimburse Broward County for costs associ-

ated with the renourishment of the Broward County, Florida, project.

Central and Southern Florida, Florida.—Within the funds provided for the Central and Southern Florida project, the Committee expects the Committee to use $600,000 to undertake a review and evaluation of the performance of the regional canal system in Miami-Dade County.

Dade County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $14,857,000 for the Dade County, Florida, project. The additional funds will enable the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Alternative Sand Test Beach project and renourish the Haulover Beach/Bal Harbour segment of the project. The funds provided will also permit the Corps of Engineers to undertake innovative beach erosion prevention and sand recycling initiatives.

Duval County, Florida.—The bill includes $3,000,000 for renourishment of the Duval County, Florida, shore protection project.

Fort Pierce Beach, Florida.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the Bryzone study and prepare plans and specifications to permanently fix the erosion problem for the one mile of beach front adjoining the Federal project south of the inlet.

Martin County, Florida.—The bill includes $3,000,000 to complete the renourishment of the Martin County, Florida, project.

Palm Beach County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $4,500,000 for renourishment of the Delray Beach segment of the project.

Pinellas County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Pinellas County, Florida, project.

Port Everglades, Florida.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to reimburse Port Everglades for the Federal share of the costs associated with widening and deepening the Southport Channel and the Turning Notch at Port Everglades, Florida.

Sarasota County, Florida.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use available funds to reimburse the City of Venice, Florida, the Federal share of the construction costs of an artificial reef that is to be considered an integral part of the Sarasota County beach nourishment project, as well as the Federal share of the costs of constructing and/or relocating any stormwater outfall whose primary function is to drain storm water from public property.

East St. Louis and Vicinity Interior Flood Control, Illinois.—The bill includes $688,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the General Reevaluation Report for the East St. Louis and Vicinity Interior Flood Control project.

Olmsted Locks and Dam, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $40,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Olmsted Locks and Dam project. Within the amount provided, the Committee urges the Corps to work with the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission to develop tools to describe and monitor the biological processes of the Ohio River for the purpose of maintaining and improving water quality.

Calumet Region, Indiana.—The bill includes $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Calumet Region, Indiana, project.

Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to continue construction of the Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana, project.

Missouri River Levee System, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri.—The Committee has provided an additional $700,000 for the Unit L15 levee project.

Carr Creek Lake, Kentucky.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to modify the Carr Creek Lake, Kentucky, project by reallocating reservoir storage and undertaking measures at full Federal expense to mitigate the impacts of raising the seasonal pool elevation to provide additional water supply storage for the Upper Kentucky River Basin in accordance with the Louisville District Carr Creek Lake Water Supply Reallocation Study, dated January 2001.

Louisville Waterfront, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue design of the Louisville Waterfront project.

Pond Creek, Kentucky.—The bill includes $425,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the study to evaluate the purchase and demolition of residences in the 100-year floodplain.

Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky.—The bill includes $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue design and construction of selected environmental infrastructure projects in southern and eastern Kentucky.

Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, Louisiana.—The Committee is aware of the potential impacts on vehicular traffic as a result of the construction of a new lock on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to work with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development and the U.S. Coast Guard on a revised traffic study. The traffic study shall evaluate the feasibility of replacing existing bridges with a tunnel or higher elevation crossings with the goal of minimizing vehicular traffic delays resulting from the project. Further, the Committee expects the Corps to make traffic impacts a high priority when developing and implementing a community mitigation plan with local community leaders.

Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana.—The Committee recognizes the life-threatening situations that have occurred several times by the closing of the Golden Meadow floodgates to protect its "interior" citizens from storm surges. While the Committee supports the use and operation of this flood control system, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to expedite to the fullest extent possible completion of the Leon Theriot Lock to allow for the unimpeded passage of mariners seeking safe harbor north of the floodgates at Bayou Lafourche.

Anacostia River and Tributaries, Maryland.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the project to restore wetland areas along the Anacostia River.

Desoto County, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Desoto County, Mississippi, project.

Bois Brule Drainage and Levee District, Missouri.—The Committee is aware of the devastating flooding and life threatening situation that occurred to residents of Perry County, Missouri, during the flood of 1993 when levee deficiencies resulted in failure of the existing Bois Brule Drainage and Levee District, Missouri, project authorized by the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1965. Therefore, the Committee has provided $1,200,000 for the project and directs the Secretary of the Army to initiate design and construction of deficiency correction work to restore the Bois Brule Drainage and Levee District project to its authorized level of protection using continuing contracts as appropriate, and with study and construction cost sharing consistent with the original project. Additionally, the Committee is aware that a portion of the study effort being performed under the Section 205 program is attributable to the design deficiency project, and, therefore, directs the Secretary to transfer the associated study costs to the design deficiency project.

St. Louis, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to work with the St. Louis Metropolitan Sewer District to address critical flooding and water contamination problems in St. Louis, Missouri.

Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-Basin, New Jersey.—The Committee has included language in the bill which directs the Secretary of the Army to construct the locally preferred plan for the Middlesex Borough element of the Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-Basin, New Jersey, project.

Atlantic Coast of New York City, Rockaway Inlet to Norton Point, New York.—The Committee has provided an additional $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to prepare plans and specifications, modify the existing Project Cooperation Agreement, and advertise a contract for implementing the recommended T-groin alternative.

Long Beach Island, New York.—The Committee remains fully supportive of the Long Beach Island, New York, project and understands that sufficient carryover funding is available to satisfy program requirements in fiscal year 2002.

Brunswick County Beaches, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $800,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preparation of a General Reevaluation Report for the Oak Island, Caswell Beach, and Holden Beach segments of the Brunswick County Beaches project in North Carolina.

Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue shoreline monitoring, and complete the General Design Memorandum and Environmental Impact Statement supplement for the Oregon Inlet project.

West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $700,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preparation of a General Reevaluation Report of the currently authorized project and the remaining shoreline at Topsail Beach.

Lower Girard Lake Dam, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the project to repair and rehabilitate the Lower Girard Lake Dam in Girard, Ohio.

Mill Creek, Ohio.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Mill Creek, Ohio, project. The funds are to be used to accelerate completion of the General Reevaluation Report and develop an early warning system to alert businesses and residents in the watershed of possible floods.

Ohio Environmental Infrastructure, Ohio.—The bill includes $4,000,000 for the Ohio Environmental Infrastructure program, including $1,500,000 to assist the City of Springfield, Ohio, with its wastewater treatment and sewer improvement needs.

Ottawa River, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the reevaluation report and initiate plans and specifications for the Ottawa River, Ohio, project.

Folly Beach, South Carolina.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to identify a new sand source for the Folly Beach, South Carolina, project.

Black Fox, Murfree, and Oaklands Springs Wetlands, Tennessee.—The bill includes $2,000,000 to continue construction of the authorized Black Fox, Murfree, and Oaklands Springs Wetlands project in Murfreesboro, Tennessee. The Corps of Engineers is directed to use available funds for additional features at the Outdoor Classroom Space and at the passive and active park areas identified in Figure 10 of the authorizing document for the project.

Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided $2,100,000 for the Corps of Engineers complete a reevaluation study, continue construction, and continue environmental monitoring for the Red River Basin Chloride Control project.

Red River Below Denison Dam, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for the Red River Below Denison Dam project. Of the amount provided, $500,000 is to rehabilitate the Bowie County Levee in Texas. The remaining funds are to be used for the levee upgrade program in northwest Louisiana.

San Antonio Channel Improvement, Texas.—The Committee has provided $1,200,000 for a General Reevaluation Report for the San Antonio Channel Improvement project to define the Federal interest in the environmental restoration and recreation components of the project. In addition, $200,000 is provided for expand ongoing hydraulic performance studies for the project.

Greenbrier River Basin, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $1,200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Marlinton element of the project.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky.—The bill includes a total of $35,200,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project. The amount provided includes: $4,500,000 for the Clover Fork, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,000,000 for the City of Cumberland, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,650,000 for the Town of Martin, Kentucky, element of the project; $2,100,000 for the Pike County, Kentucky, element of the project, including $1,100,000 for additional studies along the tributaries of the Tug Fork and continuation of a Detailed Project Report for the Levisa Fork; $3,850,000 for the Martin County, Kentucky, element of the project; $950,000

for the Floyd County, Kentucky, element of the project; $600,000 for the Harlan County, Kentucky, element of the project; and $800,000 for additional studies along the tributaries of the Cumberland River in Bell County, Kentucky.

In addition, the Committee has provided $18,600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Grundy, Virginia, element of the project, $450,000 to complete the Buchanan County, Virginia, Detailed Project Report, and $700,000 to continue the Dickenson County, Virginia, Detailed Project Report. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to continue the Dickenson County Detailed Project Report as generally defined in Plan 4 of the Huntington District Engineer's Draft Supplement to the Section 202 General Plan for Flood Damage Reduction dated April 1997, including all Russell Fork tributary streams within the County and special considerations as may be appropriate to address the unique relocations and resettlement needs for the flood prone communities within the County.

West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control, West Virginia and Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $2,300,000 for the West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control project. Of the amount provided, $600,000 is to complete the Detailed Project Reports for Philippi and Belington, West Virginia, and to implement an emergency flood warning system for the Tygart River Basin in West Virginia. In addition, $1,700,000 is provided for the Meyersdale flood damage reduction project in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, and the Hooversville flood damage reduction project in Somerset County, Pennsylvania.

Shoreline Protection Projects (Section 103).—The Committee has provided the amount of $5,000,000 for the Section 103 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $400,000 for the Carpinteria Beach Erosion Control project, California, project; $212,000 for plans and specifications for the project at Nantasket Beach, Hull, Massachusetts; $1,000,000 for the Sylvan Beach Breakwater, New York, project; $556,000 for beach restoration and shore protection on the Hudson River, Dutchess County, New York; $200,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the project on Lake Erie at Athol Springs, New York; and, $100,000 to initiate the feasibility phase on the project to restore the Bay Point Peninsula off of the City of Luna Pier, Michigan, in Maumee Bay.

Small Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The Committee has provided $15,000,000 for the Section 107 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $300,000 to determine the Federal interest in a project for navigation on the Tennessee River, Bridgeport, Alabama; $100,000 to complete the feasibility study on the Tennessee River, Barton River Port, Tuscumbia, Alabama; $1,000,000 to complete plans and specifications and to initiate construction on the Slackwater Harbor, Arkansas River, Russelville, Arkansas, project; $677,000 to complete the feasibility study of the Blytheville Slackwater Harbor, Arkansas; $250,000 to complete the feasibility phase for Pillar Point Harbor, California; $330,000 for the project at Oyster Point Marina, California; $1,500,000 to initiate construction of the Port Hueneme, California, project; $1,500,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications

and initiate construction of the San Diego Bay Harbor Deepening, California, project; $200,000 to complete the feasibility study of the Whiting Shoreline, Whiting, Indiana, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for Federal interest in navigation on the Rouge River, Michigan; $827,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Pemiscot County Harbor, Missouri, project; $1,000,000 for the construction of the Buffalo-Inner Harbor Excavation Project, Buffalo, New York; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for Lake Erie at Sturgeon Point, Evans, New York; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the West Side Rowing Club, Buffalo, New York; $2,000,000 to continue construction of the Lakeshore State Park, City of Milwaukee Navigation Improvement, Wisconsin; and $100,000 for Saxon Harbor, Wisconsin.

The Committee's recommendation also includes the necessary funds to reimburse local interests for credits authorized by Section 323 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 related to the construction of phase 1 of the New Madrid County Harbor, Missouri, project.

Mitigation Damages Attributable to Navigation Projects (Section 111).—The Committee has provided $900,000 for the Section 111 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes $350,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Saco River and Camp Ellis Beach, Saco, Maine, project; $190,000 for the Saugatuck Harbor Federal Navigation Structure project, Michigan; $260,000 for the initial assessment and feasibility study of Mattituck Inlet, Southold, New York; and $100,000 for the Puget Sound Shoreline, Washington, project.

Project Modifications for the Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135).—The Committee has provided $25,000,000 for the Section 1135 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $5,000,000 for the design and construction of the Garrow's Bend Basin Restoration, Mobile, Alabama; $340,000 for the Rillito/Swan Wetlands, Arizona, project; $100,000 to initiate and complete the feasibility study for Ditch 28, Arkansas; $650,000 initiate and complete plans and specifications and construction on the Bull Creek Channel Ecosystem Restoration, Sepulveda Flood Control Basin Restoration, California, project; $1,745,000 for the Gunnerson Pond, Lake Elsinore, California, project; $100,000 to complete the preliminary restoration plan and initiate the feasibility study on Pillar Point Harbor, California; $1,000,000 to initiate the feasibility study of the San Gabriel River Basin, Los Cerritos Wetlands Environmental Restoration, California; $750,000 to continue construction on the Colfax Reach, South Platte River, Colorado, project; $240,000 to complete the feasibility phase and initiate plans and specifications on the Sand Creek Ecosystem Restoration, Newton, Kansas, project; $1,000,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Kansas City Riverfront Habitat Restoration, Missouri, project; $685,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction on the Little Sugar Creek Habitat Restoration, North Carolina, project; $200,000 for the Great South Bay Hard Clam Restoration, New York, project; $290,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications on the Times Beach Environmental Improvement, Buffalo, New York, project; $200,000 to ini-

tiate a feasibility study of the Smokes Creek Relocation, Lackawanna, New York; $80,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Boyd's Marsh Restoration, Rhode Island, project; $60,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Allin's Cove, Rhode Island, project; $530,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the San Antonio River, Eagleland Habitat Restoration, San Antonio, Texas, project; and $844,000 to complete the feasibility study and plans and specifications on the Richland Wye Shoreline Enhancement, Washington.

Emergency Streambank and Erosion Control (Section 14).—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 for the Section 14 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $100,000 to initiate and complete the planning and design analysis for the Ditto Landing Phase II, Huntsville, Alabama, project; $800,000 to initiate and complete bank stabilization on the Little Rock Slackwater Harbor, Arkansas, project; $75,000 to complete the planning and design analysis and initiate plans and specifications for the Powers Boulevard at East Fork of Sand Creek, Colorado Springs, Colorado, project; $140,000 to prepare the detailed project report and initiate plans and specifications for the Chelton Road Bridge over Sand Creek, Colorado Springs, Colorado, project; $220,000 for the Webster County, Iowa, project; $40,000 to initiate and complete the planning and design analysis for the Ackerman Creek in Morton, Illinois; $40,000 to initiate and complete the planning and design analysis for Farm Creek in Washington, Illinois; $40,000 to initiate the planning and design analysis for the Maumee River, Shoreline Erosion Protection, Fort Wayne, Indiana; $960,000 to complete the planning and design analysis and initiate construction of the Punch Island Road, Dorchester County, Maryland, project; $100,000 to continue the planning and design analysis at Belle Isle South Shore, Michigan; $188,000 to complete construction of the Lake Michigan Center, Muskegon, Michigan, project; $60,000 to initiate and complete planning and design for the Bakers Creek, Clinton, Mississippi, project; $635,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Poughkeepsie, New York, project; $140,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Dresden, Tennessee, project; $650,000 to complete the planning and design analysis and initiate construction of the Bogachiel River near La Push, Clallam County, Washington, project; and $40,000 to initiate the planning and design analysis on the Kenosha Harbor Retaining Wall, Shoreline Erosion Protection, City of Kenosha, Wisconsin.

Beneficial Use of Dredge Material (Section 204).—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for the Section 204 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $219,000 for the Mississippi Gulf River Outlet, Louisiana and $90,000 for the Restoration of the Cat Island Chain, Wisconsin.

Small Flood Control Projects (Section 205).—The Committee has provided $40,000,000 for the Section 205 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $200,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Brewton, Alabama, project; $200,000 for the Jasper, Alabama, project; $500,000 to complete the plans and specifications and initiate construction of the locally preferred plan for the Pinhook Creek, Huntsville, Alabama, project;

$50,000 to complete the feasibility study of Bono Lake, Arkansas; $500,000 to initiate construction for the Indian Bayou in Lonoke and Jefferson Counties, Arkansas, project; $50,000 to complete the feasibility study of Spring Creek, St. Francis County, Arkansas; $113,000 to complete the detailed project report and initiate the feasibility study for Coyote Creek at Rock Springs, California; $2,000,000 to initiate construction on the Magpie Creek, Sacramento, California, project; $200,000 to continue the detailed project report of Magpie Creek on McClellan Air Force Base, California; $100,000 to continue the feasibility study of the City of Santa Clarita, Castaic Creek, Old Road Bridges, California, project; $400,000 for the feasibility study of Anaverde Creek, Palmdale, California; $375,000 for the City of Whittier, California, project; $300,000 for the City of Norwalk, California, project; $100,000 to initiate a feasibility study for flood control at Huntington Beach, California; $200,000 to initiate the detailed project report for Contra Costa Canal (Rock Slough), Oakley and Knightsen, California; $200,000 to initiate the detailed project report for Mallard Slough, Pittsburg, California; $650,000 to determine Federal interest, design, and reconstruct the Santa Venetia Pump Replacement, California, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study on Cheyenne Creek, Colorado Springs; $2,000,000 for construction of the Van Bibber-Arvada Plaza Drainage, Colorado, project; $115,000 to complete the feasibility study for flood protection of the Farm River, North Branford/East Haven, Connecticut; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study of the Ocmulgee River Levee, Macon, Georgia; $70,000 to initiate a feasibility study at Monroe County, Illinois; $1,439,000 to continue construction of the East Peoria, Illinois, project; $30,000 for the feasibility study at Grafton, Illinois; $100,000 for the Prairie du Pont, Illinois, project; $100,000 to complete the preliminary assessment and feasibility study of the Mississinewa River, Marion, Indiana; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study on the Southwest Branch, Cedar Falls, Iowa; $1,430,000 for East Boyer River Denison, Iowa, project; $450,000 for the Mad Creek, Muscatine, Iowa, project; $200,000 to expeditiously complete the feasibility study of the Whitewater and Walnut Rivers, Augusta, Kansas in light of the devastation that occurred during the Halloween flood of 1998, which resulted in millions of dollars in property damage to more that 600 homes and business; $454,000 for Cowskin Creek, Wichita, Kansas; $100,000 to complete the preliminary project report and feasibility study at Versailles, Kentucky; $100,000 to complete the preliminary project report and feasibility study at Winchester, Kentucky; $350,000 to evaluate alternative solutions and resolve the issue of continued flooding associated with the Mayfield Creek and Tributaries, Kentucky, flood control project; $100,000 to complete the preliminary project report and feasibility study at Nicholasville, Kentucky; $100,000 to complete the preliminary project report and feasibility study of Banklick Creek, Kenton County, Kentucky; $2,972,000 for the construction of the Jean Laffitte (Fisher School Basin), Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, project; $300,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Rosethorn Basin, Jean Lafitte, Louisiana, project; $200,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Pailet Basin, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, project; $100,000

to initiate a feasibility study of the Aberjona River, Winchester, Massachusetts; $25,000 for the Little River Diversion, Dutchtown, Missouri; $550,000 to complete construction of the Main Ditch 8, Pemiscot County, Missouri, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Trailwood Subdivision Area, Clinton, Mississippi; $750,000 to complete construction of the Mckeel Brook, Morris County, New Jersey, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study of Jackson Brook, New Jersey; $500,000 to initiate construction of the Mill Brook, Highland Park, New Jersey, project; $200,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Popular Brook, Monmouth County, New Jersey, project; $100,000 for the feasibility study of the Lower Palomas Creek, Sierra County, New Mexico; $50,000 for the Cazenovia Creek Ice Control Structure, West Seneca, New York, project; $100,000 for the feasibility study of Brentwood Brook, Harrison, New York; $100,000 for the feasibility study of Larchmont Reservoir, Larchmont, New York; $1,000,000 for the Red River, Wahepeton, North Dakota, project; $150,000 for the Dam Break Early Warning System, Silverton, Oregon; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the City of Keizer, Labish Ditch, Oregon, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for Coloso Valley, Aquada, Puerto Rico; $188,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Beaver Creek, Bristol, Tennessee and Virginia, project; $100,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Erwin, Tennessee, project; $195,000 to initiate and complete construction for the Baxter Bottom, Tipton County, Tennessee, project; $50,000 to complete the feasibility study at Covington, Tennessee; $100,000 to initiate and complete a feasibility study at Dresden, Tennessee; $75,000 to complete the feasibility study of the Dyer County Little Levee, Tennessee; $50,000 to complete the feasibility study of Oliver Creek, Shelby County, Tennessee; $100,000 to initiate the detailed project report of the Dry Canyon Storm Watershed, Utah; $210,000 to complete the feasibility study for Snoqualmie River at North Bend, Washington; and $210,000 for the feasibility study of Wind Lake, Wisconsin.

The Committee notes that the Snoqualmie Flood Control Project is behind schedule and expects the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the project as expeditiously as possible.

The Committee, in accordance with the authority provided in Section 332 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, has also provided $700,000 for the Bois Brule Drainage and Levee, District, Missouri project under the Continuing Authorities Program and directs the Secretary to increase the authorized level of projection from 50–years to 100–years. The project costs allocated to the incremental increase in level of projection shall be cost shared consistent with Section 103(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, notwithstanding Section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, and this increment should be constructed concurrently with the deficiency correction work to ensure a technically sound and cost effective solution is provided to the flooding problems in this area.

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (Section 206).—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for the Section 206 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $105,000 to com-

plete the ecosystem report for the Aqua Caliente Wash, Pima County, Arizona, project; $225,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Santa Clara Basin Watershed Management Initiative, California; $100,000 for the Arundo Donax, Santa Clara River, Santa Clarita, California, project; $450,000 for the Delta Science Center, California; $500,000 for the Huntington Beach Aquatic Restoration, California, project; $175,000 for the Mill River Corridor Revitalization, Connecticut, project; $200,000 to complete the feasibility study of the Stevenson Creek Estuary, Florida; $700,000 for the East Pass Opening (Channel), Panama City Harbor, Florida, project; $425,000 for the Hogan's Creek Restoration, Florida, project; $700,000 for the Dinner Key (Sea Plane) Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Florida, project; $201,000 for the Duck Creek, Davenport, Iowa, project; $45,000 for the Chouteau Island, Madison County, Illinois, project; $225,000 to initiate the feasibility study for Squaw Creek Basin, Illinois; $400,000 to prepare plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Hoffman, Armitage, and Fairbanks Dams, Illinois, modification project; $275,000 for the Kankakee River Basin aquatic ecosystem restoration, Illinois, project; $1,000,000 for the Wolf Lake, Indiana, project; $400,000 for construction of the Lake Nemaha Wetlands, Seneca, Kansas, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Lost River Valley Wetlands Development, Bowling Green, Kentucky; $200,000 for the Luling Oxidation Pond, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana, project; $118,000 for the St. James Parish Ecosystem Restoration, Louisiana; $200,000 for the Nashawannuck Pond, Easthampton, Massachusetts, project; $160,000 to complete the feasibility study of the Hennepin Marsh, Grosse Ile Township, Michigan, project; $50,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Black Lagoon, Trenton, Michigan; $600,000 for the Rivers South Recreation Plan, River Des Peres, Missouri; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the David City Wetlands, Butler County, Nebraska; $210,000 for the feasibility study of Lake Weamaconk, New Jersey; $50,000 for the Cazenovia, New York, project; $200,000 to prepare a preliminary restoration plan and feasibility study for Chenango Lake, Chenango County, New York; $100,000 for the Oyster Reef Creation, Port Jefferson, New York, project; $100,000 to initiate a feasibility study of the Oak Orchard Creek and Tonawanda Creek Watersheds, New York; $100,000 for the feasibility study of the Nepperhan River Outlet, Yonkers, New York; $180,000 for the Weir Creek, Bronx, New York, project; $10,000 for the initial assessment of the Sheldrake and Goodlife Pond, New Rochelle and Mamaroneck, New York; $10,000 for the initial assessment of the Mamaroneck Reservoir, Mamaroneck, New York; $10,000 for the initial assessment of the Duck Pond Restoration, Harrison, New York; $350,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction on the Little Sugar Creek Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, North Carolina, project; $125,000 to initiate a feasibility study of Middle Cuyahoga River, Kent Dam Restoration, Portage County, Ohio; $250,000 to continue the feasibility study of the Lake Carl Blackwell Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Oklahoma; $1,000,000 for the Springfield Millrace, Oregon, project; $400,000 for the Kettle Creek Watershed, Dents Run, Pennsylania, project; $250,000 for the environmental restoration report for the Wetland

Education Center, University of Texas Marine Science Institute, Port Aransas, Texas; $250,000 to complete the ecosystem restoration report and initiate plans and specifications for the West Jordan, Utah, project; $400,000 for the Ely/Pucketts Creek, Viriginia, project; $100,000 to determine Federal interest and initiate design of the Duwamish Waterway Marsh Restoration, Washington, project; and $150,000 for the Lake Koshkonong Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Wisconsin, project.

Snagging and Clearing (Section 208).—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Section 208 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $324,000 for construction of the Big Slough Ditch, Craighead County, Arkansas, project; $100,000 for construction of the Ditch 2, Craighead County, Arkansas, project; $80,000 to construct the Farrenburg Ditch, Missouri, project; and $205,000 to complete the planning and design analysis and initiate and complete construction of the Lateral No. 3, Missouri, project.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—Within the amount provided for the Aquatic Plant Control Program: $150,000 is for the eradication of aquatic weeds in Clear Lake, California; $50,000 is for the removal of aquatic weeds in the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers in Texas; $300,000 is for the removal of aquatic weeds in Caddo Lake, Texas; and $100,000 is for the removal of aquatic growth in the Potomac River in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

Dam Safety and Seepage/Stability Correction Program.—Within the amount provided for the Dam Safety and Seepage/Stability Correction Program, the Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue critical dam safety repairs to Waterbury Dam in Vermont.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

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

Appropriation, 2001	$350,458,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	280,000,000
Recommended, 2002	347,655,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−2,803,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+67,655,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
	SURVEYS:			
	GENERAL STUDIES:			
(FDP)	ALEXANDRIA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	3,150	500	500
	BAYOU METO BASIN	---	---	2,573
(FDP)	DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA	4,000	700	1,500
(SPE)	SPRING BAYOU, LA	2,850	500	500
(FDP)	COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	1,350	200	200
	HORN LAKE CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	---	300
(FDP)	OLIVE BRANCH, MS	1,500	300	300
(COM)	MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN & MS	2,075	394	394
(FC)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	442,000	4,000	6,500
(FC)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	6,350	205	205
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	615	615
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		7,414	13,587
	CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	3,863,000	43,405	43,905
(FC)	FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR	9,270	915	915
(FC)	HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	8,590	1,675	1,675
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	2,106,000	43,457	50,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	401,600	3,230	4,230
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	176,000	7,160	7,160
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,790,000	23,400	23,400
(FC)	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA	19,500	3,022	3,022
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS	71,300	25	25
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	99,800	1,600	2,900
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	169,195	2,628	2,628
	YAZOO BASIN:	(1,135,920)	(8,550)	(34,550)
(FC)	BACKWATER PUMP, MS	195,400	500	500
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	110,000	1,000	1,000
	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL	---	---	21,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	205,112	25	25
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	32,408	25	25
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	250,000	200	200
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	343,000	6,800	11,800
(FC)	ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	61,400	150	1,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN & MS	17,900	1,300	1,615
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	153,300	25	25
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		140,542	177,050
	MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	61,462	61,462
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	---	434	434
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	---	480	480
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	---	419	419
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	---	10	10
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	---	7,650	7,650
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	---	6,678	15,045
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	---	2,000	2,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	1,102	1,102
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	---	43	43
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	---	29	29
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	---	2,065	2,065
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	10,661	10,661
(N)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	---	216	216
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	56	56
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA	---	1,854	2,814
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	---	422	422
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	6,239	6,239
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	---	916	916
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	---	6,116	6,116
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	---	2,500	2,500
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	645	645
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	---	249	249
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	494	494
	YAZOO BASIN:	---	(21,260)	(36,407)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	4,500	8,500
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	1,000	3,700
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS	---	3,500	6,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS	---	250	250
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	4,500	6,600
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	---	275	275
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	6,500	9,500
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	350	1,197
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS	---	55	55
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	---	180	180
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS	---	150	150
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	---	143	143
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	8,000	8,500
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	---	86	86
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	---	1,118	1,118
(FC)	MAPPING	---	1,097	1,097
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		144,444	169,418
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-12,400	-12,400
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES		280,000	347,655

General investigations

Donaldsonville to the Gulf, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $800,000 for the Corps of Engineers to expedite the feasibility study of solutions for flooding in the area.

Horn Lake and Tributaries, Tennessee and Mississippi.—The Committee is aware of the residual flooding problems along the urban areas of Horn Lake Creek and the need for a higher level of flood protection to be provided. The Committee, therefore, has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the reevaluation of the project.

Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas.—The Committee is aware of the need to complete the reevaluation of the Bayou Meto Basin project, conditionally authorized by Section 363(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. The Committee, therefore, has included $2,573,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the reevaluation and preconstruction engineering and design.

Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,500,000 to continue the expedited engineering and design of the Houma Lock and completion of the Morganza to the Gulf feasibility study this calendar year.

Construction

Channel Improvement.—The Committee recognizes the critical need of providing navigation along the Mississippi River and the efficiency in the construction of dikes as they reduce dredging requirements. Therefore, the Committee has included $43,905,000 for the project, $500,000 above the budget request, to initiate dike construction at Keyes Point, Arkansas; Kate Aubrey, Arkansas; and Ashport-Goldust, Arkansas and Tennessee.

Mississippi River Levees.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the Mississippi River Levees and has provided an additional amount of $6,543,000 above the budget request of $43,457,000. Further, the committee is aware of the conditions of the levee in the vicinity of New Madrid, Missouri. This condition is primarily the result of stone being placed along the slope of the levee by the Corps of Engineers during flood situations to protect the levee from wave wash and from dilapidated structures that exist in the vicinity of the levee section. These conditions pose a threat to safe public access and prevent satisfactory maintenance of the levee. The Committee, therefore, directs the Corps to construct improvements under the Mississippi River Levees authority, which have been identified in a report prepared by the Memphis District. The Committee has included $4,100,000 within the additional amount to construct these improvements.

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee is aware of the frequent and prolonged flooding of lands and improvements along the uncompleted portion of the St. Francis Basin project. Therefore, the Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 above the budget request of $3,230,000 to complete construction of Ditches 1 & 6, Missouri.

Mississippi Delta Region, Louisiana.—The Committee has included $1,300,000 above the budget request of $1,600,000 for the project features at the Davis Pond area. Additionally, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to continue to work with the

oyster fishing industry to resolve any impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the project.

Demonstration Erosion Control, Mississippi.—The work to date by the Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service has shown positive results in the reduction of flood damages, decreased erosion and sediments, and improvements to the environment. These positive results show that continued funding for the program is important and that it should be completed to recognize the total benefits of the program. This may well be a case where the completed program gives results that are much greater than the sum of the individual items of work. The additional funds are provided to continue design, real estate acquisition, monitoring of completed work, and initiation of continuing contracts. The Committee expects the Administration to continue to request funds for this important project.

Upper Yazoo Project, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided an additional $5,000,000 to continue construction on the Upper Yazoo Project, Mississippi.

St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri.—The Committee has provided an additional $850,000 for a total of $1,000,000 to advance construction of elements within the State of Missouri on the St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway.

Nonconnah Creek, Flood Control Feature, Tennessee and Missouri.—The Committee has provided $1,615,000 of which $200,000 is to be used to reevaluate the extension of the flood control project upstream five miles and $115,000 is to be used to investigate recreational and environmental enhancements for the Nonconnah Creek project.

Maintenance

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee recognizes the critical backlog of maintenance items on this project and has provided an additional $8,367,000 above the budget request to address this problem. The funds are to be used for levee maintenance, scour repairs, and channel cleanout at various locations of the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, project.

Bonnet Carre, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $960,000 for the replacement of critical operating equipment bringing the total funds provided to $2,814,000 on the Bonnet Carre, Louisiana, project.

Yazoo Basin, Mississippi.—The Committee provides the following additional amounts for the maintenance of the Yazoo Basin projects: $4,000,000 for Arkabutla Lake, $2,700,000 for Big Sunflower River, $2,500,000 for Enid Lake, $2,100,000 for Grenada Lake, $3,000,000 for Sardis Lake, and an additional $847,000 for the Yazoo Tributaries, Mississippi.

Wappapello Lake, Missouri.—The Committee provides an additional $500,000 above the budget request for a total of $8,500,000. The additional funds are to be used for road relocation as part of the Wappapello Lake Missouri, project.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 2001	$1,897,775,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	1,745,000,000
Recommended, 2002	1,864,464,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−33,311,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+119,464,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA		
(FC)	ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	219	219
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	1,555	6,180
	BAYOU CODEN, AL	---	500
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	50	200
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	21,100	23,700
(N)	BON SECOUR RIVER, AL	20	20
(N)	DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	250	600
(N)	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	450	450
(N)	FLY CREEK, AL	200	200
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,000	5,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	100	100
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	4,900	7,200
	MOBILE AREA DIGITAL MAPPING, AL	---	3,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	18,900	24,600
(N)	PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	1,000	1,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	350	350
(MP)	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	5,000	5,600
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	80	80
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	23,800	24,300
	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	---	1,200
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	6,565	6,565
	ALASKA		
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,788	2,788
(N)	BETHEL HARBOR, AK	416	416
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,659	1,659
(N)	COOK INLET SHOALS, AK	2,200	2,200
(N)	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	384	384
(N)	HOMER HARBOR, AK	181	181
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	35	35
(N)	KETCHIKAN HARBOR, BAR POINT, AK	160	160
	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	---	750
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	173	173
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	1,458	1,458
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	527	527
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,306	1,306
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	86	86
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,310	1,310
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	32	32
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	184	184
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	4,343	4,343
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	4,734	4,734
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,148	1,148
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,402	4,402
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,337	5,337
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,235	4,235
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	947	947
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR	946	946
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	841	841
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,873	4,873
	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	---	340
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	308	308
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	22,338	22,338
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,559	1,559
(MP)	NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	3,308	4,308
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,319	1,319
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,255	3,255
	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	---	610
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	7,127	7,127
(MP)	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,912	3,912
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	10	10
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR	195	195
	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	---	150

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,952	1,952
	BODEGA BAY, CA	---	1,800
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,725	1,725
(N)	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	40	40
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,537	3,537
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,604	4,604
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	299	299
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,687	1,687
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	3,516	3,516
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,171	1,171
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	836	1,476
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	170	170
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	200	3,200
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	4,691	6,691
(N)	MARINA DEL REY, CA	40	40
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	314	314
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	273	273
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	3,860	3,860
	MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	---	2,500
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,922	1,922
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,573	1,573
(N)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	40	40
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	10,127	10,127
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,270	1,270
	PETALUMA RIVER, CA	---	2,500
	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	---	200
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,443	2,443
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	40	40
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,224	1,224
	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	---	2,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	4,389	4,389
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	1,964	1,964
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.	1,766	1,766
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	132	132
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	140	140
(N)	SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, CA	40	40
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,700	1,700
	SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	---	200
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,366	2,500
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,501	2,700
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	998	3,800
	SAN RAFAEL CREEK, CA	---	1,800
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,537	3,537
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	2,020	2,020
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,504	1,504
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,969	1,969
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	1,635	1,635
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,747	1,747
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,980	4,145
(N)	YUBA RIVER, CA	102	102
	COLORADO		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	420	420
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	797	797
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	525	525
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	70	70
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	3,454	3,454
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	249	249
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	733	733
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	490	490
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	454	454
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	221	221

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	979	979
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	424	424
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	294	294
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	485	485
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT	516	516
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	711	711
	DELAWARE		
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	12,223	12,223
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	888	888
(N)	MISPILLION RIVER, DE	140	140
(N)	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	140	140
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	2,985	2,985
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
(N)	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	928	928
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	48	48
	FLORIDA		
(N)	APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	300	300
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,966	6,896
	CARRABELLA BAY HARBOR, FL	---	150
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	11,591	11,591
	CLEARWATER PASS, FL	---	1,000
(N)	EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	700	700
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	3,037	3,037
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	49	2,000
(N)	HORSESHOE COVE, FL	520	520
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	100	100
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	2,173	2,173
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	4,040	4,040
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,719	5,719
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	20	20
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL	3,700	3,700
	MIAMI RIVER, FL	---	4,000
	NEW PASS CHANNEL, FL	---	1,800
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,520	2,520
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	3,253	3,253
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	1,000	1,000
(N)	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	500	500
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	2,032	2,032
(N)	PORT ST JOE HARBOR, FL	500	500
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	600	600
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,634	3,634
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	50	50
	SUWANEE RIVER, FL	---	2,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	4,163	4,163
(N)	WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	34	34
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	5,427	6,333
(N)	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	1,237	8,055
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	2,172	2,172
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,902	3,902
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,525	7,525
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	7,600	8,800
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	11,876	11,876
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	41	41
(MP)	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	10,325	10,325
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	6,564	6,564
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	12,911	14,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	215	215
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	4,865	4,865
	HAWAII		
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	344	344
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	122	122
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	508	508

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	IDAHO		
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,475	1,475
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	4,002	4,002
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	75	75
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,526	1,526
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	342	342
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	3,709	---
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,962	4,962
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,662	2,662
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362	362
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	170	170
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	21,881	21,881
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,610	1,610
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	758	758
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,159	1,650
(N)	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	1,037	1,037
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	6,071	6,071
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	42,431	42,431
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	13,897	13,897
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	43	43
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL	4,760	4,760
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	97	97
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	770	770
	INDIANA		
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	792	792
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	3,977	3,977
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	674	674
(FC)	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	829	829
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	64	64
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	102	102
(FC)	J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	690	690
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	1,495	1,495
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	803	803
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN	819	819
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN	757	757
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	42	42
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	710	710
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	90	90
	IOWA		
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,735	2,735
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	812	812
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	148	148
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO	3,270	3,270
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE	2,263	2,263
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,195	2,195
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,356	3,356
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,887	3,887
	KANSAS		
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,201	2,201
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,116	1,116
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	478	478
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	526	526
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	973	973
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	1,014	1,014
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	45	45
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,100	1,100
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,507	1,507
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS	1,422	1,422
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,006	2,006
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,997	1,997
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	898	898
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS	2,055	2,055

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS	2,130	2,130
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	185	185
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS	456	456
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,004	2,004
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS	2,069	2,069
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	6,896	6,896
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,900	1,900
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,099	1,099
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,440	1,560
(FC)	CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,656	1,776
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	834	834
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,371	1,371
	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR	---	460
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	2,095	2,095
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,332	1,332
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,079	1,079
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,107	2,107
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	87	87
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	913	913
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,311	1,311
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	617	617
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	106	106
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,808	1,808
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	28,572	28,572
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH	5,180	5,180
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,178	1,178
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,069	2,069
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	993	993
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	5,407	5,407
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,136	1,136
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	13,181	13,181
	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	---	2,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	652	652
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	730	730
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	28	28
	BAYOU TECHE, LA	---	2,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA	92	92
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	12,773	12,773
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,595	3,595
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	18,195	18,195
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,343	3,343
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	549	549
(N)	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	8,477	10,477
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	933	1,233
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,937	1,937
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	55,831	55,831
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	13,111	15,111
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80	80
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,000	2,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA	154	154
	WATERWAY FROM IWW TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	---	500
	MAINE		
	PENOBSCOT HARBOR, ME	---	275
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,130	1,130
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
(N)	UNION RIVER, ME	230	230
	MARYLAND		
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	464	464
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	650	650
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	22,568	22,568
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	157	157
	HERRING BAY AND ROCKHOLD CREEK, MD	---	500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	330	330
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	2,074	3,074
	NANTICOKE HARBOR, MD	---	700
(N)	NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD	865	865
	NEALE SOUND, CHARLES COUNTY, MD	---	677
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	2,798	2,798
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	459	459
(N)	RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD	736	736
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	142	142
(N)	TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD	1,901	1,901
(N)	TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	742	742
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	450	450
	MASSACHUSETTS		
	ANDREWS RIVER, MA	---	130
	AUNT LYDIA'S COVE, MA	---	300
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	489	489
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	511	511
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	427	427
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	10,150	10,150
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	294	294
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	234	234
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	325	325
(N)	GREEN HARBOR, MA	378	378
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	416	416
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	125	125
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	648	648
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	476	476
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	358	358
(N)	PLYMOUTH HARBOR, MA	3,356	3,356
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	3,536	3,536
	SCITUATE HARBOR, MA	---	1,500
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA	665	665
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA	607	607
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	397	397
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	118	118
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	122	122
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI	3,692	3,692
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	47	47
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	2,239	2,239
	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI	---	200
(N)	GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	10	10
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	554	554
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205	205
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	804	804
(N)	LELAND HARBOR, MI	191	191
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	103	103
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	42	42
(N)	MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	239	239
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	104	104
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI	52	52
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	451	451
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	1,544	1,544
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	185	185
(N)	PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	2,518	2,518
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	275	275
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI	87	87
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,587	1,587
(N)	SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	1,231	1,231
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10	10
(N)	SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,563	1,563
(N)	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	759	759
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	638	638
(MP)	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	17,418	18,418
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	3,295	3,295

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	217	217
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	2,692	2,692
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	101	101
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	573	573
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	130	130
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	45,329	45,329
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN	337	337
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	7	7
(FC)	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	146	146
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,552	3,552
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	94	94
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS	30	30
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	170	170
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,100	2,100
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	126	126
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,584	1,584
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	4,200	4,200
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	250	250
	MISSOURI		
	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	---	240
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	6,196	6,196
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,184	3,819
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,215	8,215
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	142	142
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	800	800
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	876	876
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	13,068	13,068
	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	---	290
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,204	2,204
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	10	10
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,128	1,128
	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER	---	400
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	4,065	4,065
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	6,826	8,826
(FC)	UNION LAKE, MO	10	10
	MONTANA		
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,342	4,342
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	1,791	1,791
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	6,495	6,495
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	2,019	2,019
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE	---	275
(MP)	MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,.	500	500
(MP)	MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWK	80	80
(MP)	MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWO	125	125
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	611	611
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	847	847
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	329	329
	NEVADA		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	43	43
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	576	576
(FC)	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	210	210
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	607	607
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	460	460
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	1,104	1,104
(FC)	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,412	1,412

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	781	781
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH	287	287
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	749	749
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,400	3,200
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	410	410
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	19	19
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	17,105	17,105
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,465	3,465
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,800	2,800
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	2,900	2,900
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	425	425
(N)	SHARK RIVER, NJ	100	100
	SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	---	130
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,556	1,556
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM	2,209	2,209
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,932	1,932
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM	368	368
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	80	80
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	541	541
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,049	1,049
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	130	130
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	328	328
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY	463	463
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY	252	252
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	2,795	2,795
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	515	515
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	280	280
(N)	EAST RIVER, NY	600	600
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	250	250
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	513	513
(N)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	2,300	2,300
(N)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	3,000	4,000
	GREAT KILLS HARBOR, NY	---	1,000
(N)	GREAT SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	50	50
(N)	GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	100	100
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	2,525	2,525
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	1,340	1,340
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	509	509
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY	250	250
(N)	JONES INLET, NY	100	100
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	80	80
(N)	LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	50	50
(N)	LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	70	70
(N)	MORICHES INLET, NY	80	80
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	2,616	2,616
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	4,250	4,250
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	5,030	5,030
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	750	750
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	5,570	5,570
(N)	OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	20	20
	PLATTSBURGH HARBOR, NY	---	2,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	2,563	2,563
(N)	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	35	35
(N)	RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	475	475
(N)	SAG HARBOR, NY	925	925
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	100	100
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	750	750
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	479	479
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	564	564

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	2,391	5,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	3,065	3,065
(N)	BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	35	35
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	1,267	1,267
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	486	486
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,060	1,060
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	1,516	1,516
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22	22
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	895	1,895
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,863	4,863
(N)	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	2,245	2,945
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	4,450	4,450
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	1,235	1,235
(N)	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	940	940
(N)	PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	139	139
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	64	64
(N)	ROANOKE RIVER, NC	100	100
(FC)	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	2,253	2,253
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	5,105	5,105
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	210	210
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	9,111	9,711
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND	164	164
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	52	52
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,264	1,264
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	402	402
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND	385	385
	OHIO		
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	799	799
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	2,051	2,051
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,872	1,872
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,142	1,142
(FC)	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	723	723
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,700	3,700
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	30	30
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	903	903
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	642	642
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH	527	527
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	1,235	1,235
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH	1,040	1,040
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	166	166
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,100	1,100
(FC)	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25	25
(FC)	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	809	809
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,054	1,054
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	6,284	6,284
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	358	358
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	680	680
(N)	PORT CLINTON HARBOR, OH	1,080	1,080
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	85	85
(FC)	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30	30
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	950	950
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	190	190
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,211	3,211
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	229	229
(N)	TOUSSAINT RIVER, OH	10	10
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	476	476
(FC)	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	816	816
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	429	429
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK	572	572
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,549	1,549
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK	18	18
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK	3,012	3,012

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK	824	824
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	6,277	6,277
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	4,144	4,144
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	879	879
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	234	234
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	572	572
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK	1,670	1,800
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK	406	406
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	91	91
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK	1,840	1,840
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	5,553	5,553
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK.	3,025	3,025
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,843	1,843
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	56	56
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	32	32
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,170	1,170
(MP)	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	5,130	5,130
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK	913	913
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	370	370
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	893	893
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,228	3,228
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,426	1,426
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,557	3,557
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK	602	672
	OREGON		
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	720	720
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	260	260
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	5,430	5,430
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR	402	402
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	13,042	16,042
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	7,818	7,818
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	352	352
(N)	COOS BAY, OR	4,692	4,692
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	193	193
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	981	981
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR	752	752
(N)	DEPOE BAY, OR	3	3
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR	584	584
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR	649	649
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	722	722
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	952	952
(MP)	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,196	1,196
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	377	377
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	176	176
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,056	4,056
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,818	1,818
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,049	3,049
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	3,650	3,650
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR	631	631
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	200	200
(N)	ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	674	674
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	69	69
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	781	781
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	161	161
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	134	134
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	14	214
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	834	834
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	291	291
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	68	68
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	830	830
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	2,354	2,454
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,015	6,015
(FC)	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	622	622
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	229	229
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,355	1,355
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,285	2,285

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	945	945
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,887	1,887
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	2,001	2,001
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	676	676
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,322	1,322
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA	70	70
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	729	729
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	797	797
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	365	365
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	95	95
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA	1,115	1,115
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,189	1,189
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	977	977
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,093	1,093
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	14,203	14,203
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	19,321	19,321
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	58	58
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	88	88
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	482	482
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	15	15
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,902	3,902
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	1,315	1,315
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,252	2,252
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	350	350
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	65	65
(FC)	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,501	2,501
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	2,262	3,012
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	221	221
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	761	761
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	547	547
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	1,871	1,871
	RHODE ISLAND		
(N)	PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	2,110	2,110
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	1,575	1,575
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	5,171	5,171
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,201	3,201
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC	748	748
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	5,738	5,738
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	26	26
	MURRELLS INLET, SC	---	200
(N)	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	169	169
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	45	45
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	486	486
(N)	TOWN CREEK, SC	305	305
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,136	6,136
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	433	433
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	197	197
(MP)	FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,044	8,044
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	531	531
(MP)	MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	625	625
(MP)	OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	9,480	9,480
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	306	306
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	4,757	4,757
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	4,217	4,217
(N)	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	2,315	2,315
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,910	3,910
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	4,217	4,217
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	97	97
(MP)	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,222	3,222
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,981	5,981

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	19	19
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	16,422	16,422
	TEXAS		
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	708	708
(FC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,267	1,267
(N)	BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	577	577
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,499	1,499
(N)	BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,275	2,275
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX	2,578	2,578
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,290	2,290
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,222	1,222
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,977	2,977
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX	2,743	2,743
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,399	5,399
(MP)	DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	5,532	5,532
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	5	5
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,554	2,554
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	6,950	6,950
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	130	130
(N)	GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	585	585
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,535	1,535
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,478	2,478
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	19,994	19,994
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,190	1,190
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	7,555	12,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	452	452
(FC)	JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,189	1,189
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	784	784
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX	143	143
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX	2,485	2,485
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,253	3,253
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,665	1,665
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	2,480	2,480
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,596	1,596
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,748	1,748
(FC)	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	893	893
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	976	976
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,659	2,259
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	15	15
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	821	821
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	14,272	14,272
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,417	4,417
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	243	243
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,555	2,555
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,719	1,719
(FC)	TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	1,500	1,500
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,748	1,748
(N)	TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,000	2,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX	2,412	3,912
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,320	1,320
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	4,227	4,800
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,611	2,611
	UTAH		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	75	75
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	390	390
	VERMONT		
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	743	743
(N)	BURLINGTON HARBOR BREAKWATER, VT	250	250
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	95	95
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	635	635
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	700	700
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	764	764
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	506	506

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	749	749
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA	1,795	1,795
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA	835	835
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE BAY CHANNEL, VA	430	430
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	898	898
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,535	1,535
(N)	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	1,095	1,095
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	59	59
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,680	3,680
(MP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	10,013	10,013
(FC)	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,387	1,387
(N)	LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	916	916
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	215	215
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	6,439	6,439
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	328	328
(N)	PAGAN RIVER, VA	145	145
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	3,865	3,865
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	630	630
(N)	RUDEE INLET, VA	1,053	1,053
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,190	1,190
	WINTER HARBOR, VA	---	1,000
(N)	YORK RIVER, VA	155	155
	WASHINGTON		
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	848	848
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	28	28
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	36	36
(N)	EDIZ HOOK, WA	718	718
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,345	1,345
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	11,275	15,075
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,739	1,739
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,249	3,249
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	243	243
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	7,200	7,200
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,290	1,290
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	6,114	6,114
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,230	2,230
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	3,016	3,016
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	319	319
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	2,319	2,819
(N)	NEAH BAY, WA	30	30
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	253	253
(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	938	938
(N)	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	1,760	1,760
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	427	427
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, EAST WATERWAY CHANNEL DEEPENING, WA	300	300
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	620	620
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	240	240
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	58	58
(N)	SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	515	515
(FC)	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	123	123
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	2,961	2,961
(N)	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	435	435
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,074	1,074
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,231	3,500
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,783	1,783
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,687	1,687
(FC)	ELKINS, WV	18	18
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	211	211
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	6,799	6,799
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	16,738	16,738
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,407	2,407
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,582	1,582
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	888	888
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,458	1,458
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV	2,016	2,016
(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV	3,223	3,223

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	WISCONSIN		
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	736	736
(N)	FOX RIVER, WI	4,004	9,004
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,641	1,641
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	17	17
(N)	KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	1,122	1,122
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	210	210
(FC)	LAFARGE LAKE, WI	56	56
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	249	249
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	603	603
(N)	PENSAUKEE HARBOR, WI	488	488
(N)	PORT WING HARBOR, WI	260	260
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	8	8
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	46	46
(N)	STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	2,625	2,625
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	42	42
(N)	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	1,102	1,102
	WYOMING		
(FC)	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,198	1,198
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	700	700
	COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,750	2,750
	CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	1,500	1,500
	DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	8,000	8,000
	DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,000	1,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	7,000	7,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	1,500	1,500
	EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	500	500
	GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS	500	1,000
	HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	575	575
	INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	---	4,000
	MANAGEMENT TOOLS FOR O&M	500	500
	MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,700	1,700
	NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	40	40
	NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM	25	25
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	4,000	4,000
	NATIONAL LEWIS AND CLARK COMMEMORATION COORDINATOR	300	300
	PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	415	415
	PROTECTING, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS(SEC 3)	50	50
	RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM (RMSP)	1,500	1,500
	REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT SEDIMENT DEMO PROGRAM	1,500	1,500
	RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675	675
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	500
	WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	700	700
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,000	4,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-16,457	-27,032
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,745,000	1,864,464

Alabama-Coosa River, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $4,625,000 for annual operation and maintenance including lake and recreation maintenance, environmental studies, and replacement of spillway safety signs for the Alabama-Coosa River, Alabama, project.

Bayou Coden, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for maintenance dredging of the Bayou Coden, Alabama, project.

Bayou La Batre, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $150,000 for maintenance dredging of the Bayou La Batre, Alabama, project.

Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,600,000 for annual operation and maintenance including the locks and dams, recreation facilities, and upland disposal areas on the Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers

Dauphin Island Bay, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $350,000 for annual operation and maintenance on the Dauphin Island Bay, Alabama, project.

Mobile Area Digital Area Mapping and Geographic Information System, Alabama.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work begun in fiscal year 2001 to develop an area-wide geographic information system for Mobile and Baldwin Counties in Alabama. This effort will continue the development of a geographic information system to organize, store, analyze, and maintain geospatial data associated with Federal projects in the area.

Millers Ferry Lock and Dam, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,300,000 for a debris disposal system and to replace a raw water piping system for the Millers Ferry Lock and Dam project.

Mobile Harbor, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $5,700,000 to dredge the bay and channel sumps, maintain Arlington channel, perform sediment reevaluation, continue data reporting, and develop the Chickasaw Creek disposal plan for the Mobile Harbor, Alabama, project.

Robert F. Henry Lock and Dam, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $600,000 to replace spillway safety signs on the Robert F. Henry Lock and Dam.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,700,000 for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project. The additional funds above the budget request are to be used for deferred maintenance dredging, to repair and resite the historic snagboat, Montgomery, and to clear the channel from the downstream end of the Big Creek Bendway past the confluence with Big Creek.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Wildlife Mitigation, Alabama and Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $1,200,000 for the states of Mississippi and Alabama to administer 125,925 acres of wildlife mitigation lands for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

Anchorage Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for a model study of Anchorage Harbor, Alaska.

Kodiak Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee has provided an additional $750,000 for maintenance dredging of Kodiak Harbor, Alaska.

Helena Harbor, Phillips County, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $340,000 for maintenance dredging of Helena Harbor, Arkansas.

Narrows Dam, Lake Greeson, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for recreation and powerhouse facilities rehabilitation on the Narrows Dam, Lake Greeson, Arkansas, project.

Osceola Harbor, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided an additional $610,000 for maintenance dredging of Osceola Harbor, Arkansas.

Yellow Bend Port, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided an additional $150,000 for maintenance dredging of Yellow Bend Port, Arkansas.

Bodega Bay, California.—The Committee has provided $1,800,000 for the preparation of an upland disposal site for the dredging of the Bodega Bay, California, project.

Isabella Lake, California.—The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to use funds appropriated in the Act to conduct the measures required by the June 14, 2000, Biological Opinion issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, with respect to long-term operation of Isabella Reservoir, Kern County, California. The Committee further expects the Corps of Engineers to identify the least costly actions available, including, whenever possible, the utilization of partnerships with other Federal and non-Federal agencies and organizations, so that the Corps can continue to operate and maintain Isabella Dam and Reservoir for flood control and water conservation purposes as provided in the October 23, 1964, contract among the United States of America and various public agencies.

Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 to grade and maintain the basin within Hansen Dam to enhance and maintain flood capacity and to provide for future use of the basin for compatible purposes consistent with the Master Plan, including recreation and environmental restoration on the Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California, project.

Moss Landing Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for maintenance dredging of the Federal channel in Moss Landing Harbor, California.

Redwood City Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for maintenance dredging of Redwood City Harbor, California.

San Francisco Bay, Long Term Management Strategy, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 to continue the development of a long term strategy for the disposal of dredged material for the San Francisco Bay, California, area.

San Francisco Harbor and Bay (Drift Removal), California.—The Committee has provided an additional $134,000 for debris removal activities in San Francisco Bay and Harbor, California.

San Francisco Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $199,000 for maintenance dredging of San Francisco Harbor, California.

San Joaquin River, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,802,000 for maintenance dredging on the San Joaquin River, California, project.

Ventura Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,165,000 for repairs of the South Beach Groin on the Ventura Harbor, California, project.

Cherry Creek Lake, Colorado.—None of the funds provided for operation and maintenance of the Cherry Creek Lake project in Colorado may be used to undertake a study of dam safety at the project.

Intracoastal Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland.—None of the funds provided for operation and maintenance of the Intracoastal Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay project may be used to close or remove the St. Georges Bridge without prior authorization of the Congress.

Canaveral Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,930,000 for maintenance dredging of the Canaveral Harbor, Florida, project.

Carrabella Bay Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for a sand flat removal dredge management study at the Carrabella Bay Harbor, Florida, project.

Fort Pierce Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,951,000 for maintenance dredging of the Fort Pierce Harbor, Florida, project.

Miami River, Florida.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for maintenance dredging of the Miami River, Florida, project.

Suwanee River, Florida.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the dredging of McGriff Pass on the Suwanee River, Florida, project.

Allatona Lake, Georgia.—The Committee has provided an additional $906,000 for recreational facility maintenance at the Allatona Lake, Georgia, project.

Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $6,818,000 to address the maintenance and dredging backlog on the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers project.

Of the funds provided, $540,000 is to restore fish and wildlife habitat and hydrologic connections to Florida River, Kennedy Creek, and Iamonia Lake within the Apalachicola system, and $500,000 is to restore the historic hydrologic connection between the Apalachicola River and Virginia Cut.

Carters Dam and Lake, Georgia.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,200,000 for powerhouse repairs at the Carters Dam and Lake, Georgia, project.

Savannah Harbor, Georgia.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,089,000 for operation and maintenance dredging on the Savannah Harbor, Georgia, project.

Kaskaskia River Navigation, Illinois.—The Committee has provided an additional $491,000 for maintenance dredging on the Kaskaskia River Navigation project, Illinois.

Buckhorn Lake, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided an additional $120,000 for recreational improvements on the Buckhorn Lake, Kentucky, project.

Carr Creek Lake, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided an additional $120,000 for recreational improvements on the Carr Creek Lake, Kentucky, project.

Elvis Stahr (Hickman) Harbor, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $460,000 for maintenance dredging of the Elvis Stahr Harbor, Kentucky, project.

Barataria Bay Waterway, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for dredging on the Barataria Bay Waterway project including Bayou Rigaurd and Barataria Pass in the vicinity of Grand Isle, Louisiana.

Bayou Teche, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 to dredge the bayou and East and West Calumet Floodgates on the Bayou Teche, Louisiana, project.

Freshwater Bayou, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 to perform maintenance dredging on the Freshwater Bayou, Louisiana, between the Freshwater Bayou Lock and the Gulf of Mexico.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 to address critical backlog maintenance on the J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana, project.

Mermentau River, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 to dredge between Grand Cheniere and the Gulf of Mexico on the Mermentau River, Louisiana.

Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 for embankment stabilization on the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, Louisiana, project. The Committee is very concerned about erosion problems on the channel.

Waterway from Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to Bayou Dulac, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to maintain the waterway from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to Bayou Dulac, Louisiana.

Jennings Randolph Lake, Maryland.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 to upgrade recreational facilities on the Jennings Randolph Lake, Maryland, project.

Aunt Lydia's Cove, Massachusetts.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the dredging of the Aunt Lydia's Cove, Massachusetts, project.

Andrew's River, Massachusetts.—The Committee has provided $130,000 for the dredging of the Andrew's River, Massachusetts, project.

Scituate Harbor, Massachusetts.—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 to dredge the Federal channel, anchorages, and repair the South Jetty on the Scituate Harbor, Massachusetts, project.

St. Mary's River, Little Rapids Channel, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the St. Mary's River, Little Rapids Channel.

Grand Marais, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $200,000 to conduct a major rehabilitation reevaluation of the harbor project at Grand Marais, Michigan.

Caruthersville Harbor, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $240,000 for maintenance dredging of the project at Caruthersville Harbor, Missouri.

Clearwater Lake, Missouri.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,635,000 for the relocation of recreation facilities and re-

pairs due to ice storm damage on the Clearwater Lake, Missouri, project.

New Madrid Harbor, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $290,000 for maintenance dredging of the project at New Madrid Harbor, Missouri.

Southeast Missouri Port, Mississippi River, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for maintenance dredging of the Southeast Missouri Port, Mississippi River, Missouri, project.

Table Rock Lake, Missouri.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 to address the maintenance backlog and upgrade recreation areas on the Table Rock Lake, Missouri, project.

Missouri National Recreation River, Nebraska.—The Committee has provided $275,000 for bank stabilization along the Missouri National Recreation River, Nebraska.

Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $3,200,000 for the Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, project. The additional funds above the budget request will enable the Corps to repair the south jetty and replace the north inlet bulkhead.

Shrewsbury River, Main Channel, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $130,000 for maintenance dredging of the Shrewsbury River, Main Channel, New Jersey, project.

Flushing Bay and Creek, New York.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 to restore the channel to the Federally authorized depth on the Flushing Bay and Creek, New York, project.

Plattsburgh Harbor, New York.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 to repair the breakwater on the Plattsburgh Harbor, New York, project.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,609,000 to address the critical dredging maintenance backlog along the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, North Carolina.

Lockwoods Folly River, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for maintenance dredging on the project at Lockwoods Folly River, North Carolina.

Masonboro Inlet and Connecting Channels, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided an additional $700,000 for maintenance dredging on the Masonboro Inlet and Connecting Channels, North Carolina, project.

Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for maintenance and upgrading of recreational facilities on the Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota, project, and an additional $100,000 for mosquito control in Williston, North Dakota.

Hugo Lake, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided an additional $130,000 for land transfers on the Hugo Lake, Oklahoma, project.

Wister Lake, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided an additional $70,000 for land transfers on the Wister Lake, Oklahoma, project.

Columbia River and lower Willamette River below Vancouver and Portland, Oregon.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,000,000 for the East Astoria Boat Basin breakwater project.

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 for a major maintenance report for the north and south jetties for the project at Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon.

Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oregon.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 to dredge the Newport South Beach Marina and Harbor to its Federally authorized depth at Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oregon.

Tionesta Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $750,000 for upgrades of the recreation facility at the Tionesta Lake, Pennsylvania project.

Murells Inlet, South Carolina.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for maintenance dredging on the Murrells Inlet, South Carolina, project.

Houston Ship Channel, Texas.—The Committee has provided an additional $4,445,000 maintenance dredging on the Houston Ship Channel, Texas, project.

Proctor Lake, Texas.—The Committee has provided an additional $600,000 for the planning of land acquisition on the Proctor Lake, Texas, project.

Trinity River and Tributaries, Texas.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for critical maintenance dredging on the Trinity River and Tributaries, Texas, project.

Waco Lake, Texas.—The Committee understands the importance of having a reliable water supply source to ensure the economic viability of the central Texas region. The City of Waco has partnered with the Corps of Engineers to complete a study that was approved in 1984 to reallocate storage at Waco Lake, Texas, for increasing the available water supply storage. However, significant increases in project costs since completion of the study have delayed project implementation. A portion of the cost increase is due to the need to relocate existing recreation facilities. The Committee understands that the existing facilities are reaching the limits of their useful life and would need to be rehabilitated or replaced in the near future. To minimize further delays in implementing this much needed project, the Committee has provided an additional $1,500,000 to perform cultural resource mitigation and recreation improvements. Notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 85–500, the costs for this work shall be accomplished at Federal expense.

Whitney Lake, Texas.—The Committee has provided an additional $573,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the power house upgrade in compliance with the Major Rehabilitation Report dated March 2001, submitted to the Chief of Engineers.

Winter Harbor, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for maintenance dredging on the project at Winter Harbor, Virginia.

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,800,000 for the rehabilitation of the north jetty, to investigate improvements to the north jetty, and to continue the analysis of the south jetty on the Grays Harbor and Chehalis, Washington, project.

Mud Mountain Dam, Washington.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for the design of fish passage facilities at the Mud Mountain Dam, White River, Washington, project.

Bluestone Lake, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,269,000 for continuing construction of the multi-level release tower and debris removal at the Bluestone Lake, West Virginia, project.

Fox River, Wisconsin.—The Committee has provided an additional $5,000,000 for transfer of the lock system to the State of Wisconsin.

Great Lakes Sediment Transport Models.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for the development of the sediment transport model for the Maumee River, Ohio.

Dredged Material Recycling Program.—The Committee has included language in the bill which directs the Corps of Engineers to fully investigate the development of an upland disposal site recycling program on the Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers project and the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers project. Many of the existing upland dredged disposal on these and other projects are nearing capacity and a program to recycle dredged material would enable necessary maintenance dredging to continue while reducing the need to develop new disposal sites in environmentally sensitive areas.

Inland Waterway Navigation Charts.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to begin the process of making inland waterway navigation chart date available in electronic format. Electronic navigation chart data would enable towboats and other vessels to navigate more precisely, provide increased capability in poor visibility, and aid in the training of vessel operators.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2001	$124,725,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	128,000,000
Recommended, 2002	128,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+3,275,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

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

For fiscal year 2002, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $128,000,000, the same as the budget request and $3,275,000 more than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2001.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2001	$139,692,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	140,000,000
Recommended, 2002	140,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+308,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

The Committee recommendation for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) is $140,000,000, the same as the budget request. In fiscal year 1998, Congress transferred responsibility for cleanup of contaminated sites under FUSRAP to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In appropriating FUSRAP funds to the Corps of Engineers, the Committee intended to transfer only the responsibility for administration and execution of cleanup activities at eligible sites where remediation had not been completed. It did not intend to transfer ownership of and accountability for real property interests that remain with the Department of Energy. The Committee expects the Department to continue to provide the institutional knowledge and expertise needed to best serve the Nation and the affected communities in executing this program.

The Corps of Engineers has extensive experience in the cleanup of hazardous, toxic, and radioactive wastes through its work for the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies. The Committee intends for the Corps expertise be used in the same manner for the cleanup of contaminated sites under FUSRAP, and expects the Corps to continue programming and budgeting for FUSRAP as part of the civil works program.

The Committee is concerned that many of the stakeholders living near FUSRAP sites around the Nation are not fully aware of when these FUSRAP sites will be fully remediated. To ensure that such documentation is available to FUSRAP stakeholders, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to prepare a bi-annual report which provides a brief summary on the status of remediation efforts on-going at all FUSRAP sites. Copies of this report should be made available by the Corps of Engineers to stakeholders, including the appropriate local, state and Federal officials.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2001	$151,666,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	153,000,000
Recommended, 2002	153,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+1,334,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

The Committee recommendation for General Expenses is $153,000,000, the same as the budget request and $1,334,000 above the fiscal year 2001 amount. The recommendation also includes bill language prohibiting the use of funds to support a congressional affairs office within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers.

Corps of Engineering Hiring Practices.—The Committee understands that Army Corps of Engineers' district offices do not have authority to recruit and hire new applicants for positions within Corps of Engineers, and that this policy may impede the ability of the Corps to attract qualified candidates from Hispanic and other minority groups. The needs of the Corps of Engineers are different from those of the Army generally, as Corps district offices serve the regions of the country in which they are located, whereas other

Army organizations serve the nation as a whole. The scope and complexity of the Army's centralized personnel management system for worldwide military service and combat operations may not be meeting the Corps need to hire from within the communities in which they operate in order to effectively resolve regional water management issues and to enhance relations with local communities. The centralized Army personnel management system is not designed to recruit personnel from local communities to meet Corps of Engineers regional district needs. Therefore, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the Appropriations Committees of Congress by September 1, 2001, on his plans to address this problem and how a demonstration program could be established in fiscal year 2002 to permit Corps regional offices more flexibility to recruit and hire locally, and to take advantage of untapped potential in Hispanic and other minority communities.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Sec. 101. The Committee has included language which amends the authorization for the San Gabriel Basin Restoration, California, program so that the San Gabriel Water Authority shall receive credit for prior expenditures.

Sec. 102. The Committee has included language which provides that the dredge McFARLAND may only be operated in a ready reserve status for urgent dredging, emergencies, and in support of national defense.

Sec. 103. The Committee has included language which directs the Secretary of the Army to include an alternatives analysis of a multipurpose Auburn Dam as part of the American River watershed, California, long-term study.

Sec. 104. The Committee has included language directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer property at Tuttle Creek Lake, Kansas, to the Blue Township Fire District, Blue Township, Kansas.

Sec. 105. The Committee includes language which directs the Secretary of the Army to carry out shore protection projects in accordance with the cost sharing provisions contained in existing Project Cooperation Agreements.

Sec. 106. The Committee has included language which provides that none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to revise the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual if such revision provides for an increase in the springtime water release program during the spring heavy rainfall and snow melt period in States that have rivers draining into the Missouri River below the Gavins Point Dam.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2001	$39,862,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	36,228,000
Recommended, 2002	36,228,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−3,634,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

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 2002 to carry out the provisions of the Act is $36,228,000, the same as the budget request, and $3,634,000 less than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2001.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriation, 2001	$678,953,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	647,997,000
Recommended, 2002	691,160,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+12,207,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+43,163,000

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
WATER AND RELATED				
ARIZONA				
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT.....	---	6,282	---	6,282
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER BASIN.....	31,392	50	31,392	50
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I	725	9,355	725	9,355
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM.....	3,103	---	4,103	---
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	575	---	575	---
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER REUSE PROJECT.....	250	---	250	---
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT..	4,055	---	4,055	---
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	685	---	685	---
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION.....	200	---	500	---
TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY.....	100	---	100	---
YUMA AREA PROJECTS.....	1,658	18,037	1,658	18,037
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA PROJECT.....	640	426	640	426
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	1,000	---	1,000	---
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PLANT....	1,800	---	1,800	---
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION.....	2,387	10,996	5,887	10,996
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.....	1,947	---	1,947	---
DELTA DIVISION.....	12,182	5,053	12,182	5,053
EAST SIDE DIVISION.....	604	3,630	604	6,030
FRIANT DIVISION.....	2,103	2,923	2,103	2,923
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	12,637	879	12,637	879
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT...	---	11,000	---	11,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	4,071	1,682	7,371	1,682

SAN FELIPE DIVISION	447	---	447	---
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	1,280	---	1,280	---
SHASTA DIVISION	2,456	7,025	2,456	7,025
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	7,751	5,380	7,751	5,380
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	900	7,322	900	7,322
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	4,735	6,417	4,735	6,417
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	1,500	---	1,500	---
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	200	---	3,500	---
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	1,800	---	1,800	---
LONG BEACH DESALINATION PROJECT	---	---	2,000	---
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	---	---	740	---
MISSION BASIN BRACKISH GROUNDWATER DESALTING DEMO	---	---	400	---
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	1,800	---	3,000	---
NORTH SONOMA COUNTY WATER REUSE STUDY	---	---	500	---
GROUNDWATER REPLENISHMENT SYSTEM	1,800	---	3,000	---
ORLAND PROJECT	---	410	---	410
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	800	---	3,500	---
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVERSION STUDY	---	---	5,000	---
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECYCLING PROGRAM	6,000	---	6,000	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	1,800	---	1,800	---
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	2,500	---	4,500	---
SOLANO PROJECT	1,210	1,149	1,210	1,149
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	875	---	875	---
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP SECTION 5 & 8	12,000	---	16,000	---
COLLBRAN PROJECT	127	1,202	127	1,202
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	49	7,913	49	7,913
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT - HORSETOOTH DAM	---	26,000	---	26,000
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	74	17	74	17
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	9	4,472	9	4,472
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	427	573	427	573
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	421	1,787	421	1,787
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	---	332	---	332
MANCOS PROJECT	49	23	49	23
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	---	2,119	---	2,119

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
6300	PINE RIVER PROJECT	88	62	88	62
6400	SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT	326	4,021	326	4,021
6500	UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	368	27	368	27
6600	IDAHO				
6700	BOISE AREA PROJECTS	1,526	6,071	1,526	6,071
6800	COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	11,000	---	11,000	---
6900	DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT	165	---	165	---
7100	IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	509	---	509	---
7200	MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	1,968	3,272	1,968	3,272
7300	MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	262	---	262	---
7400	KANSAS				
7500	KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	594	---	594	---
7600	WICHITA PROJECT	---	269	---	269
7700	MONTANA				
7800	FORT PECK DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	---	---	4,000	---
8000	HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	---	294	---	294
8100	MILK RIVER PROJECT	440	541	440	541
8200	MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	321	---	321	---
8300	ROCKY BOYS INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	8,000	---	8,000	---
8400	NEBRASKA				
8500	MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	23	32	23	32

NEVADA				
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	6,347	2,089	6,347	2,089
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	1,000	---	1,000	---
NEW MEXICO				
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	---	---	2,000	---
CARLSBAD PROJECT	1,689	742	1,689	742
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	2,684	8,967	2,684	8,967
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	---	50	---	50
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	1,001	2,591	1,001	2,591
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	214	---	214	---
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	200	---	200	---
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	26	---	26	---
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	217	---	217	---
NORTH DAKOTA				
DAKOTAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	354	---	354	---
DAKOTAS TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	250	---	250	---
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT	21,011	4,228	21,011	4,228
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	---	186	---	186
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	---	569	---	569
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	---	276	---	276
NORMAN PROJECT	---	183	---	183
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	263	---	263	---
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	---	731	---	731
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	---	280	---	280
OREGON				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	278	418	278	418
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	500	---	1,000	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
DESCHUTES PROJECT	360	138	960	138
DESCHUTES PROJECT-WICKUP DAM	---	12,000	---	12,000
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	340	267	340	267
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	150	---	150	---
KLAMATH PROJECT	12,277	483	12,277	483
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	457	---	457	---
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	317	162	317	162
TUALATIN PROJECT	149	107	149	107
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	100	---	100	---
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	50	---	50	---
UMATILLA PROJECT	409	2,227	409	2,227
SOUTH DAKOTA				
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	10,000	40	15,000	40
MNI WICONI PROJECT	20,511	7,489	25,511	7,489
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM	---	30	---	30
TEXAS				
BALMORHEA PROJECT	30	---	30	---
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	---	104	---	104
EL PASO WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	---	---	1,000	---
NAVAJO GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	300	---	300	---
NUECES RIVER	---	421	---	421
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT	---	688	---	688
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	---	335	---	335
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	197	---	197	---

UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT	310	8	310	8
MOON LAKE PROJECT	39	6	39	6
NAVAJO SANDSTONE AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY	250	---	250	---
NEWTON PROJECT	46	7	46	7
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	305	---	305	---
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	111	51	111	51
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	465	363	465	363
SCOFIELD PROJECT	56	25	56	25
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	300	---	300	---
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	82	7	82	7
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,704	290	1,704	290
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	356	32	356	32
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	4,044	9,119	4,044	9,119
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	425	---	425	---
YAKIMA PROJECT	516	6,753	516	6,753
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	10,600	---	11,600	---
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT	8	4,654	8	4,654
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	40	1,412	40	1,412
SHOSHONE PROJECT	54	925	54	925
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	55	---	55	---
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II: PROGRAM & COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	10,929	---	10,929	---
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5	5,349	1,821	5,349	1,821
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8, R&F&WL	4,677	61	4,677	61
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	150	---	150	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,700	---	1,700
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	---	16,400	---	16,400
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	---	17,900	---	17,900
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	---	624	---	624
DEPARTMENTAL IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	2,620	---	2,000	---
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE	582	---	2,582	---
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	3,738	---	3,000	---
EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	---	330	---	330
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	13,522	---	13,522	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,882	---	1,500	---
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,661	---	1,200	---
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	32	5,110	32	5,110
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	---	950	---	950
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	1,861	---	1,700	---
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	7,690	---	6,500	---
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	2,000	---	2,000	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	13,103	---	13,103	---
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	---	509	---	509
NATIONAL FISH & WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	1,000	---	1,000	---
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	8,400	---	8,400	---
NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,709	---	1,300	---
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	180	950	180	950
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN - OTHER PROJECTS	3,183	29,747	3,183	29,747
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	590	345	590	345
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	463	---	463	---
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	5,130	---	4,800	---
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT - TITLE XXVIII	1,922	---	1,922	---
RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	2,694	---	2,300	---

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:				
ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT DESALINATION PROGRAM.....	1,150	---	1,150	---
APPLIED SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT.....	3,290	---	3,290	---
DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.....	300	---	300	---
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION/ENHANCEMEN	660	---	660	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT.....	300	---	300	---
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	940	---	940	---
SITE SECURITY.....	---	1,755	---	1,755
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION.....	314	---	314	---
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	1,894	---	1,500	---
TITLE XVI, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM.....	1,650	---	1,650	---
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES - TECHNICAL SUPPORT	70	---	70	---
WATER MANAGEMENT & CONSERVATION PROGRAM.....	7,507	---	7,507	---
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT.....	3,836	---	3,836	---
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	-33,840	---	-40,238	---
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES.....	343,299	304,698	384,062	307,098

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

Tres Rios Wetlands Demonstration, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Tres Rios research and demonstration project.

Central Valley Project, American River Division, California.—The bill includes $3,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to reimburse the City of Folsom, California, for costs associated with the replacement of the Natoma Pipeline System, which is owned and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, and is the single water supply source for the City.

Central Valley Project, East Side Division.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,400,000 for water and sewer system upgrades and a visitor capacity study at New Melones Lake.

Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs.—Within the amounts provided for the Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Program, and the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, the Committee expects the Bureau of Reclamation to completely fulfill its obligations under the San Joaquin River Agreement, including the timely payment to non-Federal parties to the Agreement.

Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, California.—The Committee has provided $7,371,000 for the Resources Management activity of the Sacramento River Division of the Central Valley Project, $3,300,000 above the budget request. Of the amount provided, $2,000,000 is for the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District (GCID) Fish Screen Improvement Project; $1,000,000 is for detailed, site-specific environmental assessment and permitting work associated with Sites Reservoir, including an evaluation of both the GCID Main Canal and the Tehama-Colusa Canal as a means to convey water to the proposed reservoir; and $300,000 is for the Colusa Basin Drainage District's Integrated Resources Management Plan for critical flood control, conjunctive use, and waterfowl habitat activities.

Groundwater Replenishment System Project, California.—The Committee has included an additional $1,200,000 for the Groundwater Replenishment System project. This project was previously known as the Orange County Regional Water Reclamation project.

Lake Tahoe Regional Wetlands Development, California.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Tahoe Airport Stream restoration project and $1,500,000 for the project to restore Third and Incline Creeks.

Los Angeles Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, California.—The bill includes $740,000 to continue the Los Angeles Area Water Reclamation and Reuse project.

Mission Basin Brackish Groundwater Desalting Demonstration Project, California.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue work on the Mission Basin Brackish Groundwater Desalting Demonstration project.

North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project, California.—The bill includes $3,000,000 to continue work on the North San Diego County Area Water Recycling project.

Salton Sea Research Project, California.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue environmental work related to the preferred alternative for the restoration of the Salton Sea. In addition, the Committee has provided $1,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the program to perform research and construct river reclamation and wetlands projects to improve water quality in the Alamo River and New River, Imperial County, California.

San Jose Water Reclamation and Reuse Program, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 for the San Jose Water Reclamation and Reuse program.

Animas La-Plata Project, Colorado.—The bill includes $16,000,000 for the Animas La-Plata project. The additional funds above the budget request will enhance the Bureau of Reclamation's ability to complete the project within the time period established by the Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000.

Equus Beds Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Project, Kansas.—The pilot project for the Equus Beds is complete. As final reports are assembled, the Committee strongly encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to work with affected communities and the State of Kansas on design and engineering of the full-scale project.

Fort Peck Dry Prairie Rural Water System, Montana.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 to continue the Fort Peck Dry Prairie Rural Water System project in Montana.

Albuquerque Metro Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the continuation of the Albuquerque Metro Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Project.

Deschutes Ecosystem Restoration Project, Oregon.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 to facilitate efforts to improve streamflows and improve water quality in the Deschutes River Basin.

Deschutes Project, Oregon.—The Committee has provided an additional $600,000 to continue work on the project to install buried pipe in portions of the Tumalo Irrigation District's Bend Feed Canal to conserve water lost to seepage.

Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project, South Dakota.—The bill includes an additional $5,000,000 to accelerate construction on the Mid-Dakota Water Rural Water project in South Dakota.

Mni-Wiconi Project, South Dakota.—The Committee has provided an additional $5,000,000 to accelerate construction of the Mni-Wiconi project in South Dakota.

El Paso Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, Texas.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to facilitate construction of the Central Portion of the El Paso Water Reclamation and Reuse project.

Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project, Washington.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement project in Washington.

Drought Emergency Assistance.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to establish a Weather

Damage Modification Program, including a regional weather modification research program involving the states of Oklahoma, Texas, and Kansas.

Wetlands Development.—Within the amount provided for the Wetlands Development Program, the Committee has provided $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake a project to restore natural vegetation along the lower Colorado River in the vicinity of Yuma, Arizona.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2001	$9,348,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	7,495,000
Recommended, 2002	7,495,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−1,853,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	

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

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
LOAN PROGRAM			
CALIFORNIA			
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT.....	14,403	1,239	1,239
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION.....	9,401	401	401
SAN SEVAINE CREEK WATER PROJECT.....	28,100	5,575	5,575
VARIOUS			
LOAN ADMINISTRATION.....	---	280	280
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.....		7,495	7,495

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 2001	$38,360,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	55,039,000
Recommended, 2002	55,039,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+16,679,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

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

For fiscal year 2002, the Committee has provided $55,039,000, the same as the budget request.

Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District Fish Screen Improvement Project.—In addition to the funds provided under the Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, the Committee has provided $2,000,000 from within funds made available through the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue work on the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District Fish Screen Improvement Project.

Anadromous Fish Screen Program.—The Committee expects the Bureau of Reclamation to use up to $12,000,000 for the Anadromous Fish Screen program to continue work on the American Basin Fish Screen and Habitat Improvement Project (Natomas Mutual Water Company) as well as the fish screen projects being undertaken by the Sutter Mutual Water Company and Reclamation District 108.

San Joaquin River Restoration Program.—The Committee intends that within the funds provided through the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund in fiscal year 2001, the $5,000,000 made available to the San Joaquin River Restoration Program remains available for that purpose until expended.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

Appropriation, 2001	.....
Budget Estimate, 2002	$20,000,000
Recommended, 2002	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	.....
Budget Estimate, 2002	−20,000,000

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

ecosystem restoration activities in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. Attempts to reauthorize the program last year were unsuccessful. Accordingly, no funds were provided in fiscal year 2001.

The Committee remains very supportive of the efforts that have been taken in the State of California to develop this program, which will provide a safe, clean, and reliable water system for millions of people while improving the environment. However, for fiscal year 2002, the Committee has again recommended no funding in the absence of authorizing legislation for this multi-year, multi-billion dollar effort. The Committee is aware that authorizing legislation has been introduced in the House and the Senate and will reconsider funding for the program as the bill moves through the appropriations process.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2001	$50,114,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	52,968,000
Recommended, 2002	52,968,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+2,854,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

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

For fiscal year 2002, the Committee has recommended $52,968,000, the same as the budget request, and $2,854,000 above the fiscal year 2001 amount.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Sec. 201. The Committee has included language which provides that none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used by the Bureau of Reclamation to issue permits, either directly or by making funds available to an entity under a contract, for commercial rafting activities within the Auburn State Recreation Area, California, until the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act are met.

Sec. 202. The Committee has included language which amends the authorization for the American and Sacramento Rivers, California, project.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in Title III provide for Department of Energy programs relating to: Energy Supply, Non-Defense Environmental Management, Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation, Science, Nuclear Waste Disposal, Departmental Administration, the Inspector General, the National Nuclear Security Administration, Defense Environmental Management, Other Defense Activities, Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the Power Marketing Administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation provides additional funding for several Department of Energy programs: renewable energy technologies, environmental cleanup activities, and nuclear nonproliferation programs. However, due to overall funding constraints, the Committee was forced to reduce other Departmental programs in order to add funding to these critical areas.

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

The President's National Energy Policy Development Group released its National Energy Policy in May of 2001. The National Energy Policy includes a number of recommendations relevant to the Department of Energy, from increasing research in certain energy technologies to finding solutions to bottlenecks in the national transmission grid. The Committee encourages the Secretary of Energy to proceed as quickly as possible to complete the necessary reviews in order to implement the recommendations of the National Energy Policy.

Unfortunately, the National Energy Policy was released too late to have an effect on the Department's fiscal year 2002 budget request. If the Secretary needs to make changes to bring fiscal year 2002 program funding into alignment with the National Energy Policy, the Committee is receptive to making the necessary adjustments through the appropriations process and through fiscal year 2002 reprogrammings.

The Secretary should place priority on those actions that can alleviate the electricity shortage that is especially acute in the West. In particular, the Secretary should expedite reviews of Path 15 in California and other transmission constraints, the projected financing needs of the Bonneville Power Administration, and projected needs of the other Federal power marketing administrations.

The Committee wishes to emphasize that most of the Department's programs are not designed to provide immediate relief to the Nation's energy crisis. Instead, the Department's energy supply programs consist primarily of research and development into tech-

nologies intended to provide long-term solutions to the Nation's energy needs. Near-term deployment of available energy technologies is best accomplished through incentives other than appropriations.

BASIC RESEARCH FOR ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

The Committee is concerned that the Department does not have an adequate plan or policy that relates the basic research being conducted by the Office of Science to the energy needs of the country. While the Committee understands that basic research can lead in many directions, there should be a focus on the underlying needs of the Department's energy portfolio. There appears to be minimal cooperation and coordination between the Office of Science and other Departmental offices on the fundamental research needed to improve energy technologies. Each year the Committee provides funding for the Office of Science to support basic research in energy programs. The Committee directs the Department to identify ways in which coordination can be improved and research conducted which is mutually beneficial and to report to the Committee by January 15, 2002, on the Department's strategy for ensuring that the basic research programs also focus on energy technology needs.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Department has established an Office of Engineering and Construction Management (OECM) to strengthen its project management capabilities. The Committee strongly supports this effort, but continues to be concerned with the placement of this Office in the Department's organizational structure. In its recent report to Congress, the National Research Council (NRC) reaffirmed its recommendation that the Office of Engineering and Construction Management ". . . should be at the level of assistant secretary and report directly to the Deputy Secretary." The NRC also noted that, "The most important unresolved issues are: (1) definition of the authority and scope of OECM; (2) the provision of adequate financial and staff resources to improve project management . . ."

The Committee endorses the NRC recommendation that, ". . . the authority of OECM and the PMSOs be strengthened and that the resources and personnel available to them be increased to support their responsibilities." In that regard, the Committee strongly urges the Department to elevate OECM to a level equal to an Assistant Secretary with a direct reporting relationship to the Deputy Secretary/Secretarial Acquisition Executive authority. The Committee believes that the director of the office should continue to be a career position rather than a political appointment. Further, it fully expects that OECM's existing personnel should continue in their current positions in OECM's new location. The Department also should place the facilities and infrastructure policy development and program oversight responsibilities and budget under OECM.

Consistent with NRC's recommendation for strengthening available financial and staff resources, the Committee has provided $7,600,000 for OECM in fiscal year 2002 and expects the office to report directly to the Deputy Secretary.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee is aware of the continuing decline in the condition of the Department's facilities throughout the complex and of the Department's inability to properly evaluate and address the readiness and maintenance status of its facilities. Many of its aged, deteriorated facilities and infrastructure lack the functionality to provide adequate mission support.

Focus on breakdown maintenance at the Department, in lieu of preventive maintenance programs and adequate capital investments for facility upgrades, has resulted in increasing deferred maintenance costs, further exacerbating the problem and increasing the risks for mission failures. This absence of adequate maintenance and capital investment has also resulted in facility operating costs which are inordinately high. The Committee is reluctant to continue funding costly mission-critical repairs and facility upgrades that could have been prevented or corrected at less cost. The Department must develop an improved management system and allocation of resources for its facilities and infrastructure.

The Committee is also aware that the Department has an increasing number of excess facilities that require extensive budgets for surveillance and maintenance. It is critical that the Department address its long-term operations budget requirements which must take into consideration approaches to the re-engineering of its complex, priorities for recapitalization, and removal of excess facilities.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to:

- Contract with the National Research Council to provide the Congress an evaluation of the steps the Department is taking to improve its facility and infrastructure management;
- Provide by December 15, 2001, information regarding the current and projected total budgets required for facilities and infrastructure and the process being established to determine priorities and return-on-investments;
- Initiate a Site Planning Pilot program to demonstrate the reconfiguration of its facilities and infrastructure to meet its mission and to address its long-term operational costs and return on investments;
- Initiate a Pilot Site Program that can be used as a model for a cost-efficient maintenance program addressing mission requirements and life cycle costs;
- Include in the fiscal year 2003 budget request, for all construction projects and general plant projects (GPP) initiated in fiscal year 2002 or later, funds to eliminate excess facilities (based on the greatest impact on long-term costs and risk) that are at least equal to the square footage of the new facilities which are being proposed;
- Identify in the fiscal year 2003 budget request all maintenance and infrastructure costs and the adequacy of this funding to meet mission requirements by site and program; and
- Prepare Site Plans for each Department site not slated for closure under the Environmental Management program.

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. The Department reduced the number of management and operating (M&O) contractor employees assigned to the Washington metropolitan area to 220 in fiscal year 2001. The Committee expects the Department not to exceed this number in fiscal year 2002. However, at Headquarters the Department also continues to rely extensively on support service contractors for technical assistance and oversight despite the large number of Federal employees also on staff.

Report on M&O contractor employees.—The Department is to provide a report to the Committee at the end of fiscal year 2001 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. 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, 2000 through September 30, 2001, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2002.

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 descriptive and detailed 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, 2000 through September 30, 2001, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2002.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY STAFFING

The Committee continues to be concerned with the staffing levels in many Departmental organizations. Despite expectations expressed by Congress during establishment of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) in fiscal year 2001 that the new organization should incorporate many organizational and management efficiencies, there appear to be few changes in the regular way of doing business. The result of the new organization has been an increase in the number of field offices and additional staff at Headquarters. The remainder of the Department has also maintained the same staffing levels despite the creation of the NNSA and its separation from most of the Department's support organizations. This failure to address organizational and management efficiencies that were expected both in the NNSA and the remainder of the Department is a disappointment. It was hoped that the Department and NNSA would use this opportunity to revamp the op-

eration of an agency that is widely viewed as overly bureaucratic and process-oriented.

To jump-start a process that should have been implemented one year ago, the Committee directs the Department to prepare an overall staffing plan that implements organizational and management efficiencies throughout the Department and the NNSA and that could lead to a reduction in overall staffing during fiscal year 2003. Each program organization at Headquarters, each support and administrative organization at Headquarters, and each field office should be included in this review. If legislation permitting early retirements or excepted civil service hiring is required to implement this plan, the Department should request this authority when submitting the organization and staffing plan to the Committee. This plan is due by January 31, 2002.

EXTERNAL REGULATION

The Department of Energy is currently self-regulating with respect to nuclear safety and worker safety at most of its facilities under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The Committee directs the Department to prepare an implementation plan to transition to external regulation at the Department's non-defense science laboratories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) would assume responsibility for nuclear safety at the Department's non-defense science laboratories and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) would assume responsibility for worker safety at these same sites. The Department is directed in fiscal year 2002 to prepare a plan for implementation of external regulation, with a proposed effective date for the actual implementation of external regulation of October 1, 2002. This plan is due by March 31, 2002.

For planning purposes, external regulation will apply to the five multiprogram national laboratories under the Office of Science: Argonne National Laboratory; Brookhaven National Laboratory; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; Oak Ridge National Laboratory; and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. External regulation shall also apply to the five single-purpose laboratories under the Office of Science: Ames Laboratory, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory; Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory; Stanford Linear Accelerator Center; and Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility. The requirement to plan for the transition to external regulation is not applicable to the nuclear weapons laboratories, plants, or test facilities, nor to the Department's environmental remediation sites or other laboratories and research facilities.

CONTRACTOR TRAVEL

The Committee has not included a statutory limitation on contractor travel in fiscal year 2002. However, each program organization within the Department is expected to ensure that contractor travel is limited to critical mission functions and that administrative travel to Washington is limited. The Committee directs the Department to maintain a tracking system that will allow for periodic reviews of contractor travel costs and destinations.

INDEPENDENT CENTERS

The Department is directed to provide a report to the Committee by January 15, 2002, on all independent centers funded in fiscal year 2002. The report should identify all independent centers at each laboratory or facility, the annual cost, number of employees, and the source of funding; i.e., multiple programs, laboratory directed research and development funds, and overhead accounts. The report should be at the level of detail included in the fiscal year 2001 report to Congress. All centers should be specifically identified in the fiscal year 2003 budget submission.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The fiscal year 2003 budget justifications submitted by the Department should include the following: a section identifying the last year that authorizing legislation was provided by Congress for each program; 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 funding to eliminate excess facilities at least equal to the square footage of new facilities being constructed as general plant projects (GPP). The Department should work with the Committee on the specific information needed for each requirement.

SALE OF LAND

The Department recently sold 182 acres of land in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, for $54 per acre to a private development company. The Department claimed that the Atomic Energy Act provided the authority to sell land in the performance of a programmatic function without regard to standard Federal practices. It is not clear that the land was sold at fair market value, and the Committee is concerned that the Department did not act in the best interest of the Federal government and the taxpayers. The Department is directed to notify the Committee at least 60 days in advance of any proposed sale of land which does not follow the standard Federal practices for property sales and provide a detailed explanation for the waiver of Federal practices for the sale of the property.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The Committee requires the Department to promptly and fully inform the Committee 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 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 desire should not be factors for consideration.

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

Reporting and Approval Procedures.—The Committee has not provided statutory language to define reprogramming guidelines, but expects the Department to follow the spirit and the letter of the guidance provided in this report. Consistent with prior years, the Committee has not provided the Department with any internal reprogramming flexibility in fiscal year 2002, unless specifically identified in the House, Senate, or conference reports. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the Committees in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

ENERGY SUPPLY

Appropriation, 2001	$659,918,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	544,245,000
Recommended, 2002	639,317,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−20,601,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+95,072,000

The Energy Supply account includes the following programs: Renewable Energy Resources; Nuclear Energy; Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense); and Technical Information Management. As in fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends that the funds for Energy Supply activities remain available until expended.

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

The National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) in March 2000 identified a number of deficiencies in the management and organization of the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE), including the absence of clear goals and priorities, an integrated work program linked to those goals and priorities, and milestones reflecting program results. In fiscal year 2001, the Committee noted that "[a]ll of the renewable programs are requesting increases of 30 to 50 percent with no clear integration or explanation of why such increases are warranted in all programs simul-

taneously." The opposite situation exists in fiscal year 2002, where the initial budget request proposed reductions of nearly 50 percent in most renewable energy programs. A budget amendment of $39.1 million restored funding in some but not all of these renewable energy programs. Again, there is no clear rationale provided to explain the selective budget cuts, and no sense that the Department is conducting an integrated program with a well-defined scheme for measuring success. There is also no apparent coordination between the budget request, which was submitted to Congress in April 2001 and amended in early May 2001, and the National Energy Policy, which was released shortly after submission of the amended budget request.

The total Committee recommendation for renewable energy resources is $376,817,000, an increase of $100,164,000 over the amended budget request and $1,032,000 over fiscal year 2001 funding.

Metrics.—The objective of federal research on renewable energy resources should be to develop significant quantities of clean, reliable and affordable energy from renewable resources. The Secretary of Energy reports that, from fiscal year 1977 through fiscal year 2001, the cumulative Federal investment by the Department of Energy in renewable energy technologies totals over $6.1 billion. The Committee is concerned that we continue to expend federal research dollars on various renewable technologies without a clear relation between the money invested and the power generated. As the NAPA report noted, there is within EERE an "emphasis on process rather than on product." The Department needs to develop a clear set of metrics that can be used by the Congress and the Administration to compare the effectiveness of the federal investment in alternate energy sources. These metrics should include the cumulative federal investment to date in each technology, the current cost per kilowatt-hour generated, a realistic assessment of likely future costs and performance with additional research and development, the current total amount of power generated in the United States by each source, a realistic assessment of the potential future power generation capacity available from each source, and an estimate of the environmental advantages and disadvantages of each technology. Past and present subsidies to each technology should be clearly identified. The metrics should also indicate the progress of each technology along the research, development and deployment spectrum so that it is clear when a particular technology is mature enough to hand off to the private sector, recognizing the need to overcome various market barriers and infrastructure gaps. The Department should submit the above-referenced metrics as part of the detailed budget justification for Renewable Energy Resources in the fiscal year 2003 budget request and in subsequent budget requests.

Strategic Review.—The Committee is supportive of the Department's recently announced strategic review of its renewable energy programs. Such a review is consistent with the need for reliable and quantifiable measures of success, as outlined in the preceding paragraph, which can be used to guide future funding decisions. Upon completion of this strategic review, the Department should submit, if necessary, a reprogramming request to align fiscal year

2002 spending on the most cost-effective renewable energy technologies.

Renewable energy technologies

Renewable Energy Technologies include biomass/biofuels energy systems, geothermal technology development, hydrogen research, hydropower, solar energy, and wind energy systems.

Biomass/Biofuels Energy Systems.—The Committee recommendation for biomass/biofuels energy systems is $88,960,000, which is an increase of $7,005,000 over the amended budget request and $2,000,000 over the fiscal year 2001 funding level. This amount includes $41,010,000 for power systems and $47,950,000 for the transportation program.

The funds provided for power systems include: $2,000,000 for research and development on biopower from switchgrass; $1,000,000 to support a cost-shared Agricultural Waste Methane Power Generation Facility in California; $1,000,000 to support a cost-shared agricultural mixed waste biorefinery in Alabama using the thermal-depolymerization technology; and $1,000,000 to support the Black Belt Bioenergy Demonstration Project in Alabama. The funds provided for the transportation program include $1,000,000 for microcombustion research at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The control level for fiscal year 2002 is at the program account level of biomass/biofuels energy systems.

Geothermal technology development.—The Committee provides $27,000,000 for geothermal technology development, an increase of $13,100,000 over the budget request and the same as the fiscal year 2001 funding level. The Committee is particularly concerned about preserving a strong knowledge base on geothermal energy in the university community. The budget request, however, proposed to reduce university research on geothermal technologies by over 80 percent. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes sufficient funding in the geothermal technology development account to maintain university research on geothermal technologies at the fiscal year 2001 funding level of $2,600,000. The Committee recommendation also includes $2,000,000 in final funding for the Lake County Basin geothermal project in California.

Hydrogen research.—The National Energy Policy of May 2001 noted the promise of hydrogen as a clean-burning, limitless fuel of the future, and recommended continued research on next-generation hydrogen technologies. Funding of $27,000,000 is provided for hydrogen research, an increase of $119,000 over the amended budget request and the same as fiscal year 2001 funding.

Hydropower.—A major focus of the Department's recent research on hydropower has been on the development of more environmentally friendly turbine designs that will reduce fish mortality. While a worthwhile objective, such research is more appropriately funded by turbine manufacturers and by the federal agencies with responsibility for building and operating federal hydropower facilities, principally the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the power marketing administrations. The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for hydropower research by the Department of Energy, $2,000,000 less than fiscal year 2001 and $1,989,000 less than the amended budget request.

Solar Energy.—Solar energy technologies include: concentrating solar power; photovoltaic energy systems; and solar building technology research. The total Committee recommendation for solar energy is $94,657,000, an increase of $51,725,000 over the budget request and $1,132,000 over fiscal year 2001.

The Committee recommends $7,932,000 for concentrating solar power, an increase of $6,000,000 over the budget request and $5,868,000 less than fiscal year 2001. Both solar troughs and solar dish/Stirling engine technologies have the potential to be more efficient than solar tower technology. Therefore, $6,000,000 is provided to the Department for field testing of these technologies, and $1,932,000 is provided to the national laboratories for materials research, reliability testing, and support.

Photovoltaic energy systems are funded at $81,775,000, an increase of $6,000,000 over fiscal year 2001 and $42,775,000 over the budget request. The recommendation includes $8,700,000 for basic research/university programs and $18,500,000 for the thin film partnership program. The Committee supports cooperation with universities and industry to develop the science and engineering base required to move photovoltaic technology from the laboratory bench to the assembly line.

The Committee recommends $4,950,000 for solar building technology research, an increase of $1,000,000 over fiscal year 2001 and $2,950,000 over the budget request.

The control level for fiscal year 2002 is at the solar energy program account level.

Wind energy systems.—The Committee recommends $40,000,000 for wind energy systems, the same as in fiscal year 2001 and an increase of $19,500,000 over the budget request. The Committee supports the Department's current focus on developing the next generation of wind turbines that will be able to generate electricity at a competitive cost per kilowatt-hour in moderate (i.e., Class 4) winds without the need for a continuing federal subsidy. The Department is encouraged to work with private turbine manufacturers and the utility industry to develop, test, and bring such turbines to market at the earliest opportunity.

Electric energy systems and storage

The electric energy systems and storage program is funded at $60,000,000, $8,000,000 more than in fiscal year 2001 and $8,254,000 more than the amended budget request. Under this program, the Department conducts research and development on advanced technologies for the generation, transmission, storage, and distribution of electric power. The Committee encourages the Department to continue its work to support the timely deployment of distributed energy resources.

The Committee recommends $39,870,000 for high temperature superconducting research and development, $3,051,000 more than the amended budget request and $2,870,000 more than provided in fiscal year 2001. For energy storage systems, the Committee provides $7,130,000, $1,143,000 more than the budget request and $1,130,000 more than fiscal year 2001. For transmission reliability, the Committee recommends $13,000,000, an increase of $4,000,000 over the funding level in fiscal year 2001 and an increase of

$4,060,000 over the budget request. Within the funds available for transmission reliability, the Department should initiate the field testing of advanced composite conductors, which have the potential to increase the capacity of existing transmission lines.

The control level for fiscal year 2002 is at the electric energy systems and storage program account level.

Renewable support and implementation

The renewable support and implementation program includes departmental energy management, international renewable energy, the renewable energy production incentive (REPI), renewable Indian energy resources, and renewable program support. The Committee recommendation for renewable support and implementation is $12,500,000, an increase of $2,950,000 over the budget request and a decrease of $9,100,000 compared to the fiscal year 2001 funding level. This recommendation provides $2,500,000 for departmental energy management, $3,000,000 for the international renewable energy program, $4,000,000 for the renewable energy production incentive program, and $3,000,000 for renewable program support. Consistent with the budget request, the Committee has provided no funding for renewable Indian energy resources, with available funds directed to other renewable energy work.

National Renewable Energy Laboratory

The Committee recommendation for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) in Golden, Colorado, is $5,000,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $1,000,000 over the fiscal year 2001 funding level. NREL is one of the Department's newer laboratories, and it is essential that the Department maintain this facility properly so that it does not require a larger investment later in time, as is the case with much of the infrastructure elsewhere in the DOE complex.

Program direction

The Committee notes with disapproval that the Department requested a three percent increase for program direction at the same time as it proposed a 36 percent reduction in the total funding for Renewable Energy Resources. The program direction funding, and the Federal staff supported by this funding, should be proportional to the funding available for substantive research and development work on renewable energy resources. The Committee, therefore, recommends $18,700,000 for program direction, the same as the fiscal year 2001 level and a reduction of $500,000 from the budget request.

The Committee supports the Department's initiative to improve the project management capabilities in the Golden Field Office. Centralized project management by the federal staff in Golden should offer efficiencies compared to the current fragmented approach in which renewable energy projects are managed by a variety of other field offices and laboratories. However, the Committee does not believe that this initiative requires additional funding and FTEs. Instead, the Department should look first at retraining the existing federal workforce in the Golden Field Office and then

gradually shift more project management responsibilities as their capabilities improve.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Department's programs support a wide variety of applications of nuclear energy, from powering spacecraft to treating cancer to developing reactor technologies that provide 20 percent of the Nation's electricity. The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy programs is $224,130,000, an increase of $1,008,000 over the budget request but a decrease of $35,795,000 from the fiscal year 2001 funding level.

Advanced Radioisotope Power Systems.—The Committee recommendation is $28,200,000, a reduction of $894,000 from the budget request and $4,000,000 below the enacted level for fiscal year 2001. The Committee acknowledges the importance of maintaining the infrastructure and institutional knowledge base necessary to provide radioisotope power systems for space and national security missions. However, given the funding constraints on the overall Department of Energy budget, the Department should seek additional support for radioisotope power systems from the user agencies.

Isotopes.—The amount provided for isotope support and production is $22,683,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 from the budget request and $2,032,000 compared to fiscal year 2001. Funding for the Isotope Production Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory is $2,494,000, the same as the budget request. With the use of offsetting collections of $9,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, the net appropriation for isotopes is $16,177,000, $2,000,000 less than the budget request. The recommendation includes $900,000 for alpha emitting isotopes, the same level as provided in fiscal year 2001.

For the extraction of alpha emitting isotopes from excess uranium 233 presently stored in Building 3019 at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the Department should submit a project plan to the Committee by December 31, 2001, and include the proposal as part of the fiscal year 2003 budget request. This proposal should clearly identify all project costs, including the costs for storage and final disposal of the excess uranium 233 and for decontamination and decommissioning of Building 3019. The Department's proposal should include a baseline estimate for these activities, so that it can be determined whether or not the extraction of alpha emitting isotopes would increase the ultimate cleanup costs for the excess uranium 233 and for Building 3019. The Department's proposal should also address the cost-effectiveness of acquiring the medically-valuable isotopes from the Russian nuclear complex.

University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support.—The Committee recommendation is $15,895,000, an increase of $3,921,000 over the budget request and $3,895,000 over fiscal year 2001. The Committee is concerned about the recent decline in the number of graduates specializing in nuclear science and engineering. One of the major impediments to the construction of next-generation nuclear power plants in the United States may not be the technology itself, but rather the lack of skilled scientists and engineers who can design, license, build, and operate these new reactor designs. The Committee, therefore, provides additional funding for both the fuel

to support the university reactors and for the various grants and fellowships that support nuclear science and engineering education.

The Committee is aware that several universities are currently deciding whether to continue operating their reactors for teaching, research, and service. Past support for these reactors has been inadequate in view of their importance in forging the nation's nuclear technology capabilities. The Committee directs DOE to work with the nuclear engineering community, the nuclear medicine community, and the Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee to provide, through a peer-reviewed process, enhanced long-term support for key university facilities, possibly including staff support and instrumentation. The Department should submit a report to the Committee by December 31, 2001, presenting the Department's plan to accomplish this objective.

Research and Development.—The Committee strongly supports continued research and development to make the current generation of nuclear power plants safer and more efficient, and to develop the next generation of reactors. The total Committee recommendation for nuclear energy research and development is $32,579,000, an increase of $5,500,000 over the budget request and a decrease of $14,921,000 relative to fiscal year 2001.

For the nuclear energy plant optimization (NEPO) program, the Committee provides $5,000,000, the same amount as in fiscal year 2001 and $500,000 more than the budget request. As directed in fiscal year 2001, all NEPO projects should have industry contributions that equal or exceed the Federal share.

The Committee recommendation for the nuclear energy research initiative (NERI) is $23,079,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request and a decrease of $11,921,000 compared to fiscal year 2001. In addition to partnering with industry, the Department should ensure that universities play a major role in the NERI program.

The Committee provides $4,500,000 for nuclear energy technologies, the same as the budget request and $3,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2001 funding level. In addition to its efforts on developing Generation IV reactor technologies, the Department should take steps to facilitate the near-term deployment of existing advanced reactor designs. However, the Committee is not persuaded that the Federal government needs to fund the licensing of advanced reactor designs. No funds are made available for activities related to the deployment of small modular reactors in remote locations.

Infrastructure.—The Committee provides a total of $80,529,000, $750,000 less than the budget request and $11,631,000 less than fiscal year 2001. This includes $33,357,000 for ANL-West operations, $38,439,000 to implement the permanent deactivation of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), and $8,733,000 for Test Reactor Area (TRA) landlord costs. No funds are provided for initiation of conceptual design for a remote-handled facility for transuranic waste at ANL-West. Included within the TRA landlord appropriation is $500,000 for fire and life safety improvements and $950,000 for the electrical utility upgrade.

Nuclear facilities management.—The Committee recommendation is $30,250,000, a reduction of $207,000 from the budget request

and $4,600,000 from the fiscal year 2001 funding level. The recommendation includes $4,200,000 for EBR-II shutdown, $16,200,000 for the disposition of spent nuclear fuel and legacy materials, and $9,850,000 for disposition technology.

Program direction.—The Committee is concerned that the Department proposes to increase program direction funding by 8.8 percent at the same time it proposes to reduce the total program funding by 8.4 percent. Such a disproportionate increase in program direction funding is not supportable. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation for program direction funding is $20,500,000, a reduction of $1,500,000 from fiscal year 2001 and $4,562,000 from the budget request.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation is $31,500,000, a reduction of $4,000,000 from the budget request and $4,498,000 from fiscal year 2001.

As directed in section 308 of the General Provisions part of this Act, the Department is to prepare for the transition to external regulation of nuclear safety and worker health and safety for the non-defense science laboratories. The effective date for the transition to external regulation of these facilities will be October 1, 2002. The Department should transfer $4,000,000 to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to cover NRC's costs to prepare for the transition to external regulation. The Department should transfer $720,000 to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), $120,000 for external regulation preparations and $600,000 for worker health and safety at those sites transferred to non-Federal entities and for the Department's non-nuclear facilities not covered under the Atomic Energy Act.

The Department should plan on reducing its current headquarters staffing levels by at least 10 percent upon the implementation of external regulation in fiscal year 2003, and should determine whether reductions in field staffing are appropriate as well. The Department should also take steps to reduce its reliance on support contractors for the environment, safety, and health function.

The Committee supports the efforts of the Department and its contractors on the Voluntary Protection Program (VPP). Modeled after a successful OSHA program, VPP encourages the Department's contractors to apply industry best practices for health and safety.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation for the Technical Information Management program is $7,870,000, a reduction of $1,100,000 from the budget request and $730,000 from the enacted level for fiscal year 2001. Funding for program support is $1,400,000, and funding for program direction is $6,470,000. The Committee is concerned that the Department is duplicating technical information services that are already available from the private sector. The Department should carefully review its information services such as PubSCIENCE to be sure that such efforts remain focused on appro-

priate scientific journals and do not compete improperly with similar services available from the private sector.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 2001	$277,200,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	228,553,000
Recommended, 2002	227,872,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−49,328,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−681,000

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 which requires remediation, stabilization, or some other type of action. The major activities are: Site Closure for cleanup projects to be completed by the end of fiscal year 2006, and for which no further DOE mission is anticipated; Site/Project Completion for cleanup projects that will be completed by 2006, but where DOE programs will continue; Post 2006 Completion for cleanup projects that will extend beyond 2006; and Excess Facilities for final disposition of excess contaminated facilities. The Committee recommendation is $227,872,000, a decrease of $681,000 from the budget request.

The fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill contains additional funding of $11,950,000 for this program. An additional $10,000,000 was provided for cleanup activities at the Brookhaven National Laboratory and $1,950,000 to study remediation options at the former Atlas Corporation's uranium mill tailings site near Moab, Utah.

SITE CLOSURE

The recommendation for site closure is $43,000,000, the same as the budget request, which will maintain the Weldon Spring Site cleanup for completion in 2002.

SITE/PROJECT COMPLETION

The recommendation for site/project completion is $64,119,000, the same as the budget request.

POST 2006 COMPLETION

The recommendation for post 2006 completion is $115,753,000, a decrease of $4,300,000 from the budget request of $120,053,000. Additional funding of $3,700,000 has been provided to maintain the cleanup activities at the Energy Technology Engineering Center in California consistent with fiscal year 2001.

Atlas.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for stabilization activities at the Atlas uranium mill tailings site in Moab, Utah. The budget requested no funding for this activity. The Committee also provided funds in the fiscal year 2001 supplemental budget request to prepare a remediation plan for the Atlas in Moab, Utah. The Department is required to prepare this remediation plan, with the assistance of the National Academy of

Sciences, by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (P.L. 106–398) before it can proceed with site remediation.

West Valley.—The Committee recommendation for the West Valley Demonstration Project in New York is $85,115,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request of $95,115,000. This recommendation includes $38,000,000 for high-level waste vitrification and tank heel high activity waste processing and $3,000,000 for spent nuclear fuel, both funded at the same level as the budget request. The amount for site transition, decommissioning, and project completion is $44,115,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request, but only $271,000 less than fiscal year 2001. The Department is to spend these funds performing the most critical activities necessary to maintain the West Valley site in a safe and stable condition.

The Committee is concerned about the impasse in negotiations between the Department and the State of New York over a number of critical issues, including the scope of Federal cleanup activities at the site, the duration of the Federal presence at the site, non-Federal funding for disposition of vitrified high level waste and spent nuclear fuel, and the respective Federal and non-Federal cost shares. The lack of agreement does not impede completion of vitrification at West Valley, and the Department has indicated that certain other decontamination and waste management activities can proceed absent a final agreement with the State of New York. However, some site transition, decommissioning, and project completion activities are deferred pending resolution of this impasse.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) recently completed an analysis of the situation in a report entitled "Nuclear Waste: Agreement Among Agencies Responsible for the West Valley Site is Critically Needed" (GAO–01–314). This report identified the lack of agreement between the Department of Energy and the State of New York as the most significant impediment to completing cleanup of the West Valley site. The GAO found the differences between the Department and the State so serious that agreement is unlikely without Congressional intervention.

The Department may submit a reprogramming request for additional funds for remaining site transition, decommissioning, and project completion activities only upon successful conclusion of an agreement with the State of New York. Such agreement must be consistent with the project scope and cost-sharing requirements as defined in the West Valley Demonstration Project Act of 1980, and with the terms of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, regarding the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste. Any proposal by the Department to exceed the constraints of existing law must be transmitted in advance to the Committee with an explanation of why such a proposal is in the Federal interest. Offers made by the Department on behalf of the Federal government may not be protected from Congressional oversight by a confidentiality agreement.

EXCESS FACILITIES

The environmental management program is responsible for final disposition of excess contaminated facilities throughout the Department. Funds are currently being expended only for surveillance

and maintenance of most excess facilities, and these costs will continue until decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) is completed. The Committee strongly urges the Department to seek new, innovative, and less costly ways to accomplish final D&D of these facilities.

The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the excess facility program, an increase of $3,619,000 over the budget request. The budget requested only surveillance and maintenance costs for the excess facilities transferred to the program in fiscal year 2002. In addition to these surveillance and maintenance costs, the recommendation includes $3,619,000 to initiate a program to begin the actual D&D of excess facilities already owned by the environmental management program. These funds must be used to dispose of those facilities that will provide the greatest impact on reducing long-term costs and risk.

URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION

Appropriation, 2001	$392,502,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	363,425,000
Recommended, 2002	393,425,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+923,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+30,000,000

Congress created the Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation account in fiscal year 2001 to consolidate the programs previously funded in two separate accounts: one set of activities funded by the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund and managed by the Office of Environmental Management, and the other set of related uranium activities that had been managed by the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science, and Technology. The consolidated Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation account is managed by the Office of Environmental Management and includes two subaccounts, the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, and Other Uranium Activities. The Committee recommendation is $393,425,000, an increase of $30,000,000 over the budget request and $923,000 more than fiscal year 2001.

Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.—This 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 $272,641,000 for activities funded from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, an increase of $20,000,000 over the budget request and a reduction of $72,397,000 compared to fiscal year 2001. Funding for the depleted uranium hexaflouride (DUF6) conversion facilities is shifted to the Other Uranium Activities subaccount, as it was appropriated in fiscal year 2001. The Committee recommendation for the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommis-

sioning Fund includes a portion of the funds necessary to provide for winterization and cold standby at the Portsmouth plant; the balance of the funds are provided under Other Uranium Activities. The net increase over the budget request, $30,000,000 in consideration of the shift of DUF6 activities to Other Uranium Activities, is to be divided with $10,000,000 to the Paducah site and $20,000,000 to the East Tennessee Technology Park.

The Committee recommendation includes the requested amount, $1,000,000, for uranium and thorium reimbursements as authorized by Title X of the Energy Policy Act of 1992. Because of significantly increased funding for this activity in fiscal year 2001, the Department indicates that the backlog of reimbursements has been eliminated and $1,000,000 will be sufficient for anticipated claims in fiscal year 2002.

Other Uranium Activities.—The Committee recommendation is $120,784,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. This $10,000,000 reflects the transfer of DUF6 activities from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund subaccount to the Other Uranium Activities subaccount. In addition to funds for the DUF6 conversion project at Portsmouth and Paducah, the Other Uranium Activities subaccount includes maintenance of enrichment facilities and inventories, financial liabilities arising prior to the privatization of the United States Enrichment Corporation, and the balance of the winterization and cold standby activities for the Portsmouth plant. These are funded at the Administration's requested levels: $99,000,000 for maintenance of facilities and inventories, including the winterization/cold standby work at Portsmouth; $11,784,000 for pre-existing liabilities; and $10,000,000 for the DUF6 conversion facilities (transferred from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund).

SCIENCE

Appropriation, 2001	$3,180,341,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	3,159,890,000
Recommended, 2002	3,166,395,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−13,946,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+6,505,000

The Science account funds the Department's work on high energy physics, nuclear physics, biological and environmental sciences, basic energy sciences, advanced scientific computing, energy research analyses, facilities support for the multiprogram energy laboratories, fusion energy sciences, safeguards and security, and program direction. The Committee is very supportive of most of the research conducted by the Department's Office of Science, but funding constraints preclude significant increases this fiscal year. The Committee recommendation is $3,166,395,000, an increase of $6,505,000 over the budget request and $13,946,000 less than the fiscal year 2001 funding level.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The Committee recommends $716,100,000 for high energy physics, the same as the budget request and $10,030,000 less than fiscal year 2001.

Research and technology.—The Committee recommendation for research and technology in high energy physics is $247,870,000, the same as the budget request and $13,150,000 more than provided in fiscal year 2001.

Facility operations.—The Committee recommends $456,830,000 for facility operations, the same as the budget request and $2,180,000 less than fiscal year 2001. This amount includes $244,739,000 for Fermilab and $125,078,000 for the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center to provide for full operation of these facilities.

Construction.—The Committee recommendation for construction of the Neutrinos at the Main Injector project at Fermilab is $11,400,000, the same as the budget request.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee recommendation for nuclear physics is $361,510,000, $1,000,000 more than the budget request, but $8,380,000 less than provided in fiscal year 2001. Additional funds are provided for university research in nuclear physics.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation for biological and environmental research is $445,880,000, an increase of $2,910,000 over the budget request but $55,380,000 less than in fiscal year 2001.

This amount includes $19,470,000, the same as the budget request, to continue the Microbial Cell Project and to initiate the Genomes to Life program. The National Institute for Global Environmental Change (NIGEC), which is integrated throughout the Environmental Processes subaccount, is funded at the requested funding level of $8,763,000.

Joint Genome Institute.—The Committee recommendation provides the requested amount for the Joint Genome Institute, $57,200,000. The Committee encourages the Joint Genome Institute to utilize its sequencing capacity to provide sequences and draft sequences of the gene-rich regions of plant and microbial organisms of economic importance to agriculture, such as corn, wheat, and plant pathogens.

Construction.—The Committee recommendation includes $11,405,000, an increase of $1,405,000 over the budget request, to complete the construction of the Laboratory for Comparative Functional Genomics at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The total project cost for this facility is only $14,420,000. By completing construction in two rather than three fiscal years, this will enable beneficial occupancy of the new facility in May 2003 instead of May 2004. This accelerated project completion will save the costs of utilities and maintenance for the old facility, plus the site usage fee at the Y–12 site, yielding a total net savings to the Federal government of approximately $800,000.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for basic energy sciences is $1,006,705,000, $2,000,000 more than the budget request and a reduction of $6,665,000 from fiscal year 2001. For purposes of reprogramming during fiscal year 2002, the Department may allocate funding among all operating accounts within basic energy sciences.

Spallation Neutron Source.—The Committee recommends the requested amount for construction of the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS), $276,300,000. This represents an increase of $16,800,000 compared to fiscal year 2001. The Committee appreciates the recent improvements made in the management of this project, but cautions the Department to maintain a close watch on the various components of the SNS being produced by other national laboratories.

Intense Pulsed Neutrino Facility.—The Committee recognizes the value of such a facility in conjunction with the Spallation Neutron Source, but budget constraints preclude funding an intense pulsed neutrino facility in fiscal year 2002.

Nanoscale Science Research.—The Committee supports the creation of several regional nanoscale science research centers consistent with the September 1999 recommendations of the Interagency Working Group on Nanoscience, Engineering and Technology of the National Science and Technology Council. The Committee also supports the efforts of the Department to seek the active involvement of the academic community in the development of these centers. However, the Committee reminds the Department that its efforts to involve universities must reach broadly and openly rather than selectively. Consistent with existing policies for current user facilities, discussions regarding the characteristics and equipment to be provided in these planned nanoscience user facilities should be open to all U.S. universities via published notice, workshops, and other formal mechanisms. The external users of the Department's resources must be determined through the competitive peer-review process. Any partnership arrangements between the involved national laboratories and academic institutions, or any other non-federal partners, must follow procedures to ensure full and open competition, as required by section 309 of this Act.

The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 to initiate project engineering and design (PED) for three nanoscale science research centers in fiscal year 2002. This is a reduction of $1,000,000 from the budget request of $4,000,000. Any additional centers should be requested as part of the fiscal year 2003 budget request. The detailed budget justification for fiscal year 2003 should also provide more accurate cost estimates for the three centers receiving PED funds in fiscal year 2002. The Committee expects the Department to maintain tight cost and schedule controls on these three facilities.

The additional $3,000,000 included over the budget request is to be made available for university research in nanoscale science and engineering.

Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR).—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000

within available funds for EPSCoR, an increase of $2,315,000 over the budget request and $3,185,000 over fiscal year 2001.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation is $163,050,000, the same as the budget request and $6,950,000 less than the funding in fiscal year 2001. The Committee is supportive of the objectives of the Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) program, but is concerned that the effort not duplicate the work already being done on the defense side of the Department in the Advanced Scientific Computing Initiative (ASCI). The Department should submit a report not later than December 31, 2001, that specifically outlines the differences between the objectives and current and proposed work activities of ASCR and ASCI. The Department is also directed to maximize the involvement of universities in the ASCR program, so that both the Department and the academic community can share in the latest technology developments in this field.

ENERGY RESEARCH ANALYSES

The Committee recommendation for energy research analyses is $1,000,000, the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 2001 funding level.

MULTI-PROGRAM ENERGY LABORATORIES FACILITIES SUPPORT

The multi-program energy laboratories facilities support program provides funding to support the infrastructure at the five multi-program national laboratories under the direction of the Office of Science. This program also provides funding for landlord costs for the centralized Oak Ridge Operations Office. The Committee recommendation is $30,175,000, the same as the budget request but $3,755,000 less than in fiscal year 2001. This amount includes the requested funds of $3,183,000 for project engineering design for three new projects: Phase I of the mechanical and control systems upgrade at Argonne National Laboratory—East, laboratory systems upgrades at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, and the research support center at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (project 02–SC–001). Also included is $18,613,000, the same as the budget request, for various infrastructure improvement projects at the five multi-program national laboratories (project MEL–001).

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is $248,495,000, $6,505,000 less than the fiscal year 2001 funding level but the same as the amended budget request. The Committee concurs with the National Energy Policy's assessment of the potential for fusion energy, but funding constraints prevent additional research funding at this time. The Committee has also provided $25,000,000 in the inertial confinement fusion program for high average power lasers which is complementary to the work performed in fusion energy sciences.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for a new Facilities and Infrastructure program to improve the facilities and infrastructure at the Department's science laboratories. The Administration's budget proposal included no funding for this program. These funds should be used to reduce the backlog of maintenance and infrastructure upgrades and dispose of excess facilities.

The Committee is aware of the need for funding a facilities and infrastructure program, but is concerned the Department does not have in place a facilities management structure to ensure the funds are used to address those items which will have the greatest impact on reducing long-term costs and risk. The Department is to provide a semi-annual report to the Committee on the status of the facilities and infrastructure program. The report should include the current priority list of proposed facilities and infrastructure projects including cost and schedule requirements. For each site, the report is to include: a current ten-year site plan that demonstrates the reconfiguration of its facilities and infrastructure to meet its missions and to address its long-term operational costs and return on investment; the current budget for all facilities and infrastructure funding in this program as well as all funding for maintenance and infrastructure upgrades funded through other parts of the budget; and the current status of each facilities and infrastructure project compared to the original baseline cost, schedule, and scope.

The Committee directs that at least 25 percent of the facilities and infrastructure funding be used to dispose of excess facilities that will provide the greatest impact on reducing long-term costs and risk. New and innovative decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) practices must be implemented to reduce costs and expedite site cleanups. There are clearly savings to be realized throughout the complex as evidenced by a recent contractor innovation at the Rocky Flats site that reduced the cost of D&D for a building from an estimated $3,500,000 using existing DOE practices and procedures to approximately $700,000 using commercial practices. Potential cost savings of this magnitude have also been identified at other sites through the use of standard commercial practices for D&D.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

Beginning in fiscal year 2001, the cost of safeguards and security activities at the multi-program and single-purpose science laboratories are now direct funded in the Science appropriation. The Committee recommends $55,412,000, the same as the budget request and $5,594,000 more than fiscal year 2001.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation is $134,980,000, a reduction of $4,265,000 from fiscal year 2001 and $7,405,000 less than the amended budget request. The control level for fiscal year 2002 is at the program account level of program direction.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 2001	$190,654,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	134,979,000
Recommended, 2002	133,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−57,654,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−1,979,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, established the Federal government's responsibility for the permanent disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste, and established the statutory framework to guide the selection and development of a site for a permanent repository. This law also created the Nuclear Waste Fund to finance the disposal of commercially generated spent nuclear fuel through the collections of fees from the owners and generators of such spent fuel. The costs for disposal of high-level radioactive waste generated from the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy, and the spent nuclear fuel generated by the Department of Defense, are funded by the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriation.

The Department was required by statute to accept commercial spent nuclear fuel for disposal beginning on January 31, 1998, and has entered into legally enforceable contracts with utilities to execute that obligation. It is now anticipated that the Department will submit the Site Recommendation to the President in early fiscal year 2002. Assuming the President and the Congress accept the Department's recommendation, the Department will then submit a License Application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in fiscal year 2003. This will, at best, lead to initial repository operations beginning in 2010, twelve years after the Department was supposed to begin accepting spent nuclear fuel for disposal. During that time, the liability of the Federal government for its failure to meet its statutory and contractual obligation to accept commercial spent fuel beginning in January 1998 will continue to grow. The repository is also essential to the ability of the Department to remove defense-related high level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel from other sites in the DOE complex, and the delay in repository completion may affect the government's ability to meet legally enforceable cleanup milestones at those sites.

The Committee is disappointed with the latest slippage in the Department's schedule for submission of the Site Recommendation from fiscal year 2001 into fiscal year 2002, and the consequent delay in the License Application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from fiscal year 2002 to fiscal year 2003. Nevertheless, it is critical for the Department to complete the site selection process in fiscal year 2002 so that it can move forward expeditiously with the design, licensing, and construction of the repository.

The Committee recommends $133,000,000 from the Nuclear Waste Fund in fiscal year 2002. Combined with the appropriation of $310,000,000 from the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, this provides a total of $443,000,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal activities in fiscal year 2002, a reduction of $1,979,000 from the budget request. When coupled with the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriation, this represents a total increase of $48,074,000 over

the funding provided to the Department for nuclear waste disposal in fiscal year 2001.

State and local government funds.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 for the affected units of local government and $2,500,000 for the State of Nevada to conduct their respective external oversight responsibilities. These are the same funding levels as provided in fiscal year 2001. After being reassured that prior problems with improper use of Federal funds provided to the State of Nevada had been corrected, the Committee restored funding to the State in fiscal year 2001. These funds were provided through the Department to the Nevada Division of Emergency Management, for use in executing appropriate scientific and technical oversight activities. The State is prohibited from using these external oversight funds to pay the salaries and expenses of State employees, nor can it use Federal funds to engage in lobbying against the repository. Unfortunately, the Department has not yet conducted an audit to confirm whether this new funding arrangement is working as intended and is not repeating the problems of past years. The Committee is aware of the State's request for additional external oversight funding as the critical site selection decision will be made in early fiscal year 2002. The Committee is also aware that the State legislature has approved the Governor's request for $4,000,000 in State funds for use in lobbying and litigation to block the repository. In the absence of an independent audit to verify that funding provided in fiscal year 2001 has been spent properly by the State, the Committee recommends no increase in State funding for fiscal year 2002. The Department is directed to audit the Federal funds provided to Nevada at the earliest opportunity to confirm that these funds have been used in a manner consistent with Congressional guidance.

The Administration proposed changing the recipient of the external oversight funds for the State of Nevada from the Nevada Division of Emergency Management to the Nevada Office of Science, Engineering and Technology. In the absence of any justification from the Department for this change, and without an audit or other evidence to show that the present recipient (i.e., the Division of Emergency Management) is using the fiscal year 2001 Federal funds improperly, the Committee does not make the requested change in recipient.

Future program funding.—The Department has acknowledged that the current funding arrangement will not provide sufficient funds for design and construction of the repository. The one mil fee paid by the consumers of electricity generated by nuclear power yields annual collections in the $600 to $700 million range. With the improved operating efficiency of reactors in recent years and the extension of several reactor licenses, this collection is expected to exceed $700 million in fiscal year 2001. The Nuclear Waste Fund presently has a balance of over $10 billion from collections of this one mil fee in prior years.

The balance in the Waste Fund and the annual revenue generated by the one mil fee, coupled with the contribution from the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriation for defense-generated waste and spent fuel, should provide more than sufficient funds for the design, construction, and operation of the repository.

In recent years, an annual appropriation of $300 to $400 million has been sufficient to cover the expenses of the program for site characterization work. Once the program moves out of the study phase and into the design and construction phases, the annual funding requirements will increase significantly, exceeding $1 billion annually for several fiscal years. This will exceed the annual collections from the one mil fee, requiring either a major increase in the defense contribution or expenditure from the balance in the Nuclear Waste Fund, which would be scored as a new outlay. The Committee expects that the Department's budget request for fiscal year 2003 will include a specific legislative proposal to resolve future funding requirements for this program.

Waste acceptance.—Because of concerns about the Department's commitment to the timely removal of spent nuclear fuel, the Committee in fiscal year 2001 directed the Department to submit its plan for the fabrication and deployment of waste acceptance capabilities. In January 2001, the Department submitted a report entitled "Plan for Transportation Cask Fabrication and Deployment of Waste Acceptance Capability." This report merely confirms that the Department's strategy is to defer any concrete actions on waste acceptance pending final site selection. The Committee remains concerned that the Department will not be ready to fulfill its waste acceptance responsibilities consistent with the repository schedule, particularly for spent fuel from reactors presently undergoing decommissioning. The Committee recommendation includes $1,800,000 within available funds to initiate the procurement of one transportation cask for each of the six reactor sites presently undergoing dismantlement and decommissioning. Such procurement does not constitute a settlement or fulfillment of the Secretary's obligation to take acceptance of spent nuclear fuel.

Transportation planning and readiness.—The United States has an exemplary safety record in shipping commercial and naval spent nuclear fuel. Nevertheless, a major point of public concern about the permanent repository is the perceived risk of such shipments. As with waste acceptance, the Department has opted to defer serious transportation planning until after completion of the final site selection. With the site recommendation now scheduled for completion in early fiscal year 2002, the Department needs to take a more aggressive approach in educating the public and working with state and local governments to develop safe transportation routes to the repository. One of the first steps should be to work with the State of Nevada to specify the transportation modes and routes that will avoid the Las Vegas metropolitan area. The Department should use available funds in fiscal year 2002 to initiate the selection of transportation routes in Nevada and other States, in cooperation with the States, and to begin planning for construction of a rail line to the repository site.

Alternatives to the repository.—The National Research Council's Committee on Disposition of High-Level Radioactive Waste Through Geological Isolation recently completed a report entitled "Disposition of High-Level Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel: The Continuing Societal and Technical Challenges." The National Research Council found that "geological disposition and surface storage are the only options that the committee found to be feasible

now or in the foreseeable future . . . ". The National Research Council also makes clear that neither reprocessing nor transmutation of spent nuclear fuel, while having the potential to reduce the total volume of radioactive wastes and especially the volume of long-lived radionuclides, eliminates the need for a repository. Not only does the accelerator transmutation of waste approach still require a repository, but the National Research Council cites data provided by the Department of Energy showing that transmutation will cost significantly more and take longer than the current geologic repository program. The West Valley Demonstration Project, now estimated to cost $4.5 billion and take 40 more years to clean up, is testimony to the fact that spent fuel reprocessing is not without its own environmental impacts and waste streams. Accordingly, the Committee does not provide any funds in this bill for the Department to pursue these so-called alternatives to the repository.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2001	$225,942,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	221,618,000
Recommended, 2002	209,611,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−16,331,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−12,007,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 2001	−$151,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−137,810,000
Recommended, 2002	−137,810,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+13,190,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

The Committee recommendation for Departmental Administration is $209,611,000, a decrease of $12,007,000 from the budget request of $221,618,000. Funding recommended for Departmental Administration provides for general management and program support functions benefiting all elements of the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration. The account funds a wide array of activities not directly associated with program execution. Funding for many offices has been reduced due to funding constraints and the availability of prior year carryover balances.

The Committee has provided bill language allowing the Department to transfer funds previously appropriated for Year 2000 (Y2K) activities to the Departmental Administration account. In conjunction with Y2K conversion efforts begun in late 1998, the Department initiated full-scale modernization of its core financial systems under the on-going Business Management Information System (BMIS). BMIS is replacing out-of-date financial and budgeting systems and requires substantially greater federal support to assure operational reliability by 2003. Balances remaining from funds made available in the Departmental Administration, Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, and Defense Facilities Closure Projects accounts, estimated to total $1,480,000, are transferred to and merged with the funding in this account. These

funds, which otherwise would expire on September 30, 2001, will remain available until expended for the Federal costs associated with the success of these continuing information technology enhancement activities.

Engineering and Project Management.—The Committee recommendation includes a separate account for the personnel and activities of the Office of Engineering and Construction Management in line with the recommendation that the Office be provided greater authority within the Department's organizational structure. Funding for the facilities and infrastructure group has also been transferred to this office. The Committee recommendation of $7,600,000 does not include the budget proposal to fund central project management activities through a tax on other organizations.

Working Capital Fund.—The Department is using a charge-back program similar to a working capital fund which charges benefiting programs and organizations with administrative and housekeeping activities traditionally funded in a central account. The Committee continues to support this, but wants to reiterate its expectations that: no salaries or other expenses of Federal employees may be charged to the fund; Departmental representation on the Board establishing the policies should be broad-based and include smaller organizations; the pricing policies used must be sound and defensible and not include added factors for administrative costs; the advanced payments at any time may be no more than the amount minimally required to adequately cover outstanding commitments and other reasonable activities; and a defined process must be established to dispose of excess advance payments (accumulated credits). Additionally, it is the Committee's expectation that the fund manager will ensure that the fund will neither be managed in a manner to produce a profit nor allow the program customers to use the fund as a vehicle for maintaining unencumbered funds.

The working capital fund should be audited periodically by the Department's Inspector General to ensure the integrity of the accounts, and the Committee expects to be apprised of any recommendations to improve the charge-back system.

Use of Prior Year Deobligations and Construction Project Reserves.—Throughout the fiscal year, funds often become available as projects are completed and contracts closed out throughout all of the Department's appropriation accounts. These funds become available for reuse and are retained by the Controller as either prior year deobligations or transferred to construction project reserve accounts. During fiscal year 2002, these funds are not available for reallocation within the Department unless approved by Congress as part of a reprogramming or specifically identified in the budget request.

Cost of Work for Others.—The recommendation for the cost of work for others program is $71,837,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recognizes that funds received from reimbursable activities may be used to fund general purpose capital equipment which is used in support of those activities.

Revenues.—The recommendation for revenues is $137,810,000, the same as the budget request.

Transfer from Other Defense Activities.—For many years, full funding for all corporate and administrative activities of the Department has been provided in the energy portion of this bill despite the fact that over 70 percent of the Department's funding is provided in the national security programs. Consistent with the budget request, the Committee has distributed these costs more equitably in fiscal year 2002 and provided $25,000,000 from national security programs.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 2001	$31,430,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	31,430,000
Recommended, 2002	32,430,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+1,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+1,000,000

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 inspection 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. During fiscal year 2001, the Department has received payments exceeding $10 million from Inspector General investigations which resulted in settlements in favor of the Government.

The Committee recommendation is $32,430,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee is aware that additional duties assigned to the Office of the Inspector General by Congress have not been fully funded in prior years. This funding increase addresses that concern.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The Atomic Energy Defense Activities programs of the Department of Energy include the National Nuclear Security Administration which consists of Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and the Office of the Administrator; Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; Defense Facilities Closure Projects; Defense Environmental Management Privatization; 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), NNSA is responsible for the management and operation of the Nation's nuclear weapons, 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.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2001	$5,006,153,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	5,300,025,000
Recommended, 2002	5,123,888,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+117,735,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−176,137,000

The goal of the Weapons Activities program is to maintain confidence in 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 indefinitely under the nuclear testing moratorium and arms reduction treaties. The Committee's recommendation for Weapons Activities is $5,123,888,000, a decrease of $176,137,000 from the budget request of $5,300,025,000, but an increase of $117,735,000 over fiscal year 2001.

The fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill contains additional funding of $140,000,000 for weapons activities. An additional $54,000,000 was provided for directed stockpile work, $9,000,000 for campaigns, and $47,000,000 for readiness in technical base and facilities. In addition, $30,000,000 was provided to establish a new program, Facilities and Infrastructure, to reduce maintenance backlogs and dispose of excess facilities.

Strategic Review.—The Administration is currently conducting a review of the Nation's nuclear weapons strategy, but the results of this review are not yet known. The Committee is aware that the outcome of this review could significantly change the weapons activities funding requirements for fiscal year 2002 and will make appropriate adjustments as needed during the appropriations process.

Reprogramming Authority.—The Committee recommends limited reprogramming authority within weapons activities for the production plants to provide flexibility to achieve cost savings and programmatic efficiencies during the year. In fiscal year 2002, each plant may transfer between programs up to $5,000,000 or 10 percent of the funding, whichever is lower, if it can be shown that cost savings and efficiencies will result. This reprogramming authority is not to be used to cover cost overruns and schedule slips for any project or program. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be notified within 30 days of the use of this reprogramming authority.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

Directed Stockpile Work includes all activities that directly support weapons in the nuclear stockpile, including maintenance, research, development, engineering, and certification activities. The

Committee recommendation is $1,043,791,000, the same as the budget request, and an increase of $133,188,000 over fiscal year 2001.

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. Campaigns have definitive milestones, specific work plans, and specific end dates. The Committee recommendation is $1,945,413,000, a decrease of $51,000,000 from the budget request of $1,996,413,000.

Inertial Confinement Fusion.—The Committee recommends $492,943,000 for the inertial confinement fusion program, an increase of $25,000,000 over the budget request of $467,943,000. The recommendation includes $25,000,000 to continue development of high average power lasers and supporting science and technology. The Committee is disappointed that the Department has not yet supported this activity despite recommendations by the Fusion Energy Science Advisory Committee and the Secretary of Energy's Advisory Board and the continuing progress of the research. The Committee recommendation also includes the budget request of $10,000,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory and $33,450,000 for the University of Rochester.

The Department is also directed to initiate a study to determine the programmatic need for a Petawatt laser facility.

The Committee recommendation provides $245,000,000 for construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF), the same as the budget request. While the Department has stated that the NIF is back on track, a recent General Accounting Office (GAO) follow-up review of NIF expressed some continuing concerns. GAO notes that, while past internal reviewers have concluded that NIF's milestones are challenging but doable, most major performance milestones will not occur until 2004, and some reviewers have recommended that more near-term milestones be added to assess laser performance. Other issues that GAO believes continue to place NIF at risk are: persistent DOE oversight problems (i.e., the same people have performed oversight since 1999 when NIF's cost and schedule grew unnoticed); the NIF project does not manage about $700 million in research and development that directly support NIF; and NIF still lacks an independent external review process. The Committee expects the Department to address these concerns in an expeditious manner.

Advanced simulation and computing.—The Committee recommendation for the Advanced Simulation and Computing program is $638,032,000, a reduction of $100,000,000 from the budget request of $738,032,000. The Committee has consistently supported this program, but believes that recent events could require a modification to the proposed program strategy. While the Department's schedule for a 100 trillion operations per second (100 TeraOPS) computer has slipped beyond the original date of 2004, a private company has begun an effort to increase computing capability with the goal of achieving 100 TeraOPS by 2004. In addition, the Committee is funding the Advanced Scientific Computing Research pro-

gram at a level in excess of $160,000,000 in the DOE non-defense laboratories. The Department must ensure that the current program strategy takes into full account these changes which have occurred since the program was initiated in 1996.

Pit manufacturing and certification.—The Committee recommendation for pit manufacturing readiness is $128,545,000, the same as the budget request. The Department is currently unable to demonstrate that it has a viable plan to manufacture and certify pits on the schedule dictated by national security needs. The Department's management and the national laboratory's execution of this project have been quite deficient—the project is years behind schedule and hundreds of millions of dollars over the original cost estimate. The NNSA has established a separate project office to oversee pit manufacturing and certification. The Committee will base its judgment on the success of the NNSA on how well this project succeeds. At this time the proposed certification date is years away and does not meet national security requirements for a new pit. The Department is directed to submit to the Committee a comprehensive report on the status of this project on a quarterly basis beginning October 1, 2001.

Secondary readiness.—The Committee has provided an additional $24,000,000 in secondary readiness for the Y–12 Plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. These additional funds are for direct support to the stockpile life extension program, demonstration of technologies for the Special Materials Complex facility, and modernization planning.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

The Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities program supports the physical and operational infrastructure at the laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, and the production plants. The Committee recommendation is $1,481,988,000, an increase of $35,000,000 over the budget request of $1,446,988,000. Additional funding of $25,000,000 has been provided for the Pantex plant in Texas and $10,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant in Tennessee to meet facility needs.

Construction projects.—Funding of $9,500,000 has been provided for Project 02–D–101, the Microsystems and Engineering Sciences Applications (MESA) Complex at Sandia National Laboratories, an increase of $7,500,000 over the budget request. Funding of $7,500,000 for infrastructure activities has been transferred to the MESA line item construction project from Project 01–D–103, Project Engineering and Design (PE&D). The budget request of $45,5379,000 for Project 01–D–103, PE&D, has been reduced accordingly to $37,879,000. In its fiscal year 2003 budget request for MESA, the Department is directed to revise the project data sheet to include the cost of disposing of excess facilities that are equal to or greater than the new space that will be created by this project.

Underground Nuclear Testing.—The Department of Energy was slow to provide detailed justification for its supplemental appropriations funding request for fiscal year 2001 to the Committee. The information it provided to the Committee was informal and on an ad-hoc rather than a formal basis. After the Committee had made its funding recommendations for the bill, DOE submitted for-

mal justification material to justify its request. The formal material mentions funding to increase the state of readiness of underground nuclear testing.

If the Nation were to decide to invest funds to restore underground nuclear testing to a higher level than presently, this could only be done: (1) once the Secretary of Defense concluded his strategic review; (2) once the President made a recommendation to the Congress; (3) once it was approved by the Armed Services Committees of the House and the Senate; and (4) only if it were subsequently approved by Congress. None of these activities has occurred. It is not the Committee's intent to provide funding in this Act, the supplemental appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001, or any prior Act for activities to increase the readiness for underground nuclear testing. None of the funds in such Acts may be used for that purpose.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee has provided $17,000,000 for the Facilities and Infrastructure program to address the serious shortfall in maintenance throughout the nuclear weapons complex. The Administration's budget proposal included no funding for this program. These funds should be used to reduce the backlog of maintenance and infrastructure upgrades and dispose of excess facilities. Funding of $30,000,000 was also provided in the fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill.

The Committee is aware of the need for funding a facilities and infrastructure program, but is concerned the Department does not have in place a facilities management structure to ensure the funds are used to address those items which will have the greatest impact on reducing long-term costs and risk. The Department is to provide a semi-annual report to the Committee on the status of the facilities and infrastructure program. The report should include the current priority list of proposed facilities and infrastructure projects including cost and schedule requirements. For each site, the report is to include: a current ten-year site plan that demonstrates the reconfiguration of its facilities and infrastructure to meet its missions and to address its long-term operational costs and return on investment; the current budget for all facilities and infrastructure funding in this program as well as all funding for maintenance and infrastructure upgrades funded through other parts of the budget; and the current status of each facilities and infrastructure project compared to the original baseline cost, schedule, and scope.

The Committee directs that at least 25 percent of the facilities and infrastructure funding be used to dispose of excess facilities that will provide the greatest impact on reducing long-term costs and risk. New and innovative decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) practices must be implemented to reduce costs and expedite site cleanups. There are clearly savings to be realized throughout the complex as evidenced by a recent contractor innovation at the Rocky Flats site that reduced the cost of D&D for a building from an estimated $3,500,000 using existing DOE practices and procedures to approximately $700,000 using commercial practices. Potential cost savings of this magnitude have also been

identified at other sites through the use of standard commercial practices for D&D.

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 $121,800,000, 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 $448,881,000, the same as the budget request, but an increase of nearly 14 percent over fiscal year 2001. Physical safeguards and security measures are only part of the solution to address security concerns throughout the weapons complex. With program needs going unmet and infrastructure deteriorating, the Committee strongly encourages the NNSA to review these growing costs and seek smarter and more efficient ways to meet security needs.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation of $250,000,000 for program direction is a reduction of $21,137,000 from the budget request of $271,137,000, and $566,000 below fiscal year 2001. Congress assumed that creation of the NNSA would lead to efficiencies and streamlined management. However, the result has been an increase in staff at Headquarters and in the field. The conference report to accompany the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense Authorization Act (P.L. 106–398) decreased program direction funding for fiscal year 2001 because the conferees believed the Office of Defense Programs to be overstaffed. The conferees urged the Department to eliminate duplicative efforts and streamline management control and directed the Department to reorganize and realign headquarters and field offices roles and responsibilities. The Committee expects the NNSA to address this issue during fiscal year 2002 and seek additional efficiencies throughout the Headquarters and field organizations during fiscal year 2003.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation includes an adjustment of $184,985,000. This consists of a $28,985,000 security charge for reimbursable work as included in the budget request and a general reduction of $156,000,000.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriation, 2001	$872,273,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	773,700,000
Recommended, 2002	845,341,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−26,932,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+71,641,000

The Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account includes funding for Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development, Arms Control, International Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting, Russian Transition Assistance, HEU Transparency Implementation, International Nuclear Safety, Fissile Materials Disposition, and Program Direction. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

The Department requested $7,000 for official reception and representation expenses in this account. The Committee recommendation transfers this funding and combines it with the request of $5,000 for official reception and representation expenses in the Office of the Administrator for a total of $12,000.

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 $216,102,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request of $206,102,000. The recommendation provides an additional $10,000,000 for ground-based systems for treaty monitoring which was reduced from $22,510,000 in fiscal year 2001 to $12,510,900 in the budget request.

Competitive Research.—Concerns have been raised repeatedly that there should be more opportunity for open competition in certain areas of the nonproliferation and verification research and development program. A report by an outside group established by the Department to review the Office of Nonproliferation Research and Engineering included a similar recommendation. The Committee expects the Department to act in good faith on the recommendations provided by the external review group and directs the Department to continue a free and open competitive process for 25 percent of its research and development activities during fiscal year 2002 for ground-based systems treaty monitoring. The competitive process should be open to all Federal and non-Federal entities.

ARMS CONTROL

The Committee recommendation has restructured the Arms Control program to provide more visibility for program activities. The arms control and nonproliferation 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: policy analysis; reduced enrichment research and test reactor (RERTR); international safeguards; export control operations; treaty agreements; New Independent States (NIS) nonproliferation; and international security.

The Committee recommendation for Arms Control is $75,741,000, a reduction of $25,759,000 from the budget request of

$101,500,000. Funding of $4,000,000 included in the Arms Control program for Second Line of Defense activities has been transferred to the International Materials Protection, Control and Accounting program. Funding of $28,759,000 included in the budget request in the NIS nonproliferation program for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP) and the Nuclear Cities Initiative (NCI) programs has been transferred to a new program, "Russian Transition Assistance." Within Arms Control, total funding of $15,945,000, an increase of $7,000,000 over the budget request, has been provided to maintain the schedule for completing the spent fuel activities in Kazakhstan.

NONPROLIFERATION PROGRAMS WITH RUSSIA

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

In January of this year, "A Report Card on the Department of Energy's Nonproliferation Programs with Russia" was released by the Russian Task Force co-chaired by Howard Baker and Lloyd Cutler. The Committee has reviewed this report and supports the major recommendation which states that, "The President, in consultation with Congress and in cooperation with the Russian Federation, should quickly formulate a strategic plan to secure and/or neutralize in the next eight or ten years all nuclear weapons-usable material located in Russia and prevent the outflow from Russia of scientific expertise that could be used for nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction." The Task Force further notes that, "While emphasizing that enhanced efforts are needed from the U.S., the Task Force underscores that enhanced efforts are also required from Russia. Ultimately, Russia will be responsible for securing its remaining nuclear arsenal." Within available funding, the Committee has sought to support the recommendations of this Task Force.

Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Agreement.—Several external reviews have urged that excess quantities of Russian Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) be reduced as quickly as possible. Excess Russian HEU is currently being managed under the auspices of the HEU Purchase Agreement established in 1994. This agreement authorized the U.S. to purchase 500 metric tons of Russian HEU that was to be converted to low enriched uranium for commercial uses over 20 years at a cost of $12 billion. While more than 110 metric tons of HEU have been down-blended, implementation of the HEU Purchase Agreement has been slower and more difficult than anticipated. The Committee strongly urges the Department to work with the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) to explore ways to accelerate the current purchase agreement.

With the continued downsizing of the Russian nuclear weapons stockpile, more HEU is becoming available. The Administration is urged to expand the amount of HEU purchases included in the original agreement, which covers less than half of Russia's total HEU stockpile. The Committee is aware of the concerns that additional purchases could adversely impact the world market for ura-

nium. The Administration should explore options such as securing a second U.S. executive agent for the purchase; down-blending the material but leaving it in Russia until it can be sold onto international markets without adverse impacts; and working with the international community to purchase additional blended-down Russian HEU. The Committee understands that much of the Russian funding for its nuclear weapons complex conversion programs comes from the HEU purchase agreement, so any increase in purchases should also ensure that the additional revenue is used for these conversion initiatives.

Limitation on Russian Program Funds.—The Department is still not adequately addressing the concern that too much of the money for Russian programs is being spent in the U.S. at the Department's own national laboratories rather than going to the facilities in Russia. The Department's contracting mechanisms are resulting in excess funds going to pay laboratories for contract administration and oversight that would be better performed by Federal personnel. The 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 25 percent of the funding for Russian programs may be spent in the United States. The Department is not adequately reviewing the types of administrative and programmatic guidance that are needed for these programs and choosing the proper contractual mechanism. This leads to excessive costs for administration and less funding going to Russia. The Department should report to the Committee by December 15, 2001, on the steps being taken to meet the 25 percent limitation.

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS PROTECTION, CONTROL AND ACCOUNTING

The International Materials Protection, Control and Accounting (MPC&A) activities are 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 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 $190,000,000, an increase of $51,200,000 over the budget request of $138,800,000, and $16,144,000 over fiscal year 2001. Funding of $4,000,000 is provided for the Second Line of Defense program which was transferred from the Arms Control program. The Committee has provided a significant increase in funding for fiscal year 2002. This increase should be targeted toward projects to consolidate materials and reduce the number of buildings and facilities holding nuclear materials. The Committee also directs the Department to increase the level of program funding that goes to employing Russian workers and purchasing Russian-made equipment and reduce the amount of funding that is spent in the United States.

RUSSIAN TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

The Committee has transferred the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP) and the Nuclear Cities Initiative (NCI) programs from Arms Control and established a new program, "Russian Transition Assistance." The Committee recommendation is $40,000,000 for projects to employ Russian weapons scientists and downsize the Russian weapons complex. The Committee recommendation provides $30,000,000 for IPP and $10,000,000 for NCI.

A recent General Accounting Office (GAO) report suggested several areas of improvement for the NCI program and recommended combining the NCI and IPP programs since they share a common goal—employing Russian weapons scientists in nonmilitary work—and, in many cases, are implementing similar types of projects. At this time, the Committee has maintained the two separate programs, but expects the Department to provide a single program manager responsible for both. The program manager should also ensure close coordination with other Federal agencies that direct money to scientists working in closed cities, such as the State Department's International Science and Technology Center.

Management of the IPP program has improved considerably in recent years, while the NCI program appears to be suffering the same problems that IPP has overcome. The NCI program could be strengthened significantly by using the same standards, applications, and approval procedures already in place in the IPP program. While the Committee believes that non-proliferation projects should continue to take place within the closed cities, such projects should be guided by an emphasis on private sector involvement using the commercialization principles inherent in the IPP program.

To ensure that the appropriate amount of funding goes to facilities in Russia and the NIS, the Committee directs that not more than 25 percent of the funds be spent at the Department of Energy laboratories and that these funds be used by the laboratories only for technical validation of projects. The Committee also recommends that the Department direct the United States Industry Coalition (USIC) to assume responsibility for all business-related activities including structuring contracts and intellectual property rights arrangements.

A near-term measure of success for this program will be the number of technologies that are commercialized, the number of jobs created in Russia, and the amount that the Russian weapons complex is downsized. The ultimate measure of success will be elimination of U.S. aid to support these commercialization ventures. The Committee expects the program to increase the amount of cost sharing required from U.S. industry participants, and directs the Department to establish a revolving fund to support the program, and ultimately, eliminate Federal government funding of projects.

The Department is directed to report to the Committee by January 15, 2002, on the level of coordination with other Federal agencies and the implementation of the GAO recommendations to: evaluate all ongoing NCI projects; establish quantifiable goals and milestones for jobs creation and downsizing the weapons complex; and strengthen efforts to reduce national laboratories' costs to im-

plement the program. The report should also address whether the two programs should be consolidated into a single effort and whether cost savings and other programmatic and administrative efficiencies would be possible through consolidation.

HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM TRANSPARENCY IMPLEMENTATION

The highly enriched uranium (HEU) transparency implementation program is responsible for ensuring that the nonproliferation aspects of the February 1993 agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation are met. This agreement covers the purchase over 20 years of low enriched uranium (LEU) derived from at least 500 metric tons of HEU removed from dismantled Russian nuclear weapons. Under the agreement, conversion of HEU components into LEU is performed in Russian facilities. The purpose of the program is to put into place those measures agreed to by both sides that permit the U.S. to have confidence that the Russian side is abiding by the agreement.

The Committee recommendation is $13,950,000, the same as the budget request.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR SAFETY

The international nuclear safety program is designed to reduce the threats posed by the operation of unsafe and aging Soviet-designed nuclear power plants in Russia and the Newly Independent States. The Committee recommendation for this program is $10,000,000, a reduction of $3,800,000 from the budget request of $13,800,000, due to funding constraints. The Committee expects U.S. participation in this program to be completed by 2005.

From within available funds, $1,500,000 is to be used to transfer and implement the proven U.S.-developed Mechanical Stress Improvement Process technology requested by the Russian Federation. The Department is to provide a status report on the progress of this project by March 31, 2002.

The Committee directs the Department to provide an annual report showing the status of each of the Soviet-designed reactors, the work to be accomplished, the total estimated cost for each reactor, the cost of completing the upgrades to each of the reactors, the schedule by fiscal year for accomplishing this work, and the cost of each task by fiscal year. In addition, the report should provide summary tables of total annual resources expended and planned at: each reactor and each project/activity receiving funding outside explicit reactors for fiscal years 1993–2005, which total to the annual amount provided and projected to complete the program. The report should include a strategic plan outlining the most urgent and pressing safety priorities that remain and need to be addressed in order to close out the program by 2005.

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 recommendation is $290,089,000, the same as the budget request, and an increase of $40,640,000 over fiscal year 2001. Funding of $130,089,000, the same as the budget request, is provided for U.S. surplus materials disposition and $57,000,000, the same as the budget request, for the Russian plutonium disposition program. The U.S. portion of the fissile materials disposition program is not to be counted in the 25 percent limitation on funds for Russian programs to be spent in the U.S.

The Department's budget request for fissile materials disposition is insufficient to proceed with the simultaneous design and construction of three key plutonium disposition facilities. To accommodate the shortfall, DOE proposes to move ahead with the development of a mixed oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility while delaying work on the other two U.S. facilities until closer to the time when they are needed. At the same time, DOE is examining various technical alternatives to make greater use of existing facilities at Savannah River to reduce the costs of plutonium disposition.

The Department's approach is understandable in light of the fact that irradiating MOX fuel in nuclear reactors is key to working with Russia to dispose of stocks of surplus Russian plutonium. However, the Committee wants to remind DOE that it is essential to provide an unambiguous and timely pathway out of Savannah River for plutonium brought there from other sites for disposition. Should unanticipated problems make proceeding with the irradiation of MOX fuel infeasible, the Department should proceed promptly with immobilization to dispose of surplus U.S. plutonium. Only in this manner does the Committee believe that DOE can honor commitments to South Carolina, avoid billions of dollars in long-term storage costs, and assure that Savannah River does not become the de facto dumping ground for stockpiles of surplus U.S. weapons plutonium.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation of $51,459,000 for program direction is the same as the budget request.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriation, 2001	$688,645,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	688,045,000
Recommended, 2002	688,045,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−600,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

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 the continued success of over 97 reactors in operating nuclear-powered submarines and surface ships and to development of the next generation reactor.

The Committee recommendation is $688,045,000, the same as the budget request.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriation, 2001	$9,978,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	15,000,000
Recommended, 2002	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+22,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−5,000,000

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 $10,000,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request, and $22,000 more than fiscal year 2001.

The Committee recommendation provides $12,000 for official reception and representation expenses for the NNSA. This combines the request of $7,000 included in the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account with the $5,000 requested in this account.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 2001	$4,963,533,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	4,548,708,000
Recommended, 2002	5,174,539,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+211,006,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+625,831,000

The Environmental Management program is responsible for identifying and reducing risks and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out nuclear energy or weapons research and production activities which resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination requiring remediation, stabilization, or some other type of cleanup action. Environmental management activities are budgeted under the following appropriation accounts: Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; Defense Facilities Closure Projects; Defense Environmental Management Privatization; Non-Defense Environmental Management; and Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation.

The fiscal year 2002 budget request for environmental management activities was not adequate to maintain cleanup progress at each of the Department's sites. While the Committee strongly supports the Secretary's internal review of these programs, certain ongoing cleanup projects must be funded.

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management is $5,174,778,000, an increase of $625,831,000 over the budget request of $4,548,708,000. Additional funding of $100,000,000 was provided in the fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill to support a variety of cleanup activities in this account. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

GENERAL

The Secretary has ordered a top-to-bottom review of the environmental management programs. The Committee supports this effort and hopes to realize significant cost savings and program efficiencies from new and innovative cleanup strategies throughout the complex.

Low level waste disposal costs.—The Department expects to generate 10.6 million cubic meters of low level radioactive waste (LLW) and mixed low level waste (MLLW) needing disposal; of this amount, only 1.2 million cubic meters is projected for disposal at commercial facilities. The Committee is concerned that the Department is relying too heavily on the use of Federal on-site and off-site disposal cells, effectively inhibiting the development of a viable and competitive commercial disposal industry. Commercial off-site disposal facilities may offer the Department the lowest overall life-cycle cost for disposal of this waste, particularly if the Department can foster some competition for its disposal business. The General Accounting Office (GAO), in its report entitled "Nuclear Cleanup: DOE Should Reevaluate Waste Disposal Options Before Building New Facilities," (GAO–01–441, May 2001), investigated three sites which had decided to build on-site disposal facilities. The GAO found that the Department had not used the latest estimates of waste volumes and transportation costs when deciding between on-site and off-site disposal. The Committee is further concerned that the Department has implemented a rate structure for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste disposal at the Nevada Test Site (NTS) which understates the true life-cycle cost of disposal at NTS, thus making a fair comparison with commercial disposal alternatives impossible.

The Committee expects the Department, where cost-effective, to use existing Federal contracts for the disposal of low-level and mixed low-level waste at commercial off-site disposal sites. The Department is directed to prepare an objective analysis of the life-cycle costs of LLW and MLLW disposal for the various Federal and commercial disposal options. This cost analysis should include the specific costs (on a unit volume of waste basis) for: preparation of the waste; packaging of the waste for transport; transportation of the waste to the disposal site; actual disposal of the waste at the disposal site; long-term closure and stewardship costs at the disposal site; and the means and timing (as measured in cost of money) for payments for disposal. The Department is directed to submit a report to the Committee by February 1, 2002, with the detailed cost data as specified above.

Project Changes.—The Department is directed to provide a report by January 30, 2002, showing the initial funding allocation by site for each individual project. After that date, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations must be notified of any change that increases or decreases funding for any project by more than 25 percent. The Department should work with the Committee to establish the level of detail required in the initial report.

Reprogramming Authority.—The Committee continues to support the need for some flexibility to meet changing funding requirements at former defense sites which are undergoing remedial

cleanup activities. In fiscal year 2002, each site manager may transfer up to $5,000,000 between Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management program activities such as site/project completion, post–2006 completion, and construction projects to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increased or decreased by more than $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 in the House and Senate must be notified within thirty days of the use of this reprogramming authority.

Economic development.—None of the environmental management funds are available for economic development activities.

SITE/PROJECT COMPLETION

The site/project completion account provides funding for projects that will be completed by fiscal year 2006 at sites or facilities where a DOE mission will continue beyond the year 2006. This account focuses management attention on completing specific environmental projects at sites where the Department anticipates continuing missions, and distinguishes these projects from the long-term cleanup activities such as those associated with high level waste streams.

The Committee recommendation for site/project completion activities is $1,041,996,000, an increase of $130,010,000 over the budget request of $911,986,000. Additional funding of $95,000,000 is provided for the Idaho site to support activities necessary to meet deadlines for shipping waste out of the State; $20,000,000 for the Savannah River Site for plutonium packaging and stabilization activities and restoration of infrastructure funding; and $34,300,000 for the Hanford site to support the River Corridor Initiative. Funding for Project 01–D–414, Project Engineering and Design, has been reduced by $3,500,000, and Project 92–D–140, F&H Canyon Exhaust Upgrades, has been reduced by $15,790,000 due to deferral and elimination of some activities.

The Committee is extremely concerned that projects previously scheduled for completion by 2006 are slipping beyond that date. The Department should be very careful not to underestimate the strong interest of the Committee that site/project cleanups remain on schedule. The Department must demonstrate that it is capable of completing projects on schedule and within cost. It appears that the Department is much too quick to slip the schedule rather than pursue creative solutions to maintain the schedule within cost. Problems that arise during the course of project execution must be dealt with quickly to ensure project completion. During fiscal year 2002, the Department is to notify the Committee in writing of any project that slips beyond 2006 and provide a detailed explanation of the cause of the delay as well as proposed solutions for getting the project back on schedule for 2006 completion.

POST 2006 COMPLETION

Environmental Management projects currently projected to require funding beyond fiscal year 2006 are funded in the Post 2006

completion account. This includes a significant number of projects at the largest DOE sites—the Hanford site in Washington; the Savannah River site in South Carolina; the Oak Ridge Reservation in Tennessee; and the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory in Idaho—as well as the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, the Nevada Test Site, and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad, New Mexico. A variety of multi-site activities are also funded in this account.

The Committee recommendation for Post 2006 Completion is $3,393,472,000, an increase of $473,271,000 over the budget request of $2,920,201,000. Additional funding is provided to support current cleanup schedules and fiscal year 2001 levels of funding at the following sites: $109,290,000 for Savannah River; $105,200,000 for Hanford; $16,700,000 for Idaho; and $12,600,000 for the Waste Isolation Pilot Project in New Mexico.

From within available funds for the Savannah River Site, funding of $8,000,000 has been provided for the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request of $6,000,000.

Funding of $8,481,000 has been provided for the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program, an increase of $7,481,000 over the budget request, and the same as fiscal year 2001.

Consistent with the recommendations contained in the GAO report on low-level waste disposal, the Department should perform an updated cost comparison of on-site versus off-site disposal costs before committing to construction of a new CERCLA waste disposal cell at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory.

For the Office of River Protection, an additional $56,000,000 is provided for tank farm operations. Additional funding of $165,000,000 has been provided for Project 01–D–416, the Hanford Waste Treatment Plant, for a total of $665,000,000 in fiscal year 2002. This funding is necessary to maintain the current schedule for operations.

Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund Contribution.—The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $420,000,000 for the defense contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund as authorized in Public Law 102–486, the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Health Effects Studies.—The Committee recommendation does not include any funding for worker and public health effects studies.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Office of Science and Technology conducts a national program that provides a full range of resources and capabilities—from basic research through development, and demonstration, and technical and deployment assistance—that are needed to deliver scientific and technological solutions to cleanup and long-term environmental stewardship problems. The Committee recommendation for science and technology is $226,850,000, an increase of $30,850,000 over the budget request of $196,000,000.

One-year funding agreements.—It is a continuing source of frustration to the Committee that the Department signs agreements

with universities and other entities committing to five years of funding at a specified level and then fails to request funding in the budget to support these agreements. This leads to much frustration among the entities which believe that the agreement was a legitimate contract and the Committee which receives numerous requests to add funds to meet these commitments. The Committee has no role in making these agreements and should not be put in the position each year to correct the failures of the Department. Thus, the Department is directed to sign no funding agreement with any entity that commits more than one year of funding for science and technology activities.

Technology deployment.—The Committee urges the Department to make every effort to seek alternative cost-effective cleanup technologies from outside the Department in cleaning up its legacy waste. The Committee is aware that the international agreement with AEA Technology has been very successful in bringing cheaper and more efficient technologies to bear on the Department's cleanup problems and urges the Department to renew this agreement. The budget request included $2,000,000 for this agreement in fiscal year 2002, but the Committee has provided $4,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2001.

Environmental management science program.—The Committee is disappointed that the Department was again unable to provide funding for new grants in fiscal year 2002. This is a collaborative program between the Department's Office of Environmental Management and the Office of Science that identifies long-term, basic science research needs and targets the research and development toward critical cleanup problems. This program has been given high marks by the National Research Council and the Department's Environmental Management Advisory Board. The Committee believes it is critical to provide continuity of funding for this research program and has provided $5,000,000 for the next round of new and innovative research grants in fiscal year 2002.

Idaho validation and verification program.—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for basic research activities at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. The Department had requested no funds to continue this program.

University Research Program in Robotics.—The Committee has provided $4,350,000 for the university research program in robotics, an increase of $1,850,000 over the budget request of $2,500,000 and the same as fiscal year 2001.

Florida International University.—Funding of $5,000,000 has been provided for the Department's cooperative agreement with the Florida International University to support environmental cleanup technologies. This is an increase of $2,500,000 over the budget request and the same as fiscal year 2001.

EXCESS FACILITIES

The environmental management program is responsible for final disposition of excess contaminated facilities throughout the Department. Funds are currently being expended for surveillance and maintenance of these excess facilities, and these costs will continue until decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) is completed.

The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for the excess facilities program, an increase of $8,700,000 over the budget request. The budget requested only surveillance and maintenance costs of $1,300,000 for the excess facilities transferred to the program in fiscal year 2002. In addition to these surveillance and maintenance costs, the recommendation includes $8,700,000 to initiate a program to begin the actual D&D of excess facilities already owned by the environmental management program. These funds should be used to dispose of those facilities that will provide the greatest impact on reducing long-term costs and risk.

The Committee directs the Department to implement new D&D practices to reduce costs and expedite site cleanups. There are clearly savings to be realized throughout the complex as evidenced by a recent contractor innovation at the Rocky Flats site that reduced the cost of D&D for a building from an estimate of $3,500,000 using existing DOE practices and procedures to approximately $700,000 using commercial practices. Potential cost savings of this magnitude have also been identified at other sites through the use of standard commercial practices. The Department is to keep the Committee informed of the D&D projects that are to be performed and the cost of each project.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The safeguards and security program ensures appropriate levels of protection against unauthorized access, theft, diversion, or destruction of Departmental assets and hostile acts that may impact national security or the health and safety of DOE and contractor employees. The Committee recommendation for the safeguards and security program is $205,621,000, the same as the budget request.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends $355,761,000 for program direction, the same as the budget request. However, within this amount, the Committee has reduced salaries and benefits by $3,000,000 and provided funding only for the current on-board staff. No additional funding is provided for staff increases proposed at any site; increased site staffing needs must be met from within current staffing levels. In reviewing site staffing levels, there appear to be many discrepancies in the size of the Federal staff, the amount of contractor funding at the site, and the complexity of the cleanup. The Department is urged to see if there are greater efficiencies that can be made particularly at sites slated for closure.

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

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management includes the following funding adjustments; prior year balances of $36,770,000 and a security charge for reimbursable work of $5,391,000 as requested in the budget, and a general reduction of $17,000,000.

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS

Appropriation, 2001	$1,080,331,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	1,050,538,000
Recommended, 2002	1,092,878,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+12,547,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+42,340,000

The Defense Facilities Closure Projects account includes funding for sites which have established a goal of completing cleanup by the end of fiscal year 2006. After completion of cleanup, no further Departmental mission is envisioned, except for limited long-term surveillance and maintenance, and the sites may be available for some alternative use. Sites in this account include the Rocky Flats Closure Project in Colorado, and several sites in Ohio—Ashtabula, Columbus, Fernald, and Miamisburg.

This account is intended to highlight those sites where cleanup can be accelerated and substantial savings achieved by reducing long-term program costs and ongoing support costs. The Committee strongly supports this program, and the recommendation for fiscal year 2002 funding is $1,092,878,000, an increase of $42,340,000 over the budget request. Additional funding of $21,000,000 was provided in the fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill to support the Ohio closure sites. Fiscal year 2002 funding for each closure site is discussed below.

ROCKY FLATS CLOSURE PROJECT

The Department has prepared a baseline schedule showing closure of the Rocky Flats Site in Colorado by 2006. The Committee is aware that, to meet the 2006 deadline, stable funding will be required over several years, and critical path work activities must be successfully completed, not only at Rocky Flats, but at other sites throughout the Department's complex. The Department must ensure that complex-wide policy and funding issues are addressed as they relate to the closure of the Rocky Flats Site. The development of the Rocky Flats Integrated Closure Project Baseline is an important step in meeting this commitment. It is only through successful site closures that funds will be made available to support expensive future cleanup projects like the vitrification plants needed at Hanford and Idaho.

The Committee has provided fiscal year 2002 funding of $620,504,000, a reduction of $8,073,000 from the budget request. Funding for some safeguards and security activities was incorrectly included in the Rocky Flats project and has been transferred to the safeguards and security account.

OHIO SITES

The Committee is aware that each of the Ohio cleanup sites is in danger of slipping beyond the 2006 closure date. While it is not surprising that cleanups are encountering some unexpected conditions, it is very discouraging that the Federal program managers and contractors appear to be unable to maintain the schedules—rather than meeting challenges with innovations, the solution always seems to be increase the cost and slip the schedule. The Committee has consistently provided the funding requested by the De-

partment to maintain these projects on a 2006 closure schedule and has provided additional funding in fiscal year 2002 to maintain constant funding levels.

The Committee expects the Department to aggressively review the baseline closure plans for each Ohio cleanup site and take all steps necessary to meet the 2006 closure date. If during fiscal year 2002, it appears that any of these projects will not meet the 2006 closure date, the Department is to notify the Committee immediately, reduce site funding to the minimum necessary to maintain safe surveillance and maintenance conditions, and submit a reprogramming to remove the site from the Defense Facilities Closure Project account.

The Committee recommendation is $418,399,000 for the four Ohio sites, an increase of $52,061,000 over the budget request, in an attempt to maintain funding at the fiscal year 2001 levels. Funding for the Ashtabula site is $16,000,000, an increase of $6,279,000 over the budget request of $9,721,000. Funding for the Columbus Environmental Management Project is $16,100,000, an increase of $6,000,000 over the budget request of $10,100,000.

Fernald.—The Fernald site in Ohio is now operating under a recent contract modification that assumes closure of the site by 2010. Cleanup at the site has been slowed by the failure of several projects; however, there are contract incentives for closing the site by 2006. Additional funding of $20,000,000 has been provided in the fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill to support this accelerated closure schedule. The Committee expects the Department and the contractor to demonstrate during fiscal year 2002 that the site schedule can actually be accelerated to 2006. Significant cost savings can be achieved with early closure, and the Committee strongly supports this approach. The Committee recommendation for the Fernald site is $295,299,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request.

Mound.—The Committee is very concerned with the delays in the cleanup of the Mound site in Miamisburg, Ohio. Cleanup of the site is continuing to slip and now appears to extend significantly beyond fiscal year 2006. The Committee expects the Department to develop a baseline closure plan that supports the 2006 closure date. There are clearly many steps that can be taken at this site to accelerate cleanup activities and reduce managerial, bureaucratic, and worker inefficiencies while still protecting the health and safety of the workers and the community. The Committee strongly encourages the Department to explore alternative approaches to the cleanup that are truly innovative and will restore the schedule and reduce overall costs. The Committee also believes the Department should consider other health and safety regulatory oversight processes that could reduce costs and accelerate cleanup of the site. The Committee understands that increased resources over current levels may be needed to meet the 2006 closure date, but will not consider additional funding until the Department demonstrates that substantial changes have been made to current operations to ensure successful cleanup by 2006. The Committee recommends $91,000,000, an increase of $20,061,000 over the budget request of $70,939,000, and consistent with fiscal year 2001 funding levels. Additional funding of $1,000,000 has been provided in the fiscal

year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill to support the closure activities.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The safeguards and security program ensures appropriate levels of protection against unauthorized access, theft, diversion, or destruction of Departmental assets and hostile acts that may impact national security or the health and safety of DOE and contractor employees. The Committee recommendation for the safeguards and security program is $53,975,000, an increase of $8,073,000 over the budget request. This funding for safeguards and security activities, incorrectly included in the Rocky Flats project, has been transferred to this account.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

Appropriation, 2001	$65,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	141,537,000
Recommended, 2002	143,208,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+78,208,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+1,671,000

The Committee recommendation for the Defense Environmental Management Privatization program is $143,208,000, an increase of $1,671,000 over the budget request. The recommendation includes $52,000,000 for the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project at Idaho, an increase of $12,000,000 over the budget request of $40,000,000. Additional funding of $27,472,000 has been provided in the fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill to support this project.

Funding for two new projects has been provided in fiscal year 2002: $3,000,000 for the Paducah Disposal Facility, a reduction of $10,329,000 from the budget request, and $2,000,000 for the Portsmouth Disposal Facility, the same as the budget request. In light of the recent General Accounting Office report on low-level waste disposal practices at the Department, the Committee directs the Department to perform a detailed cost and risk assessment to compare on-site versus off-site disposal to determine whether off-site disposal at a commercial facility would be more cost-effective in view of long-term stewardship costs and risks before proceeding with either of these projects.

Consistent with the budget request, $49,332,000 has been provided for Spent Nuclear Fuel Dry Storage at Idaho, $26,050,000 for the Environmental Management/Waste Treatment Facility at Oak Ridge, and $10,826,000 for the Transuranic Waste Treatment Facility at Oak Ridge.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2001	$582,466,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	527,614,000
Recommended, 2002	487,464,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−95,002,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−40,150,000

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

SECURITY AND EMERGENCY OPERATIONS

Security and emergency operations provides a domestic safeguards and security program for protection of nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, nuclear facilities, and classified and unclassified information, including cyber systems, 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 $249,927,000, a reduction of $19,323,000 from the budget request of $269,250,000.

The Department's safeguards and security programs seem to careen from one incident to another—alleged loss of nuclear weapons secrets, misplaced computer hard drives with classified information, and alleged discriminatory actions toward visitors. The Department of Energy spends over $1 billion annually on safeguards and security activities, but none of these security incidents were caused by lack of funding. The Committee urges the new Administration to review the underlying basis for each of the Department's security practices to determine if current procedures result in excessive costs without commensurate protection for employees, facilities, and national security programs.

Public access to DOE facilities.—The Committee is concerned about the practice used by the Department of Energy to require identification of citizenship as a security screening tool. The Committee notes that the Department of Defense, whose security needs are no less important than those of the Department of Energy, does not use this procedure at the Pentagon. The Department of Energy's practice to require identification of citizenship for entry into its facilities, even for unclassified visits in non-secure areas, fosters the perception of racial profiling no matter how well intended. In a recent alarming incident, admittance to DOE headquarters was refused to a Chinese-American Member of Congress, who was participating in a DOE celebration of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. The Congressman was asked three times if he was an American, and two guards refused to accept his congressional identification for admittance or that of an Asian American aide who accompanied him. The Committee directs that the Secretary of Energy review security procedures for access to DOE facilities to determine whether the use of identification of citizenship is a proper, effective, and sensitive method and is consistent with procedures at other Federal facilities where classified information is kept. The Secretary shall report his findings to the Appropriations Committees of Congress by September 1, 2001.

Nuclear Safeguards and Security.—The nuclear safeguards and security program provides policy, programmatic direction, and training for the protection of the Department's nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, classified information, and facilities. The Com-

mittee recommendation is $108,000,000, a reduction of $13,188,000 from the budget request of $121,188,000. Funding for outside contractor assistance has been reduced. The Committee has also included $2,000,000 to continue the procurement of security locks that meet the Federal specifications for containers that hold sensitive classified material.

Security Investigations.—The security investigations program funds background investigations for Department of Energy and contractor personnel who, in the performance of their official duties, require access to restricted data, national security information, or special nuclear material. The Committee recommendation is $44,927,000, the same as the budget request.

Corporate Management Information Program.—The Committee recommendation is $20,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation is $77,000,000 for program direction, a decrease of $6,135,000 from the budget request of $83,135,000. With a Headquarters staff of 329 Federal employees, the Committee believes that funding for technical assistance and expertise from outside contractors should be reduced.

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. The Committee recommendation is $36,059,000, a reduction of $4,785,000 from the budget request, and the same as fiscal year 2001.

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. The Committee recommendation is $45,200,000, a reduction of $1,189,000 from the budget request, and the same as fiscal year 2001.

INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance is the focal point for independent evaluation of safeguards, security, emergency management, and cyber security. The Committee recommendation is $14,904,000, the same as the budget request, and $33,000 below fiscal year 2001.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Office of Environment, Safety and Health develops programs and policies to protect the workers and the public, conducts inde-

pendent oversight of performance, and funds health effects studies. The Committee recommendation is $105,293,000, a decrease of $9,307,000 from the budget request of $114,600,000.

Oversight.—Funding for additional contractor support for oversight activities has been reduced by $3,369,000 to $6,000,000. With a Headquarters staff of almost 300 Federal employees, the Committee believes that outside technical assistance can be significantly reduced.

Health Effects Studies.—The recommendation for health effects studies is $50,000,000, a decrease of $3,438,000 from the budget request of $53,438,000. The Department funds several programs for occupational medicine, public health studies, and epidemiologic monitoring. The Committee expects the Department to review all these activities to achieve efficiencies through consolidation.

Marshall Islands.—For over 40 years, the DOE has provided a Congressionally-mandated program of medical monitoring to the residents of Rongelap and Utrik atolls in the Marshall Islands who were exposed to high levels of radioactive fallout from a U.S. nuclear test, Castle Bravo, that occurred on March 1, 1954. The program managed by the Pacific Heath Research Institute of Honolulu through a cooperative agreement currently provides care for the remaining 123 of the original 253 individuals who enrolled in the program in 1954.

The U.S. government is currently renegotiating its diplomatic, defense and economic relationship with the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI). In those negotiations, the Committee believes it is time for the U.S. government to provide a single, combined package of assistance to support the medical and public health infrastructure needs of the Marshall Islands. This support should be managed by the U.S. Public Health Service, the Federal agency that has the greatest experience in providing public health care in the U.S. and abroad.

DOE's radiological monitoring, dose assessment and mitigation strategy research will conclude by 2006 and will complete over 30 years of scientific effort to thoroughly characterize the extent and nature of radiological contamination from U.S. atmospheric testing in the northern atolls of Bikini, Enewetak, Rongelap and Utrik. With completion of this task, the responsibility for the use of these assessments and mitigation strategies now falls to the RMI government in making decisions regarding resettlement and land use in the northern atolls. The Committee directs the Department to transition the environmental monitoring program to a program of direct support to the RMI. This will allow the RMI to conduct its own assessments and reach its own conclusions about which mitigation strategies to use in making resettlement and land use decisions.

The Committee recommendation for the Marshall Islands is $6,300,000, the same as the budget request.

Radiation Effects Research Foundation (RERF).—Through the RERF program, the United States has supported studies for more than 50 years on the health effects of radiation on the survivors of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bombings. The Committee recommendation is $13,500,000, the same as the budget request.

Energy Employees Compensation Initiative.—Title 36 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2001 (P.L. 106–398) established

the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program to provide benefits to DOE contractor workers made ill as a result of exposures from nuclear weapons production. The Department is responsible for establishing procedures to assist workers in filing compensation claims. The Committee recommendation is $15,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $20,793,000, a reduction of $2,500,000 from the budget request. This amount of funding will support employees currently on board through fiscal year 2002.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The Committee's recommendation for the worker and community transition program is $21,900,000, a reduction of $2,546,000 from the budget request of $24,446,000, due to funding constraints. Funding has been restored to many programs which the Department had proposed to reduce so there should be no significant contractor reductions requiring additional funds in fiscal year 2002. The Committee has provided $900,000 for infrastructure improvements at the former Pinellas weapons plant. The Committee expects the Department to adequately fund and fulfill the commitment that was made to the Miamisburg Mound Community Improvement Corporation, and to grant priority to those communities which received no funds in fiscal year 2001. The Committee directs that none of the funds provided for this program be used for additional severance payments and benefits for Federal employees.

The worker and community transition program was established to mitigate the impacts on workers and communities of contractor workforce reductions as a result of the end of the Cold War. Funds are provided for enhanced severance payments to employees at former defense sites, and for assisting community planning for defense conversion through Federal grants. However, the cost of this program has not been insignificant. Through fiscal year 2000, enhanced severance payments and benefits to workers and grants to communities have totaled more than $1 billion.

Program direction.—The Office of Worker and Community Transition currently has 19 employees at Headquarters. The budget proposed to reduce the staff to 18 employees, but provided $207,000 for additional support service contractor assistance to offset the reduction. The Committee recommendation of $2,900,000 for program direction, a reduction of $300,000 from the budget request, allows the staff reduction, but does not provide the additional support service.

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $25,000,000 to provide administrative support for national security programs. This will fund Departmental activities performed by offices such as the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, the General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer, Human Resources, Congressional Affairs, and Public Affairs, which support the activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

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 $2,893,000, the same as the budget request.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation for funding adjustments is $13,712,000, an increase of $3,000,000 over the budget request. Adjustments include the use of $13,000,000 in prior year balances which is an increase of $3,000,000 over the budget request, and a reduction of $712,000 for a security charge for reimbursable work as proposed in the budget.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 2001	$199,725,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	310,000,000
Recommended, 2002	310,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+110,275,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

Since passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, the Nuclear Waste Fund has incurred costs for activities related to disposal of high-level waste generated from the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy. At the end of fiscal year 2000, the balance owed by the Federal government to the Nuclear Waste Fund was $1,385,000,000 (including principal and interest). The Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriation was established to ensure payment of the Federal government's contribution to the nuclear waste repository program. Through fiscal year 2000, a total of $1,216,400,000 has been appropriated to support the nuclear waste repository activities attributable to atomic energy defense activities.

The Committee recommendation is $310,000,000, the same as the budget request. Eliminating the outstanding balance owed by the Federal government will require a significant increase in the amount paid each year and could require as much as $500,000,000 annually in future years. Since shipment of defense high level waste to the repository is contingent upon full payment of the balance owed at the time the repository is opened, the Committee believes it is prudent to address this funding shortfall sooner rather than later.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Management of the Federal power marketing functions was transferred from the Department of the 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 Rec-

lamation that have been transferred to the Western Area Power Administration.

All power marketing administrations except the Bonneville Power Administration are funded annually with appropriated funds. Revenues collected from power sales and transmission services are deposited in the Treasury to offset expenditures. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2002 includes the Administration proposal to fund purchase power and wheeling from power revenues for the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration.

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.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

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

Borrowing Authority.—Bonneville Power Administration has available $3,750,000,000 in permanent borrowing authority, authorized by the Transmission System Act (P.L. 93–454). For fiscal year 2002, the Committee recommendation includes an estimate of use of $374,500,000 of authorized borrowing authority, the same as the budget request and $50,000,000 more than fiscal year 2001. This borrowing authority is available for capital investments in power systems (including fish and wildlife measures), transmission systems, and capital equipment. With this borrowing authority, Bonneville forecasts that it will have a total of $834,000,000 in borrowing available in fiscal year 2002.

The Committee is aware that Bonneville has recently proposed a $2 billion increase in its borrowing authority to address infrastructure needs arising from an anticipated increase in generation from a variety of sources in the Bonneville service area. The Committee does not at this time have enough information to support such an increase. Consistent with the recommendation contained in the National Energy Policy, the Secretary of Energy has already been tasked to examine the national grid, identify transmission bottlenecks, and identify measures to remove such bottlenecks. The National Energy Policy also recommends a review of Bonneville's capital and financing requirements to determine if additional Federal financing or an increase in borrowing authority is warranted. Bonneville's proposal for increased borrowing authority must be considered within the context of all of the Administration's pro-

posed actions for the power marketing administrations and in view of the combined impact on the various regions of the country.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2001	$3,891,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	4,891,000
Recommended, 2002	4,891,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+1,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

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 $4,891,000, the same as the budget request and a $1,000,000 increase over fiscal year 2001. The total program level for Southeastern in fiscal year 2002 is $39,354,000, with $34,463,000 for purchase power and wheeling and $4,891,000 for program direction. The purchase power and wheeling costs will be offset by collections of $34,463,000, leaving a net appropriation of $4,891,000. The offsetting collections total of $34,463,000 includes $26,463,000 made available in Public Law 106–377 for use in fiscal year 2002, plus an additional $8,000,000 provided in this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2001	$28,038,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	28,038,000
Recommended, 2002	28,038,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	.....
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

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 $28,038,000, the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 2001 funding level. The total program level for Southwestern in fiscal year 2002 is $29,838,000, including $3,339,000 for operating expenses, $1,800,000 for purchase power and wheeling, $18,668,000 for program direction, and $6,031,000 for construction. The offset of $1,800,000 from collections for purchase power and wheeling yields a net appropriation of $28,038,000. The offsetting collections total of $1,800,000 includes $288,000 made available in Public Law 106–377 for use in fiscal year 2002, plus an additional $1,512,000 provided in this Act.

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

Appropriation, 2001	$165,465,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	169,465,000
Recommended, 2002	172,165,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+6,700,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+2,700,000

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 $172,165,000, an increase of $2,700,000 over the budget request and $6,700,000 more than the fiscal year 2001 funding level. The total program level for Western in fiscal year 2002 is $358,289,000, which includes $18,764,000 for construction and rehabilitation, $37,796,000 for system operation and maintenance, $186,124,000 for purchase power and wheeling, $114,378,000 for program direction, and $1,227,000 for Utah mitigation and conservation. Offsetting collections for purchase power and wheeling total $186,124,000, leaving a net appropriation of $172,165,000. The offsetting collections total of $186,124,000 includes $33,500,000 made available in Public Law 106–377 for use in fiscal year 2002, plus an additional $152,624,000 provided in this Act.

The amount for construction and rehabilitation includes $2,700,000 to fund high priority portions of the South of Phoenix portion of the Parker-Davis Project transmission system. The Federal share of the upfront costs is to be recovered through the transmission rates of the Parker-Davis Project. Western should pursue additional funds from those utilities requiring additional transmission capacity, and the Committee expects that any funding received will be used to offset future appropriations requirements.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriation, 2001	$2,663,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	2,663,000
Recommended, 2002	2,663,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	.....
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

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 $2,663,000, the same as the budget request and as the fiscal year 2001 funding level.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2001	$175,200,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	181,155,000
Recommended, 2002	181,155,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+5,955,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 2001	−$175,200,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−181,155,000
Recommended, 2002	−181,155,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−5,955,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

The Committee recommendation is $181,155,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $5,955,000 over the fiscal year 2001 funding level. Revenues for FERC are established at a rate equal to the budget authority, resulting in a net appropriation of $0.

The Committee understands that the Commission is establishing precedent in implementing the stranded cost provisions of Order 888 in the context of "retail turned wholesale" customers. The Committee urges the Commission to stand by its commitment to full cost recovery and directs that the Commission, in this context, use a methodology that contains a recovery period sufficient to ensure the recovery of all generating asset investments included in states approved rates used to serve the departing customers.

The Committee has included language in the bill which prohibits the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission from using the funds provided in this or any other Act to complete the remaining reviews and issue further authorizations to proceed with the Gulfstream Natural Gas Project.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
ENERGY SUPPLY			
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES			
Renewable energy technologies			
Biomass/biofuels energy systems			
Power systems	40,800	37,754	41,010
Transportation	46,160	44,201	47,950
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems	86,960	81,955	88,960
Geothermal technology development	27,000	13,900	27,000
Hydrogen research	27,000	26,881	27,000
Hydropower	5,000	4,989	3,000
Solar energy			
Concentrating solar power	13,800	1,932	7,932
Photovoltaic energy systems	75,775	39,000	81,775
Solar building technology research	3,950	2,000	4,950
Subtotal, Solar energy	93,525	42,932	94,657
Wind energy systems	40,000	20,500	40,000
Total, Renewable energy technologies	279,485	191,157	280,617
Electric energy systems and storage			
High temperature superconducting R&D	37,000	36,819	39,870
Energy storage systems	6,000	5,987	7,130
Transmission reliability	9,000	8,940	13,000
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	52,000	51,746	60,000
Renewable support and implementation			
Departmental energy management	2,000	1,000	2,500
International renewable energy program	5,000	2,500	3,000
Renewable energy production incentive program	4,000	3,991	4,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	6,600	---	---
Renewable program support	4,000	2,059	3,000
Total, Renewable support and implementation	21,600	9,550	12,500
National renewable energy laboratory	4,000	5,000	5,000
Program direction	18,700	19,200	18,700
TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES	375,785	276,653	376,817
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
Advanced radioisotope power system	32,200	29,094	28,200
Isotopes			
Isotope support and production	24,715	24,683	22,683
Construction			
99-E-201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	2,500	2,494	2,494
Subtotal, Isotope support and production	27,215	27,177	25,177
Offsetting collections	-8,000	-9,000	-9,000
Total, Isotopes	19,215	18,177	16,177
University reactor fuel assistance and support	12,000	11,974	15,895
Research and development			
Nuclear energy plant optimization	5,000	4,500	5,000
Nuclear energy research initiative	35,000	18,079	23,079
Nuclear energy technologies	7,500	4,500	4,500
Total, Research and development	47,500	27,079	32,579
Infrastructure			
ANL-West operations	39,150	34,107	33,357
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	44,010	38,439	38,439

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Test reactor area landlord	7,575	7,283	7,283
Construction			
99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	925	950	950
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	500	500	500
Subtotal, Construction	1,425	1,450	1,450
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	9,000	8,733	8,733
Total, Infrastructure	92,160	81,279	80,529
Nuclear facilities management			
EBR-II shutdown	8,800	4,200	4,200
Disposition of spent fuel and legacy materials	16,200	16,267	16,200
Disposition technology activities	9,850	9,990	9,850
Total, Nuclear facilities management	34,850	30,457	30,250
Program direction	22,000	25,062	20,500
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	259,925	223,122	224,130
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)	16,000	14,973	10,973
Program direction	19,998	20,527	20,527
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	35,998	35,500	31,500
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
Technical information management program	1,600	1,600	1,400
Program direction	7,000	7,370	6,470
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	8,600	8,970	7,870
Subtotal, Energy supply	680,308	544,245	640,317
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-1,456	---	---
General reduction	---	---	-1,000
Offset from nuclear energy royalties	-2,352	---	---
Reduction for safeguards and security	-16,582	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	659,918	544,245	639,317
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT			
Site closure	81,636	43,000	43,000
Site/project completion	61,621	64,119	64,119
Post 2006 completion	137,744	120,053	115,753
Excess facilities	---	1,381	5,000
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-612	---	---
Reduction for safeguards and security	-3,189	---	---
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	277,200	228,553	227,872

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION			
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund			
Decontamination and decommissioning	273,038	241,641	271,641
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	72,000	1,000	1,000
Depleted UF6 conversion project	---	10,000	---
Total, Uranium enrichment D&D fund	345,038	252,641	272,641
Other Uranium Activities			
Maintenance of facilities and inventories	29,193	99,000	99,000
Pre-existing liabilities	11,330	11,784	11,784
Depleted UF6 conversion project	21,877	---	10,000
Total, Other uranium activities	62,400	110,784	120,784
Reduction for safeguards and security	-14,071	---	---
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-865	---	---
TOTAL, URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION	392,502	363,425	393,425
SCIENCE			
High energy physics			
Research and technology	234,720	247,870	247,870
Facility operations	459,010	456,830	456,830
Construction			
00-G-307 SLAC office building	5,200	---	---
99-G-306 Wilson hall safety improvements, Fermilab	4,200	---	---
98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	23,000	11,400	11,400
Subtotal, Construction	32,400	11,400	11,400
Subtotal, Facility operations	491,410	468,230	468,230
Total, High energy physics	726,130	716,100	716,100
Nuclear physics	369,890	360,510	361,510
Biological and environmental research	498,760	432,970	434,475
Construction			
01-E-300 Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics, ORNL	2,500	10,000	11,405
Total, Biological and environmental research	501,260	442,970	445,880
Basic energy sciences			
Materials sciences	456,111	434,353	437,353
Chemical sciences	223,229	218,714	218,714
Engineering and geosciences	40,816	38,938	38,938
Energy biosciences	33,714	32,400	32,400
Construction			
02-SC-002 Project engineering and design (VL)	---	4,000	3,000
99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	259,500	276,300	276,300
Subtotal, Construction	259,500	280,300	279,300
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,013,370	1,004,705	1,006,705
Advanced scientific computing research	170,000	163,050	163,050
Energy research analyses	1,000	1,000	1,000
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support			
Infrastructure support	1,160	1,020	1,020

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Oak Ridge landlord	10,711	7,359	7,359
Construction			
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	22,059	18,613	18,613
02-SC-001 Multiprogram energy laboratories, project engineering design, various locations	---	3,183	3,183
Subtotal, Construction	22,059	21,796	21,796
Total, Multiprogram energy labs - fac. support	33,930	30,175	30,175
Fusion energy sciences program	255,000	248,495	248,495
Facilities and infrastructure	---	---	10,000
Safeguards and security	49,818	55,412	55,412
Program direction			
Field offices	83,307	64,400	60,700
Headquarters	51,438	73,525	69,820
Science education	4,500	4,460	4,460
Total, Program direction	139,245	142,385	134,980
Subtotal, Science	3,259,643	3,164,802	3,173,307
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-7,011	---	---
General reduction	-34,047	---	-2,000
Reduction for safeguards and security	-38,244	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	---	-4,912	-4,912
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,180,341	3,159,890	3,166,395
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Repository program	135,200	70,577	69,540
Program direction	62,800	64,402	63,460
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-420	---	---
Reduction for safeguards and security	-6,926	---	---
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	190,654	134,979	133,000
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations			
Salaries and expenses			
Office of the Secretary	5,000	4,700	4,700
Board of contract appeals	878	911	911
Chief financial officer	32,148	36,464	29,000
Contract reform and privatization	2,500	---	---
Engineering and project management	---	---	7,600
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	5,000	5,478	5,000
Economic impact and diversity	5,126	5,230	5,126
General counsel	22,724	23,058	22,724
International affairs	8,500	8,481	8,481
Management and administration	77,800	76,392	71,500
Policy office	6,600	6,649	6,600
Public affairs	3,900	4,581	3,900
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	170,176	171,944	165,542
Program support			
Minority economic impact	1,500	1,498	1,200
Policy analysis and system studies	422	420	400
Environmental policy studies	1,000	919	600
Corporate management information program	12,000	---	---
Subtotal, Program support	14,922	2,837	2,200
Total, Administrative operations	185,098	174,781	167,742

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Cost of work for others	74,027	71,837	71,837
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	259,125	246,618	239,579
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-165	---	---
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	-8,000	---	-4,968
Funding from other defense activities	-25,000	-25,000	-25,000
Reduction for safeguards and security	-18	---	---
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	225,942	221,618	209,611
Miscellaneous revenues	-151,000	-137,810	-137,810
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	74,942	83,808	71,801
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	31,500	31,430	32,430
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-70	---	---
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	31,430	31,430	32,430
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Directed stockpile work			
Stockpile research and development	272,300	305,460	305,460
Stockpile maintenance	279,994	362,493	362,493
Stockpile evaluation	174,710	180,834	180,834
Dismantlement/disposal	29,260	35,414	35,414
Production support	149,939	152,890	152,890
Field engineering, training and manuals	4,400	6,700	6,700
Total, Directed stockpile work	910,603	1,043,791	1,043,791
Campaigns			
Primary certification	41,400	55,530	55,530
Dynamic materials properties	74,408	97,810	97,810
Advanced radiography	58,000	60,510	60,510
Construction			
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	35,232	---	---
Subtotal, Advanced radiography	93,232	60,510	60,510
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins	52,964	47,270	47,270
Enhanced surety	40,600	34,797	34,797
Weapons system engineering certification	16,300	24,043	24,043
Nuclear survivability	15,400	19,050	19,050
Enhanced surveillance	106,651	82,333	82,333
Advanced design and production technologies	75,735	75,533	75,533
Inertial confinement fusion and high yield	250,500	222,943	247,943
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL	199,100	245,000	245,000
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	449,600	467,943	492,943
Advanced simulation and computing	716,175	711,185	611,185
Construction			
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	2,300	5,400	5,400
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,000	5,000	5,000
00-D-105 Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	56,000	11,070	11,070

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	6,700	5,377	5,377
Subtotal, Construction	70,000	26,847	26,847
Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing	786,175	738,032	638,032
Pit manufacturing and certification	125,038	128,545	128,545
Secondary readiness	20,000	23,169	47,169
High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness	---	3,960	3,960
Non-nuclear readiness	---	12,204	12,204
Materials readiness	40,511	1,209	1,209
Tritium readiness	77,000	43,350	43,350
Construction			
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	75,000	81,125	81,125
98-D-126 Accelerator production of Tritium, various locations	15,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	90,000	81,125	81,125
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	167,000	124,475	124,475
Total, Campaigns	2,105,014	1,996,413	1,945,413
Readiness in technical base and facilities			
Operations of facilities	1,252,232	830,427	865,427
Program readiness	74,500	188,126	188,126
Special projects	48,297	64,493	64,493
Material recycle and recovery	30,018	101,311	101,311
Containers	11,876	8,199	8,199
Storage	9,075	10,643	10,643
Nuclear weapons incident response	56,289	89,125	89,125
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,482,287	1,292,324	1,327,324
Construction			
02-D-101 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL	---	2,000	9,500
02-D-103 Project engineering and design, various locations	---	9,180	9,180
02-D-107 Electrical power systems safety communications and bus upgrades, NV	---	3,507	3,507
01-D-103 Preliminary project engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	35,500	45,379	37,879
01-D-124 HEU storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	17,800	9,500	9,500
01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,000	7,700	7,700
01-D-800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL	2,000	12,993	12,993
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,000	4,400	4,400
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,800	2,800	2,800
99-D-106 Model validation & system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	5,200	4,955	4,955
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	2,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
99-D-125 Replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	13,000	300	300
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	23,765	22,200	22,200
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	4,998	3,300	3,300
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	30,767	13,700	13,700
98-D-124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y-12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	---	6,850	6,850
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	2,918	3,000	3,000
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations	---	2,900	2,900
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project (LANL)	13,337	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	162,085	154,664	154,664
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,644,372	1,446,988	1,481,988
Facilities and infrastructure	---	---	17,000
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	79,357	77,571	77,571
Program direction	36,316	44,229	44,229
Total, Secure transportation asset	115,673	121,800	121,800
Safeguards and security	356,840	439,281	439,281
Construction			
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	18,043	9,600	9,600
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	2,713	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	20,756	9,600	9,600
Total, Safeguards and security	377,596	448,881	448,881
Program direction	224,071	271,137	250,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities	5,377,329	5,329,010	5,308,873
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-11,033	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-13,647	---	---
General reduction	-35,700	---	-156,000
Reduction for safeguards and security	-310,796	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	---	-28,985	-28,985
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	5,006,153	5,300,025	5,123,888

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	235,990	170,296	180,296
Construction			
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	17,000	35,806	35,806
Total, Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	252,990	206,102	216,102
Arms control	152,014	101,500	75,741
Nonproliferation programs with Russia			
International materials protection, control, and accounting	173,856	138,800	190,000
Russian transition assistance	---	---	40,000
HEU transparency implementation	15,190	13,950	13,950
International nuclear safety	20,000	13,800	10,000
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus materials disposition	139,517	130,089	130,089
Russian surplus materials disposition	40,000	57,000	57,000
Construction			
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend dow Savannah River, SC	20,932	24,000	24,000
01-D-142 Immobilization and associated processin facility, various locations	3,000	---	---
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility various locations	20,000	16,000	16,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility various locations	26,000	63,000	63,000
Subtotal, Construction	69,932	103,000	103,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	249,449	290,089	290,089
Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia	458,495	456,639	544,039
Program direction	51,468	51,459	51,459
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation	914,967	815,700	887,341
Use of prior year balances	-526	-42,000	-42,000
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-1,923	---	---
Reduction for safeguards and security	-40,245	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	872,273	773,700	845,341
NAVAL REACTORS			
Naval reactors development	644,500	652,245	652,245
Construction			
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	11,400	---	---
01-D-200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY	1,300	9,000	9,000
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	16,000	4,200	4,200
Subtotal, Construction	28,700	13,200	13,200
Total, Naval reactors development	673,200	665,445	665,445

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Program direction	21,400	22,600	22,600
Reduction for safeguards and security	-4,437	---	---
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-1,518	---	---
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	688,645	688,045	688,045
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR			
Office of the Administrator	10,000	15,000	10,000
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-22	---	---
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	9,978	15,000	10,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	6,577,049	6,776,770	6,667,274
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	919,167	872,030	1,021,330
Construction			
02-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, INEEL, Idaho Falls, ID	---	3,256	3,256
01-D-414 Preliminary project, engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	17,300	6,254	2,754
01-D-415 235-F packaging and stabilization project, Savannah River, SC	4,000	---	---
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	7,714	5,040	5,040
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID	4,300	2,700	2,700
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	1,690	1,910	1,910
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	3,949	---	---
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	12,512	4,244	4,244
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC	8,879	15,790	---
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility (LLNL), Livermore, CA	2,000	762	762
Subtotal, Construction	62,344	39,956	20,666
Total, Site/project completion	981,511	911,986	1,041,996
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,251,514	1,680,979	1,933,250
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	420,000	420,000	420,000
Construction			
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	27,212	6,754	6,754
Office of River Protection			
Operation and maintenance	309,619	272,151	328,151
Construction			
01-D-416 Hanford waste treatment plant, Richland, WA	377,000	500,000	665,000
99-D-403 Infrastructure support, Richland, WA	7,812	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	46,023	33,473	33,473
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	17,385	6,844	6,844
Subtotal, Construction	448,220	540,317	705,317
Subtotal, Office of River Protection	757,839	812,468	1,033,468
Total, Post 2006 completion	3,456,565	2,920,201	3,393,472
Science and technology	256,898	196,000	226,850
Excess facilities	---	1,300	10,000
Safeguards and security	203,748	205,621	205,621
Program direction	363,988	355,761	355,761
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,262,710	4,590,869	5,233,700
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-10,943	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-34,317	-36,770	-36,770
Pension refund	-50,000	---	---
General reduction	-10,700	---	-17,000
Reduction for safeguards and security	-193,217	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	---	-5,391	-5,391
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,963,533	4,548,708	5,174,539
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS			
Site closure	1,027,942	1,004,636	1,038,903
Safeguards and security	54,772	45,902	53,975
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-2,383	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS	1,080,331	1,050,538	1,092,878
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	90,092	141,537	143,208
Use of prior year balances	-25,092	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION	65,000	141,537	143,208
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	6,108,864	5,740,783	6,410,625
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Other national security programs			
Security and emergency operations			
Nuclear safeguards and security	116,409	121,188	108,000
Security investigations	33,000	44,927	44,927
Corporate management information program	---	20,000	20,000
Emergency management	33,711	---	---
Program direction	92,967	83,135	77,000
Subtotal, Security and emergency operations	276,087	269,250	249,927
Intelligence	36,059	40,844	36,059
Counterintelligence	45,200	46,389	45,200
Advanced accelerator applications	34,000	---	---
Independent oversight and performance assurance			
Program direction	14,937	14,904	14,904
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	102,963	91,307	84,500
Program direction - EH	22,604	23,293	20,793
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	125,567	114,600	105,293

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Worker and community transition	21,500	21,246	19,000
Program direction - WT	3,000	3,200	2,900
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	24,500	24,446	21,900
National Security programs administrative support	25,000	25,000	25,000
Office of hearings and appeals	3,000	2,893	2,893
Subtotal, Other defense activities	584,350	538,326	501,176
Use of prior year balances	---	-10,000	-13,000
Reduction for safeguards and security	-595	---	---
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-1,289	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	---	-712	-712
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	582,466	527,614	487,464
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	200,000	310,000	310,000
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-275	---	---
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	13,468,104	13,355,167	13,875,363
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Purchase power and wheeling	34,463	34,463	34,463
Program direction	5,000	4,891	4,891
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	39,463	39,354	39,354
Offsetting collections	-34,463	-34,463	-8,000
Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	---	---	-26,463
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-9	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-1,100	---	---
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,891	4,891	4,891
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	3,795	3,339	3,339
Purchase power and wheeling	288	1,800	1,800
Program direction	18,388	18,668	18,668
Construction	6,817	6,031	6,031
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	29,288	29,838	29,838
Offsetting collections	-288	-1,800	-1,512
Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	---	---	-288
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-62	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-900	---	---
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	28,038	28,038	28,038
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction and rehabilitation	23,115	16,064	18,764
System operation and maintenance	36,104	37,796	37,796
Purchase power and wheeling	65,224	186,124	186,124
Program direction	106,644	114,378	114,378
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,950	1,227	1,227
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	237,037	355,589	358,289

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2001 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Offsetting collections	-65,224	-186,124	-152,624
Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	---	---	-33,500
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-365	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-5,983	---	---
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	165,465	169,465	172,165
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	2,670	2,663	2,663
Across-the-board cut (.22%) (P.L. 106-554)	-7	---	---
TOTAL, FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING FUND	2,663	2,663	2,663
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	200,057	205,057	207,757
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	175,200	181,155	181,155
FERC revenues	-175,200	-181,155	-181,155
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	---	---	---
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission)	-75,000	---	---
Defense environmental privatization (rescission)	-97,000	---	---
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	18,303,148	18,106,554	18,747,360

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Contract Competition.—Section 301 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to award a management and operating contract, or award a significant extension or expansion to an existing management and operating contract, 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 60 days before such action, 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 detail, the reasons for the waiver. Section 301 does not preclude extensions of a contract awarded using competitive procedures.

The Committee's concerns regarding the Department's contracting procedures result from the Department's history of having management and operating contracts which have never been bid competitively, in some cases for over four decades. Ensuring competition for these situations in particular, and establishing competition as the norm for the Department's contracting, is imperative. However, the Committee is aware that there may be circumstances where the existing contract has been competed in the past few years; the existing contractor has been doing a good job; the mission at a specific site has been scheduled to end in a limited amount of time; or the time required for a full competitive procurement would result in significant delays to an ongoing project. In those instances where it is clearly in the taxpayers' interest, the Committee would not object to a contract extension.

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.

Limitation on Funding for Section 3161 Benefits.—Section 303 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to augment the $21,900,000 made available for obligation in this Act for severance payments 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.

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.

Limitation on Bonneville Power Administration.—Section 306 provides that none of the funds provided 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.

Limitation on Funds Used for LDRD.—Section 307 provides that none of the funds appropriated by Congress in any appropriation act other than Energy and Water Development appropriations acts may be used for Department of Energy laboratory directed research and development (LDRD).

The Department of Energy's laboratory directed research and development program allows laboratory directors to divert up to six percent of funds they receive to other projects at the laboratories at the sole discretion of the laboratory directors. The Department, however, has implemented the program in a manner which extends this policy to the funds received from other Federal agencies. The Committee is concerned that the Department of Energy through this policy has inadvertently allowed its laboratory directors to divert funds from the purpose for which they were appropriated in other Appropriations Acts, unwittingly violating the statutory language of those acts. The Committee is particularly concerned about funds that Congress has provided or added in defense appropriations acts for national missile defense and classified programs, which were provided for specific high-priority national security purposes to meet specific objectives. Diversion of these funds to unrelated laboratory directed research does not contribute to the purpose for which Congress appropriated the funds, but rather detracts from it. The Committee, therefore, recommends section 307 which limits the Department of Energy's laboratory directed research and development program to the funds provided by the Congress for the Department of Energy in this bill and ensures the integrity of funds provided to other Federal agencies in other appropriations bills.

External Regulation of Science Laboratories.—The Department of Energy (DOE) is currently self-regulating with respect to nuclear safety and worker safety at most of its facilities under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Section 308 directs the DOE to prepare an implementation plan to transition to external regulation of DOE's non-defense science laboratories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) would assume responsibility for nuclear safety at DOE's non-defense science laboratories, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) would assume responsibility for worker safety at these same sites. The Department is directed in fiscal year 2002 only to prepare a plan for implementation of external regulation, with a proposed effective date for the actual implementation of external regulation being October 1, 2002.

For purposes of the implementation plan required by this section, external regulation will apply to the five multiprogram national laboratories under the Office of Science: Argonne National Laboratory; Brookhaven National Laboratory; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; Oak Ridge National Laboratory; and Pacific

Northwest National Laboratory. External regulation shall also apply to the five single-purpose laboratories under the Office of Science: Ames Laboratory, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory; Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory; Stanford Linear Accelerator Center; and Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility. The requirement to plan for the transition to external regulation is not applicable to the nuclear weapons laboratories, plants, or test facilities, or to the Department's environmental remediation sites or other laboratories and research facilities.

The Department's external regulation implementation plan is to be prepared in consultation with the agencies that will assume regulatory responsibility from the Department, the NRC and OSHA. The Department should transfer $4,000,000 to the NRC and $120,000 to OSHA, from within the funds appropriated in fiscal year 2002 for Environment, Safety, and Health to cover their respective costs to prepare for the transition to external regulation, to coordinate with each other and with DOE, to conduct site visits as necessary and to assist DOE in the preparation of the external regulation implementation plan. Note that the transfer to OSHA for external regulation planning is in addition to the $600,000 transferred to OSHA for worker health and safety at those sites transferred to non-Federal entities and for the Department's non-nuclear facilities not covered under the Atomic Energy Act.

The Department should complete the external regulation implementation plan by March 31, 2001, and should submit the completed plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Energy and Commerce Committee, the House Science Committee, the House Education and Workforce Committee, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, and the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. The implementation plan should address the specific details on how external regulation will be implemented at the named Science laboratories, including the estimated staffing and funding requirements for NRC and OSHA as they assume their additional regulatory responsibilities, and the corresponding reduction in staffing and funding for DOE as it loses this regulatory responsibility. The implementation plan should identify any specific facilities or class of facilities for which external regulation cannot be reasonably implemented on October 1, 2002, and make recommendations on how to address nuclear and worker safety at those facilities. The implementation plan should address the modifications needed to existing management and operating contracts to reflect the change in federal regulatory oversight. The Committee expects that the NRC will, upon the effective date for external regulation, assume regulatory responsibility for regulating nuclear safety at accelerators in the named DOE Science laboratories. The responsibility for regulating accelerators located on Federal facilities is not to be delegated to the NRC Agreement States. The implementation plan should identify any statutory changes needed and propose the necessary legislative language. The Committee expects the NRC and the OSHA to enter into a memorandum of understanding prior to the effective transition date of October 1, 2002, to define the respective responsibilities of the two agencies at the named DOE laboratories.

User Facilities.—The Committee is very supportive of the Department's efforts to involve universities in the Department's research efforts. User facilities were created by Congress in the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (P.L. 102–486) in order to make the Department's unique energy research capabilities available broadly to universities, industry, private laboratories, other Federal laboratories, and others. The Department has adopted the user facility concept and extended it successfully to other DOE programs, including the National Nuclear Security Administration. The Department's laboratories and research instruments represent a valuable asset to the Nation, as well as a major investment of public funding. As such, the Department must make certain that universities, as well as other potential users, have an equal opportunity to take advantage of the Department's unique research facilities.

This Committee believes the Department already has in place procedures to ensure that the Department's research funds are distributed through a competitive, peer-reviewed process. The Committee also believes that similar competitive, peer-reviewed procedures are in place with respect to research conducted at DOE facilities using non-DOE funds. This section addresses several related parts of the process. When the Department makes a user facility available to universities and other potential users, it must provide notice of such availability in a manner that notifies the potential user community to the greatest extent practicable. The Department should publish its notices in the *Commerce Business Daily* as well as the appropriate scientific and technical journals, and should make use of workshops and other mechanisms to provide broad public notice. Similarly, when the Department seeks the input of universities and other potential users regarding significant changes to an existing user facility, or seeks their input regarding the features needed in a proposed new user facility, the Department must provide broad notice. The Committee is concerned that some of the initial outreach for the proposed nanoscale science research centers was conducted with select universities; other interested universities may not have been aware of the opportunity to provide input to DOE on these planned user facilities.

In certain instances other than management and operating contracts, the Department may choose to enter into a partnership arrangement with a university or other potential users to assist in the establishment or operation of a user facility. In such instances, this section requires the Department to conduct a full and open competition to select such a partner or partners. The opportunity to partner with one of the Department's national laboratories in the operation of a user facility is a valuable albeit limited opportunity. As such, the Department must take steps to ensure that potential partners have an equal chance to compete for that opportunity.

For purposes of this section, the term "user facility" includes, but is not limited to: a user facility as described in section 2203(a)(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13503(a)(2)); a National Nuclear Security Administration Defense Programs Technology Deployment Center/User Facility; and any other Department facility designated by the Department as a user facility. Note that the Department may not redesignate a facility as something other than

a user facility in order to avoid the notice and competition requirements of this section. Whenever the Department opens its research facilities to outside users, it must do so on a fair and equal basis.

Language not included by the Committee.—The Administration requested language authorizing intelligence activities of the Department of Energy and amending the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. The Committee recommendation does not include this proposed legislation.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2001	$66,254,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	66,290,000
Recommended, 2002	71,290,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+5,036,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+5,000,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is composed of the Governors of the thirteen Appalachian states and a Federal Co-Chairman who is appointed by the President. The Committee recommendation is $71,290,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request. Funding of $5,000,000 has been provided for a child development research center at the University of Alabama.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2001	$18,459,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	18,500,000
Recommended, 2002	18,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+41,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

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 is $18,500,000, the same as the budget request.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 2001	$19,956,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	19,992,000
Recommended, 2002	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−19,956,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−19,992,000

The Committee recommends no funding for the Delta Regional Authority in fiscal year 2002. The Delta Regional Authority was es-

tablished by Congress in fiscal year 2001, but it has not yet been organized. Prior year funds of at least $17,000,000 will be carried over from fiscal year 2001 and will be available for expenditure in fiscal year 2002.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2001	$29,934,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	29,939,000
Recommended, 2002	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−29,934,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−29,939,000

The Committee has recommended no funding for the Denali Commission in fiscal year 2002 due to funding constraints.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2001	$481,825,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	506,900,000
Recommended, 2002	516,900,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+35,075,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	+10,000,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2001	−$447,958,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−463,248,000
Recommended, 2002	−473,520,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	−25,562,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−10,272,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2001	$33,867,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	43,652,000
Recommended, 2002	43,380,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2001	+9,513,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−272,000

Nuclear energy received a strong endorsement in the National Energy Policy of May 2001, and serious industry interest has emerged in building a new generation of nuclear power plants in the United States to meet the nation's electricity demands. Industry has recently indicated intent to submit at least one early site permit application to the Nuclear Energy Commission (NRC) in fiscal year 2002, and several firms have already initiated preliminary discussions with the NRC regarding new reactor designs. The NRC needs to ensure that its regulatory infrastructure can be responsive to these potential new applications, some of which may involve new technologies not previously licensed by the NRC. Because these industry initiatives emerged only recently, the NRC's budget request does not include sufficient resources for these new activities. The NRC estimates that it may need an additional $15,000,000 to $18,000,000 in budget authority to be ready for these new activities. The Committee provides $10,000,000 in additional budget authority to the NRC so that it can adequately prepare for and re-

spond to these new reactor initiatives without jeopardizing the safety of operating facilities and without impeding ongoing initiatives on license renewals, power uprates, and moving toward a more risk-informed regulatory environment. The remaining $5,000,000 to $8,000,000 should be realized through implementing internal efficiencies in the NRC.

The Committee recommendation for the NRC is $516,900,000, an increase in budget authority of $10,000,000 over the budget request and $35,075,000 over fiscal year 2001. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $473,530,000, resulting in a net appropriation of $43,380,000. The recommendation includes $23,650,000 to be made available from the Nuclear Waste Fund to support the Department of Energy's effort to develop a permanent geologic repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste.

Fee Recovery.—Pursuant to the agreement reached in fiscal year 2001, the NRC is required to recover 96 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the Nuclear Waste Fund, by assessing license and annual fees.

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

Repository licensing regulations.—As the Department of Energy nears a determination on the suitability of Yucca Mountain as the site for the Nation's permanent geologic repository, the Committee believes that it is important that every effort be made to support the Department's schedule for the final Site Recommendation. The Environmental Protection Agency recently issued its final radiation standards for the Yucca Mountain repository. The next step will be for the NRC to conform its repository licensing regulations (10 C.F.R. part 963) to the newly-issued radiation standard. The NRC is to issue these regulations later this summer, and the Committee expects the NRC to adhere to this schedule. Timely issuance of these NRC regulations will allow the Department of Energy to promulgate its own siting guidelines shortly thereafter.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2001	$5,500,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	6,180,000
Recommended, 2002	6,180,000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 2001	+680,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2001	−$5,390,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	−5,933,000
Recommended, 2002	−5,933,000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 2001	−543,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2001	$110,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	247,000
Recommended, 2002	247,000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 2001	+137,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

By law, 96 percent of the budget authority appropriated to the Inspector General of the NRC must be recovered through the assessment of license and annual fees. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $6,180,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $680,000 over fiscal year 2001. The revenue estimate is $5,933,000, resulting in a net appropriation for the NRC Inspector General of $247,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriation, 2001	$2,894,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	3,100,000
Recommended, 2002	3,100,000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 2001	+206,000
Budget Estimate, 2002	.....

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 role of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board becomes especially critical as the Department approaches issuance of the final site recommendation for the repository site.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,100,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, the same as the budget request and an increase of $206,000 from fiscal year 2001 funding.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

Prohibition on Lobbying.—Section 501 provides that none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of Title 18, United States Code.

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

Drainage of the San Luis Unit.—Section 503 provides language clarifying the funding requirements for the San Luis Unit.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

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

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

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

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

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

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

[In millions of dollars]

	302(b) allocation		This bill	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	23,704	23,959	23,704	23,927
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....

STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

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

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

FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

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

	Millions
Budget Authority	23,704
Outlays:	
2002	15,420
2003	7,163
2004	1,073
2005	25
2006 and beyond	16

ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

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

	Millions
Budget authority	74
Fiscal year 2002 outlays resulting therefrom	12

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

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

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

> * * * of which $10,649,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $32,442,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund; of which such amounts as may be necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund; * * *
>
> * * * Provided, That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriations under this heading: * * *

Under Title III, Departmental Administration:

> * * * That of the funds provided to the Department of Energy under title III of Public Law 105–277 for activities related to achieving Year 2000 conversion of Federal information technology systems and related expenses, remaining balances, estimated to be $1,480,000, may be transferred to this account, and shall remain available until expended, for continuation of information technology enhancement activities.

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 is also included under General Investigations which directs the Secretary of the Army to use funds to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Murrieta Creek, California, project; directs the Secretary of the Army to use a certain report as the basis for the Rock Creek-Keefer Slough, California, project; and provides that the Southwest Valley Flood Reduction Study in New Mexico shall include an evaluation of flood damage reduction measures that would otherwise be excluded from the feasibility analysis based on certain restrictive policies.

Language has been included under Construction, General, permitting the use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and which provides that $15,000,000 of the funds appropriated shall be deposited in the San Gabriel Restoration Fund. Language is also provided under Construction, General, which directs the Secretary of the Army to modify the Carr Creek Lake, Kentucky, project at full Federal expense, which directs the Secretary of the Army to undertake design deficiency repairs to the Bois Brule Levee and Drainage District, Missouri, project, and which directs the Secretary of the Army to increase the level of protection for the Bois Brule Levee and Drainage District, Missouri, project. Language is also included which directs the Secretary of the Army to construct the locally preferred plan for the Middlesex Borough element of the Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-Basin, New Jersey, project.

Language has been included under Operation and Maintenance, General, stating the following:

> * * * including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; * * *

Language has been included under Operation and Maintenance, General, providing for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities and permitting the use of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Language is also included

under Operation and Maintenance, General, which directs the Secretary of the Army to perform cultural resource mitigation and recreation improvements at Waco Lake, Texas; which directs the Secretary of the Army to grade the basin Hansen Dam in California; and which directs the Secretary of the Army to investigate the development of an upland disposal recycling program.

Language has been included under the Regulatory Program regarding the regulation of navigable waters and wetlands.

Language has been included under General Expenses regarding support of the Humphreys Engineer Support Center Activity, the Institute for Water Resources and headquarters support functions at the USACE Finance Center. Language is also included under General Expenses prohibiting the use of other title I funds for the Office of the Chief of Engineers and the division offices. Language is also included prohibiting the use of funds to support an office of congressional affairs within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers.

Language has been included under Administrative Provision providing that funds are available for purchase and hire of motor vehicles.

Language is included under General Provisions as follows:

Sec. 101. The Committee has included language which amends the authorization for the San Gabriel Basin Restoration, California, program so that the San Gabriel Water Authority shall receive credit for prior expenditures.

Sec. 102. The Committee has included language which provides that the dredge McFARLAND may only be operated in a ready reserve status for urgent dredging, emergencies, and in support of national defense.

Sec. 103. The Committee has included language which directs the Secretary of the Army to include an alternatives analysis of a multipurpose Auburn Dam as part of the American River watershed, California, long-term study.

Sec. 104. The Committee has included language directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer property at Tuttle Creek Lake, Kansas, to the Blue Township Fire District, Blue Township, Kansas.

Sec. 105. The Committee has included language which directs the Secretary of the Army to carry out shore protection projects in accordance with the cost sharing provisions contained in existing Project Cooperation Agreements.

Sec. 106. The Committee has included language which provides that none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to revise the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual if such revision provides for an increase in the springtime water release program during the spring heavy rainfall and snow melt period in States that have rivers draining into the Missouri River below the Gavins Point Dam.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

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

guage is included under Water and Related Resources providing that such sums as necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund. Language is included under Water and Related Resources which permits fund transfers within the overall appropriation to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund. Language is provided under Water and Related Resources providing that funds may be used for activities under Public Law 106–163. Language is included under Water and Related Resources providing that funds may be used for work carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps. Language is included under Water and Related Resources providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund or the special fee account established by 16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(i). Language is included under Water and Related Resources which provides that funds contributed by non-Federal entities shall be available for expenditure. Language is included providing that funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation facilities are to be credited to the Water and Related Resources account. Language is also included permitting the use of funds available for the Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program for site remediation on a nonreimbursable basis. Language is included under Water and Related Resources amending the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act.

Language has been included under the Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund.

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

Language has been included under 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 may be used for activities budgeted as policy and administration expenses.

Language has been provided under General Provisions in section 201 which provides that none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used by the Bureau of Reclamation to issue permits, either directly or by making funds available to an entity under a contract, for commercial rafting activities within the Auburn State Recreation Area, California, until the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act are met. The Committee has included language in section 202 which amends the authorization for the American and Sacramento Rivers, California, project.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Language has been included under Nuclear Waste Disposal providing that funds appropriated to the State of Nevada shall be made solely to the Nevada Division of Emergency Management for oversight activities.

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 En-

ergy 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 that 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.

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

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 the Bonneville Power Administration account 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 to permit Southwestern to utilize reimbursements, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and to provide not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

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.

Language has been included under the Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration account providing $1,227,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to Title IV of the Reclamation Projects Act of 1992, and 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 the 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 previous appropriation acts.

Language has been included under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to prohibit the Commission from using funds appropriated in this or any other Act to complete the reamining reviews and issue further authorizations to proceed with the Gulfstream Natural Gas Project.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, providing that management and operating contracts must be awarded using competitive procedures unless Congress is notified 60 days in advance.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, 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, prohibiting the use of funds to augment the funding provided for section 3161 of Public Law 102–484.

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

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, 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, 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, prohibiting the use of laboratory directed research and development from programs and/or funds that were appropriated by Congress in other than Energy and Water Development Appropriations acts.

Language has been included that directs the Secretary of Energy to submit a plan to Congress containing an implementation plan for transferring from the Department of Energy the regulatory authority over nuclear safety and worker safety at the Department's science laboratories.

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

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Language has been included under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission allowing the purchase of promotional items for use in recruiting new employees. Language is also included to permit the

NRC to utilize revenues collected to offset appropriations, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

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

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 requiring, to the greatest extent practicable, that all equipment and products purchased should be American-made, and prohibiting contracts with persons falsely labeling products as "Made in America."

Language has been included under General Provisions prohibiting the use of funds to determine the point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit until development by the Secretary of Interior and the State of California of a plan to minimize the impact of drainage waters, and directing the Secretary of Interior to classify the costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program as reimbursable or nonreimbursable.

COMPLIANCE WITH CLAUSE 3 OF RULE XIII (RAMSEYER RULE)

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

The accompanying bill would amend section 110(3)(B)(ii) of Division B, title I of Public Law 106–554 as follows:

(ii) Non-Federal Responsibility.—The San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority shall be responsible for providing the non-Federal amount required by clause (i). The State of California, local government agencies, and private entities may provide all or any portion of such amount*: Provided, That the Secretary shall credit the San Gabriel Water Quality Authority with the value of all prior expenditures by the non-Federal interests that are compatible with the purposes of this Act.*

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

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

The accompanying bill would amend section 101(a)(6)(C) of the Water Resources Development Act as follows:

[(C) Makeup of Water Shortages Caused By Flood Control Operation.—The Secretary of the Interior shall enter into, or modify, such agreements with the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency regarding the operation of Folsom Dam and reservoir as may be necessary in order that, notwithstanding any prior agreement or provision of law, 100 percent of the water needed to make up for any water shortage caused by variable flood control operation during any year at Folsom Dam and resulting in a significant impact on recreation at Folsom Reservoir shall be replaced, to the extent the water is available for purchase, by the Secretary of the Interior.]

(C) Makeup of Water Shortages Caused By Flood Control Operation.—The Secretary of the Interior shall enter into, or modify, such agreements with the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency regarding the operation of Folsom Dam and Reservoir, as may be necessary, in order that, notwithstanding any prior agreement or provision of law, 100 percent of the water needed to make up for any water shortage caused by variable flood control operation during any year at Folsom Dam and resulting in a significant impact to the environment or to recreation shall be replaced, to the extent that water is available, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with 100 percent of the cost of such available water borne by the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Agency/program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriations in last year of authorization	Appropriations in this bill
Corps of Engineers:				
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	(1)	(1)	(1)	140,000
Department of Energy:				
Energy Supply:				
Biomass/Biofuels	1993	(2)	(4)	88,960
Geothermal Energy	1993	23,000	(4)	27,000
Hydrogen	2001	40,000	27,000	27,000
Hydropower	1982	11,700	(4)	3,000
Solar Energy	1993	(2)	(4)	94,657
Wind Energy Systems	1993	(2)	(4)	40,000
Electric energy systems & electric storage systems	1994	(3)	(4)	60,000
Renewable Energy Production Incentive	1995	(7)	(4)	4,000
International Renewable Energy Program	1996	(3)	(4)	3,000
Departmental Energy Management	1984	(3)	(4)	2,500
Renewable Program Support	1984	(3)	(4)	3,000
National Renewable Energy Laboratory	1984	(3)	(4)	5,000
Program Direction	1984	(3)	(4)	18,700
Nuclear Energy:				
Advanced Radioisotope Power System	1992	(2)	(4)	28,200
Isotopes	1974	(2)	(4)	16,177
University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support	1974	(2)	(4)	15,895
Research and Development	1994	(7)	(4)	32,579
Infrastructure	1974	(2)	(4)	80,259
Nuclear Facilities Management	1974	(2)	(4)	30,250
Program Direction	1992	(2)	(4)	20,500
Environment, Safety and Health	1974	(2)	(4)	31,500
Technical Information Management	1981	(2)	(4)	7,870

[In thousands of dollars]

Agency/program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriations in last year of authorization	Appropriations in this bill
Non-Defense Environmental Management	1984	([5])	([5])	227,872
West Valley Demonstration Project	1981	5,000	5,000	85,115
Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation:				
Other Uranium Activities	1974	([2])	([4])	120,784
Science	1984	500,000	635,417	3,166,395
High Energy Physics	1984	([3])	477,947	716,100
Nuclear Physics	1984	([3])	155,220	361,510
Biological and Environmental Research	1994	([3])	388,298	445,880
Basic Energy Sciences	1994	([3])	743,590	1,006,705
Advanced Scientific Computing Research	1996	169,000	111,068	163,050
Energy Research Analysis	1994	([3])	3,507	1,000
Multiprogram Energy Laboratories	1994	([3])	39,327	30,175
Fusion Energy Sciences	1994	380,000	322,277	248,495
Facilities and Infrastructure	([6])	([6])	([6])	10,000
Program Direction	1984	([2])	([4])	134,980
Nuclear Waste Disposal	([8])	([2])	190,654	133,000
Departmental Administration	1984	246,963	185,682	209,611
Office of the Inspector General	1984	([2])	14,670	32,430
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:				
National Nuclear Security Administration:				
Weapons Activities	2001	4,840,289	5,006,153	5,123,888
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2001	877,467	872,273	845,341
Naval Reactors	2001	694,600	688,645	688,045
Office of the NNSA Administrator	2001	10,000	9,978	10,000
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	2001	5,973,692	4,963,533	5,174,539
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	2001	([9])	1,080,331	1,092,878
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	2001	([10])	65,000	143,208
Other Defense Activities	2001	523,822	582,466	487,464
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	2001	112,000	199,725	310,000
Power Marketing Administrations:				
Southeastern Power Administration	1984	24,240	39,463	39,354
Southwestern Power Administration	1984	40,254	29,288	29,838
Western Area Power Administration	1984	259,700	237,037	358,289
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund	1995	([2])	2,663	2,663
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	1984	275,000	175,200	181,155
Independent Agencies:				
Appalachian Regional Commission	2001	70,000	66,254	71,290
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	2001	18,500	18,459	18,500
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	1985	460,000	448,200	516,900
Nuclear Regulatory Commission—Office of Inspector General	1985	([11])	([11])	6,180

[1] Program was initiated in 1972 and has never received a separate authorization.
[2] No amount specified.
[3] Authorized level provided for multiple programs with no separate program allowances.
[4] Funding for these activities was spread throughout multiple programs with no individual amount specified.
[5] Funding for these activities was spread throughout many programs with no amount specified. The last year of authorization was 1984. In 1989, cleanup activities were merged into the non-defense environmental management appropriation account. There has not been a separate authorization for this account.
[6] New program in FY 2002.
[7] Such sums as necessary.
[8] Overall program authorized in 1982 and 1987, but without any authorization of appropriations.
[9] Authorization for defense facilities closure projects included within overall Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management authorization of $5,973,692,000.
[10] Net authorization of $0 (authorization of $90,092,000 for FY2001 less $90,092,000 in prior year balances).
[11] The first separate appropriation for the Office of Inspector General in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission was in FY 1990. Prior to that, the NRC–IG was included within the overall authorization and appropriation for the NRC.

Full Committee Votes

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the results of each rollcall vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

There were no rollcall votes.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2001 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2002

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	160,584	130,000	163,260	+2,676	+33,260
Construction, general	1,716,165	1,324,000	1,671,854	-44,311	+347,854
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	350,458	280,000	347,655	-2,803	+67,655
Operation and maintenance, general	1,897,775	1,745,000	1,864,464	-33,311	+119,464
Regulatory program	124,725	128,000	128,000	+3,275	.....
FUSRAP	139,692	140,000	140,000	+308	.....
General expenses	151,666	153,000	153,000	+1,334	.....
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	4,541,065	3,900,000	4,468,233	-72,832	+568,233
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	19,524	24,169	24,169	+4,645	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	14,136	10,749	10,749	-3,387	.....
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	4,989	.....	.....	-4,989	.....
Subtotal	38,649	34,918	34,918	-3,731	.....

Program oversight and administration	1,213	1,310	1,310	+97	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	39,862	36,228	36,228	-3,634	.....
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	678,953	647,997	691,160	+12,207	+43,163
Loan program	9,348	7,495	7,495	-1,853	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(26,941)	(26,000)	(26,000)	(-941)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund	38,360	55,039	55,039	+16,679	.....
California Bay-Delta restoration	.....	20,000	.....	.....	-20,000
Policy and administration	50,114	52,968	52,968	+2,854	.....
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	776,775	783,499	806,662	+29,887	+23,163
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	816,637	819,727	842,890	+26,253	+23,163
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	659,918	544,245	639,317	-20,601	+95,072
Non-defense environmental management	277,200	228,553	227,872	-49,328	-681
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation	392,502	363,425	393,425	+923	+30,000
Science	3,180,341	3,159,890	3,166,395	-13,946	+6,505
Nuclear Waste Disposal	190,654	134,979	133,000	-57,654	-1,979
Departmental administration	225,942	221,618	209,611	-16,331	-12,007
Miscellaneous revenues	-151,000	-137,810	-137,810	+13,190	.....
Net appropriation	74,942	83,808	71,801	-3,141	-12,007
Office of the Inspector General	31,430	31,430	32,430	+1,000	+1,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2001 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2002—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function	(6,108,864)	(5,740,783)	(6,410,625)	(+301,761)	(+669,842)
Non-defense function	(669,702)	(591,978)	(621,297)	(-48,405)	(+29,319)
Total	(6,778,566)	(6,332,761)	(7,031,922)	(+253,356)	(+699,161)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	5,006,153	5,300,025	5,123,888	+117,735	-176,137
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	872,273	773,700	845,341	-26,932	+71,641
Naval reactors	688,645	688,045	688,045	-600	.....
Office of the Administrator	9,978	15,000	10,000	+22	-5,000
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	6,577,049	6,776,770	6,667,274	+90,225	-109,496
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	4,963,533	4,548,708	5,174,539	+211,006	+625,831
Defense facilities closure projects	1,080,331	1,050,538	1,092,878	+12,547	+42,340
Defense environmental management privatization	65,000	141,537	143,208	+78,208	+1,671
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	6,108,864	5,740,783	6,410,625	+301,761	+669,842
Other defense activities	582,466	527,614	487,464	-95,002	-40,150
Defense nuclear waste disposal	199,725	310,000	310,000	+110,275	.....
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	13,468,104	13,355,167	13,875,363	+407,259	+520,196

Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	3,891	4,891	4,891	+1,000	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	28,038	28,038	28,038	.....	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	165,465	169,465	172,165	+6,700	+2,700
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,663	2,663	2,663	.....	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	200,057	205,057	207,757	+7,700	+2,700
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	175,200	181,155	181,155	+5,955	.....
Revenues applied	-175,200	-181,155	-181,155	-5,955	.....
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission)	-75,000	.....	.....	+75,000	.....
Defense environmental privatization (rescission)	-97,000	.....	.....	+97,000	.....
Total, title III, Department of Energy	18,303,148	18,106,554	18,747,360	+444,212	+640,806
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	66,254	66,290	71,290	+5,036	+5,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,459	18,500	18,500	+41	.....
Delta Regional Authority	19,956	19,992	.....	-19,956	-19,992
Denali Commission	29,934	29,939	.....	-29,934	-29,939
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	481,825	506,900	516,900	+35,075	+10,000
Revenues	-447,958	-463,248	-473,520	-25,562	-10,272
Subtotal	33,867	43,652	43,380	+9,513	-272

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2001 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2002—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General	5,500	6,180	6,180	+680	.....
Revenues	-5,390	-5,932	-5,933	-543	-1
Subtotal	110	248	247	+137	-1
Total	33,977	43,900	43,627	+9,650	-273
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,894	3,100	3,100	+206	.....
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	171,474	181,721	136,517	-34,957	-45,204
TITLE V - EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL					
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Cerro Grande fire activities (contingent emergency appropriations)	203,012	.....	.....	-203,012	.....
Appalachian Regional Commission (contingent emergency appropriations)	10,976	.....	.....	-10,976	.....
Total, title V, Emergency Supplemental	213,988	.....	.....	-213,988	.....

Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	24,046,312	23,008,002	24,195,000	+148,688	+1,186,998
Appropriations	(24,004,324)	(23,008,002)	(24,195,000)	(+190,676)	(+1,186,998)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(213,988)	.....	.....	(-213,988)	.....
Rescissions	(-172,000)	.....	.....	(+172,000)	.....
(By transfer)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

OVERVIEW

The Majority fully cooperated with the Minority to develop this bill. It fairly represents the views of both. It is a bipartisan bill that Democrats can and will support.

It is not a perfect bill since it overemphasizes funding for nuclear weapons and does not contain sufficient funding to address the nation's energy crisis. But given the constraints that are imposed on the Committee by the Majority's budget resolution, which preclude the Committee from fully addressing the nation's energy and water needs in this bill, it is nonetheless a reasonable and prudent response to the Administration's budget proposals. The Administration proposed unwarranted reductions to water programs, non-proliferation of nuclear materials in Russia, renewable energy technologies, and environmental cleanup of nuclear weapons production sites. This bill rejects that approach, and instead restores funding to these important programs near the funding levels appropriated by Congress last year.

We commend the Majority for working with Democrats to fashion another bipartisan appropriations bill this year. We appreciate the many courtesies the Majority showed us as the bill was being developed, and the professionalism of the Majority staff.

RESPONSE TO THE NATIONAL ENERGY CRISIS

The major weakness of this bill is that it contains no significant increase in funding to address the nation's energy crisis or the President's recent National Energy Policy. It does not take a number of simple and straightforward steps that could be critical in boosting the near term availability of electrical power, protecting consumers from the extreme price gouging occurring in some segments of the industry and insulating the American economy from further damage from rising energy prices. It also does not invest a sufficient amount in developing renewable energy alternatives to fossil fuels.

That is deeply disturbing since the recent House-passed Supplemental Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001 and this bill are the best and—perhaps only—legislative vehicles that can put resources in place quickly to mitigate the national energy crisis. The Majority has missed the key opportunity to respond to the national energy crisis by failing to properly address these issues in the appropriations bills.

THE ENERGY PROBLEM

The problems facing Americans today are in some respects quite different from those the country faced last fall when Appropriations were enacted for the current fiscal year. With gasoline prices up as

much as 50 cents a gallon over the last year, a typical two car family can expect to pay about $600 a year more to the oil companies and see a similar increase in heating and electrical costs. This is about a thousand or so dollars per household that won't be available for replacing the family car, buying new clothes or saving for college education. As a result many businesses are suffering and the whole economy has gotten softer.

While higher energy prices have affected households in every part of the United States, the impact on the West Coast has been much more severe. Many Americans in other parts of the United States are still not aware of how serious the situation is in the West and how much it may impact the overall national economy. Because more than one in eight Americans live in the three West Coast states and because so much of our export oriented and high tech industries are concentrated in those states, serious economic disruptions on the coast are certain to have a big impact on the economies of virtually all of the 47 other states.

Fluctuations in the cost of energy have played a major role in the performance of the American economy since the early 1970s. Rising fuel prices have contributed to at least three recessions over the last three decades and falling fuel prices have caused dislocations and bankruptcies in our own energy producing states and wreaked serious havoc with the entire international financial system.

The current situation differs from those of the past in that it is caused not only by an imbalance between the demand and supply of fossil fuels but also by serious emerging structural problems in the industries that generate and transmit electricity. While California and the West Coast provide the most obvious examples of these problems they are not strictly West Coast problems.

The deregulation and restructuring of the electrical utility industry that began more than a decade ago has left investors with considerable uncertainty as to how far deregulation will eventually go and how competitive the market for electricity will be. As a result there has been little growth in capacity for either generating or transmitting electrical power even though the economy has grown at a remarkable pace for most of that same period. As demand for electricity began to approach the capacity to generate it some producers came to realize that by withholding output they could force significantly higher prices in the newly deregulated environment. As a result, consumers are faced with a market that is neither competitive nor regulated.

Western States

There are three fundamental reasons that this problem is more severe in California and on the West Coast. First, California's attempt at deregulation was particularly inept. Wholesale prices were unleashed while retail prices remained regulated. That worked only as long as the price of the oil and natural gas used for generating electricity continued to fall. Once oil and gas prices began to rise, retail suppliers were caught in an untenable squeeze and consumers were given no incentive to conserve.

Second, the national power grid has never had significant capacity to transmit electricity from east of the Rockies to California and the West Coast. As a result, there is much less competition in the

wholesale electricity market in the West than in other parts of the country.

Third, the West has relied more heavily on hydroelectric power than most other parts of the country. Hydroelectric power is dependent on rainfall and the Pacific Northwest where most of the dams are located has been suffering from a severe drought.

The combination of these factors has produced not only dramatic increases in the price of electricity but also in blackouts that jeopardize production and profitability in a wide array of industries. Producers are typically charging between 10 and 30 times the historical rate for electricity and in some instances they have been able to charge as much as 129 times the historical rate. Typical homeowners in many parts of the state have seen their monthly electricity bills go from $100 to more than $800. In some communities more than half of all small businesses are either in bankruptcy or in the process of applying for bankruptcy protection. A significant number of larger employers have actually shut down operations. In total, electricity costs in California have gone from $7 billion a year to around $70 billion. Even in a state with a trillion dollar a year economy, that is a huge diversion of GDP from other sectors of the economy to the utility companies.

That means that states like Wisconsin that produce capital goods have seen their California markets evaporate and now have surplus inventories. States like Michigan, Ohio and Missouri are seeing layoffs in the automobile industry. Sales are off in the publishing, recording and household products industries largely because of the bite the electricity market in California is taking out of that state's ability to grow and consume products from other parts of the United States.

What can be done?

The United States faces both short-term and long-term problems with respect to energy. Under existing technologies our growing economy requires more and more energy, makes us more and more dependent on oil from the Persian Gulf, and therefore inevitably more vulnerable to political disruptions in that part of the world. At the same time it increases air and water pollution and jeopardizes the global climate. Finding ways to reduce our consumption of energy will help control prices, improve the quality of our air and water and reduce the vulnerability of our economy to events in Southwest Asia. Finding alternative forms of energy will also help achieve all three of those objectives. Those activities require the kind of long term and high-risk investments that the private sector is not likely to undertake and they should be funded in our regular appropriation bills as the high priority investments which any sensible assessment of our economic and security needs indicate they deserve.

The Democrats on the Committee have recently proposed initiatives dealing with separate portions of the energy crisis. These include *temporary* cost-of-service price limits in Western states; $350 million for national electric power grid improvement loans; and $125 million for national hydroelectric power improvement loans. None of them were considered for inclusion in this bill.

Alternative renewable energy sources

The Department of Energy leads the national research effort to develop clean, competitive, and reliable renewable energy and power delivery technologies for the 21st century.

The combination of environmental concerns, current and potential constraints of large system power transmission and distribution systems, and technological advances are all causing distributed and hybrid systems and technologies such as combined heat and power system, fuel cells, photovoltaics, wind turbines, geothermal, and biomass systems to gradually augment and eventually replace conventional large-scale power generating technologies. This is the best way to reduce pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions from power generation within the United States in the long term.

Although regulated utilities traditionally invested in power generation R&D, increased competitive pressures from the ongoing restructuring of the U.S. electric power industry has forced utilities and other companies to reduce or eliminate their R&D budgets. This makes federal R&D essential. This bill fails to make investments that are needed to address the national energy crisis in the *near term* by getting R&D out of the lab and into use:

The bill includes no funds for the "Million Solar Roofs" initiative, which is a bipartisan cost-shared partnership between the Department of Energy and states and local communities to get solar technology out of the labs and into practical applications;

The bill includes no funds for the "Wind Powering America" initiative, which is a bipartisan cost-shared partnership between the Department of Energy and states and local communities to deploy advanced wind turbine technology'

The bill includes no funds for "Geopowering the West", which is a bipartisan cost-shared partnership between the Department of Energy and states and local communities to deploy geothermal power generation projects;

The bill contains very little for distributed energy resources, an area that the Department of Energy has recently concluded offers potentially high payoff in the future by reducing energy loss over long transmission distances.

The bill also fails to start increased investments in R&D that are needed to address the national energy crisis in the *far term* to meet goals set by the Department of Energy to:

Triple installed U.S. electricity generation capacity of non-hydroelectric renewable energy resources by 2015;

Overcome barriers to distributed power to achieve a 20 percent market penetration of new generation capacity by 2012;

Maintain the high reliability of the Nation's transmission and distribution systems during a period of increased consumer demand for electricity, while enduring numerous constraints on siting and building new transmission and distribution systems; and

To launch an ethanol industry by having (A) at least one ethanol production facility using agricultural and/or municipal solid wastes operational or under construction by 2004 and (B) a demonstration at a commercial facility in 2005 using an en-

ergy crop or closely related biomass to demonstrate a tenfold cost reduction for converting biomass to ethanol.

These are the things the Majority should have properly funded in this bill for fiscal year 2002 if they believe the President when he says there is an energy crisis.

AUBURN DAM

This bill contains legislation on Auburn Dam that should not be adopted because it is not good public policy.

Section 103 of the bill directs the Army Corps of Engineers to include a multi-purpose detention dam in Auburn, California as part of the Final Supplemental Plan Formulation Report for the American River Watershed which is currently estimated to be published in August, 2001. Ongoing studies underway by the Corps of Engineers are limited only to flood control aspects of the American River. The Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers testified to the Committee earlier this year that "Our belief is that carrying through the study as it is presently designed is probably the best way to go at this time."

This provision would delay the report and prevent Sacramento, California from securing additional flood protection for up to 14 additional years. Sacramento has been identified by the Corps of Engineers as the city with the least amount of flood protection for a city of its size in the nation. Over half a million people and more than $40 billion in property and infrastructure would be impacted by a flood in Sacremento, which is the capitol to the world's sixth largest economy.

Current estimates of the cost of a multipurpose Auburn dam are roughly $2.5 billion. Construction of the dam was halted in the mid-1970s after a regional earthquake revealed multiple fault lines near the construction site. Auburn dam no longer enjoys support from local, state, or federal agencies. Its construction would do major environmental damage to a pristine part of California.

The bill contains other legislative provisions, relating to the use of water within the region and to recreational rafting, that are aimed at putting roadblocks in place to pressure certain groups to support the Auburn dam project. These provisions are also improper, and should be removed from the bill.

CONCLUSION

It is a shame that this appropriations bill contains nothing of substance to address the immediate needs of American citizens who face a national energy crisis according to the President. The citizens in Western States will endure more hardship as the summer unfolds. Democrats offer national initiatives for real near-term solutions that could be implemented quickly on a bipartisan basis. It is unfortunate that Republicans reject such proposals, and instead have produced this appropriations bill that fails to respond to the national energy crisis in any meaningful way.

DAVID R. OBEY.

○