AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

107TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 107–681

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2003

SEPTEMBER 24, 2002.—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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 5431]

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, 2003, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page Number Bill	Page Number Report
Introduction	.....	5
I. Department of Defense—Civil:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
Introduction	.....	7
General investigations	2	8
Construction, general	3	38
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	6	62
Operation and maintenance, general	6	66
Regulatory program	8	88
Revolving fund	.....	88
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	8	89
General expenses	8	90
Administrative provisions	9	.....
General provisions	9	92
II. Department of the Interior:		
Central Utah Project completion account	11	93

81–857

	Page Number Bill	Report
Bureau of Reclamation:		
Water and related resources	11	93
Bureau of Reclamation loan program account	.....	.....
Central Valley Project restoration fund	13	107
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	.....	108
Policy and administration	14	108
Administrative provision	14	.....
General provisions	14	109
III. Department of Energy:		
Introduction	.....	111
Energy supply	18	116
Non-defense environmental management	18	124
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation	19	127
Science	19	128
Nuclear waste disposal	19	134
Departmental administration	21	136
Office of Inspector General	22	138
Atomic energy defense activities:		
National Nuclear Security Administration:		
Weapons activities	22	141
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	24	149
Naval reactors	24	155
Office of the administrator	25	155
Environmental and Other Defense Activities:		
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	25	156
Environmental management cleanup reform	25	159
Defense facilities closure projects	26	160
Defense environmental management privatization	26	161
Other defense activities	27	162
Defense nuclear waste disposal	27	165
Power marketing administrations:		
Bonneville Power Administration	27	166
Southeastern Power Administration	28	167
Southwestern Power Administration	28	168
Western Area Power Administration	29	168
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	30	169
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	30	169
General provisions	31	184
IV. Independent agencies:		
Appalachian Regional Commission	36	187
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	37	187
Delta Regional Authority	.....	188
Denali Commission	.....	188
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	37	188
Office of Inspector General	38	191
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	38	191
V. General provisions	39	193
House reporting requirements	.....	195
Additional Views of Honorable David R. Obey	.....	213

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in the Budget of the United States Government, 2003. The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 2002, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2003.

[In thousands of dollars]

	2002	2003 estimate	2003 recommendation	2003 recommendation compared with—	
				2002 appropriation	2003 estimate
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	4,657,096	4,172,954	4,765,712	108,616	592,758
Title II—Department of the Interior	951,520	881,149	947,520	(4,000)	66,371
Title III—Department of Energy	19,966,226	20,894,976	20,675,871	709,645	(219,105)
Title IV—Independent Agencies	220,517	214,378	151,897	(68,620)	(62,481)
Subtotal	25,795,359	26,163,457	26,541,000	745,641	377,543
Scorekeeping adjustments	(490,000)	(286,476)	(514,000)	(24,000)	(227,524)
Grand Total of bill	25,305,359	25,876,981	26,027,000	721,641	150,019

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2003 totals $26,027,000,000, which is $857,041,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2002 (excluding supplemental appropriations), and $150,019,000 above the President's budget request. 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 Department of Energy to continue work to ready Yucca Mountain to receive the nation's nuclear waste; maintaining the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile; and accelerating the cleanup of contaminated Department of Energy sites.

Title I of the bill provides $4,765,712,000 for the programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, an increase of $279,616,000 over fiscal year 2002 and $592,758,000 over the budget request of $4,172,954,000. The Committee has provided a modest increase 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 also included funds for a limited number of new studies and construction projects.

Title II provides $947,520,000 for the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, $33,259,000 over the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2002 and $66,371,000 over the budget request of $881,149,000. The Committee has not provided funding for the California Bay-Delta Restoration program in California pending the enactment of authorizing legislation.

Title III provides $20,675,871,000 for the Department of Energy, an increase of $806,045,000 over fiscal year 2002 and $219,105,000 below the budget request of $20,894,976,000. Basic research and science programs are supported at a level consistent with fiscal year 2002. In addition, $7.5 billion is provided for environmental cleanup programs to remediate contaminated defense and non-defense sites throughout the nation, and $524.7 million is provided for the nuclear waste 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 $7,908,417,000, an increase of $317,952,000 over fiscal year 2002 and a decrease of $114,932,000 from the budget request. For nuclear nonproliferation, the Committee has provided $1,167,630,000, an increase of $138,044,000 over fiscal year 2002 and $54,000,000 over the budget request.

Title IV provides $151,897,000 for several Independent Agencies, a decrease of $68,620,000 from fiscal year 2002 and a decrease of $62,481,000 below the budget request of $214,378,000. 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.

ACCRUAL FUNDING OF RETIREMENT COSTS AND POST-RETIREMENT HEALTH BENEFITS

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

Without passing judgment on the merits of this legislative proposal, the Committee has reduced the dollar amounts of the President's request shown in the "Comparative Statement of New Budget Authority" and other tables in this report to exclude the accrual funding proposal. The disposition by Congress of the legislative proposal is unclear at this time. Should the proposal be passed by Congress and enacted, the Committee will make appropriate adjustments to the President's request to include accrual amounts.

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

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

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The Committee views with growing concern the continuing low levels 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 for fiscal year 2003 is about $450 million below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2002. At the level of funding recommended by the Administration for fiscal year 2002 and 2003, many ongoing construction projects would be negatively impacted. In addition, the budget does not request funds for any new studies and only a single new construction project. The Committee is concerned that the Administration has not yet come to realize 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 in property damage, to say nothing of the incalculable value of lives saved, 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 2003, the Committee has recommended $4,615,712,000 for the Civil Works functions of the Corps of Engineers, $583,056,000 over the amount requested by the Administration (the total amount of $4,765,712,000 recommended for the Corps of Engineers includes $150,000,000 for the Formerly Uses Sites Remedial Action Program). Even at this level, the Commit-

tee's recommendation funds many ongoing projects at well below their optimum levels. The Committee has included a number of new construction projects and studies in the belief that the water resources development needs of the Nation are growing and cannot be met with just the projects currently underway.

Finally, the Committee reminds the Administration that it has made every reasonable effort to undertake a dialog to learn the reasons why our Nation's infrastructure needs are of such low priority to the Administration. The Committee stands ready to engage in that dialog at any time.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 2002	$154,350,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	102,483,000
Recommended, 2003	143,680,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−10,670,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	+41,197,000

Note: The original budget request of $108,000,000 for General Investigations included $5,517,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since no legislation has been enacted, the budget request for General Investigations has been reduced by this amount.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
ALABAMA				
ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL.....	300	---	627	---
BALDWIN COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, AL.....	100	---	200	---
BALDWIN COUNTY WATERSHEDS, AL.....	100	---	100	---
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL.....	50	---	50	---
BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL.....	150	---	150	---
CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL.....	50	---	50	---
DOG RIVER, AL.....	150	---	500	---
SPRING CREEK, TUSCUMBIA, AL.....	---	---	200	---
TUSCALOOSA COUNTY, AL.....	50	---	50	---
VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	250	---	250	---
ALASKA				
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK.....	---	200	---	200
ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	50	---
ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK.....	50	---	50	---
ANIAK HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	50	---
BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK.....	200	---	200	---
CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK.....	50	---	50	---
DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK.....	150	---	150	---
FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK.....	---	25	---	25
HAINES HARBOR, AK.....	---	115	---	115
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	50	---
KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	200	---
LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK.....	115	---	115	---
MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	50	---
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK.....	50	---	50	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
SAINT GEORGE NAVIGATION IMPROVEMETS, AK	75	---	75	---
SAND POINT HARBOR, AK	---	50	---	50
SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK	50	---	50	---
SITKA HARBOR, AK	50	---	50	---
SKAGWAY HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK	45	---	45	---
SKAGWAY RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, AK	50	---	50	---
UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK	50	---	50	---
UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	144	---	144	---
VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	---	150	---	150
WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK	50	---	50	---
AMERICA SOMOA				
TUTUILA HARBOR, AS	100	---	100	---
ARIZONA				
AGUA FRIA RIVER, AZ	100	---	100	---
NAVAJO NATION, AZ, NM & UT	100	---	300	---
PIMA COUNTY, AZ	200	---	1,130	---
RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	150	---	690	---
RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	---	150	---	---
RIO SALADO OESTE, SALT RIVER, AZ	150	---	150	---
SANTA CRUZ RIVER, GRANT RD TO FT LOWELL RD, AZ	50	---	50	---
SANTA CRUZ RIVER, PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS, AZ	200	---	750	---
TRES RIOS, AZ	---	350	---	---
TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	---	100	---	---
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT, AZ	200	---	1,100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
ARKANSAS				
ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEES, AR	---	50	---	200
ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, AR & OK	910	---	910	---
MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	---	100	---	100
NORTH LITTLE ROCK, DARK HOLLOW, AR	---	200	---	300
PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	---	150	---	300
WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO	400	---	400	---
WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOWS, AR	150	---	150	---
WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR	---	---	---	100
CALIFORNIA				
ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA	250	---	400	---
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	1,275	---	---
ARANA GULCH WATERSHED, CA	50	---	50	---
ARROYO DE LA LAGUNA, CA	---	---	100	---
ARROYO SECO WATERSHED RESTORATION, CA	100	---	100	---
BALLONA CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	100	---	200	---
BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	---	200	---	200
CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CA	---	---	200	---
CITY OF NORWALK, CA	---	---	---	200
CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CA	---	---	400	---
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	100	---	100	---
COAST OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTH COAST REGION, LA COUNTY, CA	---	---	250	---
COYOTE DAM, CA	50	---	50	---
DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CA	---	---	---	300
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, CA	---	---	---	200
ESTUDILLO CANAL, CA	---	---	100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
FOLSOM DAM, CA	---	---	100	---
GRAYSON AND MURDERER'S CREEKS, CA	200	---	200	---
LAGUNA CREEK WATERSHED, CA	---	---	100	---
LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	200	---	200	---
LAKE ELSINORE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	100	---	100	---
LLAGAS CREEK, CA	---	225	---	400
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	150	---	150	---
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA (CORNFIELDS), CA	---	---	100	---
LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, WOODLAND AND VICINITY,	---	200	---	300
LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	---	200	---	500
MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	200	---	200	---
MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	25	---	25	---
MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	170	---	300	---
MATILIJA DAM, CA	150	---	300	---
MIDDLE CREEK, CA	---	50	---	50
MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	200	---	300	---
MUGU LAGOON, CA	100	---	400	---
N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	200	---	200	---
N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	100	---	100	---
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	100	---	901	---
NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	150	---	150	---
NEWPORT BAY (LA-3 SITE DESIGNATION), CA	---	---	250	---
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	---	100	---	---
NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA	200	---	319	---
OCEAN BEACH, CA	50	---	50	---
ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	200	---	200	---
ORANGE COUNTY COAST BEACH EROSION, CA	---	---	400	---
ORANGE COUNTY SAMP, CA	---	---	400	---
PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	---	275	---	600

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA	100	---	100	---
PINE FLAT DAM, FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION,	---	200	---	200
PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	100	---	100	---
POSO CREEK, CA	100	---	300	---
PRADO BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	50	---	50	---
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SAMP, CA	---	---	1,000	---
ROCK CREEK AND KEEFER SLOUGH, CA	---	25	---	25
RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	200	---	200	---
SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	100	---	100	---
SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY,	2,973	---	2,973	---
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA	50	---	300	---
SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA	100	---	398	---
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SAMP, CA	---	---	700	---
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	---	---	500	---
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	225	---	300	---
SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA	100	---	400	---
SAN JOAQUIN RB, W STANISLAUS, DEL PUERTO & SALADO CREE	100	---	100	---
SAN JOAQUIN RB, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, ORESTIMBA CREE	---	100	---	100
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	100	---	200	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES & MOKELUMNE RIVERS,	100	---	100	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA	100	---	300	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	100	---	100	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA	100	---	100	---
SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA	100	---	300	---
SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	240	---	240	---
SANTA ANA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BIG BEAR LAKE, CA	100	---	400	---
SANTA CLARA RIVER, CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	100	---	300	---
SANTA CRUZ PORT, CA	50	---	50	---
SANTA ROSA CREEK WATERSHED, CA	260	---	260	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
SANTA YNEZ RIVER, CA	50	---	50	---
SOLANA BEACH, CA	---	---	500	---
SONOMA CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	150	---	150	---
STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	100	---	100	---
SUTTER COUNTY, CA	677	---	677	---
TAHOE BASIN, CA & NV	690	---	690	---
TIJUANA RIVER VALLEY, CA	200	---	400	---
TUJUNGA WASH RESTORATION, CA	---	---	100	---
UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	---	---	---	300
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	559	---	559	---
UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	150	---	150	---
VENTURA AND SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	100	---	300	---
VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	150	---	150	---
WESTMINSTER, COYOTE AND CARBON CANYON CREEK WATERSHEDS	50	---	50	---
WESTMINSTER, EAST GARDEN GROVE, CA	200	---	400	---
WHITE RIVER AND DEER CREEK, CA	100	---	200	---
WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	---	---	---	500
WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	50	---	50	---
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	---	250	---	---
COLORADO				
CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO.	200	---	200	---
FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO	330	---	330	---
ZUNI AND SUN VALLEY REACHES, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER, CO	---	200	---	200
COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS				
ROTA HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI	25	---	25	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
TINIAN HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI	50	---	50	---
CONNECTICUT				
TREATMENT OF DREDGED MAT'L FROM LONG ISLAND SOUND, CT.	---	---	250	---
DELAWARE				
DELAWARE COAST, CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE	---	100	---	200
MID-DELAWARE RIVER BASIN, DE, NJ & PA	---	---	100	---
FLORIDA				
BISCAYNE BAY, FL	---	---	300	---
DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, FL	---	---	100	---
FLAGLER COUNTY, FL	---	---	100	---
HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL	280	---	280	---
LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	126	---	126	---
LIDO KEY, SARASOTA COUNTY FL	---	---	---	300
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	---	100	---	100
ST JOHNS COUNTY BEACHES, FL	---	---	100	---
ST LUCIE COUNTY BEACHES, FL	---	---	200	---
ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	---	100	---	500
WALTON COUNTY, FL	---	---	100	---
WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FL	271	---	271	---
GEORGIA				
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	186	---	500	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
ARABIA MOUNTAIN, GA	50	---	50	---
AUGUSTA, GA	230	---	230	---
INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS,	100	---	100	---
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	150	---	150	---
METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	50	---	50	---
NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA & SC	---	50	---	276
SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA	100	---	100	---
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	---	428	---	550
SAVANNAH HARBOR SEDIMENT CONTROL WORKS, GA & SC	50	---	50	---
SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA & SC	120	---	120	---
TYBEE ISLAND, NORTH SHORE, GA	---	---	100	---
UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA	150	---	150	---
GUAM				
HAGATNA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL	---	---	100	---
HAWAII				
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	135	---	135	---
BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	---	50	---	50
KAHUKU, HI	100	---	100	---
KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI	142	---	142	---
KIHEI AREA EROSION, HI	50	---	50	---
NAWILIWILI HARBOR MODIFICATION, KAUAI, HI	50	---	50	---
WAIKIKI EROSION CONTROL, HI	---	48	---	250
WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI	---	50	---	100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
IDAHO				
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	50	---	50	---
LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, ID	145	---	145	---
ILLINOIS				
ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	147	---	147	---
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	335	---	335	---
ILLINOIS RIVER AT BEARDSTOWN, IL	---	---	100	---
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	1,051	---	951	---
ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	365	---	365	---
KEITH CREEK, ROCKFORD, IL	---	---	100	---
PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	---	237	---	450
ROCK RIVER, IL & WI	182	---	276	---
UPPER MISS & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	1,000	---	3,685	---
UPPER MISS RVR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN & WI	1,814	---	1,814	---
UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	463	---	995	---
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	---	200	---	200
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	---	130	---	130
INDIANA				
FORT WAYNE, IN	---	---	---	150
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	248	---	500	---
INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	---	---	150	---
JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY	---	1,346	---	1,346

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
IOWA				
DAVENPORT, IA	---	61	---	225
DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	51	---	51	---
FORT DODGE, IA	87	---	100	---
LOWER DES MOINES, IA & MO	89	---	89	---
KANSAS				
MANHATTAN, KS	---	---	100	---
TOPEKA, KS	125	---	125	---
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	---	250	---	350
UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS	125	---	300	---
WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS	110	---	200	---
KENTUCKY				
GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & OH	---	1,302	---	1,302
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY	225	---	225	---
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	187	---	187	---
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	140	---	250	---
OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	3,000	---	2,500	---
WILLIAMSTOWN LAKE, KY	---	---	100	---
LOUISIANA				
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.	150	---	300	---
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BAYOU MANCHAC, LA	100	---	300	---
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	100	---	500	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
BARATARIA BASIN BARRIER SHORELINE RESTORATION, LA.....	---	100	---	100
BARATARIA BASIN MARSH CREATION AND RESTORATION, LA....	---	100	---	100
BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA.....	---	110	---	400
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA.....	150	---	300	---
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA.....	150	---	300	---
GIWW ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.....	100	---	300	---
HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA.....	125	---	300	---
JEFFERSON PARISH, LA.....	---	25	---	25
LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA.....	---	125	---	125
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.....	585	---	2,000	---
ORLEANS PARISH, LA.....	---	25	---	25
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, LA & AR.....	37	---	37	---
PLAQUEMINES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA.....	100	---	200	---
PORT OF IBERIA, LA.....	185	---	300	---
ST BERNARD PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA.....	150	---	250	---
ST CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA.....	100	---	200	---
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH, LA.....	100	---	200	---
WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA.....	---	---	---	500
WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA.....	---	100	---	200
MARYLAND				
ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD & DC.....	248	---	248	---
BALTIMORE METRO, GWYNNS FALLS, MD.....	---	50	---	200
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE EROSION, MD, VA & DE.....	350	---	500	---
EASTERN SHORE, MD.....	350	---	350	---
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S, MD.....	100	---	100	---
MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN, MD.....	350	---	550	---
SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD.....	---	249	---	249

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
MASSACHUSETTS				
BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI.....	140	---	140	---
BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA.....	362	---	362	---
COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA.....	80	---	80	---
MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MA.....	---	322	---	---
SOMERSET AND SEARSBURG DAMS, DEERFIELD RIVER, MA & VT.	62	---	62	---
MICHIGAN				
DETROIT RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI.....	---	---	150	---
DETROIT RIVER MASTER PLAN, MI.....	---	---	200	---
DETROIT RIVER SEAWALLS, MI.....	---	---	---	200
GREAT LAKES FISHERY & ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.....	---	---	174	---
GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	375	---	2,000	---
JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES STRATEGIC PLAN.....	---	---	100	---
LANSING, MI.....	---	---	100	---
ROUGE RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, MI.....	---	---	200	---
ST CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST CLAIR, MI.....	---	---	120	---
MINNESOTA				
MINNESOTA DAM SAFETY, MN.....	222	---	222	---
MINNESOTA RIVER BASIN, MN.....	---	---	100	---
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD & MANITOBA, C	1,078	---	1,078	---
UPPER MISS RIVER WATERSHED MGMT, LAKE ITASCA TO L/D 2,	400	---	400	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
MISSISSIPPI				
PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS	363	---	500	---
MISSOURI				
CHESTERFIELD, MO	---	385	---	385
KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS	400	---	500	---
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, MO	100	---	331	---
RIVER DES PERES, MO	---	130	---	130
SPRINGFIELD, MO	140	---	300	---
ST LOUIS AREA MISSISSIPPI RIVERFRONT, MO & IL	185	---	185	---
ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL	---	73	---	73
ST. LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	---	150	---	150
SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	100	---	100
WEARS CREEK, JEFFERSON CITY, MO	57	---	57	---
MONTANA				
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	300	---	300	---
NEBRASKA				
LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	139	---	139	---
SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NE	---	130	---	130
WESTERN SARPY AND CLEAR CREEK, NE	---	180	---	180

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
NEVADA				
LAS VEGAS WASH, NORTH LAS VEGAS, NV	100	---	100	---
LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	100	---	200	---
TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	---	650	---	650
WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	25	---	25	---
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
CONNECTICUT RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NH & VT	25	---	25	---
MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN, NH	350	---	400	---
NEW JERSEY				
BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	---	---	---	100
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, NJ, NY, DE & PA	100	---	300	---
GREAT EGG INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ	---	300	---	400
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	---	---	100	---
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	206	---	500	---
LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	30	---	30	---
MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	---	200	---	400
NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLE	100	---	300	---
NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT	100	---	300	---
NJIWW ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NJ	---	---	---	200
PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ	---	270	---	270
PECKMAN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	50	---	200	---
RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ	100	---	100	---
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ	100	---	200	---
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, KEYPORT, NJ	100	---	200	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ.....	200	---	200	---
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, PORT MONMOUTH, NJ.....	---	100	---	250
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ.....	---	100	---	100
SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ.....	100	---	100	---
SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	---	100	---	200
STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	100	---	200	---
UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ.....	---	30	---	30
UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, NJ.....	300	---	500	---
WOODBRIDGE RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	100	---	100	---
NEW MEXICO				
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM.....	50	---	50	---
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE BOSQUE, NM.....	100	---	200	---
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX.....	300	---	300	---
SANTA FE, NM.....	205	---	205	---
SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, ALBUQUERQUE, N	---	250	---	450
NEW YORK				
AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY...	50	---	100	---
BOQUET RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY.....	50	---	100	---
BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY.....	30	---	100	---
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY.....	---	---	100	---
EAST RIVER SEAWALL, QUEENS COUNTY, NY.....	---	---	100	---
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY.....	258	---	258	---
FREEPORT CREEK, VILLAGE OF FREEPORT, NY.....	100	---	100	---
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, GOWANUS CANAL, NY & NJ.....	360	---	360	---
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ.....	676	---	2,800	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	---	50	---	50
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY.	50	---	50	---
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	200	---	200	---
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	30	---	100	---
LINDENHURST, NY	50	---	50	---
NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	364	---	364	---
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY	200	---	200	---
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	250	---	350	---
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	300	---	2,500	---
SAW MILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	50	---	50	---
SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	50	---	50	---
SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	200	---	300	---
SUSQUEHANNA RIVER ENVIRON RESTOR AND LOW FLOW MGMT	---	---	300	---
UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	146	---	300	---
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, NY	---	---	750	---
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON RESTORATION, NY.	161	---	500	---
NORTH CAROLINA				
BOGUE BANKS, NC	300	---	300	---
CATAWBA RIVER WATERSHED, NC	---	---	100	---
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	200	---	300	---
DARE COUNTY BEACHES, HATTERAS AND ORACOKE ISLANDS, NC.	150	---	300	---
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	---	---	---	300
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	100	---	200	---
SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC	173	---	300	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
OHIO				
ARCOLA CREEK WATERSHED, MADISON, OH	---	---	100	---
ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH	---	160	---	250
BELPRE, OH	---	---	---	200
BUTLER COUNTY, OH	243	---	243	---
COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	100	---	100	---
GULLEY BROOK, WILLOUGHBY, OH	---	---	100	---
HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH.	205	---	205	---
HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH.	225	---	225	---
MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH & PA	40	---	140	---
MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH	225	---	225	---
WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH	---	---	200	---
WHEELING CREEK, OH	---	---	100	---
WOODTICK PENINSULA AND TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	---	---	100	---
OKLAHOMA				
GRAND LAKE COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, OK	---	---	300	---
MIAMI AND VICINITY, OK	380	---	380	---
OOLOGAH LAKE WATERSHED, OK & KS	310	---	310	---
RED RIVER WATERWAY, OK, TX & AR	50	---	50	---
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK	100	---	100	---
SPAVINAW CREEK, OK	---	---	100	---
WASHITA RIVER BASIN, OK	---	---	100	---
WISTER LAKE WATERSHED, OK	50	---	50	---
OREGON				

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
AMAZON CREEK, OR	100	---	100	---
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	300	---	300	---
TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR	266	---	266	---
WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA	390	---	490	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	100	---	100	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR	249	---	249	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	150	---	150	---
PENNSYLVANIA				
BLOOMSBURG, PA	204	---	204	---
CHRISTINA RIVER WATERSHED, PA, DE & MD	100	---	200	---
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, WISSAHICKON, PA	100	---	100	---
SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN ESTAURINE, PA	---	---	100	---
STREETS RUN WATERSHED, PA	---	---	100	---
SUSQUEHANNA AND DELAWARE RIVER BASINS, PA	---	---	100	---
TUNUNGUANT CREEK, PA	---	---	100	---
UNAMI CREEK, PA	---	---	100	---
UPPER OHIO RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM STUDY, PA	---	---	400	---
PUERTO RICO				
RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	---	147	---	147
RIO YAGUEZ AT MAYAGUEZ, PR	---	---	100	---
RHODE ISLAND				
QUONSET DAVISVILLE PORT, RI	25	---	25	---
RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	25	---	25	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
SOUTH CAROLINA				
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	475	---	475	---
BROAD RIVER BASIN, SC	103	---	103	---
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	135	---	135	---
PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	---	100	---	100
REEDY RIVER, SC	50	---	50	---
SANTEE DELTA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, SC	50	---	50	---
WACCAMAW RIVER, SC	25	---	25	---
SOUTH DAKOTA				
NIOBRARA RIVER AND MISSOURI RIVER, SD	100	---	100	---
WATERTOWN, SD	---	---	---	500
TENNESSEE				
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER,TN	---	252	---	4,000
DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	240	---	240	---
FRENCH BROAD WATERSHED, TN	205	---	264	---
LICK BRANCH WATERSHED, TN	---	---	100	---
TEXAS				
BOIS D'ARC CREEK, BONHAM, TX	100	---	100	---
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	160	---	500	---
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES (MAIN STEM), TX	---	---	---	200
CEDAR BAYOU, TX	---	310	---	310

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
COLONIAS-LWR RIO GRANDE BASIN ALONG TX & MEXICO BORDER	---	100	---	500
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	410	---	410	---
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	200	---	200	---
FREEPORT HURRICANE PROTECTION LEVEE, TX	100	---	100	---
GIWW MODIFICATIONS, TX	225	---	225	---
GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	225	---	225	---
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	---	275	---	275
GIWW, MATAGORDA BAY, TX	---	480	---	594
GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	228	---	228	---
GIWW, VICINITY OF PORT ISABEL, TX	---	---	100	---
GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	150	---	410
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	300	---	500	---
HARRIS GULLY, TX	---	---	100	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	600	---	1,000	---
LOWER SABINE RIVER, TX	---	---	100	---
MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	50	---	150	---
MUSTANG BAYOU, BRAZORIA COUNTY, TX	137	---	137	---
NORTH BOSQUE RIVER, TX	---	50	---	50
NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	228	---	228	---
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	87	---	100	---
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	---	250	---	500
RESACAS AT BROWNSVILLE, TX	200	---	200	---
RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	---	---	300	---
RIVERSIDE OXBOW, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, TX	---	---	---	350
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	400	---	500	---
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	250	---	250	---
SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	200	---	500
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TEXAS	137	---	137	---
SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX	50	---	50	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX	---	200	---	400
UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	433	---	1,800	---
UTAH				
PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	25	---	25	---
VIRGINIA				
AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	---	275	---	275
DISMAL SWAMP, VA	---	---	100	---
ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA	---	471	---	471
FOURMILE RUN, VA	37	---	237	---
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	---	109	---	109
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216)	300	---	300	---
LOWER RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER BASIN, VA	157	---	157	---
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	37	---	---	---
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	350	---	350	---
PHILPOTT LAKE (SECTION 216), VA	---	---	100	---
POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	100	---	100	---
WASHINGTON				
BELLINGHAM BAY, WA	50	---	50	---
CENTRALIA, WA	---	500	---	800
CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	250	---	400	---
COMMENCEMENT BAY AND HYLEBOS WATERWAY, PIERCE COUNTY,	200	---	400	---
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	---	265	---	600
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	450	---	450	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA.....	50	---	50	---
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA..	250	---	600	---
SKAGIT RIVER, WA.....	450	---	750	---
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA.....	---	100	---	100
WHITE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, W	200	---	200	---
WEST VIRGINIA				
ERICKSON/WOOD COUNTY PORT STUDY, WV.....	---	---	---	300
ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV.....	---	697	---	697
LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV.....	---	---	100	---
NEW RIVER BASIN, WV, NC & VA.....	235	---	235	---
PARKERSBURG/VIENNA RIVERFRONT PARK, WV.....	---	---	---	250
SOUTH CHARLESTON, WV.....	---	---	300	---
WISCONSIN				
BARABOO RIVER, WI.....	350	---	350	---
FOX RIVER, WI.....	40	---	40	---
WYOMING				
JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY.....	---	108	---	108
MISCELLANEOUS				
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION.....	2,500	---	3,500	---
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES.....	100	---	100	---
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA.....	300	---	300	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	7,500	---	9,000	---
GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SECTION 401)	---	---	1,000	---
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	400	---	400	---
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	400	---	400	---
NATIONAL SHORELINE	500	---	500	---
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	4,850	---	5,150	---
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	6,000	---	6,500	---
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	300	---	300	---
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	200	---	200	---
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	22,000	---	22,000	---
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	100	---	100	---
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	500	---	600	---
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	500	---	500	---
TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	450	---	450	---
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-21,430	---	-41,224	---
ADJUSTMENT FOR ACTUAL RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-517	---	---	---
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	83,488	18,995	111,918	31,762

Navajo Nation, Arizona.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake flood delineation studies on the Navajo Nation.

White River, Navigation to Newport, Arkansas.—The Committee is aware of the extensive coordination involved in preparing the reevaluation report for the White River, Navigation to Newport, Arkansas, project, and has, therefore, provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue activities with the project sponsor and other interest groups and to continue work on the reevaluation and the Environmental Impact Statement.

City of Inglewood, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate planning and design for replacement of water transmission pipelines for the City of Inglewood, California.

City of Norwalk, California.—The bill includes $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide design assistance for the City of Norwalk environmental infrastructure project authorized in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001.

Desert Hot Springs, California.—The bill includes $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide technical design assistance for the Desert Hot Springs, California, resource protection and wastewater infrastructure project.

Eastern Municipal Water District, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide technical assistance to the Eastern Municipal Water District for a regional water-related infrastructure project.

Folsom Dam, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to evaluate the feasibility of constructing a second municipal and industrial water supply outlet through Folsom Dam.

Los Angeles County Drainage Area (Cornfields), California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a study of ecosystem restoration and recreation needs for the Cornfields area of the Los Angeles River in California.

Newport Bay Harbor (LA–3 Site Designation), California.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the LA–3 Ocean Disposal Site Designation Study.

San Jacinto River, California.—The Committee has included an additional $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to expand the ongoing San Jacinto River study to include an analysis of the feasibility of redesigning the existing flood control basin to include water recharge capability.

Solana Beach—Encinitas, California.—The bill includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility study for the Solana Beach—Encinitas, California, project.

Tujunga Wash Restoration, California.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study of improvements to maintain flood control and enhance environmental and recreation benefits in the Tujunga Wash, a tributary of the Los Angeles River.

Upper Guadalupe River, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Upper Guadalupe River, California, project.

Whitewater River Basin, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Whitewater River Basin project.

Treatment of Dredged Material from Long Island Sound, Connecticut.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a demonstration program for the use of innovative technologies for the treatment of dredged material from Long Island Sound as authorized by section 345 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

Hagatna River Flood Control, Guam.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Hagatna River Flood Control project in Guam.

Waikiki Beach Erosion Control, Hawaii.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Waikiki Beach Erosion Control project in Hawaii. The Committee directs that any recommendation for further action on this project shall consider the economic feasibility of the project based on National Economic Development benefits regardless of the type of benefit and shall consider recreational benefits equivalent to any other form of benefits.

Keith Creek, Rockford, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a reconnaissance study to reevaluate flood protection along Keith Creek in Rockford, Illinois.

Upper Mississippi and Illinois River Navigation Study, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.—The bill includes $3,685,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois River Navigation Study. While encouraged by the progress being made since the study was restructured and resumed in August of last year, the Committee strongly desires to have the Corps of Engineers complete this feasibility study as soon as possible. The Committee also believes that, to prevent further delay and additional cost, the Corps should be prepared to begin preconstruction engineering and design activities for work envisioned in the feasibility study at the earliest practicable time.

Fort Wayne, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide technical and design assistance for the Camp Scott Wetlands Treatment Project in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to revise the Master Plan for the Central Indianapolis Waterfront in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Fort Dodge, Iowa.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the study of the impacts of a 2–4 foot pool raise on the Des Moines River at Fort Dodge, Iowa.

Metropolitan Louisville, Southwest, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility study of water resources problems and opportunities for the Southwest Louisville, Kentucky, Flood Damage Reduction Project located in Jefferson County, Kentucky.

Williamstown Lake, Kentucky.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a reconnaissance study of the need to expand the existing Williamstown Lake in Grant County, Kentucky.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway Ecosystem Restoration, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to continue the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway Ecosystem Restoration feasibility study, including funds to address the erosion along Bayou Sorrell in Iberville Parish. The Committee expects the study to provide solutions to the problems of flooding of property and erosion of land beyond the banks of the waterway.

West Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana.—The bill includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to proceed to preconstruction engineering and design for the waterfront and riverine preservation, restoration, and enhancement project in West Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana, pursuant to section 517 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

West Shore, Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the West Shore, Lake Pontchartrain project. The Committee remains concerned about the inability of the Corps of Engineers and St. John Parish to resolve the levee alignment adjacent to Interstate 10. For the third year, the Committee urges immediate resolution of this issue.

Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Erosion, Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Erosion project, including $150,000 to initiate the shoreline erosion portion of the feasibility study.

Middle Potomac River Basin, Maryland, District of Columbia, and Virginia.—The Committee has provided $550,000 for the Middle Potomac River Basin study, $200,000 more than the budget request. The additional funds will enable the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility phase of the study. The Committee is aware that the Middle Potomac River Basin study will include a comprehensive investigation of the Holmes Run watershed in Virginia.

Lansing, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preparation of a riverfront master plan for Lansing, Michigan.

St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $120,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the management plan for the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair authorized by section 426 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

Pearl River Watershed, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Pearl River Watershed study in Mississippi, and directs the Corps of Engineers to investigate all potentially feasible alternatives, including plans similar to the plan currently referred to as the Lefleur Lakes Flood Control Project.

Hudson-Raritan Estuary, Hackensack Meadowlands, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue a separate feasibility study of ecosystem restoration opportunities in the Hackensack Meadowlands in New Jersey.

Southwest Valley Flood Reduction Study, Albuquerque, New Mexico.—The bill includes $450,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue, on an expedited basis, the feasibility phase of the Southwest

Valley Flood Reduction Study, Albuquerque, New Mexico. In addition, the Committee has included language in the bill which directs the Corps of Engineers to include in the study an evaluation of flood damage reduction measures that would otherwise be excluded from the feasibility analysis based on policies regarding the frequency of flooding, the drainage area, and the amount of runoff.

East River Seawall, Queens County, New York.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of the need to restore shoreline protection measures in the Queensbridge area along the East River.

Susquehanna River Basin Environmental Restoration and Low Flow Management, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland.—The bill includes $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a comprehensive study to develop solutions to the water resources problems of the Susquehanna River Basin, including flow management, environmental restoration, and water security.

Upper Delaware River Watershed, New York.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue feasibility study efforts to investigate tributary restoration potential on the West and East Branches of the Upper Delaware River and the Beaverkill River.

Upper Susquehanna River Basin, New York.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for the Corps of Engineers to investigate solutions to water resources problems in the vicinity of the Village of McGraw, Cortland County, New York.

Upper Susquehanna River Basin, New York and Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Upper Susquehanna River Basin study, including work on the Catatonk Creek Watershed Initiative.

Catawba River Watershed, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide technical assistance for the development of a storm water management plan for Gaston County, North Carolina.

Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue shoreline monitoring and prepare plans and specifications for the Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay project in North Carolina.

Mahoning River Environmental Dredging, Ohio and Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for a study of the need for environmental dredging of the Mahoning River within the State of Pennsylvania.

Wheeling Creek, Ohio.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance level investigation of the Wheeling Creek Basin in Belmont County, Ohio, with a focus on acid mine drainage abatement and ecosystem restoration.

Woodtick Peninsula and Toledo Harbor, Ohio.—The bill includes $100,000 for a study of a project to use material dredged from Toledo Harbor to provide erosion protection and ecosystem restoration at Woodtick Peninsula in western Lake Erie.

Grand Lake Comprehensive Study, Oklahoma.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers has completed the draft report entitled Grand Lake, Oklahoma, Preliminary Analysis of Flood Control Operation, dated August 2002, which determined that Federal action has been a significant cause of the backwater effects to

the lands upstream and adjacent to the reservoir. To that end, the Committee has provided $300,000 to initiate feasibility studies to identify feasible measures to address the flooding upstream and adjacent to the reservoir. The study is to be implemented in accordance with the provisions of Section 449 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

Spavinaw Creek, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a study of water quality problems in the Spavinaw Creek Watershed.

Walla Walla River Watershed, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to expand the Walla Walla River Watershed study and work with the Walla Walla Watershed Alliance to investigate restoration of riparian habitat and river flow improvements in the basin.

Tununguant Creek, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of flooding problems and ecosystem restoration opportunities in the Tununguant Creek watershed in the vicinity of Bradford, Pennsylvania, and Limestone, New York.

Upper Ohio River Navigation Systems Study, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for a feasibility level study of improvements to Emsworth, Dashields, and Montgomery Locks and Dams on the Ohio River.

Chickamauga Lock, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Chickamauga Lock replacement project.

Greens Bayou, Texas.—The Committee has provided $410,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Greens Bayou, Texas, project. The additional funds will enable the Corps to complete the General Reevaluation Report and initiate plans and specifications.

Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, Texas.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers project, including hydrologic studies to update flood plain mapping in Goliad, Karnes, and Wilson Counties.

Harris Gully, Texas.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a study of flood control measures for Harris Gully in Houston, Texas.

Lower Sabine River, Texas.—The bill includes $100,000 for a study of ways to increase the ability of the Lower Sabine River to move floodwaters to the Gulf of Mexico.

Rio Grande Basin, Texas.—The Committee is aware of the significant water resources issues along the Rio Grande with the State of Texas. Due to the complexity of the issues, and the number of non-Federal interests that must be coordinated with, the Committee has provided $300,000 for an expanded reconnaissance study to investigate the opportunities for flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, water supply, and other related purposes within the Rio Grande Basin in Texas.

Upper Trinity River Basin, Texas.—The Committee has provided $1,800,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the Upper Trin-

ity River Basin study, including $300,000 for the Dallas Floodway portion of the study and funds to continue the Trinity Visions project.

Duwamish and Green River Basin, Washington.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to advance completion of preconstruction engineering and design for the Duwamish and Green River Basin project in Washington.

Erickson/Wood County Public Port, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design activities for the Erickson/Wood County Public Port project. In addition, the Committee directs the Corps to reprogram $300,000 previously appropriated for the Monongahela River, Fairmont, West Virginia, study to accelerate work on this project.

Little Kanawha River, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility phase of the Little Kanawha River, West Virginia, study.

Parkersburg/Vienna Riverfront Park, West Virginia.—The bill includes $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Parkersburg/Vienna Riverfront Park project in West Virginia. In addition, the Committee directs the Corps to reprogram $45,000 previously appropriated for the Monongahela River, Fairmont, West Virginia, study to accelerate work on this project.

Coastal Field Data Collection.—The bill includes $3,500,000 for the Coastal Field Data Collection program, $1,000,000 more than the budget request. The additional funds are to be used for the Southern California Beach Process Study.

Flood Plain Management Services.—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 for the Flood Plain Management Services program, including $2,981,000 for completion of the foundational geographic information system for flood plain management in East Baton Rouge Parish in Louisiana.

Within the amount provided for the Flood Plain Management Services program, $100,000 is to be used by the Corps of Engineers to develop an initial analysis of ways to address drainage and flooding problems at the College of Mount Saint Vincent in Riverdale, New York.

Within the amount provided for Flood Plain Management Services, $200,000 is provided to assist the City of Indianapolis, Indiana, in planning and designing use of the Fall Creek flood plain for flood compatible activities.

Other Coordination Programs.—The amount provided for Other Coordination Programs includes $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide additional programmatic support to Lake Tahoe Basin restoration activities, including coordination with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, to implement the Environmental Improvement Program.

Planning Assistance to States.—The amount recommended for the Planning Assistance to States program includes $500,000 for the development of a statewide watershed management assessment plan for the State of Alabama, and $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide technical assistance to the State of New Jersey to implement a comprehensive watershed management plan in the

North Jersey Water Supply Area. The amount provided for the Planning Assistance to States program also includes $50,000 for the Corps of Engineers to assist Gwinnett County, Georgia, in the development of a mitigation instrument.

The Committee also urges the Corps of Engineers to use $100,000 for the preparation of a comprehensive drainage plan for Cayuga Creek and its tributaries in Niagara County, New York, and $150,000 to continue work related to remediation of brownfields near the Union Ship Canal in Buffalo, New York. In addition, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to use $250,000 to continue the project to upgrade the Daily Flow Model for the Delaware River Basin in New York.

The amount provided for the Planning Assistance to States program includes $425,000 to provide assistance in the State of Oklahoma, including work on: an update of the Oklahoma comprehensive plan; the Kaw Reservoir regional water supply study, phase II; the Lake Texoma regional sewer study, phase II; the Spring Creek water availability study; and the Mangum Lake geotechnical study, phase V.

The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use funds provided for the Planning Assistance to States program to participate with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the development of a comprehensive water management study for the lower Susquehanna River Basin.

The amount provided for the Planning Assistance to States Program includes $85,000 for the development of alternatives to restore the capacity of Cross Lake in Shreveport, Louisiana.

The amount provided for the Planning Assistance to States program includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to work with the officials of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to develop a comprehensive plan for restoration of the historic Delaware Canal from Easton to Bristol, Pennsylvania.

The amount provided for the Planning Assistance to States program includes $250,000 for the development of a master plan of the storm drainage system in the City of Danbury, Connecticut.

Stream Gaging (U.S. Geological Survey).—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to cooperate with the U.S. Geological Survey in maintaining stream gages on the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint and Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa River systems.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 2002	$1,715,951,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	1,415,612,000
Recommended, 2003	1,831,030,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+115,079,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	+415,418,000

Note: The original budget request of $1,440,000,000 for Construction, General included $24,388,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since no legislation has been enacted, the budget request for Construction, General has been reduced by this amount.

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

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
ALABAMA		
DUCK RIVER, CULLMAN, AL	---	1,000
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	200	11,700
WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REH	16,473	21,473
WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB)	2,852	6,000
ALASKA		
CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	3,120	3,120
FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK	---	1,000
NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	4,500	4,500
ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	5,880	5,880
SEWARD HARBOR, AK	---	3,253
WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	5,000	5,000
ARIZONA		
RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	---	1,000
RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ	14,300	20,000
TRES RIOS, AZ	---	2,000
TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	---	3,000
ARKANSAS		
FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, AR	---	500
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	3,360	3,360
MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	20,000	23,000
UNION COUNTY, AR	---	500
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), C	4,900	4,900
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	22,280	22,280
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	---	2,000
CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	100	100
COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	---	750
FARMINGTON GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMO PROGRAM, CA	---	1,000
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	5,000	7,000
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	3,900	6,000
HARBOR/SOUTH BAYWATER RECYCLING, CA	---	6,000
IMPERIAL BEACH, SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, CA	200	800
KAWEAH RIVER, CA	10,151	14,000
LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA	---	15,000
LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	1,680	1,680
MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	5,900	5,900
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	500	500
MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	5,172	5,172
MURIETTA CREEK, CA	---	1,000
NAPA RIVER, CA	5,000	9,000
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	---	972
NORTH VALLEY REGIONAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE, CA	---	1,000
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	5,000	15,000
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	4,000	8,500
SACRAMENTO AREA, CA	---	4,200
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	2,600	2,600
SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	250	250
SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	806	806
SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	---	2,300
SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	2,751	2,751
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	29,700	39,700
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	100	100
SOUTH PERRIS, CA	---	1,000
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	2,000	5,000
STOCKTON METROPOLITIAN FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSEMENT, CA	1,000	6,000
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	1,000	1,000

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
SURFSIDE - SUNSET - NEWPORT BEACH, CA	4,300	4,300
TULE RIVER, CA	---	2,000
UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	3,510	3,510
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	---	1,000
DELAWARE		
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES BEACH	500	1,500
DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	294	294
DELAWARE COAST, REHOBOTH BEACH TO DEWEY BEACH, DE	1,000	3,000
FLORIDA		
BREVARD COUNTY, FL	---	3,000
BROWARD COUNTY (REIMBURSEMENT), FL	---	4,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,600	3,600
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	108,202	96,000
DADE COUNTY, FL	---	4,000
EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	19,526	19,526
FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL	---	3,543
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	4,028	4,528
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	1,742	1,742
KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	23,727	23,727
LEE COUNTY (REIMBURSEMENT), FL	---	5,000
MANATEE COUNTY, FL	---	3,700
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	---	8,000
MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	13,100	15,000
NASSAU COUNTY, FL	---	400
PALM BEACH COUNTY (REIMBURSEMENT), FL	---	3,500
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	1,645	1,645
PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	---	3,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	---	1,000
PORT EVERGLADES, FL	---	4,000
SARASOTA COUNTY, FL	---	4,000
ST JOHNS COUNTY, FL	---	300
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	---	200
TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER, FL	---	1,000
TAMPA HARBOR, BIG BEND CHANNEL, FL	---	1,000
TAMPA HARBOR DISPOSAL AREAS, FL	---	1,000
GEORGIA		
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	11,116	14,000
BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	3,374	3,374
HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	2,493	2,493
LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC	250	250
OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA (DEF CORR)	850	850
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	1,000	1,000
THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	3,500	3,500
HAWAII		
IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	419	419
KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	4,303	4,303
MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	2,262	2,262
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, RILEY CREEK RECREATION AREA, ID	---	2,320
ILLINOIS		
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	2,037	2,037
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL, IL	---	500
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	19,000	25,000
COOK COUNTY, IL	---	500

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	---	4,000
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	800	800
EAST ST LOUIS INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL, IL	---	866
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	---	4,000
LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	10,000	10,000
LOVES PARK, IL	2,973	4,500
MADISON/ST CLAIR COUNTIES, IL	---	1,000
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	10,000	15,000
MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	1,200	3,200
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	77,000	65,000
UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO	12,200	12,200
INDIANA		
CALUMET REGION, IN	---	4,000
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE)	---	1,000
GRAND CALUMET RIVER REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN, IN	---	250
INDIANA HARBOR (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY), IN	6,800	9,800
INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	1,500
INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	2,000	2,000
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	3,562	4,562
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, CADY MARSH DITCH, FL	---	3,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	7,094	10,000
OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	732	2,000
IOWA		
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	1,366	1,366
LOCK AND DAM 12, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	5,404	5,404
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	17,500	17,500
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	6,978	8,000
PERRY CREEK, IA	4,000	4,000
KANSAS		
ARKANSAS CITY, KS	3,000	5,000
KENTUCKY		
DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	600	600
KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	27,400	30,000
KENTUCKY RIVER, LOCK AND DAM 10, KY	---	2,000
LOUISVILLE WATERFRONT, KY	---	500
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	6,192	21,000
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	3,838	3,838
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	2,000	2,000
SOUTHERN AND EASTERN, KY	---	4,000
LOUISIANA		
ASCENSION PARISH (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE), LA	---	1,000
COMITE RIVER, LA	3,000	6,000
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	---	1,000
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE)	---	1,000
GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	---	211
IBERIA PARISH (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE), LA	---	500
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	9,000	13,000
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	11,016	13,000
LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	4,900	9,000
LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	410	410
LIVINGSTON PARISH (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE), LA	---	1,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET, LA	---	1,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	200	200
NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	900	3,500
RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LA	---	2,000
SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	20,083	52,000

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
WEST BANK AND VICINITY, NEW ORLEANS, LA	5,000	7,500
MARYLAND		
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	6,900	6,900
ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	200	200
BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD & VA	10,590	10,590
CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTOR & PROTECTION, MD	---	500
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	2,000	2,500
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	10,600	10,600
MASSACHUSETTS		
CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	8,500	8,500
MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MA	---	1,000
WEST HILL DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	2,800	2,800
MICHIGAN		
CLINTON RIVER SPILLWAY, MI	---	200
GENESEE COUNTY (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE), MI	---	200
NEGAUNEE, MI	---	575
SAULT STE MARIE LOCK REPLACEMENT, MI	---	4,000
MINNESOTA		
BRECKENRIDGE, MN	---	2,000
CROOKSTON, MN	3,202	3,202
LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	3,000	3,000
LOWER ST ANTHONYS FALLS, MN	---	2,000
MILLE LACS REGIONAL WASTEWATER, MN	---	2,000
NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA, MN	---	4,000
MISSISSIPPI		
DESOTO COUNTY, MS	---	4,000
MISSISSIPPI (SECTION 592, WRDA1999)	---	2,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,476	2,476
MISSOURI		
BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	200	200
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	6,676	8,000
BOIS BRULE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, MO	---	200
MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	600	5,200
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	1,700	1,700
STE GENEVIEVE, MO	300	300
ST LOUIS, MO	---	4,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY)	10,000	3,500
MONTANA		
CITY OF CONRAD, MT	---	150
FORT PECK FISH HATCHERY, MT	---	4,000
NEBRASKA		
ANTELOPE CREEK, NE	---	2,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	750	750
WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	3,536	3,536
NEVADA		
RURAL NEVADA, NV	---	4,000
TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	33,900	33,900

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, LEBANON	---	1,000
NASHUA	---	1,000
NEW JERSEY		
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET (ABSECON ISLAND),	500	1,000
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	82	82
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, REEDS BEACH AND PIERCES POINT	---	500
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	12,000	500
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	460	460
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	2,000	4,000
NEWTON WATER INFILTRATION	---	1,000
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	3,000	3,000
RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, MAHWAH, NJ AND SUFFERN, NY	500	500
RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	5,241	5,241
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	1,000	1,000
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	5,000	10,000
SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	4,434	4,434
TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	7,000	7,000
NEW MEXICO		
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	1,500	1,500
ALAMOGORDO, NM	5,400	5,400
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	800	800
RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	800	800
NEW YORK		
ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	450	450
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	1,000	1,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	500	500
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	2,750	5,000
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	120,000	110,000
NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM, NY	---	2,550
NORTH CAROLINA		
BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	700	700
STANLEY COUNTY WASTEWATER, NC	---	1,000
WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET, NC	1,200	1,200
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	24,650	40,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BUFORD - TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION,	1,000	3,000
DEVILS LAKE, ND	---	500
GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	6,500	6,500
GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	30,000	30,000
HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	2,272	2,272
SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	2,417	2,417
OHIO		
HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	---	1,523
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	3,270	3,270
MILL CREEK, OH	1,100	3,000
OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE, OH	---	4,500
WEST COLUMBUS, OH	2,000	7,400
OKLAHOMA		
CANTON LAKE (DAM SAFETY), OK	---	2,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	3,000	3,000

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	4,600	4,600
YUKON, OK	---	4,125
OREGON		
BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	8,913	8,913
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	5,800	5,800
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	1,000	1,000
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA	100	100
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	2,000	2,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	6,000	7,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
3 RIVERS WET WEATHER DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, PA	---	1,000
KEHLY RUN DAM NO. 5, PA	---	150
LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA	1,161	1,161
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	36,017	41,000
NANTY GLO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, PA	---	1,350
NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, PA	---	2,000
PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	580	580
SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	4,103	4,103
SCHUYLKILL RIVER PARK, PA	---	900
SOUTH CENTRAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, PA	---	10,000
SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA, PA	---	400
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	9,439	9,439
PUERTO RICO		
ARECIBO RIVER, PR	5,000	5,000
PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	5,500	5,500
RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	500	500
RIO GRANDE DE MANATI, PR	4,981	4,981
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	8,778	8,778
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	1,457	1,457
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING & WIDENING)	4,539	4,539
HARTWELL LK,CLEMSON UPPER & LOWER DIVERSION, SC (DAM S	5,791	5,791
LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC	---	1,862
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	3,964	3,000
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	1,700	1,700
MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, SD	750	750
PIERRE, SD	1,426	6,400
TENNESSEE		
BLACK FOX, OAKLANDS AND MURFREE SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN	---	3,000
CUMBERLAND COUNTY WATER SUPPLY, TN	---	800
TEXAS		
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	3,798	6,000
CLEAR CREEK, TX	1,200	1,200
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TX	---	9,744
EL PASO, TX	1,000	1,000
HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	19,487	30,000
HUNTING BAYOU, TX	---	3,000
JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	3,636	3,636
MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX	---	500
NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	7,000	9,000
NORTH PADRE ISLAND, PACKERY CHANNEL, TX	---	4,000

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX	---	1,000
RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM (BOWIE COUNTY LEVEE), TX	---	4,000
SALT CREEK, GRAHAM, TX	---	500
SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	3,219	4,000
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	9,000	9,000
WACO LAKE AIRPORT PARK, TX	---	4,500
WHITNEY LAKE POWERHOUSE (MAJOR REHABILITATION), TX	---	1,900
UTAH		
UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	500	500
VERMONT		
WATERBURY DAM, VT	---	2,000
VIRGINIA		
AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	3,401	3,401
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (MAJOR REHAB)	6,600	6,600
LYNCHBURG (COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW), VA	---	500
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	477	2,000
RICHMOND (COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW), VA	---	500
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	850	2,000
SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VA	---	1,400
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	120	120
WASHINGTON		
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	98,000	85,000
GRAYS HARBOR, WA	50	50
HOWARD HANSON DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA	5,776	7,776
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	4,600	4,600
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	281	281
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	1,200	3,000
PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS RESTORATION, WA	---	500
SHOALWATER BAY SHORELINE EROSION, WA	---	500
THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA & OR (MAJOR REH	3,000	3,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	8,500	8,500
CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA, WV	---	1,000
LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	10,400	42,050
LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB)	11,934	11,934
LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	---	750
MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	10,978	16,000
ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	1,500	1,500
SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA, WV	---	1,000
WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	200	200
WISCONSIN		
LAFARGE LAKE, WI	4,361	4,361
NORTHERN WISCONSIN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE, WI	---	2,500
MISCELLANEOUS		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	10,000	20,000
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	3,000	3,500
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	1,500	1,500
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	5,000	5,000
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM	9,000	7,000
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	7,000	10,000
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	20,000	20,000
ESTUARY RESTORATION PROGRAM (PL106-457)	---	1,000

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
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	1,900
NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107).....	7,000	11,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	16,000	20,000
SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATIO	8,000	8,300
SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103).....	5,000	5,000
SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECT (SECTION 208).....	1,000	1,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-103,454	-197,837
ADJUSTMENT FOR ACTUAL RETIREMENT ACCRUALS.....	-2,388	---
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL.....	1,415,612	1,831,030

Duck River, Cullman, Alabama.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to execute the agreements necessary for Federal assistance in construction of the Duck River water supply project in Cullman, Alabama, as authorized in section 108 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001.

Huntsville Watershed Master Plan, Alabama.—The Committee is aware that a project to develop a master plan for the watershed of downtown Huntsville, Alabama, will be considered for authorization in this session of Congress. Should this project be authorized, the Committee will consider including funding at a later point in the appropriations process.

Mobile Harbor, Alabama.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a Limited Reevaluation Report to determine the feasibility of constructing portions of the authorized project for Mobile Harbor, Alabama, including a passing lane and a turning basin, and initiate construction of those features pending completion of the reevaluation report.

Montgomery Waterfront, Alabama.—The Committee is aware that a project for revitalizing the Montgomery, Alabama, waterfront will be considered for authorization in this session of Congress. Should this project be authorized, the Committee will consider including funding at a later point in the appropriations process.

Southern Alabama Environmental Infrastructure, Alabama.—The Committee is aware that a project for assisting in the improvement of environmental infrastructure in southern Alabama will be considered for authorization in this session of Congress. Should this project be authorized, the Committee will consider including funding at a later point in the appropriations process.

Seward Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee has provided $3,253,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the breakwater project at Seward Harbor, Alaska.

Rio Salado, Phoenix and Tempe Reaches, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Rio Salado project, including $5,000,000 for the Tempe portion of the project.

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

Coyote and Berryessa Creeks, California.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the reevaluation report for the Coyote and Berryessa Creeks project in California.

Los Angeles Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $15,000,000 for the Los Angeles Harbor, California, project. The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers could utilize $20,000,000 to maintain optimum progress. The Committee also understands that the local sponsor, the Port of Los Angeles, desires to advance funds for this project in accordance with section 11 of the River and Harbor Act of 1925 to achieve the most efficient construction schedule. The Committee, therefore, has included language in the bill which directs the Secretary of the Army to accept

advance funds from the non-Federal sponsor as needed to maintain the project schedule.

Murrieta Creek, California.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering and design and initiate construction for the Murrieta Creek project in California.

Newport Bay Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $972,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering and design and execute a Project Cooperation Agreement for the Newport Bay Harbor project.

Sacramento Area, California.—The Committee has provided $4,200,000 for the Sacramento Area, California, project authorized by section 502 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. The amount provided includes: $1,000,000 for the project to replace water meters and water lines, and undertake canal lining for the Placer County Water Agency; $750,000 for development of the next phase of the Regional Water Master Plan managed by the Regional Water Authority; $1,000,000 for conjunctive use projects in cooperation with the San Juan Water District; $1,000,000 for the City of Roseville's water meter replacement program; and $450,000 for the effluent pipeline project in the City of Lincoln.

South Perris, California.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate design for the South Perris Water Supply Desalination project authorized by section 108(d)(52) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001.

Yuba River Basin, California.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering and design and initiate construction for the Yuba River Basin project in California.

Broward County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $3,700,000 for the Federal share of beach renourishment costs for the Broward County, Florida, project. In addition, the Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to prepare a General Reevaluation Report for implementation of Segment I of the Broward County, Florida, Shore Protection Project.

Fort Pierce Beach, Florida.—The Committee has provided $3,543,000 for the Corps of Engineers to renourish the northern 1.3 miles of the Fort Pierce Beach project and construct a groin field.

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete plans and specifications for the proposed extension of the channel.

Manatee County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $3,700,000 for the Corps of Engineers to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for the Federal share of the cost of renourishing the Manatee County, Florida, project.

Miami Harbor Channel, Florida.—The Committee has included $15,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction dredging in the Miami Harbor Channel and initiate preconstruction engineering and design for further improvements to the Miami Harbor channel.

Nassau County, Florida.—The bill includes $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to prepare plans and specifications for the Nassau County, Florida, shore protection project.

Palm Beach County (Boca Raton Segment), Florida.—The bill includes $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to reimburse the City of Boca Raton for the cost of preparing a design memorandum needed to support construction of the project.

Palm Beach County (Delray Beach Segment), Florida.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to complete reimbursement of the Federal share of renourishing the Delray Beach Segment of the Palm Beach County project.

Palm Beach County (Jupiter/Carlin Segment), Florida.—The Committee has provided $2,300,000 to complete reimbursement of the Federal share of renourishing the Jupiter/Carlin Segment of the Palm Beach County project.

Panama City Beaches, Florida.—The Committee is aware that section 318 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 authorized construction of the Panama City Beaches, Florida, shore protection project by the local project sponsor in accordance with the provisions of section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. In addition, section 506(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 authorized periodic nourishment of the project for a period of 50 years. However, before the project can proceed, it is necessary for the Secretary of the Army to execute a Project Cooperation Agreement with the project sponsor. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to enter into the required Project Cooperation Agreement for the Panama City Beaches, Florida, project within six months of enactment of this Act.

St. Johns County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to monitor the current beach nourishment project to determine its performance and environmental impacts.

Chicago and Sanitary Ship Canal, Illinois.—The bill includes $500,000 for the operation and maintenance of the aquatic nuisance species dispersal barrier in the Chicago and Sanitary Ship Canal.

Grand Calumet River Remedial Action Plan, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a pilot project to remediate contaminated sediments in the Grand Calumet River in Indiana as authorized by section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990.

Missouri River Levee System, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri.—The Committee has provided $8,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to accelerate work on the L–385 Unit of the Missouri River Levee System project.

Louisville Waterfront Park, Phases II and III, Kentucky.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue with the detailed design of recreation and access features of the Louisville Waterfront, Phases II and III, Kentucky.

McAlpine Lock and Dam, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $21,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to accelerate work on the McAlpine Lock and Dam project, including the cofferdam/lock demolition contract and the boat mooring contract, and to allow for more efficient execution of the lock construction contract.

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 new efforts to address the potential impacts on vehicular traffic as a result of the construction of a new lock on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal. The Committee reemphasizes the report language included in House Report 107–258 regarding this issue.

Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the Leon Theriot floodgate and remains very concerned over the delay in completion of the post authorization change report. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to expedite completion of the report.

Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (Reevaluation Study), Louisiana.—The Committee recognizes the severe environmental problems caused by the construction of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet project, including the erosion of banks in excess of 1,000 feet in some cases, and is very concerned that funds were not requested to continue this study. Therefore, the Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet reevaluation study.

Red River Below Denison Dam, Louisiana.—The bill includes $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the program to rehabilitate levees in Louisiana, which includes the installation of gravel surfaces on the levees.

Southeast Louisiana, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $52,000,000 for the Southeast Louisiana project. These funds are to be used to continue engineering, design, and construction of projects to provide for flood control and improvements to rainfall drainage systems in Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Tammany Parishes, Louisiana, in accordance with reports of the New Orleans District Engineer that are within the scope of the authorization and authorized for construction by Public Law 104–46, as amended.

Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete design and initiate construction of the Muddy River environmental ecosystem and flood damage reduction project in Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts.

Clinton River Spillway, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to prepare plans and specifications for the project to remove accumulated silt and repair the banks at the Clinton River Spillway.

Genesee County Environmental Infrastructure, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers for construction of a rain gauge system in cooperation with the Office of the Genesee County Drain Commissioner as authorized in section 219(f)(59) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992.

Desoto County, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the DeSoto County, Mississippi, wastewater treatment facility.

Mississippi Environmental Infrastructure, Mississippi.—The bill includes $2,000,000 for the Mississippi Environmental Infrastruc-

ture program authorized by section 592 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to use the funds to address the most critical water resources needs within the State of Mississippi.

Bois Brule Levee and Drainage District, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue its work to correct the design deficiency on the Bois Brule Levee and Drainage District, Missouri, project, and $700,000 under the Section 205 program to increase the level of protection from 50 to 100 years.

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

City of Conrad, Montana.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide design assistance to the City of Conrad, Montana, for work associated with a new water intake and transmission lines.

Rural Nevada, Nevada.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to provide assistance under the Rural Nevada project, including work in cooperation with the City of Mesquite and the Moapa Valley Water District.

Delaware River Main Channel, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.—The Committee is aware that the General Accounting Office has identified serious problems with the Corps of Engineers economic analysis of the Delaware River Main Channel deepening project and has found that it does not provide a reliable basis for a decision to proceed with the project. The Committee is further aware that the Corps of Engineers has initiated a comprehensive reanalysis of the project. Accordingly, the Committee has deleted the funds included in the budget request for construction of the project. The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps to complete the reanalysis of the project.

Newton, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide assistance to the Town of Newton, New Jersey, for a project to construct a water filtration plant.

Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point project, including $3,170,000 for the reformulation study, $980,000 for the interim project for Shinnecock Inlet, and $820,000 for work related to the Westhampton Beach interim project.

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 requirements in fiscal year 2003.

New York State Canal System, New York.—The bill includes $2,550,000 for the Corps of Engineers to participate in maintenance and rehabilitation of the New York State Barge Canal as authorized by section 553 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Mill Creek, Ohio.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Corps of Engineers to accelerate work on the General Reevaluation Report for the Mill Creek, Ohio, project.

Ohio Environmental Assistance, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $4,500,000 for the Ohio Environmental Assistance program authorized by section 594 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. The amount provided includes: $1,500,000 for the City of Springfield wastewater treatment and sewer improvement project; $2,000,000 for wastewater improvements in the City of Toledo; and $1,000,000 for water lines along River Road in Madison Township.

Yukon, Oklahoma.—The Committee is aware that the City of Yukon, Oklahoma, has limited financial ability to rehabilitate its water infrastructure. Therefore, the Committee has provided $4,125,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide design and construction assistance to the City for rehabilitation of its municipal water infrastructure.

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

Lower Columbia River Ecosystem Restoration, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Lower Columbia Ecosystem Restoration project, the same as the budget request. These funds are intended only to help fulfill the estuary restoration actions required by the 2000 Federal Columbia River Power System Biological Opinion and for no other purpose.

Kehly Run Dam No. 5, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide assistance to improve the safety at Kehly Run Dam No. 5 in Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania.

South Central Environmental Improvement Program, Pennsylvania.—The Committee recommendation for the South Central Environmental Improvement Program includes funds to undertake spillway improvements at Dalton Run Dam, Cambria County, Pennsylvania.

Southeastern Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate design for environmental and infrastructure improvements in the Cobbs and Mill Creek Watershed in West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Athens, Tennessee.—The Committee is aware that a project to restore the aquatic ecosystem of Oostanaula Creek by addressing the primary cause of impairment will be considered for authorization in this session of Congress. Should this project be authorized, the Committee will consider including funding at a later point in the appropriations process.

Cumberland County Water Supply, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $800,000 for the design of water supply projects in Cumberland County, Tennessee.

Brays Bayou, Houston, Texas.—The recommendation of the Committee includes $6,000,000 to reimburse the sponsor for completed

discrete segments of the Detention Element scheduled for completion in fiscal year 2003. The Committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to expeditiously amend the existing Project Cooperation Agreement with the Harris County Flood Control District to include construction of all features of the Detention and Downstream Elements, and to reimburse the sponsor for any completed discrete segments of the project. The Committee encourages the Secretary to continue budgeting for reimbursement of completed discrete segments for the project. Consistent with existing authority, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to designate the Detention Element and the Diversion Element, or an approved alternative to the Diversion Element, as upstream and downstream components of a single combined project designated the Brays Bayou, Houston, Texas, Project. Subject to the Secretary's approval of the General Reevaluation Review Report for the downstream component, the Secretary of the Army is directed to use a portion of the funds appropriated for the Brays Bayou, Texas, Project to negotiate and execute an amendment to the existing Project Cooperation Agreement to include both upstream and downstream components as one project, and for reimbursement of the non-Federal sponsor for completed and approved discrete segments of work.

Dallas Floodway Extension, Texas.—The Committee has provided $9,744,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Dallas Floodway Extension project in Texas. The Committee has also included language in the bill which directs the Corps to proceed with the project in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated December 7, 1999.

Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate final design efforts for the Wichita River Basin chloride control project and continue environmental monitoring efforts.

Red River Below Denison Dam, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the rehabilitation of the Bowie County Levee in Texas. The Committee has included language in the bill which provides that the project to be constructed is defined as Alternative B in the Corps of Engineers document entitled "Bowie County Flood Protection Project, Red River, Texas, Project Design Memorandum No. 1", April 1997, and that cost sharing shall be in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1946.

San Antonio Channel Improvement, Texas.—The bill includes $4,000,000 for the San Antonio Channel Improvement project in Texas. The funds provided above the budget request are to be used to complete flood plain mapping and hydraulic performance studies on the remainder of the San Antonio River and its tributaries.

Waco Lake, Texas.—The Committee has provided $4,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a program to upgrade the recreational facilities at the Waco Lake, Texas, project. Deficiencies at the project include restroom facilities that are not ADA compliant, insufficient parking, dilapidated roads, and aging electrical systems.

Mud Mountain Dam, Washington.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Mud Mountain Dam project in Washington, of

which $1,500,000 shall be used to complete fish passage design work initiated in fiscal year 2002.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky.—The bill includes a total of $42,050,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project. The amount provided includes: $5,500,000 for the Clover Fork, Kentucky, element of the project; $3,000,000 for the City of Cumberland, Kentucky, element of the project; $8,000,000 for the Town of Martin, Kentucky, element of the project; $4,200,000 for the Pike County, Kentucky, element of the project, including $1,500,000 for implementation of work along the tributaries of the Tug Fork and continuation of a Detailed Project Report for the Levisa Fork; $5,200,000 for the Martin County, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,000,000 for the Floyd County, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,000,000 to initiate construction of the Harlan County, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,500,000 for continued studies along the tributaries of the Cumberland River in Bell County, Kentucky; $250,000 for additional studies along the Levisa Fork in Johnson County, Kentucky; and $12,400,000 to continue construction of the Grundy, Virginia, element of the project.

The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to amend the Pike County, Kentucky, Project Cooperation Agreement and implement the project described in the Pike County, Kentucky, Tug Fork Tributaries Detailed Project Report Supplement, dated January 2002.

Continuing Authorities Programs.—The Committee is aware that the Administration has proposed that no new projects be initiated in fiscal year 2003 under the various Continuing Authorities Programs. The Committee can find no justification for such a proposal as these are small projects that can provide significant benefits at relatively low cost. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to initiate new studies and construction projects under the Continuing Authorities Programs, as appropriate.

Shoreline Protection Project (Section 103).—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Section 103 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $10,000 to initiate and complete an initial appraisal for the West Beach, Santa Barbara, California, project; $300,000 to continue preparation of a detailed project report for the Carpinteria Beach, California, project; $100,000 to complete the feasibility report for the Whiting Shoreline, Indiana, project; $100,000 for planning and design for the Nantasket Beach, Massachusetts, project; $100,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Luna Pier, Michigan, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Krull Park, Newfane, New York, project; $100,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Crescent Beach, New York, project; and $100,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Lake Erie Islands Beach, Ohio, project.

Small Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The Committee has provided $11,000,000 for the Section 107 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Point Mallard Park, Decatur, Alabama, project; $125,000 to complete the detailed project report for

the Pillar Point Harbor, California, project; $2,875,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Port Hueneme, California, project; $300,000 for the Hernando Beach, Florida, project; $200,000 to complete the feasibility report for the Whiting Shoreline, Indiana, project; $100,000 to initiate and complete the feasibility report for the Greenup Slackwater Harbor, Kentucky, project; $500,000 to initiate construction of the Ocean City Inlet and Harbor, Maryland, project; $2,000,000 to initiate construction of the Rockhold Creek, Maryland, project; $125,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Rouge River, Michigan, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the City of Mackinac Island Harbor Breakwall, Michigan, project; $100,000 to continue the feasibility report for the Tri-County Port, Iuka, Mississippi, project; $100,000 to continue the feasibility report for the Lake Ontario Commercial Port, New York, project; $234,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Buffalo Inner Harbor, New York, project; $234,000 to continue the feasibility report for the Lake Erie at Sturgeon Point, New York, project; $250,000 to prepare plans and specifications for the Port of Rochester, Hojack Swing Bridge, New York, project; $100,000 to initiate a study at the Syracuse Inner Harbor and Onondaga Creek, New York; $100,000 to prepare an initial appraisal for the Swift Creek, Virginia, project; and $150,000 to continue the Saxon Creek, Wisconsin, project.

Within the amount provided for the Section 107 program, the Committee recommends $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a study at Knife Harbor, Minnesota, and $1,650,000 to continue construction of the Duluth Harbor, McQuade Road, Minnesota, project. In addition, the recommendation includes $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to prepare plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Grand Portage Harbor, Minnesota, project. In carrying out the Grand Portage Harbor project, the Committee expects the Corps to use procedures similar to those used for the Silver Bay and Taconite Harbor projects, including using existing feasibility and other study documents and designs prepared by the State of Minnesota and the Grand Portage Band, and to construct the project in cooperation with the state and the band.

Mitigation Damages Attributable to Navigation Projects (Section 111).—The Committee has provided $1,900,000 for the Section 111 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $500,000 to investigate problems at Dauphin Island, Alabama; $295,000 to initiate and complete construction for the Herring Creek, Maryland, project; $1,000,000 to initiate construction of the Saco River and Camp Ellis Beach, Maine, project; and $100,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Mattituck Inlet, New York, project.

Project Modifications for the Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135).—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for the Section 1135 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $130,000 to initiate and complete the feasibility report for the Ditch 28, Mississippi County, Arkansas, project; $100,000 to complete planning and design for the Horseshoe Lake, Arkansas, project; $1,000,000 to initiate construction of the Rillito/Swan Wetlands, Arizona, project; $200,000 for the feasibility study for the San Gabriel River Basin, Los Cerritos Wet-

lands, California, project; $1,000,000 for the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin (Bull Creek Channel) in California; $200,000 to initiate and complete the environmental restoration report for the sites 38 and 38A sand removal project on the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers system in Florida; $200,000 to initiate and complete the environmental restoration report for the site 39 sand removal project on the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers system in Florida; $90,000 to initiate planning and design for the Honey Creek Wetlands, Iowa, project; $398,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Sand Creek, Kansas, ecosystem restoration project; $350,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the New River Restoration project in Louisiana; $450,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Lake Fausse Point Ecosystem Restoration project in Louisiana; $500,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Houghs Neck Salt Marsh, Massachusetts, project; $221,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Lower Rouge River Restoration, Michigan, project; $259,000 to complete the feasibility report for the Upper Rouge River Restoration, Michigan, project; $75,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Duck Creek, Stoddard County, Missouri, project; $500,000 to initiate construction of the Kansas City Riverfront Habitat Restoration project in Missouri; $270,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Brush Creek, Missouri, project; $400,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Times Beach, New York, project; $30,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Little Sugar Creek Habitat Restoration project in North Carolina; $150,000 to continue the feasibility for the Sheldon's Marsh Nature Preserve project in Ohio; $350,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Allin's Cove, Barrington, Rhode Island, project; $460,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Boyd's Marsh Restoration project in Rhode Island; and $60,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Lower Obion River and Vicinity, Dyer County, Tennessee, project.

Emergency Streambank and Erosion Control (Section 14).—The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for the Section 14 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $500,000 to initiate construction of the project on the Alabama River in Montgomery, Alabama, from Molton to Coosa Streets; $700,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Ditto Landing Marina, Huntsville, Alabama, project; $500,000 to initiate and complete design and initiate construction of the Lake Wedowee, Randolph County, Alabama, project; $105,000 to initiate and complete design and initiate construction of the Farm Creek, City of Washington, Illinois, project; $400,000 to complete construction of the Melvina Creek, Illinois, project; $500,000 to complete phase 2 of the Kansas River, Eudora Bend Bridge, Kansas, project; $600,000 to complete planning and design and initiate construction of the Detroit River Shoreline, Michigan, project; $100,000 to complete planning and design and initiate construction of the Belle Isle South Shore, Michigan, project; $500,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Belle Isle Park, Michigan, project; $525,000 for construction of the Marquette, Michigan, project; $260,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Middle Fork, Grand River,

Missouri, project; $400,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Newton Creek, New York, project; $300,000 for planning and design of the DeLaval Bulkhead, Hudson River, Poughkeepsie, New York, project; $700,000 to initiate construction of the Minersville, Ohio, project; $98,000 for construction of the Heathcott Road, Lauderdale County, Tennessee, project; $98,000 for construction of the Steelman Road, Lauderdale County, Tennessee, project; $100,000 for planning and design of the Bogachiel River, Washington, project; and $500,000 for construction of the Kinnickinnic River, Wisconsin, project.

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: $1,000,000 for construction of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, Louisiana, project; and $70,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black project in Louisiana.

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: $500,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Jasper, Alabama, project; $1,500,000 to initiate construction of the locally preferred plan for the Pinhook Creek, Alabama, project; $1,000,000 for the Indian Bayou, Arkansas, project; $60,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Spring Creek, St. Francis County, Arkansas, project; $130,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Higginson, Arkansas, project; $300,000 to initiate and complete a detailed project report for the Desert Hot Springs, California, project; $500,000 for the City of Twentynine Palms, California, project; $3,000,000 to initiate construction of the Magpie Creek, California, project; $200,000 for the Magpie Creek (McClellan AFB), California, project; $460,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Anaverde Creek, Palmdale, California, project; $200,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Santa Venetia, California, project; $200,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Plant City, Florida, project; $2,000,000 to initiate construction of the Deer Creek, Village of Ford Heights, Illinois, project; $2,000,000 to continue construction of the East Peoria, Illinois, project; $60,000 for the a feasibility study for the Harrisburg, Illinois, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Red Mill Pond Dam, Indiana, project; $449,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Sumava Resorts, Indiana, project; $200,000 to continue preparation of plans and specifications for the Mad Creek, Muscatine, Iowa, project; $300,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Cowskin Creek Basin, Wichita, Kansas, project; $125,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Mayfield Creek and Tributaries, Kentucky, project; $40,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Bayou DeChien, Kentucky, project; $500,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Pailet Basin, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, project; $1,000,000 to initiate construction of the Rosethorn Basin, Jean Lafitte, Louisiana, project; $1,000,000 to continue construction of the Fisher School Basin, Jean Lafitte, Louisiana, project; $500,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Goose Bayou

Basin, Jefferson, Louisiana, project; $100,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Armenco Canal, Iberia Parish, Louisiana, project; $500,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Elkton, Maryland, project; $700,000 to continue construction of the Bois Brule Drainage and Levee District project in Missouri; $100,000 to initiate a feasibility study of flooding problems in Lilbourn, New Madrid County, Missouri; $100,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Hubble Creek, Missouri, project; $100,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Williams Creek, Missouri, project; $100,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Goose Creek, Missouri, project; $200,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Blacksnake Creek Basin, Missouri, project; $100,000 to continue the feasibility study for the City of Richland, Mississippi, project; $100,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems in North Natchez, Mississippi; $2,000,000 for the Wahpeton, North Dakota, project; $240,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Ridgewood Addition, Fargo, North Dakota, project; $1,000,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Jackson Brook, New Jersey, project; $200,000 to complete the feasibility report for the Poplar Brook, New Jersey, project; $221,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Fulmer Creek, New York, project; $130,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Moyer Creek, New York, project; $160,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Steele Creek, New York, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Delaware Canal and Brock Creek, Pennsylvania, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Barceloneta, Puerto Rico, project; $75,000 for engineering and design of the Rossville, Tennessee, project; $200,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications and execute a project cooperation agreement for the Town Creek, Lenoir City, Tennessee, project; $200,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Shoal Creek, Lawrenceburg, Tennessee, project; $500,000 to initiate construction of the Little Limestone Creek, Jonesborough, Tennessee, project; $100,000 to initiate a study of flooding problems along Sandy Creek in Jackson, Tennessee; $100,000 to initiate a study of flooding problems along Anderson Creek in Jackson, Tennessee; $200,000 to prepare plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Baxter Bottom, Tipton County, Tennessee, project; $230,000 for the Stroubles Creek Watershed, Virginia, project; and $200,000 to continue the feasibility of the Wind Lake, Wisconsin, project.

The Committee recommendation includes $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the feasibility study for the Augusta, Kansas, project. The Committee is aware of the devastation that occurred at Augusta during the Halloween flood of 1998, which resulted in millions of dollars in property damage to more than 600 homes and businesses. Therefore, the Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to complete the feasibility study.

In addition, the Corps of Engineers is directed to use previously appropriated funds to prepare plans and specifications and initiate construction of the flood control project along the Cass River in Spaulding Township, Michigan.

The Committee is aware that the Cedar Hammock Wares Creek project in Manatee County, Florida, has been 15 years in the mak-

ing and now has a scheduled completion date of July 2006. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to take all steps necessary to meet that date.

The amount provided for the Section 205 program includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a project for the Pennypack Creek Watershed in Pennsylvania. In conducting that project, the Committee urges the Corps to work with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to develop procedures that will lead to rapid and effective flood damage reduction measures, both structural and non-structural, with a goal of maximizing the reduction of flood damages through the application of each agency's planning and design guidelines. Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Corps should submit a report to the Committee which describes the status of its cooperative efforts with FEMA, including recommended procedures for conducting joint studies, estimates of cost savings associated with conducting combined flood control studies for watersheds, and recommendations for legislation necessary for the Corps and FEMA to carry out joint flood control studies. The report should include the comments of local interests as to their evaluation of such a program.

The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use previously appropriated funds to proceed with construction of the Flomar flood control project in Whittier, California.

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (Section 206).—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for the Section 206 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $875,000 for the Mobile Delta Initiative; $100,000 to initiate a study of ecosystem restoration opportunities at Mirror Lake, Spring Hill College, Alabama; $500,000 to update the environmental impact statement for the Theodore Industrial Canal, Mobile Harbor, Alabama; $500,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Agua Caliente Wash project in Arizona; $100,000 to continue studies on the Carpinteria Sand Dunes Restoration project in California; $10,000 for the Carpinteria Creek Park, California, project; $400,000 to continue preparation of a detailed project report for the City of Santa Clarita, Arundo Donax Control project in California; $800,000 to complete the detailed project report and initiate plans and specifications for the Upper York Creek Dam, California, project; $200,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Lower Boulder Creek, Colorado, project; $2,800,000 to continue work on the Stevenson Creek, Florida, project; $400,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Gwinnett County, Beaver Ruin Creek, Georgia, project; $400,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Gwinnett County, Jackson Creek, Georgia, project; $250,000 to complete plans and specifications and execute a project cooperation agreement for the Squaw Creek Watershed, Illinois, project; $200,000 to initiate a feasibility study for the Sequoit Creek, Illinois, project; $110,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Kankakee River aquatic ecosystem restoration project in Kankakee County, Illinois; $600,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Hoffman Dam, Illinois, project; $150,000 to complete the ecosystem restoration report for the Illinois and Michigan Canal project in Illinois; $500,000 to initiate construction of the

Koontz Lake, Marshall and Stark Counties, Indiana, project; $1,200,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction for the Wolf Lake, Indiana, project; $185,000 to complete feasibility phase studies for the Chariton River/Lake Rathbun Watershed, Iowa, project; $100,000 to prepare an aquatic restoration report for the Clear Lake, Iowa, project; $114,000 to complete the planning and design analysis for the Duck Creek-Fairmont Park Wetland Restoration project in Iowa; $189,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Iowa River and Clear Creek, Iowa, project; $119,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Buras Marina, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana, project; $100,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Mill Pond, Littleton, Massachusetts, project; $60,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Milford Pond, Massachusetts, restoration project; $200,000 for a feasibility study of restoration needs for the Fitchburg Urban Park in Massachusetts; $115,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Nashawannuck Pond, Easthampton, Massachusetts, project; $180,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Dog Island Shoals, Maryland, project; $250,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Easton Tanyard Branch, Maryland, project; $275,000 to continue plans and specifications for the Anacostia River and Tributaries, Maryland, project; $100,000 to initiate a feasibility study for the Quanicassee Wildlife Area, Bay County, Michigan, project; $40,000 for land acquisition and easements for the Little Sugar Creek Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration project in North Carolina; $200,000 to initiate a feasibility for the West Cary Stream Restoration project in North Carolina; $150,000 to complete the feasibility phase of the David City Wetlands, Butler County, Nebraska, project; $250,000 for an aquatic restoration report for McCarter Pond in Fair Haven, Monmouth County, New Jersey; $500,000 to continue the project to restore Grover's Mill Pond in West Windsor, Mercer County, New Jersey; $400,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Eaton Brook Reservoir, New York, project; $200,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Oriskany Wildlife Management Area, New York, project; $50,000 for a preliminary restoration report for the restoration of Mill Pond in Bay Shore, New York; $50,000 to develop a preliminary restoration report for the West Shore of Penataquit Creek, Bay Shore, New York project; $250,000 to initiate an ecosystem restoration report for the Sheldrake Lake/Goodlife Pond, New York, project; $250,000 for the Gardens Lake, Mamaroneck, New York, project; $50,000 for an initial assessment for the Edith Read Natural Park and Wildlife Sanctuary in Rye, New York; $50,000 for an initial assessment for the Rye, New York, Nursery Wetland; $50,000 for an initial assessment for Harbor Island Park, Mamaroneck, New York; $50,000 for an initial assessment for the Bronx River Streambank Stabilization and Channel Restoration, New York, project; $250,000 for the City of Cortland, New York, Dry Creek aquatic restoration project; $50,000 for an initial assessment for Crossway Field, Village of Scarsdale, New York; $200,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Jamesville Reservoir, New York, project; $100,000 to initiate a preliminary restoration report for aquatic restoration of the Syracuse lakefront along Onondaga Lake, the New York State Canal

System and Onondaga Creek in New York; $500,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Lake Carl Blackwell Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration project in Oklahoma; $500,000 to initiate construction of the Springfield Millrace, Oregon, project; $3,445,000 to initiate construction of the Eugene Delta Ponds, Oregon, project; $160,000 to initiate and complete planning and design of the Sheraden Park Stream and Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, project; $350,000 to complete a feasibility study of a multi-objective solution to water resources problems on Loyalsock Creek in Dushore, Pennsylvania, that addresses restoration of stream channels and wetlands while also addressing flooding problems; $1,000,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Nanticoke Creek, Pennsylvania, project; $960,000 to initiate construction of the Lonsdale Drive-In Wetlands, Rhode Island, Restoration project; $200,000 to continue the feasibility phase of the Applewhite Site, San Antonio, Texas, project; $500,000 for design and construction of the Powell River, Ely and Pucketts Creek, Virginia, project; $100,000 for a feasibility study for the Tangier Island, Virginia, project; $1,900,000 to initiate construction of the Middle and South Forks of the Nooksack River, Washington, project; $74,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Koshkonong Creek, Wisconsin, project; $185,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Token Creek, Wisconsin, project; $81,000 for planning and design of the Lake Koshkonong, Wisconsin, project; $362,000 for the Lake Belle View, Wisconsin, project; and $50,000 for a feasibility study for the Pike River, Wisconsin, project.

The Committee is aware of the on-going ecosystem restoration project at Long Lake, Indiana, and is inclined to address the matter at a later date.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—Within the amount provided for the Aquatic Plant Control Program, $100,000 is to continue the aquatic plant control program on the Potomac River, including efforts to address nuisance aquatic plants near Mount Vernon, Virginia, and $400,000 is for aquatic plant control in Caddo Lake, the Lavaca, Navidad and Rio Grande Rivers, and other high priority sites in Texas.

The Committee strongly encourages the Corps of Engineers to purchase a new milfoil machine for use on the Pend Oreille River in Washington State.

Shoreline Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program.—The Committee has provided $8,300,000 for the Shoreline Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program, the same as the budget request. Of the funds provided, $500,000 is for the Corps of Engineers to prepare detailed design documents and plans and specifications for a shoreline erosion abatement project in North San Diego County, California, and $2,300,000 is for the continuation of work at the Miami Beach, Florida, demonstration site. In addition, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to use up to $1,000,000 to demonstrate the effectiveness of a passive permeable groin system to reverse the erosion which is threatening the road which provides access to Alligator Point, Florida.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

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

Appropriation, 2002	$345,992,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	280,671,000
Recommended, 2003	342,071,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−3,921,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	+61,400,000

Note: The original budget request of $288,000,000 for Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries included $7,329,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since no legislation has been enacted, the budget request for Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries has been reduced by this amount.

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

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2003 Request	House Recommendation
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA	420	420
BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	---	1,000
SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	---	400
DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA	780	780
SPRING BAYOU, LA	505	505
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	180	180
GERMANTOWN, TN	345	345
MEMPHIS HARBOR, TN	---	500
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN & MS	25	25
MILLINGTON AND VICINITY, TN	150	150
MORGANZA TO THE GULF, LA	2,880	4,000
WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	123	---
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	600	600
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	6,008	8,905
CONSTRUCTION		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	36,690	38,340
FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR	750	750
HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	660	660
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	42,360	47,385
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	1,970	2,070
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	7,010	7,010
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	18,873	20,873
LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA	2,449	2,449
MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS	25	25
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	3,500	3,500
HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBUTARIES (INCL COW PEN CREEK), MS	300	300
YAZOO BASIN:	(10,550)	(39,700)
BACKWATER PUMP, MS	250	5,250
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	200	200
DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	---	20,000
MAIN STEM, MS	25	25
REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	25	25
TRIBUTARIES, MS	200	200
UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	9,850	14,000
ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	100	5,100
NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS	605	2,135
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	100	100
WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	---	523
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	125,942	170,920
MAINTENANCE		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	66,465	66,465
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	490	490
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	441	441
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	105	105
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	135	135
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	7,185	7,350
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	10,580	11,180
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	2,463	2,463

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2003 Request	House Recommendation
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	1,250	1,250
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	50	50
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	35	35
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,095	2,095
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	12,512	12,512
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	210	210
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	75	75
BONNET CARRE, LA	3,105	3,105
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	510	510
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	125	125
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	860	860
OLD RIVER, LA	11,520	11,520
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	3,145	3,145
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	340	340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	286	286
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	330	330
YAZOO BASIN:	(26,910)	(41,922)
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	5,380	10,380
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	115	115
ENID LAKE, MS	4,920	7,436
GREENWOOD, MS	825	825
GRENADA LAKE, MS	5,700	8,196
MAIN STEM, MS	1,265	1,265
SARDIS LAKE, MS	5,905	10,905
TRIBUTARIES, MS	1,265	1,265
WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	450	450
YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	280	280
YAZOO CITY, MS	805	805
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	167	167
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	6,730	9,393
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	96	96
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	1,750	1,750
FACILITY PROTECTION	1,000	1,000
MAPPING	1,170	1,170
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE	162,135	180,575
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-13,085	-18,329
ADJUSTMENT FOR ACTUAL RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-329	---
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	280,671	342,071

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas.—The Committee is aware of the need to complete the reevaluation of the Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas, project, which was conditionally authorized by section 363(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. The Committee has, therefore, included $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the general reevaluation report and preconstruction engineering and design for the project.

CONSTRUCTION

Channel Improvement.—The Committee recognizes the critical need to maintain navigation along the Mississippi River and the efficiency of dikes in reducing dredging requirements. Therefore, the Committee has provided $38,340,000 for the Channel Improvement program, including $250,000 for the Basket Bar, Arkansas, dike; $300,000 for the Porter Lake, Arkansas, dike; $700,000 for the Caruthersville-Linwood, Missouri, dike; $200,000 for the Donaldson Point, Missouri, dike; and $200,000 for the Island 7 & 8, Missouri, dike.

Mississippi River Levees.—The bill includes $47,385,000 for continued construction of the Mississippi River levees feature of the Mississippi River and Tributaries project, including $2,300,000 to construct the Nash Road, Missouri, relief wells; $2,325,000 for the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, levee closure and box culvert; and $400,000 to provide wave wash protection along a portion of the main line levee near Tiptonville, Tennessee.

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee has provided $2,070,000 to continue construction of the St. Francis Basin project in Arkansas and Missouri, including $100,000 for constructing channel stabilization measures in Stoddard and Dunklin Counties in Missouri.

Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $20,873,000 for the Atchafalaya Basin project. These funds should be used to continue flood proofing efforts on the waterfronts of Morgan City and Berwick, Louisiana, and for repairs to the levee system. The Committee also supports construction of the Amelia and Chacahoula pumping stations as a portion of the Barrier Plan. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to expedite these features of the Barrier Plan and other plan components that will immediately address backwater flooding issues.

Yazoo Basin, Demonstration Erosion Control, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for the Yazoo Basin Demonstration Erosion Control Program in Mississippi. The work to date by the Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service has shown positive results in reduction of flood damages, decreased erosion and sedimentation, and improvements to the environment. These positive results show that continued funding for the program is important, and that the program should be completed to realize 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 funds included in the bill are for the Corps of Engineers to continue design, real estate acquisition, monitoring of completed work,

and initiation of continuing contracts. The Committee expects the Administration to request funds for this important program until it is completed.

St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $5,100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway project in Missouri.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Mississippi River Levees.—The Committee has provided $7,350,000 for maintenance of Mississippi River levees, including $1,350,000 for graveling of the mainline levees at Osceola, Arkansas; O'Donnell Bend, Arkansas; and the levee below Helena, Arkansas.

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee has provided $11,180,000 for the St. Francis Basin project in Arkansas and Missouri, including $500,000 for channel cleanout at Ditch 290 in Missouri, and $100,000 for levee setbacks at the Elk Chute East Levee in Missouri.

Wappapello Lake, Missouri.—The bill includes $9,393,000 for the Wappapello Lake, Missouri, project. The additional funds will permit the Corps of Engineers to continue the ongoing highway relocation project.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 2002	$1,874,803,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	1,913,760,000
Recommended, 2003	1,990,280,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+115,477,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	+76,520,000

Note: The FY 2002 amount does not include $139,000,000 in emergency appropriations enacted in Public Law 107–117 and $32,000,000 enacted in Public Law 107–206. The original budget request of $1,979,000,000 for Operation and Maintenance, General included $65,240,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since no legislation has been enacted, the budget request for Operation and Maintenance, General has been reduced by this amount.

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	500	500
ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	2,974	8,024
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	2,000	2,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	24,201	30,201
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	---	500
DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	---	500
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	4,963	8,463
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	100	100
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	7,094	8,394
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	18,610	26,960
PERIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	---	1,200
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	350	350
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	5,558	8,328
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	100	100
TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	23,083	25,583
TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL & MS	---	2,000
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	6,912	6,912
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	3,616	4,616
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	2,889	2,889
COOK INLET NAVIGATION CHANNEL, AK	---	500
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	459	459
HOMER HARBOR, AK	363	363
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	40	40
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, BAR POINT, AK	500	500
KODIAK HARBOR, AK	---	750
NAKNEK RIVER, AK	215	215
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	232	232
NOME HARBOR, AK	410	410
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	543	543
ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	75	75
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,282	1,282
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	79	79
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,269	1,269
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	32	32
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	168	168
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	5,064	5,064
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	9,444	9,444
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,162	1,162
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	5,675	5,675
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,699	5,699
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,620	4,620
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	931	931
DIERKS LAKE, AR	959	959
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	861	861
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	5,445	5,445
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	23	340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	147	147
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	23,925	23,925
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,257	1,257
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	7,440	7,440
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,409	1,409
NORFORK LAKE, AR	4,368	4,368
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	21	610
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	6,491	6,991
OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,152	4,152

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	6	6
WHITE RIVER, AR	195	2,200
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	10	147
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	2,034	2,034
BODEGA BAY, CA	1,750	1,900
BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,796	1,796
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,622	4,922
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,334	3,834
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	---	1,200
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,338	4,838
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	308	308
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,751	1,751
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	3,426	4,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,130	1,130
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,227	1,227
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	170	170
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	320	2,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	4,424	8,584
MARINA DEL REY, CA	60	60
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	313	313
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	259	259
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,280	1,280
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	---	2,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,006	2,006
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,651	1,651
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	120	3,000
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	11,204	11,204
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,240	1,240
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	---	1,500
PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	---	200
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,500	2,500
PORT HUENEME, CA	60	810
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,148	1,148
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	4,381	4,381
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,189	2,189
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,271	1,271
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	145	145
SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	150	150
SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, CA	60	60
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,181	1,181
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, LONG TERM MGMT STRATEGY, CA	---	2,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,072	2,072
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,920	1,920
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	2,122	2,122
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	---	2,000
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,395	3,395
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,800	1,900
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,415	1,415
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,992	1,992
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	2,815	3,815
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,770	1,770
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,590	3,590
YUBA RIVER, CA	63	63
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	315	315
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,225	1,225
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	894	894
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	136	136
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,148	2,148
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	242	242
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,309	1,309

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	364	364
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	506	506
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	284	284
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	906	906
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	35	35
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	447	447
NEW HAVEN HARBOR, CT	4,546	4,546
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	337	337
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,185	1,185
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	349	349
THOMASTON DAM, CT	565	565
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	506	506
DELAWARE		
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	12,853	13,133
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	45	45
MISPILLION RIVER, DE	275	275
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	310	310
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	50	50
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	4,966	4,966
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	7	7
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	1,110	1,110
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	33	33
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	50	50
FLORIDA		
APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	---	2,500
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,960	3,960
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	9,347	9,347
ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	---	2,200
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	3,030	3,030
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	200	200
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	322	4,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	4,040	4,040
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	6,050	7,695
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	2,780	2,780
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	1,508	1,508
MIAMI RIVER, FL	5,550	8,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,695	2,695
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,018	4,500
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	1,000	1,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR (BAYOU TEXAR), FL	---	750
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	2,350	2,350
PORT ST JOE HARBOR, FL	1,000	1,250
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	780	780
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,911	3,911
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	8,559	8,559
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	6,456	6,456
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	1,444	6,534
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	178	178
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,993	3,993
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	8,060	8,060
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	9,958	9,958
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	12,896	12,896
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	41	41
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	13,553	13,553

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	7,548	7,548
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	12,540	12,540
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	134	134
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	5,587	5,587
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	354	354
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	275	275
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	544	544
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,677	1,677
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	3,951	3,951
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	81	81
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,488	1,488
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	371	371
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	3,190	4,840
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,856	6,106
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,616	2,616
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362	362
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	204	204
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	25,154	25,154
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,683	1,683
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	428	428
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,386	4,000
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	1,037	1,037
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,073	5,073
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	41,820	41,820
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	15,443	15,443
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	30	30
REND LAKE, IL	4,520	4,520
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	111	111
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	1,270	1,270
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	732	732
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	3,427	3,727
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	1,606	1,606
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	634	634
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	704	704
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	64	64
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	168	168
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	1,108	1,108
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	1,132	1,132
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	853	853
MONROE LAKE, IN	759	759
PATOKA LAKE, IN	727	727
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	55	55
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	649	649
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	130	130
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	3,097	3,097
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	78	78
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	147	147
MISSOURI RIVER - RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO	5,613	5,613
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE	3,075	3,075
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,189	2,189
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,609	3,609

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,088	4,088
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,934	1,934
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,491	1,491
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	460	610
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	552	552
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,204	1,879
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	752	752
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	48	48
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,144	1,144
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,521	1,521
MARION LAKE, KS	1,621	1,621
MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,034	2,034
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,997	1,997
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	1,052	1,052
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,111	2,111
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,897	1,897
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	194	194
TORONTO LAKE, KS	424	424
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,106	2,106
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,846	1,846
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	8,171	8,171
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,074	2,074
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	35	35
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,703	1,703
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,343	1,843
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	833	833
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,555	1,555
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	19	460
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,927	1,927
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,259	1,259
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,081	1,081
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,769	1,769
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	181	181
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	400	400
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,542	1,542
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	28	28
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	623	623
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	52	52
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,992	1,992
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	30,969	30,969
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH	5,577	5,577
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	982	982
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	6	6
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,120	2,320
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	913	913
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	7,162	7,862
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,156	1,156
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	14,681	14,681
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	---	2,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	794	794
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	1,085	1,085
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	40	40
BAYOU TECHE, LA	---	2,000
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	---	50
CADDO LAKE, LA	166	166
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	15,852	15,852
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,443	1,443

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	---	1,600
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	19,129	19,129
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,223	3,223
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	772	772
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	7,297	9,297
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	20	20
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	5	5
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,280	1,280
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	80	80
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	57,482	57,482
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	13,061	13,361
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80	80
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,000	2,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	180	180
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WW TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	---	575
MAINE		
BELFAST HARBOR, ME	1,305	1,305
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	16	16
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,720	1,720
PENOBSCOT RIVER, ME	---	100
ROCKLAND HARBOR, ME	1,110	1,110
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	500	500
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	663	663
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	18,444	20,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	168	168
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	930	930
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	34	34
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,653	1,653
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	1,627	1,627
POCOMOKE RIVER, MD	619	619
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	323	323
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	91	91
TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD	180	180
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	604	604
MASSACHUSETTS		
AUNT LYDIA'S COVE, CHATHAM, MA	418	418
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	533	533
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	498	498
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	431	431
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	7,659	7,659
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	260	260
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	174	174
CUTTYHUNK HARBOR, MA	174	174
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	313	313
GREEN HARBOR, MA	418	418
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	416	416
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	112	112
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	483	483
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	441	441
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	322	322
PLYMOUTH HARBOR, MA	1,000	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	1,197	1,197
SCITUATE HARBOR, MA	2,950	2,950
TULLY LAKE, MA	486	486
WEST HILL DAM, MA	657	657
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	406	406

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
MICHIGAN		
ALPENA HARBOR, MI	222	222
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	107	107
BAY PORT HARBOR, MI	299	299
BLACK RIVER HARBOR, MI	12	12
BLACK RIVER, PORT HURON, MI	14	514
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	128	128
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	124	124
CHEBOYGAN HARBOR, MI	12	12
CLINTON RIVER, MI	10	10
DETROIT RIVER, MI	3,192	4,912
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	177	177
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,250	1,250
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI	---	175
GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	227	227
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	505	505
INLAND ROUTE, MI	33	33
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	154	154
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	450	450
LAC LA BELLE, MI	102	102
LELAND HARBOR, MI	174	174
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	704	704
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	462	462
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	95	95
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	247	247
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	50	50
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	193	193
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	281	281
MONROE HARBOR, MI	792	792
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	387	387
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	156	156
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	1,745	1,745
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	25	25
PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI	---	385
PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	501	501
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	21	21
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	234	234
ROUGE RIVER, MI	933	933
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	2,351	2,351
SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	2,803	2,803
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	12	12
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	54	54
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	694	694
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	996	996
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	18,181	18,181
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,507	2,507
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	67	67
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	274	274
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	4,506	4,506
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	207	207
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	1,031	1,031
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	130	130
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	45,405	45,405
ORWELL LAKE, MN	481	481
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	72	72
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	126	126
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	4,513	4,513
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	306	306
TWO HARBORS, MN	167	167

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
MISSISSIPPI		
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	8	113
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	170	170
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,002	2,002
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	7	7
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	25	25
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,618	1,618
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	3,401	3,401
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	288	288
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	5	5
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	15	15
YAZOO RIVER, MS	15	15
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	21	240
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,959	5,959
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	1,860	4,860
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	10,253	10,253
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	1,043	1,043
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	935	935
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	980	980
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	13,878	13,878
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	16	290
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,168	2,168
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	6	6
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	296	296
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MO	---	400
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,070	1,070
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	4,268	4,268
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	6,261	7,261
UNION LAKE, MO	10	10
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	7,354	7,354
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	40	40
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	1,505	1,505
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	100	100
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	7,199	7,199
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	2,025	2,025
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	78	78
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE	---	240
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,.	500	500
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWO	45	45
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	669	669
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	925	925
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	39	39
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	556	556
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	194	194
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	454	454
COCHECO RIVER, NH	50	50
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	490	490
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	496	496
HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,074	1,074
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	11	11

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
LITTLE HARBOR, NH	200	200
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	577	577
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	273	273
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	575	575
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,750	1,750
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	425	425
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	20	20
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	19,245	19,245
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,470	3,470
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	65	65
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,586	2,586
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	75	75
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	425	425
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	782	782
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	80	80
SHARK RIVER, NJ	590	590
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,949	1,949
COCHITI LAKE, NM	2,124	2,124
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	2,032	2,290
GALISTEO DAM, NM	510	510
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	175	175
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	497	497
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,400	1,400
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	112	112
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	369	369
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL, NM	55	55
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	457	457
ARKPORT DAM, NY	246	246
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,041	1,041
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	643	643
BUFFALO RIVER, NY	---	850
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	300	300
CAPE VINCENT HARBOR, NY	11	11
CATTARAUGUS CREEK HARBOR, NY	50	50
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	480	480
EAST RIVER, NY	80	80
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	2,100	2,100
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	501	501
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	175	175
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	80	2,000
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	80	80
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	80	80
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	80	80
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	2,245	2,245
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	3,170	3,170
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	639	639
IRONDEQUOIT BAY HARBOR, NY	10	10
JAMAICA BAY, NY	1,420	1,420
JONES INLET, NY	100	100
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	80	80
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	1,284	1,284
MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	80	80
MORICHES INLET, NY	600	600
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	2,040	2,040
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	3,835	8,835
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	5,300	5,300
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	750	750

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	3,720	3,720
OAK ORCHARD HARBOR, NY	15	15
OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	10	10
PLATTSBURGH HARBOR, NY	590	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	2,595	2,595
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	35	35
SAG HARBOR, NY	2,500	2,500
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	1,346	1,346
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	760	760
STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	20	20
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	595	595
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	705	705
WILSON HARBOR, NY	20	20
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	806	4,000
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,829	1,829
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	400	400
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	867	867
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	587	587
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,060	1,060
FALLS LAKE, NC	2,281	2,281
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	32	32
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	455	895
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,732	4,732
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	45	45
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	5,100	5,100
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	815	815
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	640	940
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	139	139
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	73	73
ROANOKE RIVER, NC	100	100
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	3,480	3,480
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	8,213	8,213
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	177	177
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	11,939	12,039
HOMME LAKE, ND	281	281
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	15	15
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,354	1,354
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	395	395
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	68	68
SOURIS RIVER, ND	370	370
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	775	775
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,915	1,915
BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,857	1,857
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,234	1,234
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	773	1,173
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,520	3,520
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	585	585
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	711	1,061
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	932	932
DILLON LAKE, OH	576	576
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	1,090	1,290
HURON HARBOR, OH	860	860
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	233	233
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	3,400	3,400
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25	25
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	789	789
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,036	1,036

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	6,133	7,183
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	319	319
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	778	778
PORT CLINTON HARBOR, OH	1,275	1,275
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	150	150
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	90	90
ROCKY RIVER, OH	30	30
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30	30
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,010	1,510
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	175	175
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,525	4,425
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	240	240
TOUSSAINT RIVER, OH	520	520
VERMILION HARBOR, OH	205	205
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	461	461
WEST HARBOR, OH	30	30
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	992	992
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	451	451
BIRCH LAKE, OK	602	602
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,627	2,227
CANDY LAKE, OK	19	19
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,620	1,620
COPAN LAKE, OK	821	821
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	5,546	6,886
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	4,352	4,352
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	924	924
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	209	209
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	600	600
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,732	1,732
HULAH LAKE, OK	426	426
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	94	94
KAW LAKE, OK	1,931	1,931
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	4,647	4,647
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK.	3,923	3,923
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,360	2,360
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	59	59
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	34	34
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,187	1,187
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,648	4,648
SARDIS LAKE, OK	912	912
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	389	389
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,488	1,488
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,690	3,690
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,498	1,498
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	4,178	4,178
WISTER LAKE, OK	580	580
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	729	729
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	220	220
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	5,043	5,043
CHETCO RIVER, OR	---	390
COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	14,770	14,770
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	6,632	7,632
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	526	526
COOS BAY, OR	5,494	5,494
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	---	330
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	842	842
COUGAR LAKE, OR	732	732
DETROIT LAKE, OR	588	588
DORENA LAKE, OR	635	635
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	419	419

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	989	989
GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,122	1,122
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	401	401
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	172	172
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	3,416	3,416
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,613	1,613
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,028	3,028
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,626	4,626
PORT ORFORD, OR	606	606
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	200	200
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	---	450
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	71	71
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	466	566
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	5	325
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	134	134
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	15	315
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	963	963
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	344	344
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	67	67
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	714	714
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,450	1,450
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	4,070	4,070
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	630	630
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	270	270
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,171	1,171
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,513	2,513
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	898	948
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,915	1,915
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,746	1,746
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	722	722
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,318	1,418
ERIE HARBOR, PA	60	60
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	775	775
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	782	1,282
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	341	341
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	170	170
JOHNSTOWN, PA	1,243	1,500
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,231	1,731
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	957	1,007
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	848	848
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	14,357	14,357
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	18,589	18,589
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	488	488
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	18	18
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	506	506
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	13	13
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,941	4,441
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	60	60
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	50	50
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,734	2,734
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	392	392
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	72	72
TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,542	2,642
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	2,032	2,982
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	245	245
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	761	761
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	543	543
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	1,895	1,895
RHODE ISLAND		
BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI	502	502
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	6	6

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	2,330	2,330
PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	8,220	8,220
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	264	264
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	10,516	10,516
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,140	6,890
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	3,073	3,073
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	26	26
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	69	69
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	816	816
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	9,137	9,137
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	211	211
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	184	184
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	9,016	9,016
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	24	24
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	504	504
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	500	500
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	12,885	12,885
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	69	69
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	6,031	6,031
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,257	6,257
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	1,025	1,025
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	6,407	6,407
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	5,720	5,720
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	129	129
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	2,954	2,954
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,598	6,598
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	6	6
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	15,794	15,794
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	19	19
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	743	743
ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,373	1,373
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	606	606
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,574	1,574
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,389	2,389
BELTON LAKE, TX	2,707	3,407
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,011	2,011
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	2,143	2,143
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	3,126	3,126
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,498	2,498
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,669	5,669
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	6,132	6,832
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	5	5
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,682	2,682
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	7,298	7,298
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	4,887	4,887
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,612	1,612
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,602	2,602
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	20,829	23,829
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,250	1,250
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	8,254	12,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	498	498
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,248	1,248
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	823	823
LAKE KEMP, TX	150	150

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
LAVON LAKE, TX	2,609	2,609
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,134	3,134
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,748	1,748
MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	2,604	2,604
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,676	1,676
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,835	2,835
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	872	872
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,116	1,116
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,623	2,623
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	50	50
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	862	862
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	14,986	14,986
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,559	4,559
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	255	255
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,683	2,683
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,805	2,005
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	300	300
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	2,135	2,135
TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	---	500
WACO LAKE, TX	2,270	3,158
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	999	999
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	5,205	5,205
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,742	2,742
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	81	81
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	364	364
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	705	705
BURLINGTON HARBOR BREAKWATER, VT	2,150	2,150
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	26	26
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	95	95
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	576	576
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	647	647
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	687	687
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	538	538
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	---	2,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA	2,035	2,035
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA	1,159	1,159
CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	155	155
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	1,124	1,124
DAVIS CREEK, VA	350	350
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,612	1,612
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR (DRIFT REMOVAL	1,200	1,200
HORN HARBOR, VA	270	270
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	111	111
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,801	3,801
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	9,890	9,890
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,334	1,334
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	225	425
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	200	200
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	8,679	8,679
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	297	297
OCCOQUAN RIVER, VA	---	3,000
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	4,377	4,377
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	749	749
QUINBY CREEK, VA	400	400
RUDEE INLET, VA	1,030	1,030
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,150	1,150
WHITINGS CREEK, MIDDLESEX CO, VA	350	350

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
YORK RIVER, VA	---	1,080
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	853	853
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA	---	630
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,355	1,355
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	8,781	10,481
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,777	1,777
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,065	5,065
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	257	257
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	7,479	7,479
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,268	1,268
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,244	5,244
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,291	3,291
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	947	947
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	321	321
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	2,075	2,075
NEAH BAY, WA	---	1,200
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	253	253
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	999	999
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	975	975
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	439	439
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	640	640
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	247	247
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	60	60
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	127	127
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	2,264	2,264
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	492	492
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,167	1,167
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,149	3,149
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,555	1,555
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,832	1,832
ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	440	440
ELKINS, WV	16	16
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	131	131
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	7,544	7,544
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	18,991	18,991
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	3,260	3,260
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,431	1,431
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	905	905
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,603	1,603
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,777	1,777
TYGART LAKE, WV	5,546	5,546
WISCONSIN		
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	180	180
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	820	820
FOX RIVER, WI	1,372	7,372
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,924	1,924
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	31	31
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	1,315	1,315
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	75	75
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	278	278
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	789	789
OCONTO HARBOR, WI	13	13
PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI	261	261
PORT WING HARBOR, WI	6	6
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	56	56
SAXON HARBOR, WI	45	45
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	1,603	1,603
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	1,578	1,578

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 REQUEST	HOUSE
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	498	498
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	471	471
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,233	1,233
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	101	101
MISCELLANEOUS		
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	725	725
AUTOMATED BUDGET SYSTEM (WINABS)	285	285
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,750	2,750
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	1,545	1,545
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	8,000	8,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,180	1,180
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	6,755	6,755
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	1,545	1,545
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	300	300
FACILITY PROTECTION	64,000	35,000
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS	1,000	1,000
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	675	675
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION PROJECTS	4,120	6,120
MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,750	1,750
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	45	45
NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM	30	30
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	4,120	4,120
NATIONAL LEWIS AND CLARK COMMEMORATION COORDINATOR	310	310
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	815	815
PROTECTING, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS(SEC 3)	50	50
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM (RMSP)	1,545	1,545
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	1,545	1,545
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675	675
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	500
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	725	725
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,745	4,745
HYDROPOWER MAINTENANCE	---	-49,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-19,091	-34,780
ADJUSTMENT FOR ACTUAL RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-240	---
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,913,760	1,990,280

Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers and Alabama-Coosa River, Alabama.—The amounts provided for the Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers and Alabama-Coosa River projects include $250,000 and $50,000, respectively, for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging of backwater areas.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama and Mississippi.—The Committee is concerned with the lack of competition and industry response to annual dredging requirements on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. Therefore, in order to insure the continued reliability of the waterway for commercial navigation, the Committee has included language in the bill which directs the Corps of Engineers to investigate a full range of alternatives, including, but not limited to, the lease, lease/purchase, or purchase of a commercially manufactured dredge and ancillary equipment, for maintenance of the waterway, and to implement within two years the alternative which allows the reliable operation of the waterway in the most economic manner. It is the Committee's intent that any such plant acquired shall be operated by contractor personnel.

Anchorage Harbor, Alaska.—The bill includes $4,616,000 for operation and maintenance of the Anchorage Harbor, Alaska, project, including $1,000,000 for the completion of a modeling study to determine sedimentation rates, volumes, and patterns.

Cook Inlet, Alaska.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a modeling study of the Upper Cook Inlet navigation channel in conjunction with the ongoing modeling for the Anchorage Harbor project.

Kodiak Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for the removal of sediment and rubble deposits in the north and south entrance channels.

Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California.—The bill includes $8,584,000 for operation and maintenance of the Los Angeles County Drainage project, including $3,660,000 for the construction of additional recreational facilities within the Hansen Dam Basin, and $500,000 for additional maintenance on the Compton Creek segment of the project. The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to contract with the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy of the State of California, or its local designee, for the work to be undertaken at Hansen Dam, and to enter into a management agreement or memorandum of understanding with the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy or its local designee for the management and development of natural areas within the Hansen Dam Recreation Area.

Pillar Point Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 to complete repair of the east breakwater.

San Francisco Bay Long Term Management Strategy, California.—The bill includes $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the San Francisco Bay Long Term Management Strategy, including $200,000 for the Oakland Harbor operation and maintenance 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.

The Committee has provided an additional $30,000 for the Corps of Engineers to reimburse the City of Chesapeake City, Maryland, for the costs of installing water supply connections on two streets and continue the preparation of a decision document regarding additional damage to the City's water supply system. In addition, the Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a decision document to determine if the groundwater near the West View Shores community in Cecil County, Maryland, is being contaminated by leachates from the Pearce Creek disposal area.

Apalachicola Bay, Florida.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for maintenance dredging of the East Point Channel segment of the Apalachicola Bay, Florida, project.

Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Florida.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for maintenance dredging on the Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Ponce De Leon Inlet, Florida.

Palm Beach Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Corps of Engineers to perform the sand tightening of the south jetty and undertake repairs to the north jetty.

Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $4,840,000 for operation and maintenance of the Calumet Harbor and River project, including $900,000 for additional maintenance dredging and $750,000 for design, engineering and rehabilitation of the stone dock.

Carlyle Lake, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $6,106,000 for operation and maintenance of Carlyle Lake, including $250,000 for rehabilitation of the Dam West Campground.

Kaskaskia River, Illinois.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging at the mouth of the river and reestablish the channel to Fayetteville, Illinois.

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to analyze and implement alternatives to eliminate or minimize maintenance costs related to scouring and shoaling from propeller wash.

El Dorado Lake, Kansas.—The bill includes $610,000 for operation and maintenance of the El Dorado Lake project including $150,000 to replace the gate hoist cylinders.

Fall River Lake, Kansas.—The Committee has provided $1,879,000 for operation and maintenance of the Fall River Lake project, including $355,000 to repair the stilling basin and $320,000 to repair the sluice gates.

Carr Creek Lake, Kentucky.—To initiate additions and improvements to recreation facilities at the Carr Creek Lake, Kentucky, project, the Committee has provided an additional $500,000.

Rough River Lake, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to upgrade recreational facilities at the Axtel and North Fork Campgrounds at Rough River Park.

Wolf Creek Dam, Lake Cumberland, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $700,000 for the purchase and use of a skimmer boat to remove trash and debris from the lake.

Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $14,681,000 for operation and maintenance of the Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black project, the same as the budget request. The Committee remains concerned about safe navigation on the project for vessels with drafts up to 20 feet. The Committee commends the Corps of Engineers for its efforts to address the "fluff" problem in the channel and directs the Corps to continue to make the safe transit of this waterway a priority.

Barataria Bay Waterway, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for maintenance dredging of the Barataria Bay Waterway project. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to give priority to dredging contracts that will improve access to the Port of Grand Isle.

Bayou Teche, Louisiana.—The bill includes $2,000,000 for the Bayou Teche, Louisiana, project. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to expedite its maintenance dredging efforts on the project and complete the refurbishment of the Keystone Lock. Further, the Committee expects the Administration to request funds for this project in the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $9,297,000 for operation and maintenance of the J. Bennett Johnston Waterway project. The additional funds will enable the Corps of Engineers to perform needed maintenance dredging of the project.

Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to repair the north bank foreshore rock dike.

Penobscot River, Maine.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to evaluate disposal options, prepare an environmental impact statement, and continue coordination with the State of Maine in preparation for maintenance dredging of the Penobscot Harbor, Maine, project.

Grand Marais Harbor, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $175,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the reevaluation report for the Grand Marais Harbor project in Michigan and initiate design for a replacement for the existing breakwater.

Clearwater Lake, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $4,860,000 for the Clearwater Lake, Missouri, project. The additional funds are to be used for the preparation of a new Water Control Plan ($675,000), the continuation of the design and construction of additional high water recreational facilities ($1,125,000), and to reduce the operation and maintenance backlog at the project ($1,200,000).

Table Rock Lake, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $7,261,000 for operation and maintenance of the Table Rock Lake project for the Corps of Engineers to address the maintenance backlog at the project and modernize recreational facilities.

Conchas Dam, New Mexico.—The bill includes additional funds for the Corps of Engineers to address the dangerous traffic situation on the road across Conchas Dam.

Plattsburgh Harbor, New York.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the rehabilitation work on the Plattsburgh Harbor Breakwater in Plattsburgh, New York.

Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for mosquito control in the vicinity of Williston, North Dakota.

Clarence J. Brown Dam, Ohio.—The Committee has provided an additional $400,000 for enhancements to the Buck Creek Trail.

Deer Creek Lake, Ohio.—The Committee has provided an additional $350,000 for the Corps of Engineers to upgrade the recreational facilities at Deer Creek Lake.

Muskingum River Lakes, Ohio.—The Committee has included $7,183,000 for operation and maintenance of the Muskingum River Lakes project in Ohio, including $800,000 to conduct a system operations study and develop a flood warning system, and $250,000 to conduct a water quality study of selective withdrawal concepts at Tappan Lake.

Toledo Harbor, Ohio.—The bill includes $4,425,000 for operation and maintenance of the Toledo Harbor, Ohio, project, including $200,000 for additional dredging and $700,000 for dewatering and additional work on the confined disposal facility.

Eufaula Lake, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Eufaula Lake project in Oklahoma to address the maintenance backlog, and for work associated with the proposed transfer of abandoned land at Hickory Point to the Choctaw Nation.

Columbia River at the Mouth, Oregon.—The Committee has provided $7,632,000 for the Columbia River at the Mouth project, of which $1,000,000 is for the Corps of Engineers to continue to study the proposed placement of dredged material in the surf area at Benson Beach, Washington, at the mouth of the Columbia River. Specifically, the Corps should work collaboratively with State and local stakeholders to determine the effectiveness of this solution to dredged material disposal problems, monitor potential impacts to the region, and determine whether this dredged material disposal practice is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and cost effective.

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon.—The bill includes an additional $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to prepare plans and specifications for repair and restoration of the jetties at the Tillamook Bay and Bar project.

Conemaugh River Lake and Loyalhanna Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $50,000 each for the Conemaugh River Lake and Loyalhanna Lake projects for the Corps of Engineers to determine if the releases schedule for each project can be modified to permit greater use of the downstream rivers during summer months without adversely impacting other authorized project purposes.

East Branch Clarion River Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to upgrade the sewer and septic system at the East Branch Clarion River Lake project.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $1,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the major rehabilitation of the Johnstown, Pennsylvania, local flood protection project.

Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes an additional $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide angler/visitor access that is ADA compliant and to modernize the visitor center.

Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to improve the road leading to the Susquehanna Campground at Raystown Lake.

Tioga-Hammond Lakes, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for additional improvements to recreational facilities at the Tioga-Hammond Lakes project.

Tionesta Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $950,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the upgrade to the campground at the Tionesta Lake project.

Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Corps of Engineers to make a lump sum payment to the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources for operation of the fish lift.

Belton Lake, Texas.—The bill includes $3,407,000 for the Belton Lake, Texas, project. The additional funds will enable the Corps of Engineers to address the maintenance backlog at the project, including repairs to roads and dilapidated recreational equipment.

Denison Dam, Lake Texoma, Texas.—The Committee has provided $6,832,000 for the Denison Dam, Lake Texoma, project. The additional funds are for the Corps of Engineers to study the proposed reallocation of storage at the lake to water supply, to address critical maintenance needs at the project, and for work associated with the proposed transfer of land at the project to private interests.

North San Gabriel Dam and Lake Georgetown, Texas.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 to be used for upgrading park facilities.

Stillhouse Hollow Dam, Texas.—The Committee has provided $2,005,000 for the Stillhouse Hollow Dam, Texas, project. The additional funds will enable the Corps of Engineers to address the maintenance backlog at the project.

Waco Lake, Texas.—The Committee has provided $3,158,000 for the Waco Lake, Texas, project. The additional funds are to be used to make recreation improvements associated with raising the level of the lake.

Philpott Lake, Virginia.—The Committee directs that no funds be used to operate the campground and other facilities for overnight use at the Goose Point Recreation Area at Philpott Lake if day use for picnicking, swimming, and use of the boat ramp is prohibited at the Goose Point Recreation Area.

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington.—The bill includes $10,481,000 for operation and maintenance of the Grays Harbor and Chehalis River project in Washington, including $1,700,000 to complete rehabilitation of the north jetty.

Neah Bay, Washington.—The Committee has provided $1,200,000 for emergency rehabilitation of the breakwater at the Neah Bay project in Washington.

Bluestone Lake, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $3,149,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the drift and debris initiative being undertaken at Bluestone Lake, West Virginia.

Fox River, Wisconsin.—The bill includes $7,372,000 for the Fox River project in Wisconsin, including $6,000,000 to complete the transfer of the locks on the river to the State of Wisconsin.

Facility Protection.—The budget request included $64,000,000 to provide for additional security guards at Corps of Engineers critical infrastructure projects. The Committee has been advised that the Corps now estimates that security guard costs in fiscal year FY 2003 will be approximately $35,000,000. Accordingly, the Committee has provided $35,000,000 for this activity.

Hydropower Maintenance.—The budget includes a proposal for the Power Marketing Administrations (excluding the Bonneville Power Administration) to provide direct funding from power sale revenues for the operation and maintenance of Corps' hydropower facilities. Currently, hydropower operation and maintenance costs are appropriated from the General Fund. The Administration has submitted the necessary legislation to authorize this change. In anticipation of this change, the budget request includes $149 million for hydropower operation and maintenance, about $49,000,000 more than the amount normally recommended. Due to budgetary constraints, the Committee has not provided this additional funding pending action by the appropriate authorizing committees to enact the proposal.

Inland Waterways Navigation Charts.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 for the development of an electronic navigation charting data system on the Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers system in Alabama.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2002	$127,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	144,252,000
Recommended, 2003	134,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+7,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	– 10,252,000

Note: The original budget request of $151,000,000 for the Regulatory Program included $6,748,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since no legislation has been enacted, the budget request for the Regulatory Program has been reduced by this amount.

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 2003, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $134,000,000, $10,252,000 below the budget request and $7,000,000 more than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2002.

REVOLVING FUND

Replacement of Corps of Engineers Aircraft.—In the years since the Corps of Engineers was originally authorized to acquire airplanes for the use of some Divisions, profound changes have occurred in transportation and communications. Therefore, the Corps of Engineers may neither replace the Mississippi Valley Division

and Northwestern Division aircraft nor acquire additional aircraft until the practicability and economic benefits of such ownership has been re-evaluated and proved to have merit when compared with options including military air, lease sharing, vidoeconferencing, other alternatives, and a combination of all other available means.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2002	$140,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	140,298,000
Recommended, 2002	150,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+10,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	+9,702,000

Note: The original budget request of $141,000,000 for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program included $702,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since no legislation has been enacted, the budget request for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program has been reduced by this amount.

The Committee recommendation for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) is $150,000,000, an increase of $9,702,000 over the budget request and $10,000,000 more than fiscal year 2002 funding. The additional funds are provided to accelerate cleanup at existing FUSRAP remediation sites, with emphasis on those sites that are nearing completion, and to prepare for the new sites that have recently been added into the program. The Corps may reprogram up to $1,000,000 among FUSRAP projects; reprogramming of amounts equal to or greater than $1,000,000 require Committee approval.

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

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

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 2002	−$25,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	20,227,000
Recommended, 2003	20,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+45,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−227,000

Note: The original budget request of $22,000,000 for Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies included $1,773,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since no legislation has been enacted, the budget request for Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies has been reduced by this amount.

The Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies appropriation funds flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations,

and repair of flood control and Federal hurricane or shore protection works. It also provides funds for emergency supplies of drinking water where the source has been contaminated, and, in drought distressed areas, provides for adequate supplies of water for human and livestock consumption.

For fiscal year 2003, the Committee has recommended $20,000,000, $227,000 below the budget request.

The Committee is aware that a number of innovative systems have been developed for use in flood fights. One such system is the Rapid Deployment Flood Wall, which utilizes a series of interconnecting plastic cells which, when filled with sand, form a flood protection barrier. The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to invest in the Rapid Deployment Flood Wall technology to evaluate the improvement in flood fighting that would occur with its use and its cost effectiveness.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2002	$153,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	155,651,000
Recommended, 2003	154,651,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+1,651,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−1,000,000

Note: The original budget request of $161,000,000 for General Expenses included $5,349,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since no legislation has been enacted, the budget request for General Expenses has been reduced by this amount.

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 $154,651,000, $1,000,000 below the budget request and $1,651,000 above the fiscal year 2002 amount.

The recommendation also includes bill language prohibiting the use of funds to support a congressional affairs office within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers. This language has been included in Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act since fiscal year 2000. The Committee still believes that an office of congressional affairs is unnecessary for the effective management of the Civil Works program by the Corps' headquarters, and the efficient coordination of Civil Works issues with Members of Congress and committee staff. The Committee is concerned that, despite the language carried in this Act, the Office of Congressional Affairs has been involved in the exchange of Civil Works information between the headquarters and the Congress, at times causing delays in scheduling meetings and providing answers to Congressional inquiries. The Committee believes that the technical knowledge and managerial expertise needed for the Corps' headquarters to effectively address Civil Works authorization, appropriations, and policy matters reside in its Civil Works organization. Therefore, the Committee directs that the Office of Congressional Affairs not be part of the process by which information on Civil Works projects, programs, and activities is provided to the Congress.

In 1998, the Chief of Engineers issued a Command Directive transferring the oversight and management of the General Expenses account, as well as the manpower associated with this func-

tion, from the Civil Works Directorate to the Resource Management Office. The oversight and management of the Civil Works program lies solely with the Directorate of Civil Works, and it is funded through the General Expenses account to perform those duties. The Committee is very concerned that the lack of oversight by the Director of Civil Works over the General Expenses account may be having a detrimental impact on the performance of the Civil Works mission. Therefore, the Chief of Engineers is directed to provide to the Committee, by September 15, 2002, an assessment of the adequacy and distribution of allocations of the General Expenses account. The Committee needs to be assured that General Expenses funds are appropriately allocated in order for the Civil Works Directorate to adequately perform its mission.

Tulsa District Restructuring.—The Committee is aware that the Tulsa District of the Corps of Engineers has proposed a restructuring of its field offices. The Committee is also aware that the District has postponed acting on that proposal until it has been fully coordinated with local interests and members of the Oklahoma Congressional delegation. The Committee supports that decision.

Reprogramming of Funds.—Over the years, Committee has granted the Corps of Engineers great latitude to reprogram funds from studies, construction projects, and maintenance activities which are either delayed or are being terminated to those where the funds can be effectively used to keep projects moving and accelerate completion. The Committee believes that the ability to reprogram funds is essential to the Corps' ability to effectively manage its program. Accordingly, the Committee was very concerned to learn that the Corps of Engineers has not been reprogramming funds from a number of projects which are obviously not moving forward. It has been and continues to be the intent of the Committee that when any project is not moving forward, the Corps of Engineers look to reprogram the funds appropriated for that project to one where the funds can be effectively utilized unless explicitly instructed not to do so by the Committee on Appropriations.

Gavins Point Dam, Nebraska and South Dakota.—The Committee is aware that on March 6, 2002, the State of Nebraska filed a lawsuit seeking a judgment against the United States in the amount of $33,300,000. This represents the State's estimated cost of correcting damage to Nebraska State Highway 12, which has been undermined and weakened due to flooding and erosion brought about by the operation of the Corps of Engineers Fort Randall Dam and Gavins Point Dam on the Missouri River. The Committee is also aware that the Justice Department has determined that use of the Judgment Fund is not appropriate for this type of case. Without commenting on the merits of the case or the terms of a possible settlement, the Committee wishes to remind the Corps of Engineers that current law provides that appropriations shall be applied only to the objects for which the appropriations were made except as otherwise provided by law (31 U.S.C. 1301(a)), and that no appropriations have been made relative to this case. In addition, no funds have been requested for this purpose for fiscal year 2003. The committee believes that the appropriate course of action in this situation is for the Administration to submit a fiscal year 2003 budget amendment if funds are required in fiscal year 2003, or to

include a request for funds as part of the fiscal year 2004 budget submission. The Committee directs that the Corps of Engineers not expend funds to settle this case without consulting the Committee on Appropriations.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

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

Sec. 102. The Committee has included language which provides that the Secretary of the Army may expend funds under normal competitive procedures for renovations of the dredge McFARLAND authorized by section 563 of Public Law 104–303 provided that the dredge McFARLAND is operated in the manner recommended in the report of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) to Congress dated June 12, 2000, and is operated using the same procedures as those established to operate the dredge WHEELER.

Sec. 103. The Committee has included language which provides that none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used by the Corps of Engineers to undertake activities related to the Chicago Harbor, Illinois, Visitors Center.

Sec. 104. The Committee has included language which directs the Secretary of the Army to reduce by thirty-seven percent the full time employees in the Corps of Engineers Chicago District.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2002	$36,228,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	36,228,000
Recommended, 2003	36,228,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	.....
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

Note: The original budget request of $36,252,000 for the Central Utah Project Completion Account included $24,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Therefore, the budget request for the Central Utah Project Completion Account has been reduced by this amount.

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 2003 to carry out the provisions of the Act is $36,228,000, the same as the budget request and the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2002.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriation, 2002	$762,531,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	726,147,000
Recommended, 2003	807,518,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+44,987,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	+81,371,000

Note: The FY 2002 amount does not include $30,259,000 in emergency appropriations enacted in Public Law 107–117, and $7,000,000 enacted in Public Law 107–206. The original budget request of $739,705,000 for Water and Related Resources included $13,558,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Therefore, the budget request for Water and Related Resources has been reduced by this amount.

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

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES				
ARIZONA				
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	---	6,200	---	6,200
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER BASIN	34,709	74	34,709	74
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I	731	10,240	731	10,240
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	3,450	---	5,450	---
FORT MCDOWELL SETTLEMENT ACT	500	---	500	---
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	422	---	422	---
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER REUSE PROJECT	250	---	250	---
SALT RIVER PROJECT	39	---	39	---
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	4,825	---	4,825	---
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	797	---	2,097	---
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	200	---	500	---
TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY	100	---	100	---
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,658	19,107	1,658	19,107
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA AREA PROJECTS	778	557	778	557
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	417	---	417	---
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PLANT	1,000	---	1,800	---
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	2,043	9,658	6,943	9,658
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	7,707	44	7,707	44
DELTA DIVISION	11,095	5,323	16,095	5,323
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,230	3,855	1,230	5,255
FRIANT DIVISION	2,276	3,024	2,276	3,024

818857 92

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	12,726	1,027	14,026	1,027
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT.	---	16,000	---	16,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	4,921	1,780	8,321	1,780
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	519	---	519	---
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	249	---	249	---
SHASTA DIVISION	1,543	8,042	1,543	8,042
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	7,727	5,572	7,727	5,572
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	1,791	7,614	1,791	7,614
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	5,989	6,018	5,989	6,018
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	1,000	---	1,000	---
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	200	---	3,000	---
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	1,500	---	2,000	---
LONG BEACH DESALINATION PROJECT	---	---	1,000	---
MISSION BASIN BRACKISH GROUNDWATER DESALTING DEMO	---	---	300	---
NAPA- SOMOMA - MARIN AGRICULTURAL REUSE PROJECT	---	---	500	---
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	1,800	---	2,500	---
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT, PHAS	1,800	---	2,500	---
ORLAND PROJECT	39	430	39	430
PASADENA RECLAIMED WATER PROJECT	---	---	675	---
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	1,000	---	1,000	---
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	6,000	---	6,500	---
SAN DIEGO RIVER RESTORATION	---	---	750	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	1,800	---	1,800	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORTATION PROJECT	---	---	12,000	---
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	2,000	---	4,000	---
SOLANO PROJECT	1,248	1,513	1,248	1,513
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	842	---	1,542	---
WATSONVILLE AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	---	---	500	---

81 857 93

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP SECTION 5 & 8	33,000	---	38,000	---
COLLBRAN PROJECT	122	1,212	122	1,212
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	75	---	75	---
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	12	10,265	12	10,265
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT - HORSETOOTH DAM	---	31,100	---	31,100
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	41	118	41	118
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	---	6,785	---	6,785
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	224	612	224	612
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	582	1,552	582	1,552
MANCOS PROJECT	28	50	28	50
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	50	1,968	50	1,968
PINE RIVER PROJECT	58	65	58	65
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT	399	4,066	399	4,066
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	143	113	143	113
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	2,714	3,192	2,714	3,192
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	15,000	---	15,000	---
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT	100	---	100	---
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	578	---	578	---
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,282	2,194	3,282	2,194
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	200	---	200	---
KANSAS				
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	235	---	235	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
WICHITA PROJECT	---	285	---	285
MONTANA				
FORT PECK DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	---	---	8,000	---
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	---	300	---	300
MILK RIVER PROJECT	320	826	320	826
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	475	---	475	---
ROCKY BOYS INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	4,600	---	4,600	---
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	---	78	---	78
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	71	---	71	---
NEVADA				
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	6,215	2,339	6,215	2,339
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	1,000	---	1,000	---
SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	---	---	1,000	---
NEW MEXICO				
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER & RECLAMATION REUSE	---	---	400	---
CARLSBAD PROJECT	1,644	1,126	1,644	1,126
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	7,200	8,263	7,200	8,263
NAVAJO GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	300	---	300	---
NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	300	---	300	---
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	---	27	---	27

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	1,054	2,953	1,054	2,953
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	243	---	243	---
SANTA FE - WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	---	---	500	---
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	196	---	196	---
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	19	---	19	---
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	165	---	165	---
NORTH DAKOTA				
DAKOTAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	239	---	239	---
DAKOTAS TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	400	---	400	---
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT	20,662	4,577	22,662	4,577
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	---	193	---	193
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	---	452	---	452
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	---	306	---	306
NORMAN PROJECT	225	208	475	208
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	207	---	907	---
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	---	742	---	742
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	---	293	---	293
OREGON				
BEND FEED CANAL PIPELINE PROJECT	---	---	1,300	---
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	301	546	301	546
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	500	---	1,000	---
DESCHUTES PROJECT	382	152	382	152

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
DESCHUTES PROJECT-WICKUP DAM	---	12,300	---	12,300
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	308	275	308	275
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	150	---	150	---
KLAMATH PROJECT	13,644	623	13,644	623
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	333	---	333	---
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	454	169	454	169
TUALATIN PROJECT	238	125	238	125
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	25	---	25	---
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	50	---	50	---
UMATILLA PROJECT	408	2,363	408	2,363
WILLOW LAKE NATURAL TREATMENT SYSTEM	---	---	600	---
SOUTH DAKOTA				
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	2,000	---	7,000	---
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	10,000	40	17,000	40
MNI WICONI PROJECT	23,292	8,228	28,000	8,228
PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	---	---	2,000	---
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM	---	27	---	27
TEXAS				
AUSTIN WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	---	---	275	---
BALMORHEA PROJECT	---	71	---	71
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	---	109	---	109
EL PASO WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	---	---	1,000	---
LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCE CONSERVATION	---	---	2,000	---
NUECES RIVER	---	392	---	392
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	---	307	---	307

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	217	---	217	---
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT	120	24	120	24
MOON LAKE PROJECT	43	53	43	53
NAVAJO SANDSTONE AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY	100	---	100	---
NEWTON PROJECT	52	21	52	21
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	301	---	301	---
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	350	44	350	44
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	677	493	677	493
SCOFIELD PROJECT	97	27	97	27
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	279	---	279	---
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	107	7	107	7
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,455	399	1,455	399
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	52	71	52	71
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	4,485	6,346	4,485	6,346
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	518	---	818	---
YAKIMA PROJECT	598	6,156	598	6,156
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	11,900	---	11,900	---
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT	4	2,568	4	2,568
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	10	1,324	10	1,324
SHOSHONE PROJECT	10	1,232	10	1,232

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	37	---	37	---
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II:				
PROGRAM & COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	10,087	---	10,087	---
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5	7,178	2,302	7,278	2,302
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8, R&F&WL	3,970	22	3,970	22
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	150	---	150	---
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,275	---	1,275
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	---	21,910	---	21,910
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	---	14,315	---	14,315
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	---	50	---	50
DEPARTMENTAL IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	2,600	---	3,350	---
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE	899	---	4,128	---
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	3,087	---	3,087	---
EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	---	334	---	334
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	12,747	---	12,747	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,706	---	1,706	---
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,890	---	1,890	---
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	---	5,597	---	5,597
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,390	---	1,390
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	2,195	---	1,900	---
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	9,689	---	8,000	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	275	---	275	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	12,421	---	12,421	---
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	---	594	---	594
NATIONAL FISH & WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	850	---	850	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	8,500	---	8,500	---
NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,185	---	1,185	---
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	420	921	420	921
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN - OTHER PROJECTS	2,828	30,759	2,828	30,759
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	969	244	969	244
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	420	---	420	---
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	4,469	---	4,000	---
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT - TITLE XXVIII	2,800	---	2,800	---
RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	2,292	---	2,292	---
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:				
ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT DESALINATION PROGRAM	1,310	---	1,310	---
APPLIED SCIENCE /TECHNOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT	3,490	---	3,490	---
DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	100	---	100	---
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION/ENHANCEMEN	900	---	900	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	350	---	350	---
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,000	---	1,000	---
SITE SECURITY	---	28,440	---	28,440
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION	326	---	326	---
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	1,942	---	1,900	---
TITLE XVI, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	1,500	---	3,500	---
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES - TECHNICAL SUPPORT	67	---	67	---
WATER MANAGEMENT & CONSERVATION PROGRAM	6,581	---	6,581	---
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	3,117	---	3,617	---
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	-37,942	---	-47,213	---
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	381,164	344,983	461,135	346,383

Colorado River Front Work and Levee System, Arizona and California.—The Committee has provided $5,450,000 for the Colorado River Front Work and Levee System project. Of the total provided, $2,000,000 is for planning and design of two regulating reservoirs near the All-American Canal.

South/Central Arizona Investigations Program, Arizona.—The bill includes $2,097,000 for the South/Central Arizona Investigations Program. The amount provided includes $100,000 for the Southern Arizona Regional Water Management study and $175,000 for the Upper Gila River Watershed study, as requested by the Administration. In addition, the Committee has provided $300,000 for the West Salt River Valley Water Management study. These funds will enable the Bureau of Reclamation to continue its work with state and regional officials to finalize a plan for a regional solution to increasing renewable water supplies and reducing groundwater dependence.

The Committee is concerned about a potentially serious pollution threat on the Lower Colorado River below Hoover Dam that could adversely impact the drinking water of more than 20 million Americans. This threat remains notwithstanding the extraordinary financial commitments at the local level by members of the Colorado River Regional Sewer Coalition. The Committee recognizes that there is also a Federal responsibility to address the related water supply and quality issues, and it directs the Bureau of Reclamation to act as lead agency in conducting a study of the remaining technical, structural, and intergovernmental steps that must be taken to protect the River. The Bureau is instructed to work expeditiously with appropriate Federal, state, local, and private parties, including the Environmental Protection Agency, the Council on Environmental Quality, and the Colorado River Regional Sewer Coalition. The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for this purpose.

Central Valley Project, American River Division, California.—The bill includes $17,101,000 for the American River Division of the Central Valley Project. Of the total, $500,000 is for work associated with the construction of a parallel pipeline to serve customers of the City of Roseville and the San Juan Water District, and $900,000 is for the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate construction of a temperature control device on the El Dorado Irrigation District water intake. In addition, $3,500,000 is to reimburse the City of Folsom, California, for costs associated with the replacement of the Natoma Pipeline System. The Committee is aware of the need to relocate the road that currently crosses over Folsom Dam and intends to address this issue at a later point in the appropriations process.

Central Valley Project, Delta Division, California.—The Committee has provided $21,418,000 for the Delta Division of the Central Valley Project. Of the total, $5,000,000 is for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete design and initiate construction of an intertie between the Delta-Mendota Canal and the California Aqueduct to restore the capacity and flexibility lost in the Central Valley Project's Delta delivery system due to subsidence along the Delta-Mendota Canal.

Central Valley Project, East Side Division, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,400,000 for the Bureau of

Reclamation to continue the work to upgrade the water and sewer systems at New Melones Lake and perform a visitor capacity study at New Melones Lake.

Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs, California.—The bill includes $15,053,000 for Miscellaneous Project Programs of the Central Valley Project. Of the total, $300,000 is for post construction hydraulic evaluations and biological testing and monitoring for the Banta-Carbona Irrigation District Fish Screen project, and $500,000 is for an investigation of the resource problems and needs of the Mokelumne River Watershed. The Committee has also provided $500,000 to continue Phase II of the Kaweah River Delta Corridor Enhancement Study.

Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, California.—The Committee has provided $9,601,000 for the Sacramento River Division of the Central Valley Project. Of the total, $2,000,000 is for the continuing evaluation of water diversion and fishery protection options at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, and $400,000 is to complete planning and design of flood control and watershed enhancement elements of the Colusa Basin Integrated Resources Management Plan. In addition, $2,000,000 has been provided for the Bureau of Reclamation to help support work carried out by the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District (GCID) and the Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority to accelerate investigations associated with determining the feasibility of constructing Sites Reservoir, and for carrying out other water resources planning and management activities pursuant to the so-called Phase 8 settlement agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the State of California. The investigations related to Sites Reservoir shall include an evaluation of the utilization of both the GCID Main Canal and the Tehama-Colusa Canal as a means to convey water to the proposed reservoir. The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to participate with Butte County, California, in development of a integrated resource management plan.

City of Needles, California.—The Committee is aware that the Bureau of Reclamation has been negotiating with the City of Needles, California, to finalize a lease for approximately 25 acres of the 33 acres at the Bureau's dredge yard located in Needles, California. The lease would provide for development of the property by the City to accommodate summer and winter recreation, and provide Colorado River access. The Bureau would retain a portion of the property for dredge launching and operations, and would exchange the 25 acres of their existing yard for 10 acres of City-owned property located south of the yard. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to provide a report on the status of said lease before December 2002. The report shall include the particulars and time schedule for completing the Recreation and Public Purpose lease with the City of Needles, recommendations for eventual fee simple transfer of leased property, and a Memorandum of Understanding developed to insure continued access of the bay by both agencies.

Lake Tahoe Regional Wetlands Development, California.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue design and construction of the Lake Tahoe Regional Wetlands Development project.

Long Beach Desalination Project, California.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue to participate in the development of a desalination pilot project in cooperation with the City of Long Beach, California.

North San Diego County Water Recycling Project, California.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for the North San Diego County Water Recycling Project, including $100,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation's share of the San Elijo component of the project.

San Diego Area Water Reclamation Program, California.—The bill includes $6,500,000 for the San Diego Area Water Reclamation Program, of which $500,000 is for the North River Groundwater Production Project feasibility study.

San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund, California.—The bill includes language which provides that $12,000,000 of the funds appropriated for Water and Related Resources shall be deposited in the San Gabriel Restoration Fund to continue the program to design, construct, and operate projects to contain and treat the spreading groundwater contamination in the San Gabriel and Central Groundwater Basins in California.

Southern California Investigations Program, California.—The Committee has provided $1,542,000 for the Southern California Investigations Program. Of the funds provided, $200,000 is for the Bureau of Reclamation to work with the Antelope Valley—East Kern Water Agency to undertake an appraisal level investigation of possible alternatives to storing and delivering its California State Project water allocation, including constructing a storage reservoir known as the Antelope Buttes Reservoir, and $500,000 is for the Bureau of Reclamation to participate with the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority in the Chino Basin Conjunctive Use Program.

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

Southern Nevada Water Recycling Project, Nevada.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Las Vegas Wastewater Reclamation project in Nevada.

Albuquerque Metropolitan Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, New Mexico.—The bill includes $400,000 for the second phase of the non-potable surface water reclamation project for the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Middle Rio Grande Project, New Mexico.—The Committee is concerned that the continuing Endangered Species Act controversy regarding the silvery minnow is diverting resources from essential maintenance needs of the Middle Rio Grande project. Accordingly, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to report back to the Committee by February 1, 2003, with a determination if this is the case, and, if so, a list of the maintenance requirements that are not being met.

Santa Fe Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the feasibility report and NEPA compliance activities for the Santa Fe Water Reclamation and Reuse project.

Norman Project, Oklahoma.—The bill includes $683,000 for the Norman Project, including $250,000 for a study of measures to augment water supplies at Lake Thunderbird in cooperation with the Central Oklahoma Master Conservancy District.

Oklahoma Investigations Program, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided $907,000 for the Oklahoma Investigations Program, including $700,000 for a hydrology and water resources management study of the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer.

El Paso Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, Texas.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the continuation of work on the Central El Paso feature of the project, which will reclaim water from the Haskell R. Street Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement, Texas.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to carry out activities authorized in the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000, Section 4, Public Law 106–576.

Washington Investigations Program, Washington.—The Committee has provided $818,000 for the Washington Investigations Program. Of the total provided, $300,000 is to provide technical assistance and undertake appraisal level studies for the creation of additional water storage in the Yakima River Basin, with specific emphasis on the proposed Black Rock Reservoir.

Colorado River Storage Project, Section 5.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to examine the potential for transferring the San Juan-Chama project in New Mexico to the project beneficiaries.

Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program.—The Committee has provided $3,350,000 for the Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program. Of the total, $750,000 is for the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users Association selenium remediation demonstration project in Colorado.

Drought Emergency Assistance Program.—The Committee has included $4,128,000 for the Drought Emergency Assistance Program. The amount provided includes $479,000 for drought emergency planning in the State of Nebraska, and $750,000 to rehabilitate and replace existing wells and construct new wells to address the current drought conditions in the City and County of Santa Fe, New Mexico. In addition, $1,000,000 is provided for a regional weather modification program in the states of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Site Security.—The Committee has provided $28,440,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation's site security program, the same as the budget request. The Committee is aware that on April 4, 2002, the Commissioner of Reclamation issued policy guidance on the reimbursability of counter-terrorism funding which stated that security costs associated with the increased security of Bureau of Reclamation facilities in response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, would be nonreimbursable. The Committee is very supportive of this decision, and understands that it applies to funds appropriated in Public Law 107–117, and funds appropriated in this Act.

Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program.—The Committee has provided $3,500,000 for the Title XVI Water Reclama-

tion and Reuse Program, of which $2,000,000 is to provide continued support to the WateReuse Foundation's research program. In addition, $125,000 is provided for the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct an appraisal level investigation and feasibility study to determine the viability of recycling in the Desert Hot Springs area of California.

Water Management and Conservation Program.—The Committee is aware of the significant efforts being made by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and its member agencies to conserve water through the development and demonstration of innovative water conservation technologies. These efforts are a critical component of the State of California's plan to reduce its dependence on the Colorado River. Therefore, the Committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to continue urban water conservation programs within the service area of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

Wetlands Development.—The bill includes $3,617,000 for the Wetlands Development Program. The additional funds will enable the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate work on the Yuma East Wetlands Restoration Project.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 2002	$55,039,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	48,904,000
Recommended, 2003	48,904,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−6,135,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	—

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 2003, the Committee has provided $48,904,000, the same as the budget request.

Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District Fish Screen Improvement Project.—The Committee directs that any portion of the $2,000,000 provided under this heading in fiscal year 2002 for the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District Fish Screen Improvement Project that has not been used for that project shall be made available for work carried out by the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District to accelerate investigations associated with determining the feasibility of constructing Sites Reservoir and for carrying out other water resources planning and management activities pursuant to the so-called Phase 8 settlement agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the State of California.

Anadromous Fish Screen Program.—The Committee directs that an additional $5,382,000 be provided 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.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

Appropriation, 2002	—
Budget Estimate, 2003	$15,000,000
Recommended, 2003	—
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	—
Budget Estimate, 2003	– 15,000,000

The purpose of the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration account is to fund the Federal share of ecosystem restoration and other activities being developed for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta by a State and Federal partnership (CALFED). Federal participation in this program was authorized in the California Bay-Delta Environmental and Water Security Act enacted in the fall of 1996. That Act authorized the appropriation of $143,300,000 for ecosystem restoration activities in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. Attempts to reauthorize the program have thus far been unsuccessful. Accordingly, no funds were provided in fiscal years 2001 and 2002 in support of the CALFED effort through this account.

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 2003, 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, 2002	$52,968,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	54,870,000
Recommended, 2003	54,870,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+1,902,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	—

Note: The original budget request of $66,238,000 for Policy and Administration included $11,368,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Therefore, the budget request for Policy and Administration has been reduced by this amount.

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

For fiscal year 2003, the Committee has recommended $54,870,000, the same as the budget request, and $1,902,000 above the fiscal year 2002 amount.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Sec. 201. The Committee has included language proposed by the Administration authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to continue the program of providing grants to institutions of higher learning to support the training of Native Americans to manage their water resources. This language was included in the fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

Sec. 202. The Committee has included language proposed by the Administration regarding the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson Reservoir in California. This language has been included in Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts for several years.

Sec. 203. The Committee has included language which amends section 212 of the FY 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act related to the conveyance of the Sly Park Unit in California.

Sec. 204. The Committee has included language which clarifies that the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund may be used to reimburse the Central Basin Municipal Water District for expenditures made between February 11, 1993 and December 21, 2000 in connection with the San Gabriel Basin Restoration project authorized in Public Law 106–554.

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 supports the Administration's budget request for the Department of Energy and adjusts funding for some programs to reflect specific Congressional interests. Total funding for the Department of Energy is $20,675,871,000, an increase of $806,045,000 over fiscal year 2002 and $146,995,000 over the budget request.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

Over the past year, the Department has disregarded the Congressional direction provided by this Committee in House Reports 107–112 and 107–258 which accompanied the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002. Required reports to Congress have not been delivered in a timely manner, if at all; directed fund transfers have not been accomplished; legislative drafting requests have gone unanswered; and projects have not been executed in a timely manner.

Beginning not less than 30 days after enactment of this bill into law, the Secretary is required to submit to the House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, a monthly report on the status of all projects, reports, fund transfers, and other actions contained in this House report, in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2003, and in the conference report accompanying that Act. As this status report must address Congressional directives applicable to both the National Nuclear Security Administration and the rest of the Department, the Secretary may not delegate the responsibility for submitting this monthly report. The Department should work with the Committee on the content of this report.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The fiscal year 2003 budget from the Department included several budget structure changes that were not discussed in advance with the Committee as is the accepted procedure for proposed budget structure changes. The Committee has not approved these

changes. The Committee wants to make very clear to the Department that any budget structure changes proposed for fiscal year 2004 must be approved in advance by the Committee.

The fiscal year 2004 budget justifications submitted by the Department must include the following: (1) a section identifying the last year that authorizing legislation was provided by Congress for each program; (2) funding within each construction project data sheet for elimination of excess facilities at least equal to the square footage of the new facilities being requested; and (3) funding to eliminate excess facilities at least equal to the square footage of new facilities being constructed as general plant projects (GPP). The Department should work with the Committee on the specific information needed for each requirement.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY FUNDING

Heightened security concerns have necessitated a substantial increase in safeguards and security funding to ensure there is minimal risk to Department sites in the face of potential terrorist threats. The Department must ensure, however, that such funding is used for its stated purpose and not as an indirect source for other site services or activities, especially those unrelated to safeguards and security. As much as half of the safeguards and security funding at some sites appears to have been allocated to support indirect costs. Therefore, the Committee directs that all Departmental sites adhere to strict guidelines on utilizing these funds solely for safeguards and security, eliminating the use of standard formula-based overhead rates, and restricting indirect charges only to those that specifically and proportionately benefit safeguards and security programs.

The Committee expects the Secretary to inform all Departmental organizations that these funds are to be used directly and demonstrably for safeguards and security emergency measures. In no case should indirect charges on these funds exceed 15 percent, unless granted an exception by explicit waiver from the Secretary. The House and Senate Committees on Appropriations are to be notified of any waivers granted by the Secretary. Also, the Committee directs the Office of the Inspector General to oversee and advise Congress on the appropriate expenditure of these funds.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Committee continues to strongly support the Department's Office of Engineering and Construction Management (OECM), and the effort being made to establish DOE's Project Management Order 413.3. The Committee expects every Departmental program and facility, including all elements of the National Nuclear Security Administration, to comply with these project management requirements.

The Committee has consistently emphasized the need for the Department to improve project management essential to cost effective and time efficient construction projects. While some progress has been made, further steps must be taken. The Committee directs the Department to include funding for project management integration and technical support programs in each project data sheet included in the budget request. These funds should be itemized as

part of the Other Project Costs line item and include project management excellence programs necessary to achieve internationally accepted professional standards and best practices. Such project management costs should support integrated project teams including: risk development, assessment, and execution; university and industry project management training, consulting, and mentoring; project-conducted independent project reviews; subject matter experts; and project management technical support for federal project managers.

The Committee is also concerned that a large number of new facilities are being requested and funded, particularly in the National Nuclear Security Administration, with no plans to tear down the buildings that are being replaced. The Committee directs the Department to include the costs of tearing down the facilities that are being replaced in the costs of all construction projects and identified clearly in the construction project data sheets.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee is well aware of the deterioration of the Department's facilities and of the Department's inability to evaluate and address the readiness and maintenance status of its facilities. The Committee is encouraged by the Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation's efforts to strengthen and standardize management of the Department's facilities and infrastructure (F&I) program and to address management of all F&I assets. The Committee fully supports current efforts to develop a directive establishing requirements for Department-wide implementation of an F&I program, also to be complied with on a corporate basis.

The F&I directive should establish a comprehensive program for the corporate management of all Departmental assets throughout their entire life-cycle and require appropriate data be provided to ensure that funds budgeted and spent on F&I assets can be tracked and outcomes measured. The F&I policy must also address the large inventory of excess facilities maintained throughout the complex and ensure that these facilities are decontaminated, decommissioned, and demolished as quickly and as cost-effectively as possible. The Committee also expects the Department to assign Federal staff at each site and Headquarters to provide oversight of this activity and ensure accountability.

One of the primary reasons the capital assets in the Department have been allowed to deteriorate to an unacceptable degree is insufficient funding for maintenance. Preventative and corrective maintenance is funded indirectly through overhead accounts and is always the first thing eliminated when higher priority needs arise. The Committee is now providing huge amounts of funding to restore the capital assets to an acceptable condition and wants to ensure that these assets remain in good working order. To do this, the Committee directs the Department to provide direct funding of all maintenance as a key component of its F&I policy and to initiate this direct funding in the fiscal year 2004 budget.

EXCESS FACILITIES

A recent Inspector General report "Disposition of the Department's Excess Facilities" found the Department's program to dis-

pose of excess facilities was not fully satisfactory. Facility disposition activities were not prioritized to balance mission requirements, reduce risks, and minimize life-cycle costs. In some cases, disposition plans were in conflict with requirements for new facilities, while in others, facilities posing little risk were decommissioned while the Department failed to dispose of buildings representing a substantially greater risk. The Committee expects the Department to quickly implement the Inspector General's recommendations to develop a corporate approach to disposition activities; collect and report reliable data on costs; and provide sufficient funding to carry out an effective disposition program.

The Committee expects the Department to decontaminate and decommission (D&D) and dispose of excess facilities that will provide the greatest impact on reducing long-term costs and risk. New and innovative disposal practices must be implemented to reduce costs and expedite site cleanups. Anecdotal evidence indicates that, for a variety of reasons, the Department is not always procuring services to demolish excess facilities in the most cost effective manner. Thus, the Committee directs that none of the funds for disposal of excess facilities may be used to D&D or demolish excess facilities at any site unless the services are procured though an open-competitive process which allows experienced contractors throughout the country the opportunity to bid on each project.

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 2002, and the Committee expects the Department not to exceed 200 in fiscal year 2003. 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 2002 on the use of M&O contractor employees assigned to the Washington metropolitan area. The report is to identify all M&O contractor employees who work in the Washington metropolitan area, including the name of the employee, the name of the contractor, the organization to which he or she is assigned, the job title and a description of the tasks the employee is performing, the annual cost of the employee to the Department, the Headquarters program organization sponsoring each M&O employee, the program account funding that employee, and the length of time the employee has been detailed to the Department or elsewhere in the Washington metropolitan area (for example, the Congress, the Executive Office of the President, and other Federal agencies). The report should also include detailed information on the cost of maintaining each M&O office in the Washington metropolitan area. This report is to include actual data for the period October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2002, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2003.

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, 2001 through September 30, 2002, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2003.

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 2003, 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, 2002	$666,726,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	693,934,000
Recommended, 2003	633,909,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−32,817,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−60,025,000

Note: The original budget request of $696,690,000 for Energy Supply included $2,756,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

The Energy Supply account includes the following programs: Renewable Energy Resources; Nuclear Energy; and Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense). Technical Information Management, which had formerly been included in the Energy Supply appropriation but is managed by the Office of Science, is transferred to the Science appropriation. As in fiscal year 2002, the Committee recommends that the funds for Energy Supply activities remain available until expended.

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

The total committee recommendation for renewable energy resources is $396,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2002 funding and a decrease of $11,000,000 from the budget request.

The Committee is disappointed with the Department's slow pace in executing projects directed in the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. In part, this delay is due to the fact that certain parts of the Renewable Energy Resources program are, for historical reasons, being executed by a wide variety of field offices and laboratories, some not within the chain of command of the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. While the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy has made a significant effort to streamline its headquarters organization, it has not yet done the same with the field structure that executes its programs. Accordingly, the Department is directed to concentrate its Renewable Energy Resources work at the field offices and laboratories that are subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. The Assistant Secretary should also review, as recommended in the Strategic Program Review, the cost of doing business at the three weapons laboratories.

In the House report accompanying the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002, the Committee directed the Department 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. The Department was directed to submit these as part of the detailed budget justification for Renewable Energy Resources in the fiscal year 2003 budget request, but has failed to do so. While the Department deserves credit for preparing a Strategic Program Review

that attempts to quantify the historic performance of various renewable technologies, this Strategic Program Review does not provide the kind of metrics specifically requested by the House. The Committee renews its direction to the Department to provide Congress with a set of quantitative measures that can be used to evaluate the potential costs and benefits of various renewable technologies. Absent such metrics, the Congress has no objective basis for supporting the changes in research emphasis proposed in the fiscal year 2003 budget request.

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 integrated research and development on biomass and biofuels, which includes both biopower energy systems and biofuels energy systems, is $86,005,000, the same as the budget request and a decrease of $6,995,000 from the fiscal year 2002 funding level. Within this amount is included $3,000,000 for initiatives on corn bioproduct research and $2,000,000 for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research.

Geothermal technology development.—The Committee provides $26,500,000 for geothermal technology development, the same as the budget request and a decrease of $2,500,000 compared to the fiscal year 2002 funding level. Despite a strong statement of support by the Committee in last year's House report for university research on geothermal energy, the Department proposes to reduce university research under the Geoscience and Supporting Technologies subprogram to only $1,200,000 in fiscal year 2003. The Committee recommendation provides $2,600,000 for university research in geothermal technologies in fiscal year 2003, the same as in fiscal year 2002, with a corresponding reduction of $1,400,000 for geothermal research conducted at DOE laboratories.

Hydrogen research.—The Department's budget request emphasizes the potential of hydrogen for stationary and vehicular fuel cell applications, and proposes a significant increase in research on technologies for the generation and storage of hydrogen, as well as the demonstration of hydrogen infrastructure and stationary fuel cell applications. The Committee recommends $35,476,000 for hydrogen research, a decrease of $4,405,000 from the budget request and an increase of $4,476,000 over fiscal year 2002 funding. The Committee generally concurs with the Department's assessment of hydrogen's potential, but funding constraints preclude funding the full request. Also, the Committee is concerned that the Department not duplicate work already done in the U.S. and elsewhere on hydrogen generation and storage technologies. The Committee encourages the Department to explore the transition to a methane economy as an intermediate step to the eventual shift to a hydrogen economy. Within available funds for Utilization and Distributed/Remote Power, $4,000,000 is provided for the continued development and validation of advanced proton exchange membrane fuel cells and metal membrane fuel purification technologies.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommends $6,489,000 for hydropower research, an increase of $1,189,000 over fiscal year 2002 and $1,000,000 less than the budget request for fiscal year 2003. The Department should use this reduced funding to complete a limited program of testing and demonstration of new turbine technologies and then "graduate" this program within the next two fiscal years.

Solar Energy.—Solar energy technologies include: concentrating solar power; photovoltaic energy systems; and solar building technology research. As in fiscal year 2002, these subprograms are combined into a single account for solar energy. The total Committee recommendation for solar energy in fiscal year 2003 is $87,625,000, the same as the budget request and a decrease of $7,375,000 compared to fiscal year 2002. Of these funds, $5,000,000 is provided for industry-based 20–25kW Dish-Stirling and 20kW Dish-PV development. The control level for fiscal year 2003 continues at the solar energy program account level.

Wind energy systems.—The Committee recommends $44,000,000 for wind energy systems, the same as the budget request and $3,000,000 more than fiscal year 2002. The Committee concurs with Department's emphasis on technologies that will be effective in low wind speeds.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

Under the electric energy systems and storage program, the Department conducts research and development on advanced technologies for the generation, transmission, storage, and distribution of electric power. The electric energy systems and storage program is funded at $70,447,000, the same as the fiscal year 2003 budget request and $7,447,000 more than the fiscal year 2002 funding level. Within the funds available for transmission reliability, the Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for the Department to continue field testing of advanced aluminum matrix composite conductors.

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. Due to funding constraints, the Committee recommendation for renewable support and implementation is $19,866,000, $4,000,000 less than the budget request and an increase of $5,366,000 compared to the fiscal year 2002 funding level. This recommendation provides $1,500,000 for departmental energy management, $4,000,000 for international renewable energy, including $2,000,000 for International Utility Efficiency Partnerships, $6,000,000 for the renewable energy production incentive program, $6,307,000 for renewable Indian energy resources, and $2,059,000 for renewable program support, of which $1,000,000 is to support the National Alliance of Clean Energy Incubators.

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 as the fiscal year 2002 funding level.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

Due to fiscal constraints, the Committee recommendation for program direction is $14,592,000, a reduction of $1,595,000 from the budget request and a decrease of $4,608,000, or 24 percent, compared to fiscal year 2002 funding.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy programs is $213,698,000, a decrease of $36,100,000 from the budget request and $36,758,000 from the fiscal year 2002 funding level. The reduction from the budget request reflects the transfer of the Fast Flux Test Facility to the Non-Defense Environmental Management account.

The Department's fiscal year 2003 budget request for Nuclear Energy assumed two major changes to the existing budget structure: the consolidation of various programs into the new Radiological Facilities Management account, and the merger of the previous Nuclear Facilities Management program with the Advanced Accelerator Applications program. The Committee does not concur with the changes as proposed by the Department. Any future proposals to change the current budget structure must be approved, in advance, by the House and Senate Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittees before inclusion in the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

Advanced Radioisotope Power Systems.—The Committee recommendation is $26,450,000, the same as the budget request and $2,550,000 less than fiscal year 2002. The requested amount is contained within the Department's proposed Radiological Facilities Management program. To maintain visibility on the Advanced Radioisotope Power Systems program, the Committee continues to fund this as a separate program in fiscal year 2003. As recommended by the Inspector General in audit report DOE/IG–0540, the Department should act promptly to develop memoranda of understanding with the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to recover mission-specific, safety-related costs from those agencies.

Isotope Support and Production.—The Committee recommendation is $13,818,000, the same as the budget request and $3,359,000 less than fiscal year 2002. The requested amount is contained within the Department's proposed Radiological Facilities Management program. This amount represents a net appropriation, with a total program level of $20,218,000 and offsetting collections of $6,400,000. Included within this program amount is $1,721,000 for construction of the Isotope Production Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Committee supports the Department's Nuclear Energy Protocol for Research Isotopes (NEPRI), which should

provide the basis for more rational planning for the production and distribution of research isotopes.

The Committee has approved a phased approach to the extraction of medically valuable isotopes from excess uranium–233 stored in Building 3019 at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, beginning with the issuance of a Request for Proposals (RFP) in fiscal year 2002. Under this project, the uranium–233 will be processed to extract thorium–229, which yields the radioisotopes actinium–225 and bismuth–213, the latter of which is undergoing clinical trials as cancer treatments. The Committee reiterates its direction to the Department that the processing of the uranium–233 and the extraction of thorium–229 must be done in a manner that does not increase the ultimate decontamination and decommissioning costs for Building 3019. Unfortunately, the program plan submitted by the Department in May 2002 did not provide adequate information on the baseline costs for Building 3019 and the disposal costs for uranium–233 to enable a valid comparison against the proposed thorium–229 extraction alternative. Therefore, the Department is authorized at this time to proceed only with Phase I for detailed project planning, design, and cost estimating. The Department is directed to report back to the Committee when it has evaluated the responses to the RFP and prior to the award of the Phase I contract, upon completion of the external independent review and the should-cost analysis, and upon completion of the business case supporting award of the Phase II contract. Pending the possible implementation of this new process for producing actinium–225, the Department is encouraged to consider offers of private funding to increase the production of actinium–225 above current levels.

University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support.—The Committee recommendation is $17,500,000, the same as the budget request and as fiscal year 2002. Although funding constraints do not allow the Committee to provide additional funds for this activity, the Committee remains concerned about the recent decline in the number of graduates specializing in nuclear science and engineering. The need to add more nuclear generation capacity to the national grid underscores the need for skilled scientists and engineers who can design, build, and operate these new reactor designs. The Committee, therefore, continues to provide funding for both a reliable source of fuel to operate the university reactors and for the grants and fellowships that support nuclear science and engineering education.

Research and Development.—The Committee supports continued research and development to make the current generation of nuclear power plants safer and more efficient, and to resolve the technical, institutional, and regulatory barriers to deployment of the next generation of reactors. The total Committee recommendation for nuclear energy research and development is $71,500,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $20,500,000 relative to fiscal year 2002.

Given the importance of maintaining and optimizing the generating capacity of existing nuclear reactors, and the strong industry participation in this program, the Committee does not concur with the Administration's proposal to terminate funding for the nuclear energy plant optimization (NEPO) program in fiscal year 2003. For

NEPO, the Committee provides $5,000,000, $2,000,000 less than in fiscal year 2002 and $5,000,000 more than the budget request.

The Committee recommendation for the nuclear energy research initiative (NERI) is $25,000,000, the same as the budget request and a decrease of $7,000,000 compared to fiscal year 2002. The Committee notes that the Department is carrying a very large unobligated balance in this account in fiscal year 2002.

The Committee provides $41,500,000 for nuclear energy technologies, $5,000,000 less than the budget request and $29,500,000 more than the fiscal year 2002 funding level. The funding reduction reflects the transfer of $5,000,000 to provide funding for the NEPO program.

On May 23, 2002, U.S. President Bush and Russian Federation President Putin signed a declaration establishing a joint task force to study advanced nuclear reactor and fuel cycle technologies. Within the amount provided for nuclear energy technologies is included $5,000,000 to pursue the recommendations of this joint task force, to include but not limited to thorium-uranium and thorium-plutonium fuel cycles and the gas turbine-modular helium reactor. This amount is not fenced pending the outcome of the repository siting approval resolution. Any research and development efforts on advanced reactor designs and fuel cycles, including this $5,000,000 for the joint U.S.-Russian task force and including the reprocessing or transmutation of spent nuclear fuel, should be cost-shared with private industry. While a 50–50 cost share may not be appropriate for the early phases of research, requiring the financial participation of the nuclear industry is a simple way of ensuring that the Department is pursuing technologies that have some likelihood of being implemented by the private sector. As with NERI, any research and development on advanced reactors, advanced fuel cycles, reprocessing, and transmutation should be conducted on a competitive, peer-reviewed basis.

Domestic Enrichment Capability.—On June 17, 2002, the Department signed an agreement with the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) which, in part, requires USEC to deploy an advanced uranium enrichment technology at either the Portsmouth or Paducah sites by 2010 or 2011, respectively. While the Committee supports making the technical expertise and facilities of the Department available to USEC on a reimbursable basis, the Committee is concerned about the commitments, both explicit and implicit, made by the Department in this agreement regarding assistance to USEC in the development of advanced enrichment technology. The Department is directed to submit to Congress by May 31, 2003, a program plan that clearly identifies the actions to be taken by the Federal government under this June 2002 agreement with respect to development and deployment of advanced enrichment technology.

The Department is also directed to contract with the National Academy of Sciences to review and evaluate plans for the deployment of advanced enrichment technology in the United States, including: (1) an assessment of the need for additional domestic enrichment capacity; (2) USEC plans for demonstration and deployment of advanced enrichment technology; (3) the role of DOE in meeting these demonstration and deployment objectives; and (4) an

assessment of the technical capabilities of the public and private sector to meet these enrichment technology objectives. This review should identify what role, if any, there is for continued research and development by the Department to support the private sector deployment of advanced enrichment technology. The Department is directed to transfer promptly $600,000 to the National Academy of Sciences for this review, which should be completed by December 31, 2003.

Fast Flux Test Facility.—The Committee transfers the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) and its associated funding to the Non-Defense Environmental Management account.

Radiological Facilities Management.—The fiscal year 2003 budget request proposed a new Radiological Facilities Management account, merging the elements from the Advanced Radioisotope Power Systems, Isotope Support and Production, ANL-West operations, and Test Reactor Area (TRA) landlord costs. The Committee supports only the merger of the ANL-West operations and TRA landlord costs under this new program. Advanced Radioisotope Power Systems and Isotope Support and Production are maintained as separate programs so that Congress and the Department have continued visibility on the funding necessary to support these primarily reimbursable functions. The Committee recommendation for Radiological Facilities Management is $42,770,000, the same as the budget request for ANL-West operations and TRA Landlord costs. This amount includes $31,615,000 for ANL-West operations and $11,155,000 for TRA Landlord costs. The control level is at the Radiological Facilities Management account level.

Spent Fuel Pyroprocessing.—The Committee recommendation is $18,221,000, the same as the budget request, including $15,450,000 for EBR–II spent fuel treatment and $2,771,000 for research and development on pyroprocessing of sodium-bonded spent fuel. The focus of these activities should be on treating the sodium-bonded spent fuel presently stored at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, and preparing those materials for shipment to the permanent repository in accordance with the terms of the 1995 settlement agreement with the State of Idaho. The Department is directed to submit to Congress by March 31, 2003, a detailed program plan, identifying specific actions with associated costs and milestone schedules, to show how the Department intends to meet the settlement agreement deadline for removing this spent fuel from the site. Further, the Department should consider approaches that would allow it to accelerate the treatment and removal of this spent fuel.

The Administration did not request, nor did the Committee provide, any funds for reprocessing and transmutation activities in fiscal year 2003. The Department has not yet submitted its report on these technologies, which was due to Congress on May 1, 2002. Absent this report evaluating the costs and benefits of the various reprocessing and transmutation technologies, the Committee has no technical or policy basis for appropriating any funds for this purpose in fiscal year 2003. Under the Research and Development program, the Committee does provide $5,000,000 for the Department to pursue the recommendations of the joint U.S.-Russia task force on advanced reactor and fuel cycle technologies.

Program direction.—The Committee recommends $23,439,000, the same as the budget request and $439,000 more than fiscal year 2002.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation is $26,211,000, a reduction of $3,000,000 from the budget request and $4,289,000 from fiscal year 2002. A review by the General Accounting Office of external regulation of other government laboratories and private sector companies found that DOE requires significantly more staff to execute its safety responsibilities, without any measurable gain in overall performance to justify the additional resources required by DOE.

The conference report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Act for Fiscal Year 2002 directed the Department to prepare an implementation plan for external regulation of nuclear and worker safety at the Department's Science laboratories. Instead of submitting a serious and comprehensive implementation plan, which was due to Congress by May 31, 2002, the Department submitted on July 1, 2002, a proposal calling for more studies of external regulation. One of the Department's stated reasons for recommending further study is the lack of information on the cost of bringing these Science laboratories into compliance with the regulations of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). The experience in transitioning the gaseous diffusion plants at Portsmouth and Paducah from DOE self-regulation to external regulation by NRC and OSHA revealed that the majority of transition costs derived, not from NRC and OSHA having markedly different standards than DOE, but from the fact that these facilities were substantially out of compliance with DOE's own safety orders and regulations. Under the Science portion of this report, the Department is directed to submit to the House and Senate Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittees a report providing a detailed estimate of the cost of bringing the ten Science laboratories (named in House Report 107–112) into compliance with NRC and OSHA standards for nuclear safety and worker safety. To support this task, the Department is directed to transfer $2,500,000 to the NRC and $1,500,000 to OSHA. In addition, the Department is directed to transfer $1,000,000 to OSHA to cover the costs of OSHA regulation of worker health and safety at the Department's non-nuclear facilities not covered under the Atomic Energy Act.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

The Committee moves the Technical Information Management program from the Energy Supply account to the Science account. The Technical Information Management program is presently managed by the Office of Science, and this transfer will align program resources with program management.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

A general reduction of $2,000,000 has been applied to the Energy Supply account.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 2002	$236,372,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	166,000,000
Recommended, 2003	213,259,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−23,113,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	+47,259,000

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; Fast Flux Test Facility; Long-Term Stewardship; and Excess Facilities for final disposition of excess contaminated facilities. The Committee recommendation is $213,259,000, an increase of $47,259,000 over the budget request.

SITE CLOSURE

The recommendation for site closure is $90,000,000, an increase of $90,000,000 over the budget request. The $90,000,000 represents the funding requested for the accelerated cleanup of the West Valley Demonstration Project, which is transferred from the Post 2006 Completion account to the Site Closure account.

Bill language from the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002, required the Department to either reach agreement with the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) on the final scope of Federal activities at the West Valley site and on the respective Federal and State cost shares for those activities, or reduce funding to the minimum necessary to keep the site in a safe and stable condition. Unfortunately, the Department ignored this statutory requirement and requested the same funding level as in fiscal year 2002, without having reached agreement with NYSERDA on the key issues in disputes. The parties have made no apparent progress toward resolving their differences, although both have issued clear written statements of their respective positions.

The Department has recently developed an accelerated cleanup plan for the West Valley Demonstration Project that will allow DOE to complete its statutorily-required cleanup responsibilities by 2005, with only long-term surveillance and monitoring in subsequent years. The Committee is encouraged by this proposal to reduce risks and accelerate cleanup at West Valley. However, before proceeding to implement this acceleration plan in fiscal year 2003, the Department is directed to submit a site performance management plan at the same level of detail, and agreed to by the appropriate state regulator, as is being required at other acceleration sites in the Environmental Management Cleanup Reform program.

The Committee encourages the Department and NYSERDA to continue to attempt to resolve their differences, but the Depart-

ment is reminded that any proposed agreement with NYSERDA must be in full compliance with all relevant Federal statutes and is in the best interest of the Federal government.

SITE/PROJECT COMPLETION

The recommendation for site/project completion is $42,425,000, a reduction of $8,847,000 from the budget request of $51,272,000. The budget request of $8,847,000 for long-term stewardship activities has been transferred to a new program to provide greater visibility for long-term stewardship activities.

POST 2006 COMPLETION

The recommendation for post 2006 completion is $17,554,000, a reduction of $95,333,000 from the budget request of $112,887,000. Funding of $90,000,000 for the West Valley Demonstration Project has been transferred to the site closure account; $1,000,000 for packaging certification activities has been transferred to Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; $5,333,000 for long-term stewardship activities has been transferred to a new program to provide greater visibility for these activities; and an additional $1,000,000 has been provided for the Atlas site in Moab, Utah.

Atlas site in Moab, Utah.—The Department requested $966,000 for remediation activities at the Atlas uranium mill tailings site at Moab, Utah, on the assumption that the Department possesses a valid plan for the remediation of this site. However, the National Academy of Sciences Board on Radioactive Waste Management recently completed a review of the Department's October 2001 Draft Preliminary Plan for Remediation of the Moab Site and concluded that the Department lacks sufficient technical basis at this time to make an informed decision among remediation alternatives. The Department is directed to follow the specific recommendations made by the Board on Radioactive Waste Management in its June 11, 2002, report and prepare a revised remediation plan for this site addressing the specific deficiencies identified in the Board's report. The Committee recommendation is $1,966,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request. These additional funds are to be used to prepare a scientifically-sound remediation plan for the site.

FAST FLUX TEST FACILITY

The Committee recommendation includes $44,100,000, an increase of $8,000,000 over the budget request of $36,100,000, for the permanent deactivation, decontamination, and decommissioning of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) at Richland, Washington. The budget request for the FFTF was included in the Office of Nuclear Energy, but the Committee has transferred responsibility and funding for the program to the Office of Environmental Management. The Committee expects the Department to expedite closure by choosing the most cost-effective method for decontaminating and decommissioning of this reactor. This must involve an open competitive contracting process to attract a wide range of experienced companies to submit proposals.

LONG-TERM STEWARDSHIP

The Committee recommendation includes $14,180,000 for a new Long-Term Stewardship program. This consists of $8,847,000 transferred from the site/project completion program and $5,333,000 transferred from the post 2006 completion program. Long-term stewardship activities will continue to grow as the Department completes cleanup and closure of sites, and the Committee wants to ensure visibility of these efforts.

Weldon Springs, Missouri.—The Committee understands there will be approximately $5,000,000 of prior year funds available to the Weldon Springs, Missouri, site for final closeout activities to prepare regulatory documents and complete records disposition during fiscal years 2003 and 2004. In addition, funds are available in fiscal year 2003 to begin routine long-term stewardship activities associated with a closed site. Weldon Springs is one of the first sites to complete cleanup. The Committee understands that completion of cleanup requires establishing a different working relationship with the site, but expects the Department to ensure that long-term stewardship activities continue to protect the health and safety of the community.

National Academy of Science Study.—The Committee directs the Department to ask the National Academy of Science to review the long-term stewardship program and to work with the Committee to define the parameters of the study. The long-term stewardship program will have responsibility for managing those sites that will not achieve cleanup levels to allow release for unrestricted use. This program could eventually have responsibility for over 100 sites to ensure the continued protection of public and environmental health. Moreover, its responsibilities may grow in the future because cleanup goals are being reassessed as part of the accelerated cleanup effort and a variety of stewardship arrangements (e.g., reindustrialization, formation of wildlife refuges) are being considered.

The Committee believes that it would be helpful to have the National Academies' views on the technical and institutional requirements for an effective long-term stewardship organization, particularly with respect to the following questions:

—What are the technical and institutional characteristics of an effective long-term stewardship organization?

—Are there existing organizations within the Federal government, especially those with land or property management responsibilities, that possess these characteristics? If so, which ones are they, and what additional capabilities, if any, would these organizations require to take on this long-term stewardship mission?

—If the long-term stewardship program were transferred out of the Department, what additional technical and institutional measures would be needed to ensure effective execution and coordination of both the clean-up and stewardship missions?

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 facilities program, an increase of $3,159,000 over the budget request of $1,841,000. 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 $3,159,000 for 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, 2002	$418,425,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	382,154,000
Recommended, 2003	382,154,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−36,271
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

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 $382,154,000, the same as the budget request and $36,271,000 less than fiscal year 2002.

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 $235,523,000 for activities funded from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, the same as the budget request and a reduction of $64,118,000 compared to fiscal year 2002. This amount includes $234,523,000 for decontamination and decommissioning activities and $1,000,000 for uranium and thorium reimbursements. Should pending legislation be enacted to raise the current ceiling on thorium reimbursements, the Department should meet its additional

thorium reimbursements obligations in fiscal year 2003 from available carryover funds.

Other Uranium Activities.—The Committee recommendation is $146,631,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $22,847,000 over fiscal year 2002. In addition to providing the requested $10,000,000 for the conversion project for depleted uranium hexaflouride (DUF6), 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 maintenance of the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant in cold standby.

SCIENCE

Appropriation, 2002	$3,233,100,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	3,279,456,000
Recommended, 2003	3,271,233,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+38,133,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−8,223,000

Note: The original budget request of $3,285,088,000 for Science included $5,632,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

The Science account funds the Department's work on high energy physics, nuclear physics, biological and environmental sciences, basic energy sciences, advanced scientific computing, maintenance of the laboratories' physical infrastructure, fusion energy sciences, safeguards and security, science workforce development, and science program direction. The Committee is very supportive of the research conducted by the Department's Office of Science, but funding constraints preclude significant increases for fiscal year 2003. The Committee recommendation is $3,271,233,000, a decrease of $8,223,000 compared to the budget request, but $38,133,000 more than fiscal year 2002.

As are many others, the Committee is concerned about the growing imbalance in the Federal investment in research in the physical sciences versus the life sciences. The recent emphasis on science research with direct applications to homeland security needs only exacerbates the under-investment in basic research in the physical sciences. Strength in the physical sciences is essential for the future well-being of the Nation because these sciences play a critical role in enabling U.S. technological innovation and global economic leadership. The physical sciences provide the foundation of knowledge for many fields of scientific endeavor, including the life sciences, and have many possible applications, including but not limited to national security and homeland defense.

The Committee hopes that the Department submits a fiscal year 2004 budget request that will support a robust physical sciences research program in the Office of Science. In addition to funding the capabilities that already exist at the national laboratories, the next budget request should also invest in the future by supporting the development of the next generation of scientists and engineers and the next generation of research instruments. The Committee will support future growth in the Science budget if the Department is able to present a rational scheme for setting priorities among the various research areas and among the wide range of possible new

projects (e.g., Next Linear Collider, Rare Isotope Accelerator, etc.), can improve its program and project management, and takes tangible and aggressive steps to implement external regulation at its Science laboratories. Continued self-regulation of these laboratories does not yield any measurable improvement in safety performance as compared to external regulation, and consumes resources that could be better spent on scientific research. The Committee firmly believes that a shift to external regulation would improve public trust and understanding of Office of Science activities, resulting in stronger Congressional support for its research programs.

The Committee encourages the Office of Science to streamline its field structure along the lines of the model being implemented by the National Nuclear Security Administration. The Committee also strongly encourages the Office of Science to focus its resources on the laboratories and field offices that are subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Director of the Office of Science.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The Committee recommends $724,990,000 for high energy physics, the same as the budget request and $8,890,000 more than fiscal year 2002. The previous subaccounts within the High Energy Physics account—research and technology and facility operations—are consolidated into a single account for fiscal year 2003, with the control level at the High Energy Physics level. The Committee is concerned about the difficulties being experienced with the luminosity upgrade of the Tevatron and with the Neutrinos at the Main Injector, both projects at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory. The Committee expects the Department and the laboratory to exercise aggressive project management to bring these projects back on schedule, and to do so within the funds available for High Energy Physics. The Committee encourages the Department to work with the Office of Management and Budget to remove the existing limit on funding that may be spent for planning and research and development in support of the Next Linear Collider.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee recommendation for nuclear physics is $382,370,000, the same as the budget request and $21,860,000 more than provided in fiscal year 2002. The Committee hopes the Department will move expeditiously through the project approval process for the 12 GeV upgrade for the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility. The Committee recommendation includes the requested amount of $3,500,000 for research and development and pre-conceptual design activities in support of the Rare Isotope Accelerator.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation for biological and environmental research is $504,215,000, the same as the budget request but $23,190,000 less than in fiscal year 2002. The Committee recommendation includes the requested level of funding, $5,841,000, for the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory. The Committee encourages the Department to explore technologies for the preserva-

tion and recovery of frozen mouse gametes, which have the potential to reduce significantly the cost of developing and transporting strains of live mice around the country.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for basic energy sciences is $1,019,600,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $15,895,000 from fiscal year 2002. For purposes of reprogramming during fiscal year 2003, the Department may allocate funding among all operating accounts within Basic Energy Sciences.

Research.—The Committee recommendation includes $547,883,000 for materials sciences and engineering, and $220,146,000 for chemical sciences, geosciences, and energy biosciences, both the same as the budget request. Included within the material sciences and engineering account is $7,685,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR), the same as the budget request and as the fiscal year 2002 funding level.

Construction.—The Committee recommends the requested amount of $251,571,000, which includes $210,571,000 for construction of the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS), $11,000,000 for project engineering and design of Nanoscale Science Research Centers at Oak Ridge, Lawrence Berkeley, and Sandia National Laboratories, $24,000,000 to initiate construction of the Center for Nanophase Materials Sciences at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and $6,000,000 for project engineering and design of the Linac Coherent Light Source at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation is $174,625,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request and $16,575,000 more than the funding in fiscal year 2002. The Committee is very concerned about the recent Japanese advances in scientific supercomputing, specifically with the Earth Simulator computer that is more capable by one or two orders of magnitude than the most advanced U.S. supercomputers. The Japanese advances suggest not only that the DOE approach to stimulating U.S. industry to produce high-performance computers using commodity components may not be working as well as hoped, but also means that U.S. scientists will be relegated to using second-class computing resources to support their research projects in the near future. The Office of Science, the Advanced Scientific Computing Research Advisory Committee, and the Advanced Scientific Computing Research program deserve credit for acting promptly to develop a U.S. response to the challenge posed by the Japanese Earth Simulator supercomputer. The Committee provides additional funds for the Department's efforts to re-evaluate the U.S. approach to advanced scientific computing and to explore whether alternative approaches such as topical computing may be more successful.

ENERGY RESEARCH ANALYSES

This program is transferred as a subprogram under Science Program Direction.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

This program combines the previously separate Multiprogram Energy Laboratories—Facilities Support program and the Facilities and Infrastructure program, which were funded in fiscal year 2002 at $30,175,000 and $10,000,000, respectively. For the combined Science Laboratories Infrastructure program, the Committee recommends $47,680,000, an increase of $4,945,000 over the budget request and $7,505,000 over fiscal year 2002. Within this amount is included an additional $1,500,000 to modernize outdated infrastructure at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory. The Committee recommendation also provides $10,000,000 for excess facilities disposal.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is $248,495,000, the same as the fiscal year 2002 funding level and $8,815,000 less than the budget request. The Committee notes that the fiscal year 2002 funding level included $19,604,000 for the completion of decontamination and decommissioning of the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor (TFTR), leaving $228,891,000 available for fusion research and facility operations in fiscal year 2002. By comparison, the Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2003 makes this $19,604,000 available for fusion research and facility operations, including initiation of fabrication of the National Compact Stellarator Experiment (NCSX), an increase of 8.5 percent over the comparable amount available in fiscal year 2002.

Within the funding available for fusion energy sciences, the Committee recommendation provides an additional $1,000,000 for National Spherical Torus Experiment (NSTX) research, an additional $500,000 for NSTX operations, and an additional $1,000,000 for preliminary design for the National Compact Stellarator Experiment (NCSX).

The Committee acknowledges the significant scientific and engineering advances accomplished both in magnetic and inertial fusion. The Department is directed to prepare an updated program plan for fusion energy sciences, with particular attention to improving the integration of the magnetic fusion energy program and the work on inertial fusion funded primarily under the National Nuclear Security Administration. This updated program plan should also identify and evaluate the logical next steps in the U.S. fusion energy program, including the possibility of re-engaging in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER). The program plan should also address the specific concerns with fusion power that were identified in the August 2002 draft report by the Rand Corporation entitled "Energy Technologies for 2050: A Methodology for Determining Research and Development Directions" and identify research actions to resolve those concerns. The Department should submit this updated program plan to Congress not later than March 31, 2003.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $48,127,000, the same as the budget request and $7,285,000 less than fiscal year 2002. Within this

amount is included an additional $2,100,000 for essential safeguards and security upgrades at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory.

SCIENCE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

The national laboratories under the Office of Science represent a unique national asset, both in terms of state-of-the-art research facilities and expert scientists and engineers. The Department is encouraged to expand on existing programs to make these capabilities available to teachers of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Not only will these opportunities help to raise the level of teaching in the classroom in the near term, but improving science education is directly relevant to the quality of the future workforce available to the Department. The Committee recommendation is $5,460,000, the same as the budget request for Science Education and an increase of $1,000,000 over fiscal year 2002. This new program is intended to refocus the activities previously funded in the Science Education subprogram within Program Direction.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation is $134,310,000 for Science program direction. This amount includes: $125,540,000 for program direction at DOE headquarters and field offices, a reduction of $2,847,000 from the budget request and $9,960,000 less than fiscal year 2002; $7,770,000 for Technical Information Management; and $1,000,000 for Energy Research Analyses. The Technical Information Management program is transferred from the Energy Supply account to the Science account, so that program management will be aligned with program resources. It is included as a subprogram within the Science Program Direction program as the information management and program management functions are integrally related. The Committee recommendation for Technical Information Management is $7,770,000, the same as fiscal year 2002 and $155,000 less than the budget request. The Energy Research Analyses program is also transferred as a subprogram within Science Program Direction. The Committee recommendation provides $1,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2002 and $20,000 less than the budget request. The control level for fiscal year 2003 is at the program account level of Science Program Direction.

External Regulation of DOE Science Laboratories.—The conference report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002 directed the Department to prepare a detailed implementation plan for external regulation of nuclear and worker safety at the Department's Science laboratories. The Committee is very disappointed in the response of the Office of Science and of the Department as a whole to this direction. With the concept of external regulation strongly supported by this Committee and by the directors of these ten laboratories, the Committee expected the Office of Science to take an aggressive role in developing and promoting this implementation plan within the Department. Instead, the Office of Science produced a weak initial draft plan and then failed to champion it effectively against the forces of bureaucratic inertia that plague the rest of the Department.

The implementation plan that was finally completed by the Office of Management, Budget, and Evaluation, and which was submitted one month after it was due to the Committee, remains grossly inadequate. The funding levels for Science Program Direction, as well as for Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense) and Departmental Administration, reflect the level of Committee dissatisfaction with this product. The question of external regulation has been studied extensively over the past decade, not only by the Department itself, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), but also by outside experts including the National Academy of Public Administration and the General Accounting Office (GAO). A recent GAO review of safety regulation at other government laboratories, major private sector companies, and European energy laboratories found that these other entities are all externally regulated, requiring consistently fewer resources than self-regulation by DOE and with no loss in safety performance.

Unfortunately, from that mass of available information, including external regulation pilot projects already completed at several DOE laboratories, the best that the Department could produce for a detailed implementation plan is a 17-page report calling for more studies. In many instances, including the tasking to provide the changes needed in statutory language and the estimate of reductions in funding and staffing at DOE headquarters, the Department merely repeated the questions posed by the Committee instead of making any attempt to answer those questions. The plan submitted by the Department proposes a number of additional studies but provides neither cost estimates nor completion dates for those efforts. Despite statements made at hearings before this Committee, it is clear that the leadership of the Department is more interested in preserving the status quo of self-regulation than in making a serious effort to improve the safety and efficiency of its laboratory operations. It is also clear that the Department cannot be relied upon to provide accurate and objective information in response to Committee requests for information on this issue.

There is a legitimate question on the cost of bringing the ten Science laboratories into compliance with NRC and OSHA regulations. The Department is, therefore, directed to submit to the House and Senate Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittees, not later than September 30, 2003, a report providing a detailed estimate of the cost of bringing the ten Science laboratories named in House Report 107–112 into full compliance with NRC and OSHA standards for nuclear safety and worker safety. Funds to execute this task are provided under the Environment, Safety, and Health (non-defense) account. The NRC and OSHA are to conduct comprehensive compliance audits at the ten Science laboratories; from this information, the laboratories are to develop estimates of the costs necessary to correct the safety deficiencies identified by NRC and OSHA and bring their facilities and operations into compliance with NRC and OSHA standards. As part of this estimate, the laboratories should also isolate those costs for corrective measures that are needed to meet DOE's own safety standards, separate from those required to meet NRC and OSHA standards. The Department is to provide the results of these com-

pliance audits and compliance cost estimates directly to the Committee without delay or modification by DOE staff. To support the fiscal year 2004 appropriations process, NRC and OSHA, in consultation with the laboratories, should select an agreed-upon subset of four Science laboratories for which the compliance audits and compliance cost estimates can be completed not later than May 31, 2003. This subset should include one multiprogram laboratory with a nuclear reactor, a multiprogram laboratory with an accelerator, and two of the single-purpose laboratories. Of the laboratories in this subset with accelerators, at least one should be in an NRC agreement state and at least one in a non-agreement state. Further, the NRC and OSHA should select laboratories for this subset that were not studied previously under the external regulation pilot projects. The Committee expects the NRC and OSHA to enter into a Memorandum of Agreement, or modify an existing agreement, to define their respective responsibilities for radiation safety. This agreement should be provided to the Committee not later than May 31, 2003.

An additional question posed by the Committee but left unanswered by DOE is the cost savings that will result from staff and funding reductions at DOE headquarters and field offices once external regulation is in place. The Department is unable to answer this question because it does not know how much it presently spends on self-regulation of these ten Science laboratories. The Committee intends to task the General Accounting Office (GAO) to develop objective estimates of current resources expended by DOE and the potential savings from external regulation.

The Committee expects the Department to provide full support for the afore-mentioned efforts of the NRC, OSHA, GAO, and the ten Science laboratories.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The budget request included an offset of $4,383,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work. The Committee has provided direct funding for this activity and eliminated the funding offset. A general reduction of $18,639,000 has been applied to the Science account.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 2002	$95,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	275,802,000
Recommended, 2003	209,702,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+114,702,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−66,100,000

Note: The original budget request of $212,045,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal included $2,343,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

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-gen-

erated spent nuclear fuel through the collection 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 Nuclear Waste Policy Act also established an expedited procedure for final approval of repository siting. The President formally recommended the Yucca Mountain site to Congress on February 15, 2002, and the Governor of Nevada subsequently submitted a notice of disapproval to Congress on April 8, 2002. As provided for in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, this State disapproval may be overcome if a joint resolution of siting approval is passed by both chambers of Congress within 90 days of continuous session after receipt of the notice of disapproval and is subsequently enacted into law. The House passed the resolution of repository siting approval on May 8, 2002, by a vote of 306–117.

The Committee recommends $209,702,000 from the Nuclear Waste Fund in fiscal year 2003. Combined with the appropriation of $315,000,000 from the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, this provides a total of $524,702,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal activities in fiscal year 2003, the same as the budget request and an increase of $149,702,000 from fiscal year 2002. On August 2, 2002, the Administration submitted an amended budget request for an additional $66,100,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal. Due to the late submittal of this amended request and the fact that the Administration did not identify an offset for the amount of the amendment, the Committee recommendation does not include this additional $66,100,000.

License application.—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. Until the repository is open and the Department can begin accepting spent fuel, the liability of the Federal government for its failure to meet its statutory and contractual obligation to accept commercial spent fuel will continue to grow. With the submission of the Site Recommendation in February 2002, the Department now plans to submit the license application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in late 2004 and begin repository operations, at the earliest, in 2010. Any delay in repository opening will not only increase the Federal government's liability on commercial spent fuel, but will also impact 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 may affect the government's ability to meet legally enforceable cleanup milestones at those sites. Given the importance of timely repository opening, the Department should take all reasonable steps to accelerate submission of the license application into early fiscal year 2004.

State and local government funds.—The Committee recommendation includes an amount not to exceed $6,000,000 for the affected units of local government and an amount not to exceed $2,500,000 for the State of Nevada to conduct their respective external oversight responsibilities. These are the same funding levels as pro-

vided in fiscal year 2002 and as requested for fiscal year 2003. The Department is reminded to ensure that these Federal funds are audited annually.

Future program funding.—The Committee was disappointed that the Department failed to submit with its fiscal year 2003 budget request a long-term budget plan for the repository program. As the program moves out of the site characterization phase and into license application, design, and construction phases, the funding requirements will increase significantly in coming fiscal years. Therefore, it is even more critical that the Department develops an integrated long-term budget plan for this program, and submits the legislative proposal necessary to secure future funding for the repository. The Committee reiterates its direction that the Department should submit its long-term budget plan for the repository program, including the necessary changes to existing law, as part of its next budget submission to the Congress.

Waste acceptance, storage, and transportation.—As the program moves into the license application phase, the Committee continues to be concerned that the Department will not be ready to fulfill its waste acceptance, storage, and transportation responsibilities consistent with the repository schedule. The Department should move aggressively to initiate work with state and local governments to develop safe transportation routes to the selected repository site, beginning with the development of transportation routes and modes in Nevada that will avoid the Las Vegas metropolitan area. The Department should also reinitiate its activities to obtain proposals from the private sector for the procurement of transportation casks for reactor sites presently undergoing dismantlement and decommissioning.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2002	$210,853,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	299,220,000
Recommended, 2003	208,672,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−3,819,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−90,548,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 2002	−$137,810,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−137,524,000
Recommended, 2003	−80,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+57,810,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	+57,524,000

Note: The original net budget request of $169,635,000 for Departmental Administration included $7,939,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

The Committee recommendation for Departmental Administration is $208,672,000, a decrease of $90,548,000 from the budget request of $299,220,000. 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 been disappointed in the response of the Department to Committee direction included in the reports accompanying the fiscal year 2002 appropriations bill; to additional requests for information in support of the fiscal year 2003 appropriation; and to the submission of reports required by the fiscal year 2002 appropriations bill.

Engineering and Construction Management Reviews.—The Committee believes that project management at the Department is being improved through the actions of the Office of Engineering and Construction Management and continues to strongly support this office and its leadership. The Committee expects the Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation to ensure sufficient staffing and support for improved project management activities, expanded facilities and infrastructure activities, and increased training programs for project managers. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for external independent reviews of proposed projects and programs.

Cybersecurity, Secure Communications, and Corporate Management.—The budget request for Departmental Administration included $32,027,000 for cybersecurity and secure communications and $20,420,000 for the corporate management information program. These are corporate activities that contribute substantially to both the defense and non-defense programs of the Department. For cybersecurity and secure communications, the recommendation provides $15,000,000 in this account and $15,000,000 in the Other Defense Activities appropriation account. For the corporate management information program, the recommendation provides $10,000,000 in this account and $10,000,000 in the Other Defense Activities appropriation account.

Working Capital Fund.—The Department uses 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 expect that: no salaries or other expenses of Federal employees are to be charged to the fund; Departmental representation on the Board establishing the policies must be broad-based and include smaller organizations; pricing policies must be sound and defensible and not include added factors for administrative costs; 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 ac-

counts, and the Committee expects to be apprised of any recommendations to improve the charge-back system.

Cost of Work for Others.—The recommendation for the cost of work for others program is $29,916,000, a reduction of $40,000,000 from the budget request. The budget request included $40,000,000 for safeguards and security reimbursable activities in several program accounts. The Committee has provided direct funding for these program activities and will not require a reimbursable offset in Departmental Administration.

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.

Use of Prior Year Balances.—The recommendation includes the use of $10,000,000 from prior year funds to be carried over from fiscal year 2002 to offset the fiscal year 2003 funding requirements.

Revenues.—The recommendation for revenues is $80,000,000, a reduction of $57,524,000 from the budget request. The budget request included $40,000,000 in revenues to be received from safeguards and security reimbursable activities. The Committee has provided direct funding for these activities and will not require revenues to offset this cost. The recommendation also includes a reduction of $17,524,000 based on the Congressional Budget Office's current estimate of the Department's revenue collections during fiscal year 2003.

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. The Committee recommendation distributes these costs more equitably in fiscal year 2003 and provides $30,587,000 from national security programs, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request of $25,587,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 2002	$32,430,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	37,671,000
Recommended, 2003	37,671,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+5,241,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

Note: The original budget request of $38,872,000 for the Inspector General included $1,201,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

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

During fiscal year 2001, Office of Inspector General reviews resulted in $13,600,000 being returned to the Department of the

Treasury. In addition, the Inspector General's audits have identified significant opportunities to improve Departmental operations and increase program efficiency.

The Committee recommendation is $37,671,000, the same as the budget request.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The Atomic Energy Defense Activities programs of the Department of Energy include the National Nuclear Security Administration which consists of Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and the Office of the Administrator; Defense Environmental Management programs which include Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, Defense Environmental Management Cleanup Reform, Defense Facilities Closure Projects, and 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.

The Committee recommendation for the NNSA is $7,908,417,000, a decrease of $114,932,000 from the budget request of $8,023,349,000, but an increase of $317,952,000 over fiscal year 2002.

Response to Inspector General Report.—The Inspector General issued a report "Nuclear Materials Accounting Systems Modernization Initiative" which concluded that the Department of Energy's efforts to redesign or modernize its nuclear materials accounting systems were not adequate. The Department appears to spend over $200,000,000 annually to operate over 50 separate nuclear materials tracking systems and perform other activities pertaining to its nuclear materials inventory. The Inspector General recommended that the NNSA, the Office of Security, and the Chief Information Officer develop a coordinated approach, select a final alternative for modernizing nuclear accounting information systems that is consistent, and impose a moratorium on development efforts to minimize redundancy during development and selection of an alternative.

The NNSA non-concurred with this recommendation by stating that "While we appreciate the efforts the IG made Department-wide, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), as a

separately organized agency, will evaluate the programmatic requirements for each site and then will make a determination if a common system is beneficial to the NNSA. This approach has caused some confusion on the part of DOE staff offices regarding the interrelationships between the two organizations."

While the NNSA may believe there is confusion regarding the interrelationships between the two organizations, the Committee does not. The NNSA is a semi-autonomous agency, but still part of the Department of Energy. It would better serve the nation's interests if the NNSA chose to help further overall Department-wide objectives for efficiencies. Very few "NNSA sites" are funded 100 percent by the NNSA—the Department of Energy's energy efficiency and renewable energy, nuclear energy, science, environmental management, and fossil energy programs provide funding to almost all NNSA sites. Unless the NNSA chooses to eliminate all other Departmental sources of funding at its sites, it will always be necessary to consider corporate-wide needs.

Future Years Nuclear Security Program.—The Committee had hoped that the NNSA's first Future Years Nuclear Security Program (FYNSP) issued in March 2002 would represent the effective use of multi-year programming and budgeting information, including realistic resource constraints, which forces meaningful decisions on potential tradeoffs between programs. However, the FYNSP has several fundamental weaknesses that limit its usefulness for Congressional oversight. The actual funding NNSA needs to carry out its mission is not clearly delineated in the FYNSP. There is a significant amount of funding ($700 million in fiscal year 2004) identified as "Additional DOD funding for NNSA Nuclear Posture Review activities" which is apparently contained somewhere in the Department of Defense's (DOD) budget structure.

The NNSA budget and the FYNSP are built around activities rather than programs and products. The principal deliverables are the work products associated with the nine warhead types in the nuclear weapons stockpile, yet it is impossible to determine the total costs associated with any warhead. The FYNSP includes a laundry list of performance targets—few of which are the same as an identifiable program—and there is no specific funding associated with any of the performance targets. Thus, it is impossible to determine how a specific resource allocation will impact performance.

Much of the funding is not well justified. Many weapons-related activities justify their need for funding in the name of the Nuclear Posture Review. However, the Nuclear Posture Review is a conceptual document that covers considerably more than the NNSA's activities. Moreover, what discussion the Nuclear Posture Review does contain about NNSA is at a very high level—no specific costs associated with NNSA are contained in the Nuclear Posture Review. Since NNSA is expecting to require an additional $3.75 billion from DOD's budget for Nuclear Posture Review activities, a more detailed description of how these additional funds will be used would be expected.

It is difficult for the Congress to determine what NNSA proposes to accomplish with these funds. Performance targets for each activity are not presented in a consistent format. While some activities

contain milestones that are measurable, many more activities, such as the Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities, use only general broad descriptions. These deficiencies indicate that the FYNSP was not created with the benefit of a sound, fully developed planning, programming, and budgeting system. When the NNSA develops an adequate planning, programming, and budgeting system, it should be able to produce a FYNSP that is: (1) shaped by high-level, prioritized program and budgetary guidance that is consistent with Administration's policies and outyear budget projections; (2) built, consistent with this guidance, from the "bottom-up" by the NNSA programs, and (3) reviewed by NNSA's senior leadership to ensure that the FYNSP is responsible, doable, and congruent with previously established program and budgetary guidance.

It is not possible to develop a credible future-year national security program plan without the basic foundation provided by a robust planning, programming, and budgeting system (PPBS). The Committee directs the Department to conduct an independent assessment of the NNSA's PPBS process and structure, including its comparability to that of the Department of Defense. The review should also determine whether the NNSA's PPBS is capable of being used as the central decision-making process for current and future resource allocation decisions and the extent to which it has been incorporated into the operational systems of the NNSA management and operating contractors.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2002	$5,560,238,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	5,867,000,000
Recommended, 2003	5,772,068,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+211,830,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−94,932,000

Note: The original budget request of $5,869,379,000 for Weapons Activities included $2,379,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. The budget request has been reduced by this amount.

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 $5,772,068,000, a decrease of $94,932,000 from the budget request of $5,867,000,000, but an increase of $211,830,000 over fiscal year 2002.

Availability of funds.—Consistent with the provisions of H.R. 4546, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as passed by the House of Representatives, the funds in this account are available until September 30, 2005.

Strategic Weapons Modernization.—The Administration's Nuclear Posture Review has created great uncertainty within the Department of Energy and in Congress on the exact nature, rationale, scope, and duration of every strategic nuclear weapons modernization program. It does not appear that cost or cost-effectiveness were criteria considered during the review. The National Nuclear Security Administration has not been able to reconcile the recently an-

nounced dramatic reductions planned for deployed operational nuclear warheads to its strategic weapons modernizations plans, some of which will cost billions of dollars each, and which are currently structured to upgrade the maximum number of warheads. Without a more definitive understanding of the nature of the suggested nuclear reserve force, and the investments that would be required to implement it, there is great risk that the Department of Energy will needlessly spend funds on weapons that will never be used. Meanwhile, NNSA has great infrastructure and other needs that are unmet, as does the nation as a whole. The Committee believes that much more work needs to be done during the next year by the Nuclear Weapons Council, a joint Departments of Defense and Energy organization, to better rationalize and articulate the requirements for future strategic weapons modernization.

The Committee is concerned that no one has a clear understanding of what the nation needs to have a robust yet cost-effective strategic weapons modernization program. The Committee directs the Secretary of Energy in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of Congress providing a specific inventory-objective for each nuclear weapon systems by year and in total through 2012: an indication of the likely number of warheads that must be modernized and why; an estimate of the cost in then-year dollars to perform such modernization; and a certification that the Departments of Defense and Energy future years defense funding plans accompanying the fiscal year 2004 President's budget are completely synchronized. This report is due to the Congressional defense committees not later than January 1, 2003.

Selected Acquisition Reports.—The conference report for the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002, directed the Administrator of the NNSA to submit Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) once a year to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of Congress to accompany the annual submission of the President's Budget. The conferees directed that these reports be similar in content and format to those submitted to Congress by the Department of Defense for its weapon systems pursuant to section 2432 of Title 10 of United States Code. The SAR reporting system developed by the Department of Defense has been in place for decades and is well defined. Conversely, the Department of Energy's weapon system reporting process atrophied, and no reports have been submitted from 1991 until this year.

This year NNSA submitted reports on three weapon systems, each of whose acquisition cost is expected to exceed $1 billion, using the title "Nuclear Weapons Acquisition Report" rather than "Selected Acquisition Report". However, NNSA used a decade-old format that is not responsive to the conference report direction, does not conform to reporting standards used by the Department of Defense, omits a significant amount of information required by Congress, and uses the different name.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) in a report entitled "NNSA: Nuclear Weapons Reports Need to be More Detailed and Comprehensive" examined the Department's acquisition reports submitted to Congress for fiscal year 2003 and found major weaknesses. First, GAO questions why NNSA chose to report costs be-

ginning with Phase 6.3 (Development Engineering) rather than Phase 6.2 (Design Definition and Cost Study) of weapons system acquisition. The Committee agrees with GAO that once weapon-specific research and development costs are approved by the Nuclear Weapons Council, they should be reported in annual SARs. Second, NNSA was specifically directed to report on all blocks of weapons to be refurbished in blocks, but this was ignored. GAO observes that DOE has "block" information in its Weapon Design and Cost Report, but it elected not to share it with the Congress. Third, GAO notes that NNSA's reports are less detailed, less comprehensive, and omit significant cost components when compared to the Defense SARs. Unlike the Department of Defense, NNSA uses varying program baselines, has no written guidance, has no link to the budget or the Future Years Nuclear Security Program plan, and does not include all system-related costs. GAO cites ADAPT support for modifying Y–12 capabilities and ACORN production line expansion at the Kansas City plant as two examples of known costs that are being underreported. NNSA failed to include non-directed stockpile work costs such as system-specific construction, campaign work directly related to a refurbishment or life extension program, and readiness in technical base and facilities work directly related to a life extension program. GAO further notes that while NNSA did provide information on overall program milestones, it provided no information on contractor performance, and provided no cost and schedule variance analysis data in its fiscal year 2003 reports. Fourth, GAO indicates that NNSA has over-classified the documents by marking them as classified in their entirety rather than specifically portion-marking each section as is routinely done by the Department of Defense.

The Committee notes that acquisition decisions affecting nuclear weapon refurbishment and life extension are made by the joint Departments of Defense and Energy Nuclear Weapons Council. A member of the Council is the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology who is charged with the responsibility for submitting defense Selected Acquisition Reports to Congress. The Council therefore, by virtue of its membership, has sufficient expertise to ensure that Congressional Selected Acquisition Reporting requirements can be met.

The Committee directs NNSA to submit Selected Acquisition Reports to Congress in fiscal year 2004 and subsequent fiscal years in an identical manner to those submitted by the Department of Defense. NNSA shall use the title "Selected Acquisition Report", use the Department of Defense standard format and classification methodology, and include identical types of information on program cost, schedule, and contractor performance. The Committee has included a provision requiring that after March 1, 2003, none of the funds for Weapons Activities may be obligated or expended for activities of the Nuclear Weapons Council until the Council certifies to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of Congress that Selected Acquisition Reports submitted to Congress in the fiscal year 2004 budget by the Department of Energy are identical in format, content, and security classification to those submitted by the Department of Defense.

Budgeting and Accounting for Nuclear Weapons Systems.—A December 2000 report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) entitled "Improved Management Needed to Implement Stockpile Stewardship Program Effectively" discusses weaknesses in the National Nuclear Security Agency's budgeting system and other management systems for nuclear weapons. Title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) which established the NNSA included section 3252 which responded to criticisms voiced by GAO and others by mandating establishment of a planning, programming and budgeting system that comports with sound financial and fiscal management principles. Despite this requirement, deficiencies continue to exist. For example, a March 2002 report to Congress by the Panel to Assess the Reliability, Safety, and Security of the United States Nuclear Stockpile says that NNSA must create a multi-year program that describes program deliverables, allocates resources to those deliverables, makes budget categories transparent, and clearly identifies direct and indirect charges. An April 2002 report to the Secretary of Energy by the Center for Strategic and International Studies on Science and Security in the 21st Century recommends that the Department install a rigorous multi-year budget process modeled on the planning, programming, and budgeting system at the Department of Defense. It is apparent that external reviewers find the NNSA's current budgeting and accounting system inadequate. While NNSA is now implementing a planning, programming, and budgeting system, its approach is substantially different from the Department of Defense model and has yet to yield the quality of information envisioned in Title 32.

Before a credible planning, programming, and budgeting system can be implemented, the Department of Energy (like all major corporations) must have meaningful cost and accounting information on which to base such systems. In response to questions raised during a hearing this year, the Administrator of the NNSA acknowledged that the Department of Energy's official budget and accounting systems do not track the cost of each nuclear weapon system. Information provided to the Committee also indicates that the cost estimate for refurbishment of the W–80 warhead for air launched cruise missiles grew 27 percent-over $210 million in less than one year-before Congress had even approved the start of the program. GAO found similar cost overruns with the W87 life extension program. Obviously, the Department's budgeting and accounting for nuclear weapons costs, and its ability to estimate costs accurately, is suspect.

The conference report for the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002, required NNSA to budget by weapon system. The Department's fiscal year 2003 budget did not adequately respond to that requirement; it contains a one page list of weapon system costs, but no detailed budget justification for programs which cost hundreds of millions or even billions of dollars. In addition, nearly $500,000,000 was not allocated to any weapon system. During his testimony before the Committee this year, the Secretary of Energy acknowledged shortcomings in the Department's systems for budgeting and accounting for nuclear weapons.

The Committee has also included bill language to require the Department of Energy to improve its budget and accounting systems and to have such improvements in place by the time the fiscal year 2005 President's budget is submitted to the Congress. The Committee further recommends that $10,000,000 be provided only for that purpose.

Reprogramming Authority.—The conference agreement provides limited reprogramming authority within the Weapons Activities account without submission of a reprogramming to be approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. The reprogramming thresholds will be as follows: directed stockpile work, science campaigns, engineering campaigns, inertial confinement fusion, advanced simulation and computing, pit manufacturing and certification, readiness campaigns, and operating expenses for readiness in technical base and facilities. This should provide the needed flexibility to manage these programs.

In addition, funding of not more than $5,000,000 may be transferred between each of these categories and each construction project subject to the following limitations: only one transfer may be made to or from any program or project; the transfer must be necessary to address a risk to health, safety or the environment or to assure the most efficient use of weapons activities funds at a site; and funds may not be used for an item for which Congress has specifically denied funds or for a new program or project that has not been authorized by Congress.

Congressional notification within 15 days of the use of this reprogramming authority is required. Transfers during the fiscal year which would result in increases or decreases in excess of $5,000,000 or which would be subject to the limitations outlined in the previous paragraph require prior notification and approval from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

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 $1,234,467,000, the same as the budget request.

The fiscal year 2003 budget request identified specific funding amounts by weapons system. The Committee is to be notified in advance if the proposed funding levels for any weapons system change from the estimate provided in the fiscal year 2003 budget justification.

Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator.—The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $15,000,000 to initiate a study for a Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. This three-year study will evaluate the feasibility and costs associated with modifying one of the two candidate existing nuclear weapons to improve its utility against hard and deeply buried targets. The study will involve simulation, sub- and full system impact testing, and analysis and prototyping of components. Congressional approval will be required before any actual modifications are initiated.

CAMPAIGNS

Campaigns are focused efforts involving the three weapons laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, the weapons production plants, and selected external organizations to address critical capabilities needed to achieve program objectives. The Committee recommendation is $2,088,917,000, an increase of $21,083,000 over the budget request of $2,067,834,000.

From within funds provided for the various campaigns, $4,300,000 is for the University Research Program in Robotics.

As part of its review of the fiscal year 2003 budget request, the Committee asked the Department to provide project baseline data for each campaign to include a brief description of the campaign with planned completion dates, the total estimated cost of each campaign, the costs by fiscal year for each major component of the campaign, and a list of major milestones by year. The Department failed to provide most of the requested information. This lack of project definition and budget plans makes it very difficult to determine how the campaigns are actually contributing to the overall goals of the stockpile stewardship programs and whether they are doing it on a timely basis. The Committee expects the Department to provide detailed project baseline data for each campaign showing the annual and five-year costs, schedule, scope, and deliverables for individual project activities as part of the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

Science campaigns.—The Committee recommendation for science campaigns in $213,949,000, a reduction of $21,519,000 from the budget request. The dynamic materials properties campaign was reduced by $5,594,000, and the advanced radiography campaign was reduced by $15,925,000 due to slower than anticipated costing rates.

Engineering campaigns.—The Committee recommendation for engineering campaigns is $239,410,000, the same as the budget request.

Inertial Confinement Fusion.—The Committee recommends $498,793,000 for the inertial confinement fusion program, an increase of $47,000,000 over the budget request of $451,793,000.

The recommendation includes $25,000,000 to continue development of high average power lasers and supporting science and technology, and an additional $4,000,000 for development of petawatt laser capabilities.

The Committee recommendation also includes the budget request of $10,000,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory, and $54,200,000 for the University of Rochester, an increase of $18,0000,000 over the budget request. This additional funding has been provided to the University of Rochester's Laboratory for Laser Energetics for the OMEGA Extended Performance Facility in support of the nation's stockpile stewardship program.

The Committee recommendation provides $214,045,000 for construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF), the same as the budget request. The Committee is disturbed to see that NNSA is changing the focus from the specific goal of ignition to a generalized physics research program. Ignition now appears to be only one of several objectives for the NIF. At this stage in the construction

project, the Committee expects that confidence in achieving the ignition objective should be increasing, not receding. The Committee directs NNSA to re-establish ignition as the primary objective and justification for the NIF.

The Committee chose not to change the name of the Inertial Confinement Fusion program to High Energy Density as proposed by the Department.

Advanced simulation and computing.—The Committee recommendation for Advanced Simulation and Computing is $724,862,000, the same as the budget request.

Pit manufacturing and certification.—The Committee recommendation for pit manufacturing readiness is $194,484,000, the same as the budget request.

Readiness campaigns.—The Committee recommendation for readiness campaigns is $217,419,000, a reduction of $4,398,000 from the budget request. The non-nuclear readiness campaign was reduced by $4,398,000 due to slower than anticipated costing rates.

Tritium readiness.—The Department continues to maintain a schedule to produce tritium by 2006. Anticipated changes in the nuclear weapons stockpile will extend the date by which tritium is needed. In striving to meet this deadline, the cost of the Tritium Extraction Facility has increased by 25 percent. The Committee urges the Department to work with the Department of Defense to determine a more realistic schedule for starting production of tritium which will not require additional funding nor lead to operating new facilities which will then be contaminated and shutdown for an extended period of time due to lack of need for the tritium.

The Department recently acknowledged that the Tritium Extraction Facility at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina has experienced serious cost overruns and schedule delays. Once again lax Federal project management oversight and poor contractor performance have resulted in a project that will cost substantially more than planned and fail to meet deadlines for performance. The Department should submit to the Committee a detailed report identifying the steps being taken to correct the problems on this project and to ensure that similar problems are not occurring on other projects.

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 $1,738,229,000, an increase of $50,000,000 over the budget request of $1,688,229,000.

Additional funding of $25,000,000 has been provided for the Pantex plant in Texas and $20,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant in Tennessee to meet facility needs.

Enhanced test readiness.—As part of the Nuclear Posture Review, the NNSA was directed to refine test scenarios and evaluate cost/benefits to determine the optimum test readiness time to support the stockpile stewardship mission. Pending completion of that study and a specific policy change, the recommendation provides the budget request of $15,000,000. The Department is directed to

notify the Committee before any of these funds are obligated in fiscal year 2003.

Material recycle and recovery.—The Committee recommendation for material recycle and recovery is $103,816,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request. Additional funding of $5,000,000 has been provided for activities at the Y–12 Plant in Tennessee.

Construction projects.—Project 03–D–103, Project engineering and design (PE&D), has been increased by $1,500,000 to $17,039,000. Funding for the LIGA Technologies Facility that was included in the fiscal year 2002 PE&D project has been transferred to fiscal year 2003 since design is currently scheduled to being in fiscal year 2003.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION

The Committee recommendation for Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization program (F&I) is $242,512,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee is encouraged by the execution of this program to date and expects the NNSA to ensure that the results of this funding are quantifiable and quickly show measured improvements at each site.

This is a corporate program to restore, rebuild, and revitalize the physical infrastructure of the nuclear weapons complex. It is to stem the downward trend in the condition of the complex and address the backlog of maintenance, repair, and upgrade projects. Base maintenance and infrastructure efforts at NNSA sites are primarily funded within the Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities program and through site overhead allocations. These efforts ensure that facilities necessary for immediate programmatic workload activities are maintained to support that workload. The Committee directs NNSA to ensure that funds for recapitalization are not diverted to fund ongoing maintenance and programmatic needs.

The Committee directs that at least 25 percent of the facilities and infrastructure funding in fiscal year 2003 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. Anecdotal evidence indicates that for a variety of reasons the Department is not always procuring services to demolish excess facilities in the most cost effective manner. Thus, the Committee directs that none of these funds may be used to D&D or demolish excess facilities unless the services are procured though an open-competition allowing experienced contractors throughout the country to bid on each disposal project.

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 $152,989,000, 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 $509,954,000, the same as the budget request, and an increase of nearly 14 percent over fiscal year 2002. 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.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation for Weapons Activities includes the use of prior year balances of $195,000,000. The budget request included an offset of $28,985,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work. The Committee has provided direct funding for this activity and eliminated the funding offset.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriation, 2002	$1,029,586,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	1,113,630,000
Recommended, 2003	1,167,630,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+138,044,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	+54,000,000

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

Availability of funds.—Consistent with the provisions of H.R. 4546, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as passed by the House of Representatives, the funds in this account are available until September 30, 2005.

NONPROLIFERATION AND VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

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

The Committee recommendation is $283,407,000, the same as the budget request, and includes $121,500,000 for proliferation detection; $89,395,000 for nuclear explosion monitoring, of which $20,160,000 is for ground-based systems for treaty monitoring;

$69,000,000 for chemical and biological national security; and $3,512,000 for supporting activities.

The Committee has continuing concerns with the management of the research and development program. The Department needs to involve the end users in the project proposal process, not allow laboratories and Headquarters program managers to come up with ideas and then shop them around to end users. While funds for research and development are increasing, there is a gap not being filled between long-term laboratory research and development and what private industry is currently developing. The potential users of these technologies are looking for short-term improved products, not long-term research and development projects. The need to quickly bring incrementally-improved technologies to the marketplace has never been more urgent.

An additional concern is the lack of integrated program plans that ensure projects are complementary and not duplicative and a lack of metrics to evaluate project performance. Effective mechanisms are not in place to ensure efforts are not duplicating the work of other Federal agencies, and there is limited coordination of Federal research with private and academic research.

Competitive Research.—The Committee directs the Department to provide additional opportunities for open competition in 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 believes there are numerous private companies, non-DOE laboratories, and universities that have products, expertise and abilities to offer in the development of tools to strengthen the United States' response to threats to national security. The Committee directs the Department to provide a free and open competitive process for at least $113,000,000 which is 40 percent of the nonproliferation and verification research and development activities during fiscal year 2003. The competitive process should be open to all Federal and non-Federal entities.

Annual Report Requirement.—The Committee directs the Department to prepare an annual report of each project with the baseline cost, scope and schedule, deliverables, lab performing the research and development, and the proposed user and submit this with the fiscal year 2004 budget.

NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The nonproliferation and international security program (formerly the Arms Control program) seeks to detect, prevent, and reverse the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction materials, technology, and expertise. The major functional areas of the program include: nonproliferation policy; international safeguards; export control; and treaties and agreements. The Committee recommendation for nonproliferation and international security is $92,668,000, the same as the budget request.

Within the nonproliferation policy program is the Reduced Enrichment for Research and Test Reactor (RERTR) program to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons by minimizing and possibly eliminating the use of highly enriched uranium (HEU) in civilian

nuclear programs worldwide. The RERTR program develops the technologies needed to substitute LEU for HEU in research and test reactors, and this is to be completed by 2009. The recommendation includes the budget request of $5,500,000.

Also in the nonproliferation policy program is the Russian Foreign Research Reactor Fuel Return (RFR) initiative to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons by repatriating to Russia civilian HEU fuel from Russian-supplied research reactors in various countries including those located in regions of proliferation concern. The recommendation includes the budget request of $9,500,000.

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.

Limitation on Russian Program Funds.—The Department is still not adequately addressing the problem 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, 2002, on the steps being taken to meet the 25 percent limitation.

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS PROTECTION, CONTROL AND COOPERATION

The International Materials Protection, Control and Cooperation program, (formerly called the International Materials Protection, Control and Accounting program), is designed to work cooperatively with Russia to secure weapons and weapons-usable nuclear material. The focus is to improve the physical security at facilities that possess or process significant quantities of nuclear weapons-usable 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 $243,077,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request of $233,077,000. 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 INITIATIVE

The Committee recommendation for the Russian Transition Initiative program is $39,334,000, the same as the budget request. This includes the Initiative for Proliferation Prevention (IPP) program and the Nuclear Cities Initiatives (NCI) to develop projects to employ Russian weapons scientists and downsize the Russian weapons complex.

HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM (HEU) TRANSPARENCY IMPLEMENTATION

The highly enriched uranium (HEU) transparency implementation program develops and implements mutually-agreeable transparency measures for the February 1993 agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation. This agreement, which has an estimated value of $12 billion, covers the purchase over 20 years of low enriched uranium (LEU) derived from 500 metric tons of HEU removed from dismantled Russian nuclear weapons. Under the agreement, conversion of HEU components into LEU is performed in Russian facilities. The Committee recommendation is $17,229,000, the same as the budget request.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR SAFETY AND COOPERATION

With the completion in fiscal year 2003 of the Soviet-designed reactor safety program, the international nuclear safety and cooperation program will reorient its activities to address critical nuclear safety issues worldwide in countries of concern. The Committee recommendation is $11,576,000, a reduction of $3,000,000 from the budget request of $14,576,000. The Committee notes that other Federal and international entities already have nuclear safety as a primary mission.

ELIMINATION OF WEAPONS-GRADE PLUTONIUM PRODUCTION

The Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production Program will be transferred from the Department of Defense to the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2003. This is a cooperative effort with the Federation of Russia to stop plutonium production at three nuclear reactors still in operation in Russia, two located at Seversk and one at Zheleznogorsk. The three reactors have approximately 15 years of remaining lifetime and could generate an additional 25 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium. They also provide heat and electricity required by the surrounding communities. The current approach is to shutdown these three reactors within six years by providing alternate fossil-fueled energy plants to supply heat and electricity to the surrounding communities. The total estimated cost to shutdown the three nuclear reactors and build two new fossil-fuel plants is $470,000,000. The Committee recommendation is $49,339,000, the same as the budget request. In addition to the budget request, $74,000,000 in unobligated balances is being transferred from the Department of Defense's Cooperative Threat Reduction program to DOE.

The Committee is quite concerned about execution of this very complicated program which involves substantial contributions and coordination with the Russian Government. The Department has been so anxious to move forward on this program that it non-com-

petitively assigned the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) to serve as lead U.S. contractor, at a time when the program still officially belonged to Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) and not to DOE. While PNNL may be a logical choice for the reactor safety upgrade tasks, PNNL has limited expertise and experience in the design and construction of large-scale civil construction projects in Russia, especially in the closed cities. Also, the Department proposes to contract through PNNL with Rosatomstroy, an unproven subsidiary of the Ministry for Atomic Energy of the Russian Federation (MINATOM), for management and integration of the fossil fuel projects. In so doing, the Department ignores at its peril the lessons learned by the U.S. Government on the Fissile Material Storage Facility at Mayak.

The Department is rushing forward with neither a sound acquisition strategy nor a management approach designed to ensure the success of this $470 million program. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of the NNSA to require the application to the fossil fuel projects of the Department's established directives on project management, to include acquisition planning, alternative analysis, and critical decision approvals of these products at the levels prescribed by the Department's directives, before expenditure of funds appropriated for this program can begin. The Department is required to provide to the Committee, not later than January 31, 2003, a revised project management plan for the two fossil fuel plants, including a revised baseline schedule and cost estimate developed with the assistance of the Office of Engineering and Construction Management in the Office of Management, Budget, and Evaluation.

Further, the Department is directed to explore alternative means of accomplishing the design and construction of the fossil fuel plants in Russia. One option the Committee supports exploring is for the Department to use the services of the Army Corps of Engineers on a reimbursable basis, with the Department designating the Corps as the project manager for the fossil fuel plants. PNNL would remain as the project manager for the reactor safety upgrades. For purposes of the various agreements between the United States of America and the Russian Federation, and between the U.S. Department of Energy and MINATOM, concerning the cessation of plutonium production at the operating reactors in Seversk and the reactor in Zheleznogorsk, the Department would need to designate the Army Corps of Engineers as DOE's technical representative for matters relating to the design, analyses, procurement, construction, acceptance testing, startup, equipment, property, materials, personnel, training, and technical services required to implement the fossil fuel provisions of these agreements. The Department of Energy would maintain its official status as the Executive Agent for the United States for these agreements.

Misuse of Funds.—The Committee is aware that the Department allowed its contractor to initiate program activities in advance of receiving funds for the elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program. Almost $1,000,000 of funding was diverted from other programs to begin activities that had neither been approved nor funded by Congress. The Committee directs that none of the fiscal year 2003 funding provided herein be used to repay

any program expenditure made before October 1, 2002. The Committee also directs the Chief Financial Officer to prepare a report explaining how the Department's contracting and financial controls allowed this expenditure in advance of an appropriation. This report is due to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by October 15, 2002.

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 $438,000,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request. Funding of $350,000,000 is provided for U.S. surplus materials disposition and $88,000,000 for the Russian plutonium disposition program. The $10,000,000 reduction is to be applied to the Russian program for support and oversight in the United States, which has increased to more than one-third of the funding for this 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.

Construction projects.—Based on needs identified in the latest project review, the Committee recommendation transfers $2,000,000 to Project 99–D–141, the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility, from the operating expenses associated with this project.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recognizes that program activities managed by the Department's Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation have continued to increase. The Committee has previously directed the Office to reduce the number of contractors at Headquarters by converting these positions to Federal employees and expects the Office to move promptly. Thus, the Committee directs that a minimum of 250 Federal employees be fully funded in the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation in fiscal year 2003 to allow for increased program oversight by the Federal employees.

The Committee recommendation provides $57,000,000 for salaries and other expenses for the Federal employees in the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation organization. Funding for this activity was included in the budget request for the Office of the Administrator for NNSA, but no amount was specified. This funding provides for Federal employees and supporting activities at Headquarters, field offices, and international offices.

None of these funds may be taxed by the NNSA for any purpose without prior notification and approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $64,000,000 of prior year balances, the same as the budget request.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriation, 2002	$688,045,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	706,790,000
Recommended, 2003	706,790,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+18,745,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

Note: The original budget request of $708,020,000 for Naval Reactors included $1,230,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. The budget request has been reduced by this amount.

The Naval Reactors program is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion—from technology development through reactor operations to ultimate reactor plant disposal. The program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. These efforts are critical to ensuring the safety and reliability of 102 operating Naval reactor plants and to developing the next generation reactor.

The Committee recommendation is $706,790,000, the same as the budget request.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriation, 2002	$312,596,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	335,929,000
Recommended, 2003	261,929,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−50,667,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−74,000,000

Note: The original budget request of $347,705,000 for the Office of the Administrator included $11,776,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

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 $261,929,000, a reduction of $74,000,000 from the budget request. Funding of $54,000,000 has been transferred to the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program to allow greater management flexibility for that office in hiring and supporting Federal employees.

The NNSA has been in existence for more than two years, but the management efficiencies and economies that Congress expected to result from this new organization have so far failed to materialize. The Committee is still waiting for the streamlined processes and redefined roles in the management of the nation's nuclear weapons complex that will lead to reduced staffing needs. The Committee has also been disappointed in the response of the NNSA to Committee direction included in the reports accompanying the fiscal year 2002 appropriations bill; to additional requests for information in support of the fiscal year 2003 appropriation; and to the submission of reports required by the fiscal year 2002 appropria-

tions bill. Consistent with the direction provided in the House-passed Fiscal Year 2003 National Defense Authorization bill, a reduction of $20,000,000 has been applied to this account.

The Committee urges the Administrator of NNSA to provide at least $5,000,000 for the NNSA Office of Project Management and Engineering Support to continue its project oversight work and to provide training and mentoring programs to improve the skills of NNSA project managers.

The Committee recommendation provides $12,000, the same as the budget request, for official reception and representation expenses for the NNSA.

Availability of funds.—Consistent with the provisions of H.R. 4546, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as passed by the House of Representatives, the funds in this account are available until September 30, 2003.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 2002	$5,242,776,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	4,544,133,000
Recommended, 2003	4,543,661,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−699,115,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−472,000

Note: The original budget request of $4,558,360,000 for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management included $14,227,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

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. These responsibilities include facilities and areas at 114 geographic sites. These sites are located in 30 states and one territory and occupy an area equal to that of Rhode Island and Delaware combined—or about two million acres.

Environmental management activities are budgeted under the following appropriation accounts: Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; Environmental Management Cleanup Reform; Defense Facilities Closure Projects; Defense Environmental Management Privatization; Non-Defense Environmental Management; and Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation.

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management is $4,543,661,000, a reduction of $472,000 from the budget request. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

GENERAL

The Committee strongly supports the Department's reform initiatives and hopes to realize significant life-cycle cost savings and program efficiencies from new and innovative cleanup strategies throughout the complex. Efforts should continue to focus on reduc-

ing risk, accelerating cleanup, and eliminating activities that do not contribute to risk reduction and cleanup.

Budget Justifications.—The Environmental Management program budget justifications need to be revised to more fully identify the effects of the accelerated cleanup program. With the current budget structure, it is difficult to tie specific resources to measurable outcomes; complete project baseline data including the total cost, scope and schedule is not available; overhead costs are not transparent; and numerous activities that have no direct relevance to cleanup are buried throughout the budget. The Office of Environmental Management is directed to work with the Committee to identify specific changes to be made in the fiscal year 2004 budget submittal.

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 2003, 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 funds 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 is $787,950,000, the same as the budget request.

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.

From within available funds provided to the Richland site, funding is available to support the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) training and education center during fiscal year 2003. The Committee understands that this facility will seek another source of funding and be moved from the environmental management program after fiscal year 2003.

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

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING (D&D) FUND CONTRIBUTION

The Energy Policy Act of 1992, Public Law 102–486, created the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund to pay for the cost of cleanup of the gaseous diffusion facilities located in Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Paducah, Kentucky; and Portsmouth, Ohio. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $442,000,000 for the defense contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund as authorized in Public Law 102–486. These funds were included in the budget request for multi-site activities, but the recommendation has provided the funding in a separate program to provide greater visibility for this expenditure.

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 $103,000,000, an increase of $11,000,000 over the budget request of $92,000,000.

While the Committee supports the effort to restructure the science and technology program to focus on core research and development functions to support intermediate and long-term needs for cleanup and closure, failure to fund multi-year agreements hurts the Department's credibility as a reliable partner. The Committee recommendation includes $7,000,000 to continue the five-year cooperative agreement with the Florida International University's Hemispheric Center for Environmental Technology and $4,000,000 to continue the five-year AEA Technology International Agreement.

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 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.

MULTI-SITE ACTIVITIES

Multi-site activities provide management and direction for various crosscutting initiatives, establish national and departmental policies, and conduct analysis and integrate actions across the complex. The Committee recommendation is $47,352,000 for multi-site activities, a reduction of $432,519,000 from the budget request of $479,871,000. The following funding adjustments are included: $442,000,000 requested for the Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund Contribution has been transferred to a separate program; $1,000,000 requested for packaging certification in the non-defense account has been transferred here; and $8,481,000 has been provided for the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program.

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 $228,260,000, the same as the budget request.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends $344,000,000 for program direction, the same as the budget request.

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 use of prior year balances of $34,000,000. The budget request included an offset of $4,347,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work. The Committee has provided direct funding for this activity and eliminated the funding offset.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT CLEANUP REFORM

Appropriation, 2002	.....
Budget Estimate, 2003	$1,100,000,000
Recommended, 2003	1,100,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+1,100,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

The Environmental Management Cleanup Reform appropriation is designed to enable the Department, the States, and the American taxpayer to begin realizing the benefits immediately of alternative cleanup approaches that will produce more real risk reduction, accelerate cleanup, and achieve much needed cost and schedule improvements. This new account is critical to beginning implementation of the recent top-to-bottom review of the Department's environmental management programs.

These funds will be made available only when the Department enters into revised agreements that have the potential for significant life-cycle cost savings over the current baseline cleanup approach. When the Department reaches agreement with regulatory officials, establishes a new funding profile, and estimates the cost savings for the alternate cleanup strategy, these funds will be transferred to the existing cleanup accounts to fund the new projects or supplement funding for ongoing projects.

The Administration's original budget request indicated that an additional $300,000,000 would be requested in a budget amendment if the approved agreements exceeded the available funding of $800,000,000. From the accelerated cleanup agreements reached to date which total more than $750,000,000, it is apparent that the initial request of $800,000,000 will be exceeded during fiscal year 2003. Thus, the Committee has provided a total of $1,100,000,000. [Note: The Administration submitted a budget amendment for the additional $300,000,000 on August 2, 2002.]

The Committee directs that none of the funds be released until the execution of a site performance management plan and upon its submission to the congressional defense committees. The site performance management plan is defined as a plan, agreed to by the applicable Federal and State agencies with regulatory jurisdiction with respect to the site, that provides for the performance of activities that will accelerate the reduction of environmental risk and accelerate cleanup at the site. Upon transfer and merger of the funds, all funds in the merged account are available only to carry out the site performance management plan at the site.

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS

Appropriation, 2002	$1,092,878,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	1,091,314,000
Recommended, 2003	1,091,314,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−1,564,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

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. Sites in this account include the Rocky Flats Closure Project in Colorado, and several sites in Ohio—Ashtabula, Columbus, Fernald, and Miamisburg. Fiscal year 2003 funding for each closure site is discussed below.

Rocky Flats Closure Project.—The Committee has provided fiscal year 2003 funding of $664,000,000, the same as the budget request, for the Rocky Flats site in Colorado. The Committee is aware that,

to meet the 2006 deadline for closure, 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. It is only through successful site closures that funds will be made available to support expensive future cleanup projects at Hanford and Idaho.

Ohio Sites.—The Committee is encouraged that the Department is seeking to ensure that the 2006 closure date for each of these sites is met. 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 2003, 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 $427,314,000, the same as the budget request, for the following Ohio sites: Ashtabula—$16,000,000; Columbus Environmental Management Project—$16,100,000; Miamisburg—$96,028,000; and Fernald—$299,186,000.

A recent Inspector General report "Cost Sharing at the Ashtabula Environmental Management Project" raised concerns that the Department was accepting full financial responsibility for remediating the site when a portion of the work performed by the contractor was for commercial customers. In addition, the Inspector General questioned the fees paid for work that is taking place on contractor-owned sites. The Committee expects the Department to address this issue, assure an equitable allocation of site cleanup costs, and report to the Committee on the resolution of this issue by December 15, 2002.

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 at closure sites is $37,161,000, the same as the budget request.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

Appropriation, 2002	$153,537,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	158,399,000
Recommended, 2003	158,399,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+4,862,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

The Committee recommendation for the Defense Environmental Management Privatization program is $158,399,000, the same as the budget request. The recommendation includes $105,000,000 for the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project and $53,399,000 for the Spent Nuclear Fuel Dry Storage Facility, both located in Idaho.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2002	$547,544,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	468,664,000
Recommended, 2003	485,076,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−62,468,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	+16,412,000

Note: The original budget request of $472,156,000 for Other Defense Activities included $3,492,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

This account provides funding for Energy Security and Assurance; the Office of Security; 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.

ENERGY SECURITY AND ASSURANCE

The Energy Security and Assurance program supports the national security by working to protect the Nation against severe energy supply disruptions. Though protecting our energy vulnerabilities will largely be accomplished through the private sector, there is a strong national coordinating and analytical role to be filled by the Federal government. This effort in fiscal year 2003 will provide resources to enhance energy assurance critical assessment and response capabilities, conduct infrastructure vulnerability assessments, analyze energy systems and infrastructure security, respond to energy emergencies, and support the National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center (NISAC).

The Committee recommendation for energy security and assurance is $27,686,000, the same as the budget request, for energy security and assurance activities to coordinate with the States and industry and to lead the Federal government's effort to ensure a secure flow of energy. Funding of $19,311,000, the same as the budget request, has been provided for the National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center which is proposed for transfer to the new Office of Homeland Security. The Committee expects the focus of NISAC to remain on critical energy infrastructure vulnerabilities during fiscal year 2003.

The Committee strongly supports the development of critical energy infrastructure vulnerability assessments and expects the Department to provide a detailed project plan by November 30, 2002, that includes the cost, schedule, scope and milestones for this effort. The plan should address how each State will be involved in the program, and describe the training program to be used for state emergency planning.

OFFICE OF SECURITY

The Office of Security provides a domestic safeguards and security program for protection of nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, nuclear facilities, and classified and unclassified information 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 $210,515,000, an increase of $25,000,000 over the budget request of $185,515,000.

The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to fund a portion of the Department's corporate management information program which is the same amount as fiscal year 2002, and $15,000,000 to fund a portion of the Department's cybersecurity and secure communications activities. In fiscal year 2002 the conference agreement allocated these costs between the defense and non-defense accounts of the Department, but the fiscal year 2003 budget request included all costs in the Departmental Administration account. The Committee recommendation once again apportions these costs between programs.

In fiscal year 2003, the Department of Energy will spend over $1 billion on safeguards and security activities at Headquarters and field locations. The $210,515,000 provided to the Office of Security is for Headquarters activities only. Funding for safeguards and security activities at Departmental facilities and laboratories in the field is included within each program budget.

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE

The intelligence program provides information and technical analyses on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy related matters to policy makers in the Department and other U.S. Government agencies. The focus of the Department's intelligence analysis and reporting is on emerging proliferant nations, nuclear technology transfers, foreign nuclear materials production, and proliferation implications of the breakup of the Former Soviet Union. The Committee recommendation is $41,246,000, the same as the budget request.

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 $45,955,000, the same as the budget request.

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, environment, safety and health, and cyber security. The Committee recommendation is $22,430,000, the same as the budget request.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Office of Environment, Safety and Health develops programs and policies to protect the workers and the public, and funds health effects studies. The Committee recommendation is $94,041,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request of $99,041,000, due to funding constraints. With a significant Headquarters staff

of Federal employees, the Committee continues to believe that outside contractor assistance can be reduced.

The recommendation for health effects studies is $48,160,000, the same as the budget request. The recommended level of funding is the same as the prior fiscal year after eliminating the special purpose projects of $8,750,000 that were included in the fiscal year 2002 appropriation. 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.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The Committee's recommendation for the worker and community transition program is $19,683,000, a reduction of $6,000,000 from the budget request of $25,683,000, due to funding constraints. Funding has remained stable or increased in many Departmental programs, and there are no significant contractor reductions requiring additional funds in fiscal year 2003.

The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for infrastructure improvements at the former Pinellas weapons plant.

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 and now exceeds $1 billion. With program funds increasing in fiscal year 2003 at NNSA and environmental cleanup sites, the Committee sees no need to increase funding for severance benefits above the fiscal year 2002 level.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation of $2,000,000 for program direction, a reduction of $718,000 from the budget request, is the same as fiscal year 2002.

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $30,587,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request of $25,587,000, to provide administrative support for national security programs. This will fund Departmental activities performed by offices such as the Secretary, Deputy Secretary and Under Secretary, the General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer, Human Resources, Congressional Affairs, and Public Affairs which organizations support the organizations funded in the atomic energy defense activities accounts.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

The Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) is responsible for all of the Department's adjudicatory processes, other than those administered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The

Committee recommendation is $2,933,000, the same as the budget request.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation for funding adjustments includes the use of $10,000,000 in prior year balances, an increase of $3,300,000 over the budget request of $6,700,000. The budget request also included an offset of $712,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work. The Committee has provided direct funding for this activity and eliminated the need for this funding offset.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 2002	$280,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	315,000,000
Recommended, 2003	315,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+35,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

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 2001, the balance owed by the Federal government to the Nuclear Waste Fund was $1,350,039,000 (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 2002, a total of $1,693,129,000 has been appropriated to support nuclear waste repository activities attributable to atomic energy defense activities.

The Committee recommendation is $315,000,000, the same as the budget request. Combined with the budget request of $209,702,000 from the Nuclear Waste Fund, this will provide a total of $524,702,000 for nuclear waste fund activities at the Yucca Mountain site in Nevada in fiscal year 2003.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

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

All power marketing administrations except the Bonneville Power Administration are funded annually with appropriated funds. Revenues collected from power sales and transmission services are deposited in the Treasury to offset expenditures. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2003 does not support the Administration proposal to continue the phase-out of federal fi-

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

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

Purchase power and wheeling.—The Committee is eliminating the phase out by the end of fiscal year 2004 of the use of receipts by the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration for purchase power and wheeling. This approach was originally proposed in the Administration's fiscal year 2001 budget request and endorsed in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 2002 (P.L. 106–377). In recognition of the Western energy crisis during the previous year, Congress did not adhere to the P.L. 106–377 limitations on purchase power and wheeling in fiscal year 2002. The budget request for fiscal year 2003 proposed resuming the phase-out of purchase power and wheeling along the schedule contained in P.L. 106–377. However, the Committee finds that there is no compelling reason to continue the phase out of purchase power and wheeling, particularly since this activity is budget neutral. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2003 maintains purchase power and wheeling activities at the fiscal year 2002 level. The Committee will continue to establish ceilings on the use of receipts for purchase power and wheeling, and also establish the amount of offsetting collections.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

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 presently has available $3,750,000,000 in permanent borrowing authority, authorized by the Transmission System Act (P.L. 93–454). For fiscal year 2003, the Committee recommendation includes an estimate of use of $630,800,000 of authorized borrowing authority, the same as the budget request and $256,300,000 more than fiscal year 2002. This borrowing authority is available for capital investments in power systems (including fish and wildlife measures), trans-

mission systems, and capital equipment. Bonneville forecasts that it will fully utilize its remaining borrowing authority during fiscal year 2004.

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

Northwest Power Planning Council.—The Northwest Power Act of 1980 established the Northwest Power Planning Council to be an independent regional body to provide oversight on Columbia River Basin energy, fish, and wildlife issues. It is the Committee's view, however, that the Council has not exercised as much independence as Congress intended on major capital funding decisions by Bonneville, including the ill-fated Tenaska power plant project, energy conservation, and recent efforts by Bonneville to increase its permanent borrowing authority for transmission system upgrades. The Committee reminds the Council that Bonneville's historic record on resource acquisition decisions is fraught with mistakes, and that a full measure of critical thinking by an independent body is a prudent safeguard to help ensure the Northwest an adequate, efficient, economical and reliable power supply. Because the Council's operational funding comes from Bonneville's electricity revenues, and the Bonneville Administrator has oversight authority over the Council's statutory funding limitation, the Committee is concerned that a potential conflict of interest exists, which has diminished the Council's independence. To help ensure that such a conflict is avoided, the Committee directs Bonneville and the Council to submit to the Committee by November 1, 2002, the most recent information pertaining to the formulation of the Council's budget as it pertains to the Council's capability to carry out its responsibilities with the independence and objectivity that Congress intended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2002	$4,891,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	4,534,000
Recommended, 2003	4,534,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−357,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	

Note: The original budget request of $4,784,000 for the Southeastern Power Marketing Administration included $250,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

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 $4,534,000, the same as the budget request and a $357,000 decrease compared to fiscal year 2002. The total program level for Southeastern in fiscal year 2003 is $39,141,000, with $34,463,000 for purchase power and wheeling and $4,606,000 for

program direction. The purchase power and wheeling costs will be offset by collections of $34,463,000. With the use of $72,000 of prior year balances, this results in a net appropriation of $4,534,000. The offsetting collections total of $34,463,000 includes $20,000,000 made available in Public Law 106–377 for use in fiscal year 2003, plus an additional $14,463,000 provided in this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2002	$28,038,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	27,378,000
Recommended, 2003	27,378,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−660,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

Note: The original budget request of $28,444,000 for the Southwestern Power Marketing Administration included $1,066,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

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 $27,378,000, the same as the budget request and $660,000 less than the fiscal year 2002 funding level. The total program level for Southwestern in fiscal year 2003 is $29,578,000, including $3,814,000 for operating expenses, $1,800,000 for purchase power and wheeling, $17,933,000 for program direction, and $6,031,000 for construction. The offset of $1,800,000 from collections for purchase power and wheeling, plus $400,000 from use of prior year balances, yields a net appropriation of $27,378,000. The offsetting collections total of $1,800,000 includes $288,000 made available in Public Law 106–377 for use in fiscal year 2003, plus an additional $1,512,000 provided in this Act. The Committee recommendation also increases the authority for Southwestern to accept an additional $8,043,000 of non-Federal reimbursable funding to fulfill Southwestern's obligation under the Southwest Power Pool Open Access Transmission Tariff to upgrade designated Southwestern transmission facilities.

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

Appropriation, 2002	$171,938,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	162,758,000
Recommended, 2003	162,758,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−9,180,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

Note: The original budget request of $168,788,000 for the Western Area Power Administration included $6,030,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

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 $162,758,000, the same as the budget request and $9,180,000 less than the fiscal year 2002 funding level. The total program level for Western in fiscal year 2003 is $350,082,000, which includes $17,784,000 for construction and rehabilitation, $37,796,000 for system operation and maintenance, $186,124,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and $108,378,000 for program direction. Consistent with the budget request, no funds are provided for Utah mitigation and conservation. Offsetting collections for purchase power and wheeling total $186,124,000; with the use of $1,200,000, this requires a net appropriation of $162,758,000. The offsetting collections total of $186,124,000 includes $30,000,000 made available in Public Law 106–377 for use in fiscal year 2003, plus an additional $156,124,000 provided in this Act.

Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for upgrades to substations and transmission lines for the South of Phoenix portion of the Parker-Davis project.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriation, 2002	$2,663,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	2,734,000
Recommended, 2003	2,734,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+71,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

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 $2,734,000, the same as the budget request and $71,000 more than the fiscal year 2002 funding level.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2002	$184,155,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	192,000,000
Recommended, 2003	192,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+7,845,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 2002	−$184,155,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−192,000,000
Recommended, 2003	−192,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−7,845,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

Note: The original budget request of $199,928,000 for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission included $7,928,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request and the corresponding revenues have been reduced by this amount.

The Committee recommendation is $192,000,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $7,845,000 over the fiscal year 2002 funding level. Revenues for FERC are established at a rate equal to the budget authority, resulting in a net appropriation of $0.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has underway an analysis of the land rents charged by FERC for non-federal hydropower projects located on federal lands. Preliminary results from GAO indicate that the fee schedule presently used by FERC significantly underestimates, possibly by as much as two orders of magnitude, the fair market value of these project lands used for non-federal hydropower. The Committee directs FERC to submit a proposal to Congress that will revise the existing fee schedule to a new methodology that will capture more of the real market value of these federal lands. This proposal should be submitted as part of the Fiscal Year 2004 budget request.

The Committee is very concerned about the possible impact on regional electricity prices of FERC's proposed rule for Standard Market Design (SMD). Not less than 90 days prior to finalizing the SMD rule, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations an independent analysis of the impact of the SMD rule that FERC proposes to finalize. This independent analysis must compare wholesale and retail electricity prices in the major regions of the country both under existing conditions and under the proposed new rule. This analysis must also address the proposed SMD rule's:

(a) costs and benefits, including its impacts on energy infrastructure development and investor confidence;

(b) impacts on state utility regulation;

(c) financial impact on retail customers;

(d) impact on the reasonableness of electricity prices; and

(e) impact on the safe, reliable, and secure operation of the Nation's generation and transmission facilities.

The Committee intends to address this issue in more detail at conference.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
ENERGY SUPPLY			
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES			
Renewable energy technologies			
Biomass/biofuels energy systems	93,000	86,005	86,005
Geothermal technology development	29,000	26,500	26,500
Hydrogen research	31,000	39,881	35,476
Hydropower	5,300	7,489	6,489
Solar energy	95,000	87,625	87,625
Wind energy systems	41,000	44,000	44,000
Total, Renewable energy technologies	294,300	291,500	286,095
Electric energy systems and storage	63,000	70,447	70,447
Renewable support and implementation			
Departmental energy management	1,500	3,000	1,500
International renewable energy program	3,000	6,500	4,000
Renewable energy production incentive program	4,000	4,000	6,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	3,000	8,307	6,307
Renewable program support	3,000	2,059	2,059
Total, Renewable support and implementation	14,500	23,866	19,866
National renewable energy laboratory	4,200	4,200	4,200
Construction			
02-E-001 Project engineering and design, NREL Golden, CO	800	800	800
Total, National renewable energy laboratory	5,000	5,000	5,000
Program direction	19,200	16,187	14,592
TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES	396,000	407,000	396,000
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
Advanced radioisotope power system	29,000	---	26,450
Isotopes			
Isotope support and production	23,683	---	18,497
Construction			
99-E-201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	2,494	---	1,721
Subtotal, Isotope support and production	26,177	---	20,218
Offsetting collections	-9,000	---	-6,400
Total, Isotopes	17,177	---	13,818
University reactor fuel assistance and support	17,500	17,500	17,500
Research and development			
Nuclear energy plant optimization	7,000	---	5,000
Nuclear energy research initiative	32,000	25,000	25,000
Nuclear energy technologies	12,000	46,500	41,500
Total, Research and development	51,000	71,500	71,500
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	38,439	36,100	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
Radiological facilities management			
Radiological facilities	---	78,977	---
ANL-West operations	35,357	---	31,615
Test reactor area landlord	7,283	---	8,815
Subtotal	42,640	78,977	40,430
Construction			
99-E-2-1 Isotope production facility (LANL)	---	1,721	---
99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Lab, ID	950	1,840	1,840
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Lab, ID	500	500	500
Subtotal, Construction	1,450	4,061	2,340
Total, Radiological facilities management	44,090	83,038	42,770
Nuclear facilities management			
EBR-II shutdown	4,200	---	---
Disposition of spent fuel and legacy materials	16,200	---	---
Disposition technology activities	9,850	---	---
Total, Nuclear facilities management	30,250	---	---
Spent fuel pyroprocessing and transmutation	---	18,221	18,221
Program direction	23,000	23,439	23,439
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	250,456	249,798	213,698
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)	10,973	10,340	8,340
Program direction	19,527	18,871	17,871
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	30,500	29,211	26,211
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
Technical information management program	1,400	1,400	---
Program direction	6,370	6,525	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	7,770	7,925	---
Subtotal, Energy supply	684,726	693,934	635,909
General reduction	-18,000	---	-2,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	666,726	693,934	633,909
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT			
Site closure	43,000	---	90,000
Site/project completion	64,119	51,272	42,425
Post 2006 completion	125,753	112,887	17,554
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	---	---	44,100
Long-term stewardship	---	---	14,180

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
Excess facilities	3,500	1,841	5,000
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	236,372	166,000	213,259
URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION			
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund			
Decontamination and decommissioning	298,641	234,523	234,523
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total, Uranium enrichment D&D fund	299,641	235,523	235,523
Other Uranium Activities			
Maintenance and pre-existing liabilities	110,784	146,631	146,631
02-U-101 Depleted uranium hexafluoride conversion project, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH	10,000	---	---
96-U-201 DUF6 cylinder storage yard, Paducah, KY	3,000	---	---
Total, Other uranium activities	123,784	146,631	146,631
Use of prior year balances	-5,000	---	---
TOTAL, URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION	418,425	382,154	382,154
SCIENCE			
High energy physics	704,700	704,897	704,897
Construction			
98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	11,400	20,093	20,093
Total, High energy physics	716,100	724,990	724,990
Nuclear physics	360,510	382,370	382,370
Biological and environmental research	516,000	504,215	504,215
Construction			
01-E-300 Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics, ORNL	11,405	---	---
Total, Biological and environmental research	527,405	504,215	504,215
Basic energy sciences			
Research			
Materials sciences and engineering research	434,353	547,883	547,883
Chemical sciences, geosciences and energy biosciences	218,714	220,146	220,146
Engineering and geosciences	38,938	---	---
Energy biosciences	32,400	---	---
Subtotal, Research	724,405	768,029	768,029
Construction			
03-SC-002 Project engineering & design (PED) SLAC	---	6,000	6,000
03-R-312 Center for nanophase materials sciences, ORNL	---	24,000	24,000
02-SC-002 Project engineering and design (VL)	3,000	11,000	11,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	276,300	210,571	210,571
Subtotal, Construction	279,300	251,571	251,571
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,003,705	1,019,600	1,019,600
Advanced scientific computing research	158,050	169,625	174,625
Energy research analyses	1,000	1,020	---
Science laboratories infrastructure			
Infrastructure support	1,020	1,020	1,020
Oak Ridge landlord	7,359	5,079	5,079
Excess facilities disposal	10,000	5,055	10,000
Construction			
03-SC-001 Science laboratories infrastructure project engineering and design (PED), various loc.	---	3,355	3,355
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	18,613	28,226	28,226
02-SC-001 Multiprogram energy laboratories, project engineering design, various locations	3,183	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	21,796	31,581	31,581
Total, Science laboratories infrastructure	40,175	42,735	47,680
Fusion energy sciences program	248,495	257,310	248,495
Safeguards and security	55,412	48,127	48,127
Science workforce development	---	---	5,460
Science program direction			
Field offices	63,000	70,163	68,600
Headquarters	72,500	58,224	56,940
Science education	4,460	5,460	---
Technical information management program	---	---	7,770
Energy research analyses	---	---	1,000
Total, Science program direction	139,960	133,847	134,310
Subtotal, Science	3,250,812	3,283,839	3,289,872
General reduction	-12,800	---	-18,639
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-4,912	-4,383	---
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,233,100	3,279,456	3,271,233
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Repository program	39,000	212,813	146,713
Program direction	56,000	62,989	62,989
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	95,000	275,802	209,702
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations			
Salaries and expenses			
Office of the Secretary	4,700	4,645	4,000
Board of contract appeals	911	743	743

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
Chief information officer	---	30,862	29,000
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,500	4,953	4,500
Economic impact and diversity	5,000	5,121	5,000
General counsel	22,724	22,813	20,000
International affairs	8,481	---	---
Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation	107,000	106,536	105,000
Policy office	6,600	---	---
Policy and international affairs	---	16,840	14,000
Public affairs	3,900	4,531	3,900
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	163,816	197,044	186,143
Program support			
Minority economic impact	1,200	1,400	1,200
Policy analysis and system studies	400	800	400
Energy security and assurance	---	2,000	1,000
Environmental policy studies	600	1,200	600
Engineering and construction management reviews	---	---	5,000
Cybersecurity and secure communications	---	32,027	15,000
Corporate management information program	5,000	20,420	10,000
Subtotal, Program support	7,200	57,847	33,200
Total, Administrative operations	171,016	254,891	219,343
Cost of work for others	71,837	69,916	29,916
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	242,853	324,807	249,259
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	-10,000	---	-10,000
Funding from other defense activities	-22,000	-25,587	-30,587
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	210,853	299,220	208,672
Miscellaneous revenues	-137,810	-137,524	-80,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	73,043	161,696	128,672
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	32,430	37,671	37,671
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	32,430	37,671	37,671
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Directed stockpile work			
Stockpile research and development	349,000	467,149	467,149
Stockpile maintenance	350,000	401,157	401,157
Stockpile evaluation	178,500	197,184	197,184
Dismantlement/disposal	27,000	24,378	24,378
Production support	134,896	137,706	137,706
Field engineering, training and manuals	6,418	6,893	6,893
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,045,814	1,234,467	1,234,467

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
Campaigns			
Science campaigns			
Primary certification	52,500	47,159	47,159
Dynamic materials properties	87,400	87,594	82,000
Advanced radiography	85,803	52,925	37,000
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins	44,000	47,790	47,790
Subtotal, Science campaigns	269,703	235,468	213,949
Engineering campaigns			
Enhanced surety	37,000	37,713	37,713
Weapons system engineering certification	26,665	27,007	27,007
Nuclear survivability	23,694	23,394	23,394
Enhanced surveillance	82,333	77,155	77,155
Advanced design and production technologies	75,533	74,141	74,141
Subtotal, Engineering campaigns	245,225	239,410	239,410
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield	261,443	237,748	284,748
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL	245,000	214,045	214,045
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	506,443	451,793	498,793
Advanced simulation and computing	675,000	669,527	669,527
Construction			
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	8,400	13,305	13,305
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	22,000	35,030	35,030
00-D-105 Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	11,070	---	---
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	13,377	7,000	7,000
Subtotal, Construction	54,847	55,335	55,335
Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing	729,847	724,862	724,862
Pit manufacturing and certification	219,000	194,484	194,484
Readiness campaigns			
Stockpile readiness	47,169	61,027	61,027
High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness	6,846	12,093	12,093
Non-nuclear readiness	18,187	22,398	18,000
Materials readiness	1,209	---	---
Tritium readiness	42,350	56,134	56,134
Construction			
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	81,125	70,165	70,165
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	123,475	126,299	126,299
Subtotal, Readiness campaigns	196,886	221,817	217,419
Total, Campaigns	2,167,104	2,067,834	2,088,917

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
Readiness in technical base and facilities			
Operations of facilities	897,800	949,920	994,920
Program readiness	192,000	208,089	208,089
Special projects	60,385	37,744	37,744
Material recycle and recovery	90,310	98,816	103,816
Containers	8,199	17,721	17,721
Storage	10,643	14,593	14,593
Nuclear weapons incident response	88,923	91,000	91,000
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,348,260	1,417,883	1,467,883
Construction			
03-D-101 Sandia underground reactor facility SURF, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	---	2,000	2,000
03-D-103 Project engineering and design various locations	---	15,539	17,039
03-D-121 Gas transfer capacity expansion, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO	---	4,000	4,000
03-D-122 Prototype purification facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	20,800	20,800
03-D-123 Special nuclear materials requalification, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	---	3,000	3,000
02-D-103 Project engineering and design, various locations	22,830	27,245	25,745
02-D-105 Engineering technology complex upgrade, LLNL	4,750	10,000	10,000
02-D-107 Electrical power systems safety communications and bus upgrades, NV	3,507	7,500	7,500
01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	16,379	6,164	6,164
01-D-107 Atlas relocation, Nevada test site	3,300	4,123	4,123
01-D-108 Microsystems and engineering sciences applications complex (MESA), SNL	67,000	75,000	75,000
01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	25,000	25,000
01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	7,700	8,650	8,650
01-D-800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL	12,993	9,611	9,611
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	4,400	4,011	4,011
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,800	5,915	5,915
99-D-106 Model validation & system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	4,955	---	---
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	2,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
99-D-125 Replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	300	---	---
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	22,200	29,900	29,900
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	3,300	407	407
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	13,700	10,481	10,481
98-D-124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y-12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	6,850	---	---
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	3,000	---	---
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations	2,900	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Construction	204,864	270,346	270,346
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,553,124	1,688,229	1,738,229
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	200,000	242,512	242,512
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	79,071	100,863	100,863
Program direction	44,229	52,126	52,126
Total, Secure transportation asset	123,300	152,989	152,989
Safeguards and security	439,281	501,054	501,054
Construction			
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	9,600	8,900	8,900
Total, Safeguards and security	448,881	509,954	509,954
Subtotal, Weapons activities	5,538,223	5,895,985	5,967,068
Use of prior year balances	---	---	-195,000
General reduction	-80,000	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-28,985	-28,985	---
Subtotal, Weapons activities	5,429,238	5,867,000	5,772,068
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117)	131,000	---	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-206)	19,400	---	---
Rescission (P.L. 107-206)	-14,460	---	---
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	5,565,178	5,867,000	5,772,068

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	208,500	283,407	283,407
Construction			
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	35,806	---	---
Total, Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	244,306	283,407	283,407
Nonproliferation and international security	75,741	92,668	92,668
Nonproliferation programs with Russia			
International materials protection, control, and cooperation	173,000	233,077	243,077
Russian transition initiative	42,000	39,334	39,334
HEU transparency implementation	13,950	17,229	17,229
International nuclear safety	10,000	14,576	11,576
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	---	49,339	49,339
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus materials disposition	135,089	194,000	192,000
Russian surplus materials disposition	61,000	98,000	88,000
Construction			
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC	29,340	30,000	30,000
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility Savannah River, SC	11,000	33,000	35,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	65,993	93,000	93,000
Subtotal, Construction	106,333	156,000	158,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	302,422	448,000	438,000
Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia	541,372	801,555	798,555
Program direction	---	---	57,000
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation	861,419	1,177,630	1,231,630
Use of prior year balances	-57,833	-64,000	-64,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117)	226,000	---	---
Regular appropriations (P.L. 107-206)	100,000	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,129,586	1,113,630	1,167,630
NAVAL REACTORS			
Naval reactors development	652,245	671,290	671,290
Construction			
03-D-201 Cleanroom technology facility, Bettis atomic power lab, West Mifflin, PA	---	7,200	7,200
01-D-200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY	9,000	2,100	2,100

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	4,200	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Construction	13,200	11,300	11,300
Total, Naval reactors development	665,445	682,590	682,590
Program direction	22,600	24,200	24,200
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	688,045	706,790	706,790
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR			
Office of the Administrator	312,596	335,929	261,929
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	312,596	335,929	261,929
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	7,695,405	8,023,349	7,908,417
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	960,330	779,706	779,706
Construction			
02-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, INEEL, Idaho Falls, ID	3,256	1,119	1,119
02-D-420 Plutonium packaging and stabilization, Savannah River	20,000	2,000	2,000
01-D-414 Preliminary project, engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	2,754	5,125	5,125
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	5,040	---	---
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID	2,700	---	---
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	1,910	---	---
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	4,244	---	---
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility (LLNL), Livermore, CA	762	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	40,666	8,244	8,244
Total, Site/project completion	1,000,996	787,950	787,950
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,105,479	1,702,241	1,702,241
Construction			
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	6,754	14,870	14,870

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
Office of River Protection			
Operation and maintenance	328,151	226,256	226,256
Construction			
03-D-403 Immobilized high-level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA	---	6,363	6,363
01-D-416 Hanford waste treatment plant, Richland, WA	665,000	619,000	619,000
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	33,473	25,424	25,424
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	6,844	20,945	20,945
Subtotal, Construction	705,317	671,732	671,732
Subtotal, Office of River Protection	1,033,468	897,988	897,988
Total, Post 2006 completion	3,145,701	2,615,099	2,615,099
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	420,000	---	442,000
Science and technology	255,768	92,000	103,000
Excess facilities	5,000	1,300	10,000
Multi-site activities	---	479,871	47,352
Safeguards and security	205,621	228,260	228,260
Program direction	355,761	344,000	344,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,388,847	4,548,480	4,577,661
Use of prior year balances	-56,770	---	-34,000
General reduction	-92,110	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-5,391	-4,347	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117)	8,200	---	---
Rescission (P.L. 107-206)	-15,540	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	5,227,236	4,544,133	4,543,661
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT CLEANUP REFORM			
Environmental management cleanup reform	---	1,100,000	1,100,000
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS			
Site closure	1,038,903	1,054,153	1,054,153
Safeguards and security	53,975	37,161	37,161
TOTAL, DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS	1,092,878	1,091,314	1,091,314
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	153,537	158,399	158,399
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION	153,537	158,399	158,399
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	6,473,651	6,893,846	6,893,374

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Other national security programs			
Energy security and assurance			
Energy security	---	23,411	23,411
Program direction	---	4,275	4,275
Subtotal, Energy security and assurance	---	27,686	27,686
Office of Security			
Nuclear safeguards and security	116,500	91,102	91,102
Security investigations	44,927	45,870	45,870
Corporate management information program	10,000	---	10,000
Cyber security and secure communications	---	---	15,000
Program direction	79,000	48,543	48,543
Subtotal, Office of Security	250,427	185,515	210,515
Intelligence	40,844	41,246	41,246
Counterintelligence	46,000	45,955	45,955
Independent oversight and performance assurance	14,904	22,430	22,430
Advanced accelerator applications	50,000	---	---
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	95,688	81,892	76,892
Program direction - EH	22,000	17,149	17,149
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	117,688	99,041	94,041
Worker and community transition	18,000	22,965	17,683
Program direction - WT	2,000	2,718	2,000
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	20,000	25,683	19,683
National Security programs administrative support	22,000	25,587	30,587
Office of hearings and appeals	2,893	2,933	2,933
Subtotal, Other defense activities	564,756	476,076	495,076
Use of prior year balances	-20,000	-6,700	-10,000
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-712	-712	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117)	3,500	---	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-206)	7,000	---	---
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	554,544	468,664	485,076
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	280,000	315,000	315,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	15,003,600	15,700,859	15,601,867
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Purchase power and wheeling	34,463	20,000	34,463
Program direction	4,891	4,606	4,606
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	39,354	24,606	39,069
Offsetting collections	-8,000	---	-14,463
Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	-26,463	-20,000	-20,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	House
Use of prior year balances	---	-72	-72
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	4,891	4,534	4,534
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	3,339	3,814	3,814
Purchase power and wheeling	1,800	288	1,800
Program direction	18,668	17,933	17,933
Construction	6,031	6,031	6,031
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	29,838	28,066	29,578
Offsetting collections	-1,512	---	-1,512
Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	-288	-288	-288
Use of prior year balances	---	-400	-400
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	28,038	27,378	27,378
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction and rehabilitation	18,764	17,784	17,784
System operation and maintenance	37,796	37,796	37,796
Purchase power and wheeling	186,124	30,000	186,124
Program direction	109,378	108,378	108,378
Utah mitigation and conservation	6,000	---	---
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	358,062	193,958	350,082
Offsetting collections	-152,624	---	-156,124
Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	-33,500	-30,000	-30,000
Use of prior year balances	---	-1,200	-1,200
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	171,938	162,758	162,758
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	2,663	2,734	2,734
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	207,530	197,404	197,404
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	184,155	192,000	192,000
FERC revenues	-184,155	-192,000	-192,000
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	19,966,226	20,894,976	20,675,871

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 a contract for environmental remediation or waste management in excess of $100 million in annual funding at a current or former management and operating contract site or facility, or award a significant extension or expansion to an existing management and operating contract, or other contract covered by this section, unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures, or the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. At least 60 days before granting such a waiver, the Secretary of Energy must submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report notifying the Committees of the waiver and setting forth, in specificity, the reasons for the waiver. Section 301 does not preclude extensions of a contract awarded using competitive procedures, but does establish a presumption of competition unless the Secretary invokes the waiver option.

The 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. The waiver for non-competitive awards or extensions should be invoked only in truly exceptional circumstances, not as a matter of routine. A non-competitive award or extension may be in the taxpayers' interest, but the burden of proof is on the Department to make that case in the waiver request.

Limitation on Benefits for Federal Employees.—Section 302 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to prepare or implement workforce restructuring plans or provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484. The Committee has provided no funds to implement workforce restructuring plans which would provide benefits to Federal employees of the Department of Energy which are not available to other Federal employees of the United States Government. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002.

Limitation on Funding for Section 3161 Benefits.—Section 303 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to augment the $19,683,000 made available for obligation in this Act for enhanced severance payments to contractors and other benefits and community assistance grants authorized under the provisions of section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002.

Limitation on Initiation of Requests for Proposals.—Section 304 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to initiate requests for proposals or expressions of interest for new programs

which have not yet been presented to Congress in the annual budget submission, and which have not yet been approved and funded by Congress. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002.

Transfer and Merger of Unexpended Balances.—Section 305 permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002.

Limitation on Bonneville Power Administration.—Section 306 provides that none of the funds in this or any other Act may be used by the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration to perform energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory unless the Administrator certifies in advance that such services are not available from private sector businesses. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002.

User Facilities.—Section 307 establishes certain notice and competition requirements with respect to the involvement of universities in Department of Energy user facilities. 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 to other DOE programs, including those of 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 all universities, as well as other potential users, have an equal opportunity to take advantage of the Department's unique research facilities.

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 as broadly as possible. 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 input regarding the features needed in a proposed new user facility, the Department must provide broad notice of the opportunity to provide such input.

In certain instances other than maintenance 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 and 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. 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.

Research, Development and Demonstration Activities.—Section 308 provides authority for up to 2 percent of national security plant funding to be used for research, development, and demonstration activities. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002.

Research, Development and Demonstration Activities.—Section 309 provides authority for up to 2 percent of Nevada Test Site national security funding to be used for research, development, and demonstration activities. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002.

Repeal of Section 310 of Public Law 106–60.—Section 310 repeals section 310 of Public Law 106–60, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000, which required submission of funding plans from Department of Energy laboratories.

Authorization of Intelligence Activities.—Section 311 authorizes intelligence activities of the Department of Energy for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 during fiscal year 2003 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2003.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2002	$71,290,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	66,290,000
Recommended, 2003	71,290,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	.....
Budget Estimate, 2003	+5,000,000

Note: The original budget request of $66,400,287 for the Appalachian Regional Commission included $110,287 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

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 and research center at the University of Alabama.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2002	$18,500,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	19,000,000
Recommended, 2003	19,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+500,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

Note: The original budget request of $19,494,000 for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board included $494,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

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 $19,000,000, the same as the budget request.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 2002	$10,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	10,000,000
Recommended, 2003	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−10,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−10,000,000

Note: The original budget request of $10,017,170 for the Delta Regional Authority included $17,170 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

The Committee recommends no funding for the Delta Regional Authority in fiscal year 2003. The Delta Regional Authority was established by Congress in fiscal year 2001, but it has not yet been fully organized. Prior year funds of approximately $24,000,000 will be carried over from fiscal year 2002 and prior years and will be available for expenditure in fiscal year 2003.

In addition, the conference report accompanying the fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act directed the Authority to submit quarterly financial reports providing detailed accounting data on the expenditure of funds during fiscal year 2002 and thereafter. The Authority has not complied with this requirement. The conference report also directed the Authority to submit a detailed budget justification if funds were requested in fiscal year 2003. The Authority did not comply with this requirement.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2002	$38,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	29,939,000
Recommended, 2003	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−38,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−29,939,000

Note: The original budget request of $29,959,604 for the Denali Commission included $20,604 to fund proposed legislation to require the agency to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced by this amount.

The Committee has recommended no funding for the Denali Commission in fiscal year 2003 due to funding constraints.

The conference report accompanying the fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act directed the Commission to submit quarterly financial reports providing detailed accounting data on the expenditure of funds during fiscal year 2002 and thereafter. The Commission has not complied with this requirement. The conference report also directed the Commission to submit a detailed budget justification if funds were requested in fiscal year 2003. The Commission did not comply with this requirement.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2002	$552,900,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	578,184,000
Recommended, 2003	578,184,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+25,284,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2002	$ − 473,520,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	− 492,545,000
Recommended, 2003	− 520,087,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	− 46,567,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	− 27,542,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2002	$79,627,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	85,639,000
Recommended, 2003	58,097,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	− 21,283,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	− 27,542,000

Note: The original budget request of $598,405,000 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission—Salaries and Expenses included $20,221,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the Commission to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request and the corresponding request for offsetting revenues have been reduced accordingly.

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is $578,184,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $25,284,000 over fiscal year 2002 (including the $36,000,000 of emergency supplemental appropriations provided in Public Law 107–117). This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $520,087,000 resulting in a net appropriation of $58,097,000. The recommendation includes the requested amount of $24,900,000 to be made available from the Nuclear Waste Fund to support the Department of Energy's effort to develop a permanent geologic repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste.

Fee Recovery.—Pursuant to the agreement reached in fiscal year 2001, the NRC is required in fiscal year 2003 to recover 94 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the Nuclear Waste Fund, by assessing license and annual fees.

Homeland Security Expenses.—The budget request includes $29,300,000 for additional security efforts related to the threat facing NRC-licensed facilities. The fiscal year 2003 budget request proposes that these expenses be funded from the General Fund and exempt from license fee revenues. In the Department of Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States Act, 2002, the Congress provided $36,000,000 to the NRC for "emergency expenses to respond to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States, and for other expenses to increase the security of the Nation's nuclear power plants." The funds provided in the fiscal year 2002 supplemental were exempt from license fee revenues. Because of the urgency surrounding the events of September 11, the Committee views this supplemental appropriation and the accompanying exemption from license fee revenues as a one-time exception to the general rule that NRC should recover the majority of its costs from revenues derived from license and annual fees. Therefore, the Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2003 includes the requested $29,300,000 for homeland security expenses, but makes that amount subject to the requirement that 94 percent of that budget authority be recovered through license and annual fee revenues. The FY2003 recommendation does provide a total of $33,197,000 from the general fund, exclusive of the Nuclear Waste

Fund contribution; this amount is available to the Commission to fund its highest priority tasks, including the requested homeland security expenses.

Enhanced Control of Radioactive Materials.—There have been numerous reports that terrorists organizations may be attempting to acquire radioactive materials to use in radiological dispersion devices (i.e., "dirty bombs"). The Committee is concerned about this potential threat and believes the Commission and its licensees should take all prudent and reasonable actions to protect radioactive materials licensed by the NRC for medical, industrial, and academic uses. The Committee understands the NRC is already taking some actions to enhance the security of these materials, and the Committee has provided funds in fiscal years 2002 and 2003 for NRC to do so. However, the Committee requests that the NRC provide a report to Congress within six months of enactment detailing the existing controls on these materials, identifying actions already underway to strengthen controls on these materials, and outlining additional steps that could be taken to protect the materials that are the most likely candidates for a radiological dispersion device.

Repository Licensing.—Now that the Commission's repository regulations have been completed, it is important that they be implemented effectively to ensure the protection of public health and safety while at the same time providing to timely and efficient licensing of the repository. The Committee expects that, in its review of any license application for construction of a repository and in keeping with NRC's established regulatory framework, the Commission will apply the principles of "adaptive staging" being developed by the National Academy of Sciences. In particular, the timely development and consideration of new information at appropriate regulatory decision points, and a commitment to auditability, transparency, and integrity in the decision-making process, will ensure the creation of a well-founded public record upon which the Commission's licensing decisions can be based. In addressing the technical uncertainties that still remain, the Commission should utilize the expertise of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as appropriate, and consider opportunities to gain additional knowledge through research conducted throughout the later steps of the licensing process.

Davis-Beese Nuclear Power Plant.—Earlier this year, corrosion of the reactor vessel head caused the shutdown of the Davis-Besse reactor in Ohio. The Committee is concerned that this corrosion problem was not detected earlier, either by the licensee or by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspectors. The NRC is presently considering a petition requesting an independent review of the problem at Davis-Beese. The Committee strongly encourages the NRC to give full consideration to this request. Given the severity of the corrosion at Davis-Beese, the burden of proof is quite high on the NRC and its licensee to demonstrate not only that the immediate technical problem has been corrected, but also that the institutional deficiencies that allowed this problem to develop undetected have also been corrected before the NRC approves the restart of the Davis-Besse reactor.

Reports.—The Committee directs the Commission to continue to provide monthly reports on the status of its licensing and other regulatory activities, including the status of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Plant, as well as restart plans, a six-month review, one-year review, and eighteen-month review of that plant."

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2002	$6,180,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	6,800,000
Recommended, 2003	6,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+620,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2002	$ −5,933,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	−6,392,000
Recommended, 2003	−6,392,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	−459,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2002	$247,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	408,000
Recommended, 2003	408,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+161,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

Note: The original budget request of $7,152,000 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission—Office of Inspector General included $352,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the Commission to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request and the corresponding request for offsetting revenues have been reduced accordingly.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $6,800,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $620,000 over fiscal year 2002. The Commission is required by law to recover 94 percent of this budget authority in fiscal year 2003 through the assessment of license and annual fees. Therefore, the revenue estimate is $6,392,000, resulting in a net appropriation for the NRC Inspector General of $408,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriation, 2002	$3,100,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	3,102,000
Recommended, 2003	3,102,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2002	+2,000
Budget Estimate, 2003	.....

Note: The original budget request of $3,200,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board included $98,000 to fund proposed legislation to require the Commission to pay the full government share of the accruing cost of retirement for certain Federal employees. Since this legislation has not been enacted, the budget request has been reduced accordingly.

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 Depart-

ment approaches issuance of the final site recommendation for the repository site.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,102,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, the same as the budget request and an increase of $2,000 from fiscal year 2002 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.

Transfer of Funds.—Section 503 provides that none of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

The purpose of this language is to ensure that any planned transfers from appropriated accounts to any new cabinet agency for homeland security are made in appropriations acts and not by transfer in an authorization bill. The Committee supports the creation of a new agency for homeland defense, but wants to ensure that all appropriated funds are used for the purposes for which they were provided.

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	26,027	25,642	26,027	25,641
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	26,027
Outlays:	
2003	16,765
2004	7,718
2005	1,379
2006	100
2007 and beyond	7

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	63
Fiscal year 2003 outlays resulting therefrom	6

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 $36,400,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $34,327,000 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: * * *
>
> * * * Provided further, That $12,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be deposited in the San Gabriel Restoration Fund established by section 110 of division B, title I of Public Law 106–554, as amended * * *

Under Title III, Weapons Activities:

> * * * Provided further, that not less than $10,000,000 of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be transferred to the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Energy for the sole purpose of upgrading the Department of Energy's accounting and financial systems to track Na-

tional Nuclear Security Administration costs by weapon system.

Under Title III, Environmental Management Cleanup Reform:

> * * * Provided, That these amounts may be transferred to and merged with accounts under this title which fund specific cleanup activities only after the Secretary of Energy enters into an agreement satisfactory to the Secretary and the appropriate State and Federal regulators, for each site for which these funds may be used.

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 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 is included under General Investigations which directs the Secretary of the Army to use $800,000 to develop a plan to establish a Central Gulf Coast water resources management agency.

Language has been included under Construction, General, permitting the use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Language is also provided under Construction, General, which directs the Secretary of the Army to undertake design deficiency repairs to the Bois Brule Levee and Drainage District, Missouri, project; which directs the Secretary of the Army to use funds to continue construction of the Dallas Floodway Extension project in Dallas, Texas; which directs the Secretary of the Army to undertake the Bowie County Levee project in Texas; and which provides that cost sharing for the Bowie County Levee project shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1946. Language has been included under Construction, General, directing the Secretary of the Army to accept advance funds for the Los Angeles Harbor, California, project pursuant to Section 11 of the River and Harbor Act of 1925.

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 undertake recreation improvements at Waco Lake, Texas, associated with raising the pool level. Language has been included under Operations and Maintenance, General which directs the Secretary of the Army to investigate and implement alternative methods of maintaining the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project, and which directs the Secretary of the Army to use funds to expand and improve recreational facilities at the Hansen Dam Recreation Area in California.

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

Sec. 102. The Committee has included language which provides that the Secretary of the Army may expend funds under normal competitive procedures for renovations of the dredge McFARLAND authorized by section 563 of Public Law 104–303 provided that the dredge McFARLAND is operated in the manner recommended in the report of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) to Congress dated June 12, 2000, and is operated using the same procedures as those established to operate the dredge WHEELER.

Sec. 103. The Committee has included language which provides that none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used by the Corps of Engineers to undertake activities related to the Chicago Harbor, Illinois, Visitors Center.

Sec. 104. The Committee has included language which directs the Secretary of the Army to reduce by thirty-seven percent the full time employees in the Corps of Engineers Chicago District.

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. Language 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. 4601–6a(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 included under Water and Related Resources providing that $12,000,000 shall be deposited in the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund. Language is also included permitting the use of funds available for the Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program for site remediation on a non-reimbursable basis. Language is included under Water and Related Resources amending the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act.

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 as follows:

Sec. 201. The Committee has included language proposed by the Administration authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to continue its program of providing grants to institutions of higher learning to support the training of Native Americans to manage their water resources. This language was included in the fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

Sec. 202. The Committee has included language proposed by the Administration regarding the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson

Reservoir in California. This language was included in the fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

Sec. 203. The Committee has included language which amends section 212 of the FY 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act related to the conveyance of the Sly Park Unit in California.

Sec. 204. The bill includes language which clarifies that the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund may be used to reimburse the Central Basin Municipal Water District for certain expenditures made in connection with the San Gabriel Basin Restoration project in California.

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 Energy to use revenues to offset appropriations. The appropriations language for this account reflects the total estimated program funding to be reduced as revenues are received. This language has been carried in prior appropriations Acts.

Language has been included under Departmental Administration providing 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 Weapons Activities providing: that none of the funds may be obligated for the Nuclear Weapons Council after March 1, 2003, until the council certifies that Selected Acquisition Reports submitted to Congress are identical in format, content, and security classification to those submitted by the Department of Defense; that none of the funds may be obligated or expended after February 1, 2004, until the Department of Energy has a financial system that fully tracks costs by nuclear weapons system and the President's budget provides detailed justification for each weapon system; and that not less than $10,000,000 shall be transferred to the Chief Financial Officer to upgrade the financial systems to track costs by weapon system.

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 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 (FERC) providing that no funds appropriated in the Act may be used by FERC to grant any public utility the authority to use market-based rates until FERC has issued a final order in all market-based rate cases that have been pending before the Commission for more than 18 months.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, providing that management and operating contracts and contracts for environmental restoration or waste management in excess of $100 million 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 unless a reprogramming is submitted to the Committee.

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, requiring the Department of Energy to ensure broad 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.

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

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, allowing the manager of the Nevada Operations Office to engage in research, development, and demonstration activities using no more than 2 percent of the amounts available from national security programs.

Language proposed by the Administration has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, repealing section 310 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000.

Language proposed by the Administration has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, providing that funds for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 during fiscal year 2003.

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 transfer of funds in this Act except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other Appropriation Act.

COMPLIANCE WITH CLAUSE 3 OF RULE XIII (RAMSEYER RULE)

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

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

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

The accompanying bill would amend Section 212 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2001 (114 Stat. 1441B–13) as follows:

SEC. 212. (a) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this section, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior;

(2) "Sly Park Unit" means the Sly Park Dam and Reservoir, Camp Creek Diversion Dam and Tunnel, and conduits and canals as authorized under the American River Act of October 14, 1949 (63 Stat. 853), including those used to convey, treat, and store water delivered from Sly Park, as well as *all real and personal property rights and interests associated with such conduits and canals, all water rights of whatever nature or kind associated therewith, and* all recreation facilities *and improvements* thereto; and

(3) "District" means the El Dorado Irrigation District.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, [as soon as practicable after date of the enactment of this Act] *by no later than June 30, 2003* and in accordance with all applicable law, transfer all right, title, and interest in and to the Sly Park Unit to the District *including all real and personal property rights, water rights, and facilities held by or appropriated to the United States.*

(c) SALE PRICE.—[The Secretary] *(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary* is authorized to receive from the District $2,000,000 to relieve payment obligations and extinguish the debt under contract number 14–06–200–949IR3 *and subsequentinterim renewal contracts associated therewith,* and $9,500,000 to relieve payment obligations and extinguish all debts associated with contracts numbered 14–06–200–7734, as amended by contracts numbered 14–06–

200–4282A and 14–06–200–8536A. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the District shall continue to make payments required by section 3407(c) of Public Law 102–575 through year 2029.

(2) The amount the Secretary is authorized to receive under paragraph (1) shall be reduced by an amount equal to any payments received by the United States from the District under the contracts referred to in paragraph (1) in the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date of conveyance of the Sly Park Unit under this section.

(d) CREDIT REVENUE TO PROJECT REPAYMENT.—Upon payment authorized under subsection (b), the amount paid shall be credited toward repayment of capital costs of the Central Valley Project in an amount equal to the associated undiscounted obligation.

(e) FUTURE BENEFITS.—Upon payment, the Sly Park Unit shall no longer be a Federal reclamation project or a unit of the Central Valley Project, and the District shall not be entitled to receive any further reclamation benefits.

(f) LIABILITY.—Except as otherwise provided by law, effective on the date of conveyance of the Sly Park Unit under this Act, the United States shall not be liable for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence based on its prior ownership or operation of the conveyed property.

(g) COSTS.—All costs, including interest charges, associated with the Project that have been included as a reimbursable cost of the Central Valley Project are declared to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

The accompanying bill amend section 110(a)(3)(A) of Division B of the Miscellaneous Appropriations Act (as enacted into law by section 1(a)(4) of Public Law 106–554) as follows:

SEC. 110. SAN GABRIEL BASIN, CALIFORNIA. (a) SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There shall be established within the Treasury of the United States an interest bearing account to be known as the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund (in this section referred to as the "Restoration Fund").

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF FUND.—The Restoration Fund shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority or its successor agency.

(3) PURPOSE OF FUND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the amounts in the Restoration Fund, including interest accrued, shall be utilized by the Secretary—

(i) to provide grants to the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority and the Central Basin Municipal Water District to reimburse such agencies for the Federal share of the costs associated with designing and constructing water quality projects to be administered by such agencies, *including all expenditures made by the Central Basin Municipal Water District between February 11, 1993, and December 21, 2000;* and

(ii) to provide grants to reimburse the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority and the Central Basin Municipal Water District for the Federal share of the

costs required to operate any project constructed under this section for a period not to exceed 10 years, following the initial date of operation of the project.

(B) COST-SHARING LIMITATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not obligate any funds appropriated to the Restoration Fund in a fiscal year until the Secretary has deposited in the Fund an amount provided by non-Federal interests sufficient to ensure that at least 35 percent of any funds obligated by the Secretary are from funds provided to the Secretary by the non-Federal interests.

(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.

(iii) CREDITS TOWARD NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—For purposes of clause (ii), the Secretary shall credit the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority with the value of all prior expenditures by non-Federal interests made after February 11, 1993, that are compatible with the purposes of this section, including—

(I) all expenditures made by non-Federal interests to design and construct water quality projects, including expenditures associated with environmental analyses and public involvement activities that were required to implement the water quality projects in compliance with applicable Federal and State laws; and

(II) all expenditures made by non-Federal interests to acquire lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, disposal areas, and water rights that were required to implement a water quality project.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAW.—In carrying out the activities described in this section, the Secretary shall comply with any applicable Federal and State laws.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect other Federal or State authorities that are being used or may be used to facilitate the cleanup and protection of the San Gabriel and Central groundwater basins. In carrying out the activities described in this section, the Secretary shall integrate such activities with ongoing Federal and State projects and activities. None of the funds made available for such activities pursuant to this section shall be counted against any Federal authorization ceiling established for any previously authorized Federal project or activities.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Restoration Fund established under subsection (a) $85,000,000. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

(2) SET-ASIDE.—Of the amounts appropriated under paragraph (1), no more than $10,000,000 shall be available to carry out the Central Basin Water Quality Project.

(e) ADJUSTMENT.—Of the $25,000,000 made available for San Gabriel Basin Groundwater Restoration, California, under the heading "Construction, General" in title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2001—

(1) $2,000,000 shall be available only for studies and other investigative activities and planning and design of projects determined by the Secretary to offer a long-term solution to the problem of groundwater contamination caused by perchlorates at sites located in the city of Santa Clarita, California; and

(2) $23,000,000 shall be deposited in the Restoration Fund, of which $4,000,000 shall be used for remediation in the Central Basin, California.

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)	150,000
Department of Energy:				
Energy Supply:				
Biomass/Biofuels	1993	(2)	(4)	86,005
Geothermal Energy	1993	23,000	(4)	26,500
Hydrogen	2001	40,000	27,000	35,476
Hydropower	1982	11,700	(4)	6,489
Solar Energy	1993	(2)	(4)	87,625
Wind Energy Systems	1993	(2)	(4)	44,000
Electric energy systems & electric storage systems	1994	(3)	(4)	70,447
Renewable Energy Production Incentive	1995	(7)	(4)	6,000
International Renewable Energy Program	1996	(3)	(4)	4,000
Departmental Energy Management	1984	(3)	(4)	1,500
Renewable Program Support	1984	(3)	(4)	2,059
National Renewable Energy Laboratory	1984	(3)	(4)	5,000
Program Direction	1984	(3)	(4)	14,592
Nuclear Energy:				
Advanced Radioisotope Power System	1992	(2)	(4)	26,450
Isotopes	1974	(2)	(4)	13,818
University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support	1974	(2)	(4)	17,500
Research and Development	1994	(7)	(4)	71,500
Radiological Facilities Management	1974	(2)	(4)	42,770
Program Direction	1992	(2)	(4)	23,439
Environment, Safety and Health	1974	(2)	(4)	26,211
Non-Defense Environmental Management	1984	(5)	(5)	213,259
West Valley Demonstration Project	1981	5,000	5,000	90,000
Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation:				
Other Uranium Activities	1974	(2)	(4)	146,631
Science	1984	500,000	635,417	3,271,233
High Energy Physics	1984	(3)	477,947	724,990
Nuclear Physics	1984	(3)	155,220	382,370
Biological and Environmental Research	1994	(3)	388,298	504,215
Basic Energy Sciences	1994	(3)	743,590	1,019,600
Advanced Scientific Computing Research	1996	169,000	111,068	174,625
Science Laboratories Infrastructure	1994	(3)	39,327	47,680

[In thousands of dollars]

Agency/program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriations in last year of authorization	Appropriations in this bill
Fusion Energy Sciences	1994	380,000	322,277	248,495
Science Program Direction	1984	(2)	(4)	134,310
Energy Research Analysis	1994	(3)	3,507	1,000
Technical Information Management	1981	(2)	(4)	7,770
Nuclear Waste Disposal	(8)	(2)	190,654	209,702
Departmental Administration	1984	246,963	185,682	128,672
Office of the Inspector General	1984	(2)	14,670	37,671
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:				
National Nuclear Security Administration:				
Weapons Activities	2002	5,343,567	5,560,238	5,772,068
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2002	776,886	1,029,586	1,167,630
Naval Reactors	2002	688,445	688,045	706,790
Office of the NNSA Administrator	2002	312,596	312,596	261,929
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	2002	6,022,415	5,242,776	4,543,661
Environmental Management Cleanup Reform	(6)	(6)	(6)	1,100,000
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	2002	1,080,538	1,092,878	1,091,314
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	2002	153,537	153,537	158,399
Other Defense Activities	2002	499,663	547,544	485,076
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	2002	280,000	280,000	315,000
Power Marketing Administrations:				
Southeastern Power Administration	1984	24,240	39,463	39,141
Southwestern Power Administration	1984	40,254	29,288	29,578
Western Area Power Administration	1984	259,700	237,037	350,082
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund	1995	(2)	2,663	2,734
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	1984	275,000	175,200	192,000
Independent Agencies:				
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	2002	18,500	18,459	19,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	1985	460,000	448,200	578,184
Nuclear Regulatory Commission—Office of Inspector General	1985	(9)	(9)	6,800

[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 2003.
[7] Such sums as necessary.
[8] Overall program authorized in 1982 and 1987, but without any authorization of appropriations.
[9] The first separate appropriation for the Office of the 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.

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

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.

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigation	154,350	102,483	143,680	-10,670	+41,197
Construction, general	1,715,951	1,415,612	1,831,030	+115,079	+415,418
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	345,992	280,671	342,071	-3,921	+61,400
Operation and maintenance, general	1,874,803	1,913,760	1,990,280	+115,477	+76,520
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117)	139,000	---	---	-139,000	---
Regular appropriations (P.L. 107-206)	32,000	---	---	-32,000	---
Regulatory program	127,000	144,252	134,000	+7,000	-10,252
FUSRAP	140,000	140,298	150,000	+10,000	+9,702
Flood control and coastal emergencies	---	20,227	20,000	+20,000	-227
Rescission	-25,000	---	---	+25,000	---
General expenses	153,000	155,651	154,651	+1,651	-1,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	4,657,096	4,172,954	4,765,712	+108,616	+592,758
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	24,169	23,643	23,643	-526	---
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	10,749	11,259	11,259	+510	---
Subtotal	34,918	34,902	34,902	-16	---

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Program oversight and administration	1,310	1,326	1,326	+16	---
Total, Central Utah project completion account	36,228	36,228	36,228	---	---
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	762,531	726,147	807,518	+44,987	+81,371
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117)	30,259	---	---	-30,259	---
Regular appropriations (P.L. 107-206)	7,000	---	---	-7,000	---
Loan program	7,495	---	---	-7,495	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(26,000)	---	---	(-26,000)	---
Central Valley project restoration fund	55,039	48,904	48,904	-6,135	---
California Bay-Delta restoration	---	15,000	---	---	-15,000
Policy and administration	52,968	54,870	54,870	+1,902	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	915,292	844,921	911,292	-4,000	+66,371
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	951,520	881,149	947,520	-4,000	+66,371
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	666,726	693,934	633,909	-32,817	-60,025
Non-defense environmental management	236,372	166,000	213,259	-23,113	+47,259
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation	418,425	382,154	382,154	-36,271	---
Science	3,233,100	3,279,456	3,271,233	+38,133	-8,223
Nuclear Waste Disposal	95,000	275,802	209,702	+114,702	-66,100
Departmental administration	210,853	299,220	208,672	-2,181	-90,548
Miscellaneous revenues	-137,810	-137,524	-80,000	+57,810	+57,524
Net appropriation	73,043	161,696	128,672	+55,629	-33,024

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of the Inspector General	32,430	37,671	37,671	+5,241	---
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function	(6,473,651)	(6,893,846)	(6,893,374)	(+419,723)	(-472)
Non-defense function	(654,797)	(548,154)	(595,413)	(-59,384)	(+47,259)
Total	(7,128,448)	(7,442,000)	(7,488,787)	(+360,339)	(+46,787)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	5,429,238	5,867,000	5,772,068	+342,830	-94,932
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117)	131,000	---	---	-131,000	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-206)	19,400	---	---	-19,400	---
Rescission (P.L. 107-206)	-14,460	---	---	+14,460	---
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	803,586	1,113,630	1,167,630	+364,044	+54,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117)	226,000	---	---	-226,000	---
Regular appropriations (P.L. 107-206)	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Naval reactors	688,045	706,790	706,790	+18,745	---
Office of the Administrator	312,596	335,929	261,929	-50,667	-74,000
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	7,695,405	8,023,349	7,908,417	+213,012	-114,932
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	5,234,576	4,544,133	4,543,661	-690,915	-472
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117)	8,200	---	---	-8,200	---
Rescission (P.L. 107-206)	-15,540	---	---	+15,540	---
Defense environmental management cleanup reform	---	1,100,000	1,100,000	+1,100,000	---
Defense facilities closure projects	1,092,878	1,091,314	1,091,314	-1,564	---
Defense environmental management privatization	153,537	158,399	158,399	+4,862	---
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	6,473,651	6,893,846	6,893,374	+419,723	-472

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Other defense activities	544,044	468,664	485,076	-58,968	+16,412
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117)	3,500	---	---	-3,500	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-206)	7,000	---	---	-7,000	---
Defense nuclear waste disposal	280,000	315,000	315,000	+35,000	---
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	15,003,600	15,700,859	15,601,867	+598,267	-98,992
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	4,891	4,534	4,534	-357	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	28,038	27,378	27,378	-660	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	171,938	162,758	162,758	-9,180	---
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,663	2,734	2,734	+71	---
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	207,530	197,404	197,404	-10,126	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	184,155	192,000	192,000	+7,845	---
Revenues applied	-184,155	-192,000	-192,000	-7,845	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy	19,966,226	20,894,976	20,675,871	+709,645	-219,105
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	71,290	66,290	71,290	---	+5,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,500	19,000	19,000	+500	---
Delta Regional Authority	10,000	10,000	---	-10,000	-10,000
Denali Commission	38,000	29,939	---	-38,000	-29,939

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	516,900	578,184	578,184	+61,284	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 107-117)	36,000	---	---	-36,000	---
Revenues	-473,520	-492,545	-520,087	-46,567	-27,542
Subtotal	79,380	85,639	58,097	-21,283	-27,542
Office of Inspector General	6,180	6,800	6,800	+620	---
Revenues	-5,933	-6,392	-6,392	-459	---
Subtotal	247	408	408	+161	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	79,627	86,047	58,505	-21,122	-27,542
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,100	3,102	3,102	+2	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	220,517	214,378	151,897	-68,620	-62,481
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	25,795,359	26,163,457	26,541,000	+745,641	+377,543
Appropriations	(25,250,000)	(26,163,457)	(26,541,000)	(+1,291,000)	(+377,543)
Emergency appropriations	(600,359)	---	---	(-600,359)	---
Rescissions	(-55,000)	---	---	(+55,000)	---

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF THE HONORABLE DAVID R. OBEY

As the fiscal year ends and we begin to look at the priorities we have addressed, those that we have failed to address and those that we are most likely to do anything about for the foreseeable future, we can only conclude that we are in a remarkable situation. Last year there was barely a week that went by that we were not passing yet another tax break. For the most part those tax breaks were tightly focused on a very small group of people who had already enjoyed a spectacular decade even after they paid their taxes. We were told time and time again that we could afford all of these tax cuts and still expect huge back to back surpluses in the years to come.

Now we have deficits and we are told that we can't respond to emergencies even when the lives of thousands, perhaps millions, of Americans may well be on the line.

This bill is a perfect example, In the Supplemental Appropriations Act that we passed in July we included $235 million for securing nuclear weapons and nuclear materials in facilities operated by the U.S. Department of Energy that the President had not requested. We did it in response to an urgent request from Secretary Abraham and we did it on a broad bi-partisan basis. We did it because of the widespread concern among security experts about the prospect of terrorists getting the materials needed to construct a dirty bomb.

Secretary Abraham said this in a March 2002 letter to OMB:

> * * * we are storing vast amounts of materials that remain highly volatile and subject to unthinkable consequences if placed in the wrong hands. These materials permeate the Departmental complex including sites under the programmatic jurisdiction of the National Nuclear Security Administration, the Office of Environmental Management, and the Office of Science * * * Although the initial supplemental and funds appropriated by Congress helped respond to the most urgent near-term security needs, the Department is now unable to meet the next round of critical security mission requirements * * * Failure to support these urgent security requirements is a risk that would be unwise.

The Secretary identified $380 million of immediate and critical security requirements in his letter, to ensure adequate security of: nuclear weapons, materials, and facilities; environmental management (former nuclear weapons) sites; and the Department's world-class science laboratories.

These included enhanced security for the transportation of nuclear weapons. Many are not aware that our most powerful nuclear warheads are frequently being transported over our nation's Inter-

state Highways. The man in charge, the Secretary of Energy, says that the security arrangements with respect to those shipments are not adequate. Mitch Daniels, with the great concentration of expertise that he has assembled at OMB, says that the security is fine. The committee staff, on a bipartisan basis looked at this problem and concluded, without any question, that the Secretary was right. We put $18 million in the Supplemental Act—the full amount the Secretary said was needed.

The Secretary also felt it was necessary to greatly enhance the physical security at nuclear weapons facilities. This is where we store thousands of actual nuclear weapons, thousands of weapons components, and large amounts of plutonium and other materials needed for the construction of a nuclear weapon. Again Mitch Daniels applied his vast expertise in these matters and concluded there was no problem. We reviewed the information and added $90 million over the budget for enhanced security.

The Secretary also felt that we had a big problem with respect to the Department's former weapons facilities and science laboratories, where we have yet to clear up low level radioactive materials that could be useful in the construction of dirty bombs. There are two choices. One is build more secure, permanent security at these facilities. The other is to clean them up and send all of this material to a centralized and secure facility that has already been designated and is available for such shipments. The Secretary recommended the latter and we gave him $94 million to go forward—again, over Mitch Daniel's objection. The Department also needs these funds to fully implement and sustain the heightened security posture of these sites that the Secretary mandated in response to the terrorist attacks.

The Appropriations Committees are not the only ones who are dismayed by the remarkable insensitivity of this White House to the need to keep these materials out of the hands of terrorists. The Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Energy who was appointed by President Bush last May wrote in exasperation to several senior-level operatives at OMB to state:

> We are disconcerted that OMB refused our security supplemental request. I would have much preferred to have heard this from you personally, and been given an opportunity to discuss, not to mention, appeal your decision.

The $235 million that we put in the Supplemental to deal with these problems was part of the $5.1 billion that the President is now refusing to spend. It ought to be put right back in this bill, along with the $108 million needed to protect our dams and other public facilities operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Denying the agencies funded in this bill the money required to insure that terrorists do not gain control of the most deadly weapons in the history of the world is mindless. This money is not provided within the regular allocation and the House majority leadership has made it clear that they will not allow the committee to provide these funds as an emergency. I think the leadership owes the full House the opportunity to make those choices. I will oppose any rule that does not allow the House to vote on this question and I challenge the Speaker to explain why he would prevent Members

from the opportunity of voting on a matter of such grave importance to their constituents.

DAVE OBEY.

○