AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

108TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 108–212

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2004

JULY 16, 2003.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 2754]

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, 2004, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page Number Bill	Page Number Report
Introduction	.....	4
I. Department of Defense—Civil:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
Introduction	.....	7
General investigations	2	9
Construction, general	3	36
Flood control, Mississippi River and Tributaries	4	55
Operation and maintenance, general	5	59
Regulatory program	6	80
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	6	81
Flood control and coastal emergencies	6	81
General expenses	6	82
Administrative provisions	7	.....
General provisions	7	82
II. Department of the Interior:		
Central Utah Project completion account	9	85
Bureau of Reclamation:		
Water and related resources	9	87
Bureau of Reclamation loan program account	11	104
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	.....	105
Central Valley Project restoration fund	11	105

★88–380

	Page Number Bill	Report
Policy and administration	12	106
Working Capitol Fund	13	106
Administrative provision	13	.....
General provisions	13	107
III. Department of Energy:		
Introduction	.....	109
Energy supply	16	115
Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion	17	123
Non-defense environmental Services	17	123
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	18	124
Science	18	125
Nuclear waste disposal	18	130
Departmental administration	21	136
Office of Inspector General	22	138
Atomic energy defense activities:	23	139
National Nuclear Security Administration:		
Weapons activities	23	141
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	23	152
Naval reactors	24	159
Office of the administrator	24	159
Environmental and Other Defense Activities:		
Defense site acceleration completion	24	162
Defense environmental services	25	163
Other defense activities	25	164
Defense nuclear waste disposal	26	168
Power marketing administrations:		
Cerro Grande Fire Activities	26	168
Bonneville Power Administration	26	169
Southeastern Power Administration	26	170
Southwestern Power Administration	27	170
Western Area Power Administration	28	171
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	29	171
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	29	172
General provisions	30	189
IV. Independent agencies:		
Appalachian Regional Commission	35	193
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	36	193
Delta Regional Authority	36	193
Denali Commission	.....	194
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	36	194
Office of Inspector General	37	195
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	38	196
V. General provisions	38	197
House reporting requirements	.....	199

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in the Budget of the United States Government, 2004. The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 2003, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2004.

[in thousands of dollars]

	2003	2004 estimate	2004 recommendation	2004 recommendation compared with—	
				2003 appropriation	2004 estimate
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	4,638,827	4,194,000	4,482,328	(156,499)	288,328
Title II—Department of the Interior	972,294	922,208	947,904	(24,390)	25,696
Title III—Department of Energy	20,834,432	22,163,367	22,016,347	1,181,915	(147,020)
Title IV—Independent Agencies	206,642	147,921	138,421	(68,221)	(9,500)
Subtotal	26,652,195	27,427,496	27,585,000	932,805	157,504
Scorekeeping adjustments	(514,000)	(481,332)	(505,000)	9,000	(23,668)
Grand Total of bill	26,138,195	26,946,164	27,080,000	941,805	133,836

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2004 totals $27,080,000,000, $133,836,000 above the President's budget request, and $941,805,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003.

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee has placed a high priority on the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository program. While the Department of Energy maintains that its fiscal year 2004 funding request is sufficient to meet its next major milestone, the submission of the License Application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in December 2004, it is clear that chronic funding shortfalls have forced the Department to delay work related to the acceptance and transport of spent nuclear fuel to support initial repository operations in 2010. The Committee believes that it is essential for safety and security to begin shipments of spent nuclear fuel, which is presently stored at commercial power plants and DOE sites around the country, to the repository site at the earliest possible date. Accordingly, the Committee has funded the budget request of $591,000,000 to ensure the License Application is submitted on schedule, and, in addition, has provided an additional $174,000,000 for transportation and supporting infrastructure development in Nevada, for national waste acceptance and transportation planning, and for other related purposes.

Title I of the bill provides $4,482,328,000 for the programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a decrease of $156,499,000 below fiscal year 2003 and $288,328,000 over the budget request of $4,194,000,000. Due to the severe budgetary constraints, the Committee has only been able to provide a modest increase for the civil works program and has not provided funds for new studies and construction projects. 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.

Title II provides $947,904,000 for the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, $24,390,000 below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003 and $25,696,000 over the budget request of $922,208,000. The Committee has not provided funding for the California Bay-Delta Restoration program in California pending the enactment of authorizing legislation.

Title III provides $22,016,347,000 for the Department of Energy, an increase of $1,181,915,000 over fiscal year 2003 and $147,020,000 below the budget request of $22,163,376,000. The Committee recognizes the importance of basic research and science programs and has provided an increase of over $200 million above the fiscal year 2003 level. In addition, $7.2 billion is provided for environmental cleanup programs to remediate contaminated defense and non-defense sites throughout the nation.

Funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration, which includes nuclear weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation, naval reactors, and the office of the administrator is $8,508,184,000, an increase of $330,617,000 over fiscal year 2003 and a decrease of $326,391,000 from the budget request. For nuclear nonproliferation, the Committee has provided $1,280,195,000, an increase of $259,335,000 over fiscal year 2003.

The Committee views with skepticism the large increases that DOE's National Nuclear Security Administration's Weapons Activities account has received over the past three years. Since FY 2000, the weapons account grew by an average of 9.8 percent a year, increasing from $4.5 billion in fiscal year 2000 to $6.0 billion in fiscal year 2003. In the fiscal year 2004 budget request, DOE proposes an additional 6.6 percent increase. The Department has consistently justified these large increases as necessary to meet nuclear weapons requirements established by the Department of Defense. Each year, the Committee is confronted with a flawed budget process in which the NNSA Weapons Activities request is determined by DoD requirements but funded by DOE. Absent in such an arrangement are the usual tradeoffs that any agency must perform in setting its budget priorities and reaching a reasonable balance among competing priorities. In this case, DoD sets requirements for DOE to maintain a Cold War stockpile and nuclear weapons complex, at no cost to DoD, and DOE has little option but to budget to meet those requirements. In its fiscal year 2004 recommendations, the Committee has balanced the Weapons Activities request against the other important Energy and Water Development funding needs and adjusted funding levels to reflect the Committee's priorities.

Title IV provides $138,421,000 for several Independent Agencies, a decrease of $68,621,000 from fiscal year 2003 and a decrease of $9,500,000 below the budget request of $147,921,000. Funding is provided for the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Board, the Delta Regional Authority, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and its Inspector General, and the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, this Committee has expressed a growing concern about a series of inadequate budget requests by the Administration for the Civil Works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This year's request does nothing to relieve our concern. Once again, the Administration, particularly the Office of Management and Budget, demonstrates by the numbers it submits that it has a fundamental misunderstanding of the value of the Civil Works program to the Nation's well-being. Much of that value is expressed in the stewardship of the Corps of Engineers over an inadequate national infrastructure which supports much of the Nation's commerce and provides a physical safety net against natural disaster for many of our citizens.

In the budget submission, the Administration highlights the need to reduce the growing backlog of construction projects within the Civil Works program. The Committee agrees that this requires attention. However, the Committee believes that the way the Administration proposes to deal with this backlog is somewhat myopic. The Office of Management and Budget appears to believe that the way to reduce the existing construction backlog is to keep the Civil Works budget static at a little over $4 billion while not initiating any new projects already authorized for construction, and by cutting off the flow of new commitments by intentionally slowing down projects that are currently in the study process and not initiating any new studies.

The Committee believes that this is ill-advised and counterproductive for a variety of reasons. The foremost of these is that the water resources needs of the Nation are growing and cannot be adequately addressed with just the projects currently under construction. Our Nation's water resources infrastructure is already over-taxed. In order for the Nation to remain competitive in the world economy, we will continue to have to make improvements to our harbors and inland navigation system. As the population of the country continues to grow, more and more of our citizens will inevitably be placed in danger from floods and coastal storms. In addition, in recent years, the Congress has also assigned to the Corps of Engineers the responsibility of dealing with the problems of aging water supply systems and inadequate sewage treatment systems. To meet all of these National needs, we need to increase our

investment in our water resources infrastructure, not allow it to stagnate.

The second reason why the budget request is wrong for the future of the Nation is that the amount proposed by the Administration is inadequate to meet the funding needs of the projects included in the budget request. The Administration has chosen a handful of projects for full funding and appears to be content to have the others flounder, after which, most likely, it will call for their removal from the authorized backlog. The third reason is that there appears to be no sound scientific or economic basis for the selection of the Administration's favored projects, since it omits or shortchanges many of the projects which objective analysis would identify as producing the greatest benefit to the nation, its citizens, and its economy.

Accordingly, the Committee has included an additional $288 million over the budget request for the Corps of Engineers Civil Works program. Even with these additional funds, the Corps will not be able to carry out projects on their most efficient schedules. Though the Committee has provided no funds for new studies and construction projects, the added funds are inadequate for needed work on ongoing projects, including those included in the budget request and those for which the Administration chose not to request funds. The Committee has also reluctantly made minor reductions in some of the Administration's favored projects described above, believing that these reductions will not adversely affect these projects given the total amount appropriated for the Construction account and the Corps' ability to reprogram funds.

Like many other Federal agencies, the Corps of Engineers is an organization confronted with the need to change in order to meet the challenges of the 21st century, including new responsibilities which will not respond readily to old methods and old management structures. The Committee is aware that the Corps is in the midst of a serious, thorough effort to modernize its vision, skills and culture, and wants to encourage these actions. Re-hashing the events of the past, even with the clearest of hindsight, is a waste of time and money in an atmosphere of rapid change and the Corps is to be congratulated on its courage and resolve.

The Committee reminds that Administration that it has made every reasonable effort to undertake a dialog to learn the reasons why our Nation's infrastructure needs are of low priority to the Administration, and why the Administration appears to reject the premise that the Congress is entitled to at least an equal role in the formulation and funding of the Corps of Engineers budget. The Administration has not responded to our requests. It is the position of the Commission that coming to an understanding on these issues is worth the time and effort it would require and we renew our request to begin that conversation.

We want to urge upon the Administration another issue, as well. There is no better time than the present to begin the process of laying out a roadmap for the role of infrastructure and its stewards for the rest of this new century. Several areas of cooperation need to be resolved in order to optimize the Nation's infrastructure. Which of our old harbors, locks, and dams are essential and must be rehabilitated, and which no longer serve a worthwhile purpose

and can be retired, saving the cost of their operation and upkeep? Which emerging opportunities for the good of our economy and our people are to be the responsibility of the Congress and the Administration and which will be left to States and communities? We need to stop talking past each other and begin to answer these questions so that the Corps of Engineers can be given clear and unmistakable instructions on its role in a prosperous and secure future for our Nation.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 2003	$134,141,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	100,000,000
Recommended, 2004	117,788,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−16,353,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	+17,788,000

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 RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
ALABAMA				
BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL	300	---	300	---
CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL	50	---	50	---
VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	200	---	200	---
ALASKA				
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	100	---	100	---
ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK	50	---	50	---
BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	200	---	200	---
CRAIG HARBOR, AK	50	---	50	---
DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK	200	---	200	---
EKLUTNA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	100	---	---	---
HAINES HARBOR, AK	100	---	100	---
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK	50	---	50	---
KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	50	---	50	---
LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK	50	---	50	---
MATANUSKA RIVER EROSION CONTROL, AK	---	---	250	---
MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK	50	---	50	---
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	100	---	100	---
SAINT GEORGE NAVIGATION IMPROVEMETS, AK	50	---	50	---
UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK	50	---	50	---
UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	150	---	150	---
VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	50	---	50	---
WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK	50	---	50	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
AMERICAN SOMOA				
TUTUILA HARBOR, AS	46	---	46	---
ARIZONA				
AGUA FRIA RIVER, AZ	150	---	150	---
CANADA DEL ORO WASH, AZ	100	---	---	---
NAVAJO NATION, AZ, NM & UT	130	---	250	---
PIMA COUNTY, AZ	300	---	1,000	---
RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	300	---	300	---
RIO SALADO OESTE, SALT RIVER, AZ	250	---	750	---
SANTA CRUZ RIVER, GRANT RD TO FT LOWELL RD, AZ	100	---	100	---
SANTA CRUZ RIVER, PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS, AZ	152	---	250	---
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT, AZ	370	---	800	---
ARKANSAS				
ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, AR & OK	1,070	---	1,200	---
HOT SPRINGS, AR	---	---	31	---
RED RIVER NAVIGATION, SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS, AR AND LA	---	---	---	100
WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO	300	---	1,200	---
WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOWS, AR & MO	---	---	---	200
WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY	---	---	---	150

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
CALIFORNIA				
ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA	150	---	150	---
ARANA GULCH WATERSHED, CA	100	---	100	---
ARROYO SECO WATERSHED RESTORATION, CA	150	---	150	---
BALLONA CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	150	---	250	---
BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	---	---	50	---
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN	---	---	300	---
CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CA	---	---	250	---
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	141	---	141	---
CITY OF SAN BERNADINO, CALIFORNIA (CITY OF SAN BERNADI	---	---	100	---
COAST OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA (STORM & T	---	---	250	---
COYOTE DAM, CA	100	---	100	---
GRAYSON AND MURDERER'S CREEKS, CA	400	---	400	---
LA RIVER WATERCOURSE, HEADWORKS AREA, CA	250	---	250	---
LA RIVER WATERCOURSE, SAN JOSE CREEK, CA	100	---	100	---
LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	150	---	150	---
LAKE ELSINORE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	50	---	50	---
LLAGAS CREEK FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT	---	---	---	300
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	150	---	450	---
LOWER MISSION CREEK (FLOOD CONTROL & REHABILITATION PR	---	---	200	---
MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	270	---	270	---
MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	150	---	150	---
MATILIJA DAM, CA	300	---	600	---
MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	250	---	250	---
MUGU LAGOON, CA	150	---	150	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	200	---	200	---
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA.....	200	---	200	200
NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA.....	150	---	200	---
NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA.....	186	---	186	---
OCEAN BEACH, CA.....	100	---	100	---
ORANGE COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA.....	---	---	380	---
ORANGE COUNTY SHORELINE, LOWER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSH	100	---	100	---
ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	150	---	150	---
PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA.....	---	---	---	550
PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA.....	100	---	100	---
POSO CREEK, CA.....	300	---	300	---
PRADO BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA.....	100	---	100	---
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA.....	---	---	250	---
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA.....	---	---	250	---
RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA.....	150	---	150	---
SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA.....	1,100	---	1,100	---
SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY,.	1,020	---	1,020	---
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA.....	100	---	150	---
SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA.....	100	---	100	---
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA.....	420	---	---	---
SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK, CA.....	100	---	---	---
SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA.....	100	---	100	---
SAN JOAQUIN RB, W STANISLAUS, DEL PUERTO & SALADO CREE	50	---	50	---
SAN JOAQUIN RB, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, ORESTIMBA CREE	300	---	300	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES & MOKELUMNE RIVERS,	200	---	200	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA.....	100	---	100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA	350	---	350	---
SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA	100	---	100	---
SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	200	---	200	---
SANTA ANA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BIG BEAR LAKE, CA	200	---	200	---
SANTA CLARA RIVER, CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	150	---	150	---
SANTA ROSA CREEK WATERSHED, CA	120	---	120	---
SOLANA BEACH/ENCITAS SHORELINE PROTECTION STUDY, CA	---	---	944	---
SONOMA CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	150	---	150	---
STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	50	---	50	---
SUTTER COUNTY, CA	200	---	200	---
TAHOE BASIN, CA & NV	1,000	---	1,000	---
TIJUANA RIVER VALLEY, CA	100	---	300	---
TUJUNGA WASH RESTORATION, CA	---	---	300	---
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	460	---	460	---
UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	150	---	150	---
VENTURA AND SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	100	---	100	---
VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	121	---	121	---
WESTMINSTER, COYOTE AND CARBON CANYON CREEK WATERSHEDS	150	---	150	---
WESTMINSTER, EAST GARDEN GROVE, CA	100	---	100	---
WHITE RIVER AND DEER CREEK, CA	100	---	100	---
WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	100	---	100	---
COLORADO				
ADAMS COUNTY (DENVER), CO	---	---	100	---
CACHE LA POUDRE RIVER FLOODWAY, GREELEY, CO	---	---	32	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO.	260	---	260	---
FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO.....	350	---	350	---
ZUNI AND SUN VALLEY REACHES, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER, CO...	---	186	---	186
COMMONWEALTH OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS				
ROTA HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI.....	102	---	102	---
TINIAN HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI.....	102	---	102	---
DELAWARE				
DELAWARE COAST, CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE...	---	214	---	---
FLORIDA				
BISCAYNE BAY FEASIBILITY, FL.....	---	---	100	---
DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	100	---
FLAGLER COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	100	---
HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL.....	340	---	340	---
LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL.....	370	---	370	---
SARASOTA COUNTY, LIDO KEY, FL.....	---	---	---	250
ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	100	---
ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	150	---
WALTON COUNTY BEACH & ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION STUDY,	---	---	332	---
WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FL.....	340	---	340	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
GEORGIA				
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	150	---	300	---
ARABIA MOUNTAIN, GA	150	---	150	---
AUGUSTA, GA	300	---	360	---
INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS,	175	---	175	---
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	150	---	150	---
SAVANNAH ESTURARY AND FRESHWATER WETLANDS	---	---	100	---
SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA	150	---	150	---
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA & SC	---	---	---	400
SAVANNAH HARBOR SEDIMENT CONTROL WORKS, GA & SC	100	---	100	---
SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA & SC	200	---	200	---
UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA	100	---	100	---
GUAM				
HAGATNA RIVER, GUAM	---	---	150	---
HAWAII				
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	100	---	100	---
BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	100	---	100	---
IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, HI (ISLAND OF MAUI)	---	---	---	100
KAHUKU, HI	100	---	100	---
KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI	100	---	100	---
KIHEI AREA EROSION, HI	100	---	100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
NAWILIWILI HARBOR MODIFICATION, KAUAI, HI	100	---	100	---
WAIKIKI BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECT, OAHU, HI	---	---	---	250
IDAHO				
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	110	---	110	---
LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, ID	100	---	100	---
ILLINOIS				
ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	103	---	103	---
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	278	---	278	---
GREAT LAKES FISHERY & ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL, IN, M	---	---	36	---
ILLINOIS RIVER AT BEARDSTOWN, IL (BEARDSTOWN HARBOR)	---	---	100	---
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	504	---	504	---
ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	148	---	148	---
PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	---	600	---	600
ROCK RIVER, IL & WI	48	---	48	---
UPPER MISS & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	3,216	---	3,216	---
UPPER MISS RVR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN & WI	494	---	1,750	---
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL (1970 MODIFICATION)	---	---	---	175
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	---	---	---	100
INDIANA				
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	150	---	500	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
LONG LAKE, IN	---	---	220	---
IOWA				
DAVENPORT, IA	---	159	---	159
DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	565	---	565	---
FORT DODGE, IA	23	---	217	---
LOWER DES MOINES RIVER, IA & MO	50	---	50	---
KANSAS				
BRUSH CREEK BASIN STUDY, KS & MO	---	---	100	---
GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER BASIN WATERSHED, KS & OK	---	---	100	---
TOPEKA, KS	125	---	125	---
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	---	205	---	205
UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS	229	---	229	---
WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS	160	---	160	---
KENTUCKY				
GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & OH	---	2,895	---	2,895
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY	200	---	200	---
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	176	---	176	---
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	225	---	469	---
OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	1,350	---	1,350	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
LOUISIANA				
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.	50	---	50	---
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BAYOU MANCHAC, LA.....	100	---	100	---
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	150	---	1,150	---
BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA.....	---	707	---	707
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA.....	100	---	100	---
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA.....	50	---	50	---
CROSS LAKE, LA WATER SUPPLY IMPROVEMENTS.....	---	---	200	---
EAST BATON ROUGE, LA GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM....	---	---	500	---
GIWW ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.....	100	---	100	---
HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA.....	100	---	100	---
LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA.....	---	645	---	645
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.....	848	---	3,000	---
PLAQUEMINES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA.....	100	---	100	---
PORT OF IBERIA, LA.....	150	---	1,150	---
ST BERNARD PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA.....	100	---	100	---
ST CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA.....	100	---	100	---
ST JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH, LA.....	100	---	400	---
WEST SHORE - LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA, FEASIBILITY STUDY	---	---	---	200
MARYLAND				
ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC.....	---	---	200	---
ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD & DC.....	194	---	194	---
BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES, GWYNNS FALLS,.	---	---	---	150

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE EROSION, MD, VA & DE.....	200	---	400	---
EASTERN SHORE, MID CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND, MD.....	351	---	1,000	---
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S, MD.....	200	---	294	---
MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN, MD.....	100	---	250	---
MASSACHUSETTS				
BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI.....	50	---	50	---
BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA.....	500	---	500	---
COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA.....	170	---	170	---
MICHIGAN				
DETROIT RIVER MASTER PLAN, MI.....	---	---	110	---
DETROIT RIVER SEAWALLS, MI.....	---	---	---	100
GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	740	---	2,000	---
JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN (STRATEGIC PLAN), MI, IL,	---	---	131	---
JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN (BIOHYDROLOGICAL), MI, IL	---	---	45	---
JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN (RECREATION BOATING), MI,	---	---	324	---
MUSKEGON LAKE, MI - ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING.....	---	---	---	100
MINNESOTA				
MINNEHAHA CREEK WATERSHED, UMR LAKE ITASCA TO L&D 2, M	250	---	250	---
MINNESOTA RIVER BASIN, MN & SD.....	---	---	132	---
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD & MANITOBA, C	1,200	---	1,200	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
SOUTH WASHINGTON CTY WATERSHED, UMR LAKE ITASCA TO L&D	250	---	250	---
MISSISSIPPI				
GULFPORT AND HARRISON COUNTY WATERSHED STUDY, MS.....	100	---	---	---
HANCOCK COUNTY SEAWALL RESTORATION, MS.....	150	---	150	---
PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS.....	400	---	400	---
MISSOURI				
CHESTERFIELD, MO.....	---	439	---	439
KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS.....	316	---	316	---
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, MO	150	---	150	---
SPRINGFIELD, MO.....	230	---	400	---
ST LOUIS MISSISSIPPI RIVERFRONT, MO & IL.....	151	---	251	---
SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	---	---	---	150
WEARS CREEK, JEFFERSON CITY, MO.....	100	---	100	---
MONTANA				
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT.....	209	---	209	---
NEBRASKA				
LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE.....	191	---	191	---
SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NE.....	---	546	---	546

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
WESTERN SARPY AND CLEAR CREEK, NE	---	318	---	318
NEVADA				
LAS VEGAS WASH, NORTH LAS VEGAS, NV	50	---	50	---
LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	50	---	50	---
WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	100	---	100	---
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
CONNECTICUT RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NH & VT	115	---	115	---
MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN, NH	400	---	400	---
NEW JERSEY				
BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	---	---	---	200
BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	---	100
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, NJ, NY, DE & PA	50	---	250	---
GOFFLE BROOK, BOROUGH OF HAWTHORNE, NJ	25	---	25	---
GREAT EGG INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ	---	539	---	625
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	100	---	900	---
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	25	---	500	---
MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	---	---	---	200
MID-DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, NJ, PA	---	---	100	---
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTOR	---	---	100	---
NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLE	100	---	100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT	100	---	300	---
PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ	---	---	---	100
PASSAIC RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION	25	---	100	---
PECKMAN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	200	---	400	---
RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ	150	---	150	---
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ	200	---	200	---
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, KEYPORT, NJ	200	---	200	---
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ	150	---	150	---
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, PORT MONMOUTH, NJ	---	---	---	350
SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	150	---	150	---
SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN	---	---	100	---
STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ	200	---	200	---
UPPER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	---	---	---	700
UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, NJ	441	---	320	---
WOODBRIDGE RIVER BASIN, NJ	150	---	150	---
NEW MEXICO				
EAST MESA, LAS CRUCES, NM	---	---	130	---
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	50	---	50	---
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE BOSQUE, NM	225	---	225	---
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX	125	---	164	---
SANTA FE, NM	225	---	225	---
SOUTHWEST VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, ALBUQUE	---	---	---	100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
NEW YORK				
BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY	50	---	50	---
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	52	---	100	---
EAST RIVER SEAWALL, QUEENS COUNTY, NY	---	---	100	---
EIGHTEENMILE CREEK, NIAGARA COUNTY, NY (GREAT LAKES RE	---	---	100	---
FLUSHING BAY & CREEK, NY	---	---	---	25
FREEPORT CREEK, VILLAGE OF FREEPORT, NY	25	---	25	---
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, GOWANUS CANAL, NY & NJ	255	---	500	---
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	685	---	1,500	---
HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	25	---	25	---
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	147	---	147	---
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	85	---	85	---
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY	134	---	134	---
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	170	---	170	---
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	307	---	1,000	---
SAW MILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	50	---	50	---
SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	250	---	300	---
SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND.	---	---	200	---
TONAWANDA CREEK WATERSHED, NY	---	---	100	---
UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	50	---	50	---
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON RESTORATION, NY.	200	---	200	---
NORTH CAROLINA				
BOGUE BANKS, NC	400	---	400	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	150	---	150	---
DARE COUNTY BEACHES, HATTERAS AND ORACOKE ISLANDS, NC.	150	---	300	---
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	100	---	100	---
SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC	200	---	200	---
TAR RIVER BASIN, NC	100	---	---	---
OHIO				
ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH	---	250	---	250
COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	365	---	365	---
DUCK CREEK WATERSHED IN WASHINGTON, NOBLE, GUERNSEY &.	---	---	25	---
HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH.	40	---	40	---
MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH & PA	450	---	450	---
MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH	357	---	357	---
OHIO RIVERFRONT, CINCINNATI, OH	---	---	---	350
WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH, IN & MI	130	---	250	---
OKLAHOMA				
ARKANSAS RIVER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN (PLANNING ASSISTAN	---	---	100	---
GRAND LAKE, OK	---	---	200	---
MIAMI AND VICINITY, OK	231	---	231	---
OOLOGAH LAKE WATERSHED, OK & KS	259	---	259	---
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK	50	---	50	---
SPAVINAW CREEK WATERSHED, OK & AR	---	---	---	100
WASHITA RIVER BASIN	---	---	100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
OREGON				
AMAZON CREEK, OR	250	---	250	---
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	250	---	250	---
TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR	43	---	43	---
WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA	439	---	439	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	94	---	94	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR	313	---	313	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	210	---	210	---
PENNSYLVANIA				
CHRISTINA RIVER WATERSHED, PA, DE & MD	50	---	50	---
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, WISSAHICKON, PA	50	---	50	---
SUSQUEHANNA & DELAWARE RIVER BASIN (SOUTHERN ANTHRACIT	---	---	75	---
TOWN OF BLOOMSBURG LOCAL FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT, PA.	---	---	65	---
UNAMI CREEK, PA	---	---	32	---
UPPER OHIO RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM STUDY, PA (EMSWORTH	---	---	400	---
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, PA (PHASE II)	180	---	180	---
PUERTO RICO				
CANO MARTIN PENA, SAN JUAN, PR (ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORAT	---	---	---	300

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
RHODE ISLAND				
RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	20	---	20	---
SOUTH CAROLINA				
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	430	---	430	---
BROAD RIVER BASIN, SC	100	---	100	---
GEORGETOWN & WILLIAMSBURG COUNTIES, SC	---	---	200	---
REEDY RIVER, SC	170	---	170	---
SANTEE DELTA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, SC	75	---	75	---
WACCAMAW RIVER, SC	50	---	50	---
SOUTH DAKOTA				
JAMES RIVER, SD & ND	150	---	150	---
WATERTOWN & VICINITY, SD	---	---	---	310
TENNESSEE				
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK	---	---	---	5,400
DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	243	---	243	---
TEXAS				
ABILENE, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN - ELM CREEK)	---	---	250	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX....	100	---	575	---
BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES (MAINSTEM), TX.....	---	---	---	100
COLONIAS - LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX.....	---	---	---	250
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX.....	250	---	250	---
FREEPORT HURRICANE PROTECTION LEVEE, TX.....	200	---	200	---
GIWW MODIFICATIONS, TX.....	350	---	350	---
GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX.....	361	---	361	---
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER REALIGNMENTS, TX....	200	---	200	---
GIWW, VICINITY OF PORT ISABEL, (CAMERON COUNTY), TX...	---	---	300	---
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX.....	---	315	---	315
GIWW, MATAGORDA BAY, TX.....	---	100	---	100
GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX.....	400	---	400	---
GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	---	774	---	774
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX.....	150	---	500	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX.....	600	---	750	---
LOWER SABINE RIVER, TX & LA.....	---	---	100	---
MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX.....	50	---	400	---
NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX.....	300	---	300	---
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX.....	100	---	100	---
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX.....	---	---	---	500
RESACAS AT BROWNSVILLE, TX.....	300	---	300	---
RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX.....	---	---	100	---
RIVERSIDE OXBOW, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, FT WORTH, TX....	---	350	---	350
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX.....	300	---	300	---
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX.....	450	---	450	---
SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX.....	---	---	---	250

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX	235	---	235	---
SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX	50	---	50	---
TRI-COUNTY FLOOD STUDY, SAN ANTONIO RIVER, TX	100	---	400	---
UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	400	---	1,200	---
UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS				
CROWN BAY, ST. THOMAS, USVI	---	---	---	400
UTAH				
PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	100	---	100	---
VIRGINIA				
AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	---	694	---	694
DISMAL SWAMP & DISMAL SWAMP CANAL	---	---	100	---
ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENV RESTORATION, VA (PHASE II)	200	---	200	---
ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA	---	75	---	75
FOURMILE RUN, VA	150	---	150	---
GATHRIGHT DAM & LAKE MOOMAW, VA	---	---	200	---
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216)	250	---	250	---
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	300	---	300	---
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	56	---	56	---
PHILPOTT LAKE STUDY (SEC 216)	---	---	100	---
POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	197	---	197	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
WASHINGTON				
CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	310	---	310	---
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER, WA	---	---	500	---
ELLIOTT BAY SEAWALL, SEATTLE, WA	---	---	32	---
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	446	---	446	---
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	350	---	350	---
SKAGIT RIVER, WA	350	---	1,000	---
WHITE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, W	250	---	250	---
WEST VIRGINIA				
LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV	65	---	65	---
NEW RIVER BASIN, WV, NC & VA	130	---	130	---
SOUTH CHARLESTON PORT, WV	---	---	164	---
WISCONSIN				
BARABOO RIVER, WI	500	---	500	---
FOX RIVER, WI	100	---	100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
MISCELLANEOUS				
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	2,500	---	3,500	---
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	100	---	100	---
EX POST FACTO NATIONAL STUDY	2,000	---	---	---
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	300	---	300	---
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	7,500	---	7,200	---
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	400	---	400	---
INDEPENDENT REVIEW NATIONAL STUDY	3,000	---	---	---
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	400	---	400	---
NATIONAL SHORELINE	500	---	500	---
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	4,850	---	4,850	---
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	6,000	---	6,000	---
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	300	---	300	---
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	200	---	200	---
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	22,000	---	23,000	---
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	100	---	100	---
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	500	---	500	---
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	500	---	500	---
TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	450	---	450	---
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-20,400	---	-42,735	---
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	89,989	10,011	94,695	23,093

Matanuska River, Alaska.—The Committee has provided $250,000 to complete a reconnaissance report and initiate a feasibility study addressing erosion in the Matanuska River Watershed.

Navajo Nation, Arizona, New Mexico and Utah.—The bill includes $250,000 to continue technical assistance as authorized by section 520 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

Arkansas River Navigation Study, Arkansas and Oklahoma.—The Committee is aware of the extensive coordination involved in preparing the reevaluation for this project and the need to continue the work. The Committee, therefore, has included $1,200,000 in the bill for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on this study.

Hot Springs, Arkansas.—The committee has provided $31,000 to complete reconnaissance studies for the purpose of identifying flood damage reduction measures and improved drainage in the Hot Springs, Arkansas, area.

Red River, Southwest Arkansas, Arkansas and Louisiana.—The bill includes $100,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of navigation alternatives between Shreveport, Louisiana, and Index, Arkansas.

White River Minimum Flows, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee has included $200,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of project modifications needed to meet minimum flows criteria if the pending reallocation report is favorable.

White River Navigation, Arkansas.—The bill includes $150,000 to continue coordination with the sponsor, local interests, and resource agencies, and to continue work on the project reevaluation and environmental documentation.

California Coastal Sediment Master Plan, California.—The committee has provided $300,000 to execute a feasibility cost sharing agreement and begin the feasibility phase of this study.

San Diego County Special Area Management Plan, California.—The bill includes $250,000 for continuation of a special area management plan study for balancing aquatic resources protection and development in San Diego County.

San Francisco Bay, California.—The bill does not include the $420,000 included in the budget request for a study of navigation hazards in the San Francisco Bay. The local sponsor, California State Lands, decided to terminate the study.

Solana Beach—Encinitas, California.—The Committee has provided $944,000 to complete the feasibility study and report for the Solana Beach—Encinitas shoreline protection project.

Tujunga Wash, California.—The bill includes $300,000 to continue the feasibility phase of the Tujunga Wash environmental restoration project in Studio City.

Adams County, Colorado.—The Committee has included $100,000 to complete the reconnaissance phase and begin a feasibility study of an ecosystem restoration project on the South Platte River.

Hagatna River, Guam.—The bill includes $150,000 to complete a reconnaissance study and initiate a feasibility study on the Hagatna River project. The Committee is aware that this project has previously been authorized and deauthorized, and that reauthorization would be required prior to the initiation of construction.

Waikiki Beach, Oahu, HI.—The Committee has included $250,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of an erosion control project.

Upper Mississippi River and Illinois River Navigation Study, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.—The Committee has provided $3,216,000 to complete the feasibility study on this vital waterway system. The Committee is aware of the need for hearings and reviews prior to completion, but urges that these take place as expediently as possible, so that the Division Commanders Notice may be published before the end of fiscal year 2004, as scheduled.

Fort Dodge, Iowa.—The bill includes $217,000 for the completion of the feasibility phase of an ecosystem restoration project on the Des Moines river at Fort Dodge.

Turkey Creek Basin, Kansas City, Kansas and Missouri.—The Committee has provided $205,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of a tunnel upgrade project.

West Shore—Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana.—The Committee has included $200,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for a hurricane protection project.

Anacostia River and Tributaries, Maryland and District of Columbia.—The bill includes $200,000 to develop work begun in the early 1990's into a Comprehensive Plan to prioritize restoration activities in the Anacostia River basin.

Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Erosion, Maryland, New York, Virginia, and Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the study of shoreline erosion in the area of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, including the management of sediment at dams on the Lower Susquehanna River.

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

Middle Potomac Watershed, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $250,000 to initiate one or more of a number of feasibility studies identified in the reconnaissance phase. It is the intent of the Committee that the Holmes Run watershed in Virginia continues to be within the scope of this study.

Great Lakes Navigational System, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.—The bill includes $2,000,000 to continue work on a supplement to the reconnaissance report.

Sand Creek Environmental Restoration Project, Nebraska.—In order to optimize needed coordination with highway work being performed by the State of Nebraska, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to work closely with the local sponsor on the Sand Creek Environmental Restoration project, accepting advance funds offered by the sponsor, and agreeing to credits and reimbursements, as appropriate, for work done by the sponsor, includ-

ing work performed in connection with the design and construction of seven upstream detention storage structures.

Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $625,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design of a shoreline protection program for this portion of the New Jersey coastline.

Mid-Delaware River Basin Comprehensive Study, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to complete the reconnaissance phase and initiate feasibility studies.

Passaic River Environmental Restoration, New Jersey.—The Committee has renamed the Lower Passaic River study as the Passaic River Environmental Restoration study and has included $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study, conduct public scoping activities, and collect survey data.

Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction Study, Albuquerque, New Mexico.—The bill includes $100,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for a flood damage reduction project in the southwest valley of the city of Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Ohio Riverfront Study, Cincinnati, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $350,000 to continue the Riverfront Study in Cincinnati, Ohio. The Committee has also included language in the bill which provides that the non-Federal sponsor shall receive credit towards project costs for work it has performed.

Susquehanna & Delaware River Basin, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $75,000 to complete the reconnaissance phase of a study addressing aquatic system restoration, acid mine drainage abatement, floodplain management, flood control and water supply in the Southern Anthracite Region.

Abilene, Texas.—The Committee has included $250,000 to reactivate a feasibility study for Elm Creek, in Taylor County and the city of Abilene, Texas. The City has requested that the Corps restudy this area in response to recent flooding.

Colonias—Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas.—The bill includes $250,000 to provide technical and design assistance for rural communities, along the U.S.-Mexican border, which lack basic, adequate water supply and wastewater infrastructure.

Crown Bay, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.—The Committee has provided $400,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design for a project to improve the commercial harbor just west of downtown Charlotte Amalie, USVI.

Skagit River, Washington.—The bill includes $1,000,000 to continue and accelerate the feasibility phase of a flood damage reduction project in the Skagit River Basin, north of Seattle.

South Charleston Port, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $164,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate the master plan study for an inland port development in the Kanawha Valley of West Virginia.

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

Flood Plain Management Services.—The Committee has provided $7,200,000 for the Flood Plain Management Services program, including $500,000 to initiate mapping of areas of the Kenai Penin-

sula of Alaska which were heavily flooded in November 2002. Also provided is $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to assist the Town of Rye, New York, in developing local floodplain management plans for Crawford Park.

Other Coordination Programs.—Funding provided for Other Coordination Programs includes $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide programmatic support to Lake Tahoe restoration activities, including coordination with the Federal Interagency Partnership and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, to implement the Environmental Improvement Program.

Planning Assistance to States.—The amount recommended for the Planning Assistance to States includes $100,000 for a study to identify problems and potential solutions relating to current and future water treatment and conveyance in Butler, Kansas. For the study of a Conduit Hydroelectric Project at El Dorado Lake, on the Walnut River, in Butler County, Kansas, $50,000 is provided.

The amount recommended for the Planning Assistance to States program includes $100,000 to begin a New Jersey Marine Fish Evaluation Study. The Corps of Engineers is urged to consider using the Save the Fish Foundation to carry out this investigation. To address the problem of sump pump discharges into the sanitary sewage system of the Township of Ewing, in Mercer County, New Jersey, $100,000 is provided in the amount for Planning Assistance to States.

The Committee also urges the Corps of Engineers to use $400,000 to continue the project to upgrade the Daily Flow Model for the Delaware River Basin in New York.

Provided a sponsor can be found, and matching funds made available, within the amount provided for the Planning Assistance to the States program, $100,000 is to be used by the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a comprehensive watershed plan to protect the Indian Brook Reservoir watershed, Ossining, New York.

Within the funds provided for Planning Assistance to States, the Committee expects the Corps to use $100,000 to initiate an Arkansas River Corridor Master Plan study in the State of Oklahoma. Also provided is $200,000 for a study of water needs in Georgetown and Williamsburg Counties, South Carolina, specifically as relates to the viability of relieving the effects of drought with a desalination facility. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to use $100,000 to initiate a study of the development of the riverfront in Memphis, Tennessee. In addition, the Corps is urged to use $100,000 on a study of the Oliver Creek watershed, Shelby County, Tennessee.

Within the funds provided for Planning Assistance to States, $100,000 should be used to identify a plan for regional water and wastewater development for Denison and Pottsboro, Texas, and to support environmentally sustainable economic development at Lake Texoma.

Research and Development.—The bill includes $23,000,000 for research and development, including $1,000,000 to be used for a continuation of a study of urban flooding by the Desert Research Institute of Nevada.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 2003	$1,744,598,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	1,350,000,000
Recommended, 2004	1,642,911,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−101,687,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	+292,911,000

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

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ALABAMA		
DUCK RIVER WATER SUPPLY PROJECT, CULLMAN, AL	---	1,000
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	2,003	2,003
WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REH	12,035	12,035
WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB)	3,000	3,000
ALASKA		
NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	6,000	6,000
ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	3,826	3,826
ARIZONA		
RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ	11,600	19,000
NOGALES WASH, AZ	---	2,000
RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	---	2,000
TRES RIOS, AZ	---	1,000
ARKANSAS		
GREERS FERRY LAKE DAM SITE PARK, AR (RAMP)	---	2,000
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	3,300	3,300
MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	20,000	20,000
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), C	4,000	6,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	4,000	2,000
CAMBRIA SEAWATER DESALINIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE, CA	---	500
CORTE MADERA CREEK FLOOD CONTROL	---	125
COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	---	250
FARMINGTON RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, CA	---	1,500
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	13,000	15,000
HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT, LOS ANGELES.	---	5,000
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	2,000	3,000
IMPERIAL BEACH (SILVER STRAND BEACH RESTORATION PROJEC	---	300
KAWEAH RIVER, CA	8,400	8,400
MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	500	1,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	---	350
MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	500	500
MURRIETA CREEK, CA (FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT)	---	1,000
NAPA RIVER, CA	7,500	10,000
NORTH VALLEY REGIONAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE (CITY OF LA	---	3,500
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	7,000	15,000
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	2,000	7,300
PORT OF LOS ANGELES, CA (MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING)	---	15,000
SACRAMENTO AREA	---	8,600
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	2,000	2,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL	---	250
SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	---	750
SAN RAMON VALLEY RECYCLED WATER PROJECT, CA	---	1,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	15,700	25,700
SOUTH PERRIS, CA (WATER SUPPLY DESALINIZATION)	---	1,000
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	2,100	4,100
STOCKTON METROPOLITIAN FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSEMENT, CA	500	3,000
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	1,000	1,000
TULE RIVER, CA	1,600	2,100
UPPER NEWPORT BAY, CA	---	1,000
UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	1,000	2,000
YUBA RIVER BASIN PROJECT	---	1,000
DELAWARE		
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ - PT. MAHON, DE	---	1,000
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES BEACH	2,008	2,008

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
DELAWARE COAST, CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE...	---	214
DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE.....	285	285
DELAWARE COAST, REHOBOTH BEACH TO DEWEY BEACH, DE.....	5,768	5,768
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY (FLOOD CONTROL).....	---	500
FLORIDA		
BREVARD COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, FL.....	---	500
BROWARD COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, FL.....	---	1,000
BROWARD COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION (SEGMENT I - DEERFIELD	---	500
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL.....	2,000	3,000
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL.....	112,498	112,498
DADE COUNTY (BEACH EROSION CONTROL & HURRICANE PROTECT	---	1,500
DUVAL COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION PROJECT, FL.....	---	500
EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	14,835	14,835
FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL.....	---	1,000
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (MAJOR REHAB).....	1,000	1,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	2,000	3,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	873	873
KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL.....	17,706	17,706
LEE COUNTY(SHORE PROTECTION, ALL ELEMENTS), FL.....	---	2,000
MANATEE HARBOR, FL.....	---	3,000
MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL.....	2,700	2,700
PALM BEACH COUNTY (DELRAY BEACH, JUPITER/CARLIN CENTRA	---	2,100
PINELLAS COUNTY, FL.....	---	2,500
PONCE DE LEON INLET, SOUTH JETTY, FL.....	---	750
PORT EVERGLADES, FL - (SOUTHPORT CHANNEL & TURNING NOT	---	1,500
SARASOTA COUNTY (CITY OF VENICE SEGMENT), FL.....	---	2,000
TAMPA HARBOR - ALAFIA RIVER, FL.....	---	8,000
TAMPA HARBOR (BIG BEND CHANNEL), FL.....	---	6,000
GEORGIA		
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	4,500	8,500
BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB).....	3,000	3,000
OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA (DEF CORR).....	500	500
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC.....	4,328	4,328
THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB).....	5,500	5,500
TYBEE ISLAND SHORE PROTECTION, GA.....	---	225
HAWAII		
KAUMALAPAU HARBOR (ISLAND OF LANAI, HAWAII).....	---	500
KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI.....	3,633	3,633
MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI.....	191	191
IDAHO		
RURAL IDAHO.....	---	4,450
ILLINOIS		
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	2,300	2,300
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL.	500	800
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL.....	24,000	24,000
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE I).....	---	250
EAST ST LOUIS, IL.....	815	815
EAST ST. LOUIS & VICINITY INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL, IL..	---	100
COOK COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, IL.....	---	350
GREAT LAKES FISHERY & ECO REST, IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, PA	---	700
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL.....	---	1,500
LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	13,000	13,000
LOVES PARK, IL.....	5,785	5,785

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MADISON & ST. CLAIR COUNTIES, IL (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRAS	---	850
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	18,000	21,000
MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	600	600
NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	---	200
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	73,000	68,000
UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO	33,320	18,320
INDIANA		
CALUMET REGION ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE (GARY SEWE	---	3,000
GRAND CALUMET RIVER REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN, IN	---	150
INDIANAPOLIS, ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (C	---	1,000
INDIANA HARBOR (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY), IN	5,700	8,000
INDIANA SHORELINE (DUNES), IN	---	1,000
INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	2,600	2,600
JOHN T. MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN	---	500
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN (CADY MARSH DITCH), IN	---	4,500
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	3,800	4,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	21,000	21,000
OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	1,000	1,000
OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION, IN (INDIANA SHORELINE)	---	750
IOWA		
DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER & GREENBELT, IA	---	4,000
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	1,313	1,313
LOCK AND DAM 19, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	---	500
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	22,000	18,000
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	7,000	7,000
PERRY CREEK, IA	2,200	2,200
KANSAS		
ARKANSAS CITY, KS	2,600	2,600
KENTUCKY		
DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	1,946	1,946
KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	24,866	24,866
KENTUCKY RIVER LOCK AND DAM 10, KY	---	1,000
LOUISVILLE WATERFRONT PARK, PHASE II & PHASE III, KY	---	750
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	26,100	26,100
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	1,400	1,400
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	2,500	2,500
SOUTHERN & EASTERN KY	---	3,000
LOUISIANA		
ASCENSION PARISH ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, LA	---	300
COMITE RIVER, LA	2,000	3,500
EAST BATON ROUGE, LA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	---	1,000
EAST BATON ROUGE, LA FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT	---	500
GRAND ISLE & VICINITY, LA	---	100
IBERIA PARISH ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, LA	---	100
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	7,000	12,000
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	13,700	16,200
LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	3,000	5,000
LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	461	461
LIVINGSTON PARISH ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, LA	---	700
MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET, LA (REEVALUATION STUDY)	---	813
MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	196	196
NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	2,000	2,000
OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA	---	1,000
SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	16,500	31,500
WEST BANK AND VICINITY, NEW ORLEANS, LA	35,000	30,000

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MARYLAND		
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	1,003	1,003
ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	500	500
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	3,000	3,000
PAINT BRANCH FISH PASSAGE & STREAM RESTORATION PROJECT	---	200
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	14,101	14,101
MASSACHUSETTS		
CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	9,895	9,895
MUDDY RIVER, BOSTON AND BROOKLINE, MA	---	750
MICHIGAN		
GENESEE COUNTY, MI (WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE ASSISTAN	---	906
NEGAUNEE, MI (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE)	---	117
SAULT STE MARIE REPLACEMENT LOCK, MI	---	3,000
TWELVE TOWNS (GEORGE W. KUHN) DRAIN RETENTION TREATMEN	---	388
MINNESOTA		
BRECKENRIDGE, MN	---	1,500
CROOKSTON, MN	1,043	1,043
LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	600	600
LOWER ST. ANTHONY FALLS RAPIDS RESTORATION, MINNEAPOLI	---	1,000
MILLE LACS REGIONAL SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT, MN	---	750
MISSISSIPPI		
DESOTO COUNTY, WASTEWATER TREATMENT, MS	---	8,000
MISSISSIPPI ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE (SEC. 592), M	---	2,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,989	2,989
MISSOURI		
BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	2,000	2,000
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	6,000	6,000
BOIS BRULE LEVEE & DRAINAGE DISTRICT, MO	---	1,200
CAPE GIRARDEAU (FLOODWALL), MO	---	500
MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	2,000	2,500
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	1,700	1,700
STE GENEVIEVE, MO	150	150
ST. LOUIS, MO (COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS PROJECT)	---	2,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY)	5,000	5,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO (CAMPBELL POINT, CAPE FAIR, MO	---	2,500
MONTANA		
FORT PECK FISH HATCHERY, MT	---	4,000
RURAL MONTANA	---	2,000
NEBRASKA		
ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	---	1,500
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	1,000	1,000
WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	1,082	1,082
NEVADA		
LAWTON-VERDI INTERCEPTOR, NV	---	1,000
RURAL NEVADA	---	2,050
TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	23,300	23,300

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
LEBANON, NH (CSOS)	---	1,000
NASHUA, NH (CSOS)	---	1,000
NEW JERSEY		
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET (ABSECON ISLAND),	1,000	4,000
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET (BRIGANTINE	---	500
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	1,728	1,728
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ, REEDS BEACH TO PIERCE	---	1,000
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	300	8,000
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	7,355	7,355
HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	---	100
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	1,841	1,841
NEWARK RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, NJ (MINISH PAR	---	750
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	1,000	4,000
RAMAPO & MAHWAY RIVERS, MAHWAH, NJ & SUFFERN, NY	---	500
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	100	100
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	6,488	8,000
SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	3,000	3,000
TOWN OF NEWTON, NJ (WATER SUPPLY FILTRATION PLANT)	---	300
TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	9,200	9,200
NEW MEXICO		
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	1,800	1,800
ALAMOGORDO, NM	3,500	3,500
CENTRAL, NM	---	2,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	---	600
NEW YORK		
ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	1,750	1,750
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	1,250	1,250
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	2,700	3,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	3,800	3,800
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	115,000	115,000
NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM, NY	---	1,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	2,040	2,040
CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	3,510	3,510
DARE COUNTY BEACHES HURRICANE PROTECTION & SHORE PRESE	---	1,000
LITTLE SUGAR CREEK, MECKLENBURG CO, NC	---	75
WEST CARY STREAM RESTORATION PROJECT, NC	---	100
WEST ONSLOW BEACH & NEW RIVER INLET, NC (GRR)	---	100
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	9,650	15,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BUFORD - TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION,	1,518	2,100
GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	6,500	6,500
GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	23,496	24,096
SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	3,367	3,367
OHIO		
HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	---	2,000
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	8,500	8,500
MILL CREEK, OH	3,900	3,900
WEST COLUMBUS, OH	1,800	1,800
OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTTRUCTURE	---	17,000

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
OKLAHOMA		
CANTON LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	---	1,500
LAWTON, OK, WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE REHABILITATION P	---	250
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	4,400	4,400
OREGON		
BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	3,363	3,363
COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR & WA	---	2,000
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	2,900	2,900
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	500	500
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	2,000	2,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	10,000	10,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
3 RIVERS WET WEATHER DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, PA	---	1,500
CONEMAUGH RIVER, NANTY GLO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION P	---	1,000
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	35,000	40,000
NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, PA	---	2,000
PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	600	600
SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT PRO	---	15,000
SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA (SEC. 566, WRDA 1996), CITY.	---	750
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	10,021	10,021
PUERTO RICO		
ARECIBO RIVER, PR	1,000	1,000
PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	5,200	5,200
RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	1,100	1,100
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	16,500	16,500
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING & WIDENING)	5,000	6,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	6,000	6,000
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	2,800	2,800
PIERRE, SD	4,300	4,300
TENNESSEE		
BLACK FOX, MURFREE, & OAKLAND SPRINGS WETLANDS, MURFRE	---	1,072
TEXAS		
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	4,700	6,000
CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	2,966	2,966
CLEAR CREEK, TX	---	1,200
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TX	---	9,280
EL PASO, TX	2,800	2,800
HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	18,726	33,726
HUNTING BAYOU, TX	---	1,000
JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	2,200	2,200
KELLY, SAN ANTONIO, BEXAR COUNTY, WATER SYSTEM FLOOD C	---	100
MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX	---	350
NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	4,108	4,108
RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL PROJECT, WICHITA RIVER BASI	---	1,000
SALT CREEK, GRAHAM, TX	---	1,000
SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	---	1,000
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	12,000	12,000
WACO LAKE, TX (AIRPORT PARK)	---	1,000

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
VIRGINIA		
AIWW, BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	9,706	9,706
ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION, FRONT ROYAL, VA (AVTEX)	---	5,000
JAMES RIVER, VA (TURNING BASIN)	---	1,150
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (MAJOR REHAB)	6,000	6,000
LAKE MERRIWEATHER, LITTLE CALFPASTURE (GOSHEN DAM), VA	---	500
LYNCHBURG (COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS, VA	---	500
NORFOLK HARBOR DEEPENING, VA	---	2,000
OCCOQUAN RIVER, VA	---	710
RICHMOND (COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS, VA	---	500
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	2,000	2,000
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	2,294	2,294
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM GAS ABATEMENT, WA	900	---
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	95,000	85,000
HOWARD HANSON DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA	9,500	10,500
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	2,000	2,000
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	200	200
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	1,400	1,400
PUGET SOUND & ADJACENT WATERS RESTORATION, WA	---	400
THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA & OR (MAJOR REH	250	250
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	2,600	2,600
CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	---	1,000
CHEAT RIVER BASIN (LICK RUN), WV (ACID MINE DRAINAGE)	---	513
LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	15,000	50,400
LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WV	---	750
MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	52,154	52,154
ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	2,500	2,500
SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	---	2,000
WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	2,000	2,000
WISCONSIN		
CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY, CITY OF MEQUON, WI	---	40
NORTHERN WISCONSIN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE	---	10,000
MISCELLANEOUS		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	10,000	18,050
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	3,000	3,800
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL	3,000	3,000
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	8,000	8,000
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM	7,000	7,000
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	7,000	7,000
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	19,130	19,130
ESTUARY RESTORATION PROGRAM (PL 106-457)	---	1,500
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	20,000	20,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE	45	45
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE	185	185
NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)	500	500
NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	6,000	9,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	14,000	14,000
SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATIO	6,000	6,000
SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	3,500	3,500
SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECT (SECTION 208)	500	500
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-116,095	-206,306
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL	1,350,000	1,642,911

Duck River, Cullman, Alabama.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to continue assisting the Cullman-Morgan Water District with contract administration and construction management activities on its water supply infrastructure upgrade project.

Nogales Wash, Arizona.—The bill includes $2,000,000 to continue construction of this flood warning and damage reduction project in Southern Arizona.

Greers Ferry Lake, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for modernization of the Dam Site Park to a more current standard and to make facilities accessible to the handicapped.

Petaluma River, California.—The bill includes $7,300,000 for completion, including required reimbursements, of the flood control project within the city of Petaluma, California.

Sacramento Area, California.—The bill includes $8,600,000 for the Sacramento Area, California, project authorized by section 502 of the Water Resources 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; $1,000,000 for the City of Roseville Water Meter Retrofit Program; $4,600,000 for Technical Design and Construction Assistance on the El Dorado Irrigation District, Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant; $800,000 for the Redundant Water Supply Intake at Folsom Reservoir; and $1,200,000 for the El Dorado Irrigation District Sly Park Recreation Area water system.

Santa Ana River Mainstem, California.—The Committee has provided $25,700,000 for continued construction of the Santa Ana River Mainstem project, including $10,000,000 for the acceleration of work on the San Timoteo Creek element.

Everglades Restoration, Florida.—The recent enactment of certain laws in Florida is widely perceived to presage or to permit a decline in support for Everglades restoration by non-Federal interests crucial to the success of the entire restoration effort. Under these circumstances, the Committee is naturally concerned about the wisdom of making full Federal funding available without additional safeguards over these funds. The Committee has, therefore, included language in the bill which will allow funds appropriated for Everglades restoration to be freed for other worthwhile uses if non-Federal participants do not meet their agreed-upon responsibilities under the governing consent decree.

Pinellas County, Florida.—The bill includes $2,500,000 for the renourishment of Long Key and Treasure Island in Pinellas County, Florida.

Tybee Island, Georgia.—The Committee has provided $225,000 to initiate a general reevaluation study of the existing shore protection project to identify needed modifications and to determine the feasibility of including the north end of Tybee Beach.

Rural Idaho, Idaho.—The Committee has provided $4,450,000 for environmental infrastructure projects as authorized in section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, as amended, in rural Idaho. Funds are to be used as follows: City of Burley, Idaho, $2,000,000; Coolin Sewer District, Idaho; $1,900,000; City of Horseshoe Bend, Idaho, $300,000; Upper St. Joe Distribution Line, Idaho, $250,000.

Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Illinois.—The bill includes $800,000 for the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal dispersal barrier demonstration project which is intended to prevent the movement of invasive aquatic nuisance species between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River. Of the amount provided, $500,000 is intended for operating of the existing barrier, and $300,000 is to be used to initiate the design work necessary to make this barrier permanent. In addition, $750,000 is provided in a section 1135 "continuing authorities project" to continue work on a second barrier.

Lock and Dam 19, Mississippi River, Iowa.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to continue the major rehabilitation of Mississippi River Lock and Dam 19, in Keokuk, Iowa.

Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky.—The bill includes $3,000,000 for development and upgrade of wastewater facilities in southern and eastern Kentucky, as authorized by section 531 of the Water Resources Development Act, as amended.

Mississippi River—Gulf Outlet, Louisiana.—The bill includes $813,000 to complete the reevaluation study, including the investigation of ecosystem restoration issues, of the Mississippi River, Gulf Outlet project.

George W. Kuhn Drain, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $388,000 to initiate design of Phase 2 of the George W. Kuhn Drain, previously known as the Twelve Towns Drain Retention Treatment Facility, Oakland County, Michigan.

DeSoto County, Mississippi.—The bill contains $8,000,000 to complete currently authorized wastewater treatment work in DeSoto County, in northeast Mississippi.

Mississippi Environmental Infrastructure, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Mississippi Environmental Infrastructure program authorized by section 592 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to continue to address the most critical water resources needs within the State of Mississippi. Of the funds provided, $100,000 is for a study of an alternative water supply for the Northeast Mississippi Regional Water Supply District.

Bois Brule Levee and Drainage District, Missouri.—The bill includes $1,200,000 for continuation of the design deficiency on the Bois Brule Levee and Drainage District, Missouri, project. The sponsor has decided that the Section 205 project to increase the level of protection is not presently feasible and should be placed on hold.

St. Louis, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 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.

Table Rock Lake, Missouri.—The bill contains $2,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to modernize facilities at its Campbell Point, Cape Fair, Indian Point, and Baxter Parks, at Table Rock Lake, Missouri.

Rural Montana, Montana.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for environmental infrastructure projects as authorized in section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, as amended, in rural Montana. Funds are to be used as follows: City

of Conrad, Montana, $1,000,000; City of Laurel, Montana, $1,000,000.

Rural Nevada, Nevada.—The Committee has provided $2,050,000 for environmental infrastructure projects as authorized in section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, as amended, in rural Nevada. Funds are to be used as follows: Boulder City, Nevada, $750,000; City of Mesquite, Nevada, $1,000,000; and Tonopah, Nevada, $3,00,000.

Passaic River, New Jersey.—The bill contains $4,000,000 to accelerate the Passaic River Preservation of Natural Flood Storage Areas, in the Central Basin of the Passaic River, New Jersey.

Central New Mexico, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for design and construction assistance to non-Federal interests as authorized under section 593 of the Water Resources and Development Act of 1999. Of these funds, $,1,000,000 is to be used for the Black Mesa, New Mexico, Area Flood Management 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 2004.

New York and New Jersey Harbors, New York and New Jersey.—The Committee is aware of the difficulty posed by the requirement that a second shipper be in place on the Port Jersey element of the project before the construction may begin, and has included language in the bill to change the requirement to allow work to proceed whenever the sponsor has identified and secured commitments to ship from a second user. In addition, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use $2,000,000 of the funds provided for the project to plan for and enter into an agreement with a state or non-Federal sponsor to develop a dredged material processing facility that would accomplish the objectives of reducing the cost of dredged material management in the port, preparing dredged material for beneficial uses, and implementing innovative dredged material management technologies.

Dare County, North Carolina.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for preconstruction monitoring and real estate acquisition on the Bodie County element of the Dare County, North Carolina, beaches project.

Holes Creek, West Carrollton, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for floodwall completion and relocations, to complete the Holes Creek, Ohio, flood damage reduction project.

Ohio Environmental Assistance, Ohio.—The bill contains $17,000,000 for the Ohio Environmental Assistance program authorized by section 592 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. The amount provided includes: $1,500,000 for the City of Chardon, Geauga County, Ohio; $1,000,000 for a Wastewater Treatment Plant, Toledo, Ohio; $3,000,000 for Clark County and Lower Mad River Valley Sewer Infrastructure, Ohio; $2,000,000 for Clark County & Lower Mad River Valley Storm Water Management Infrastructure, Ohio; $1,500,000 for the Dayton International Airport Sites Sewer & Drainage, Ohio; $200,000 for a Drain Line Replacement, Lafayette Township, Coshocton County, Ohio; $300,000 for the Oxbow and Sand Road Pond Water Pollution Con-

trol Facility, City of Fremont, Ohio; $1,000,000 for a Sanitary Sewer Collection and Wastewater Treatment System, Village of Hartford, Hartford Township, Licking County, Ohio; $1,000,000 for a Sanitary Sewer Line Extension, City of Wellston, Jackson County, Ohio; $1,000,000 for Hospital Site Preparation, Springfield, Ohio; $268,000 for the State Route 285 Water Line Project, Noble County, Ohio; $2,500,000 for Environmental Restoration, Tech Town, Ohio; $375,000 for design of a project for Mason Run, Turkey Run & Walnut Creek, Ohio; and $1,000,000 for the Water Line Project, Guernsey County, Ohio.

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.

Conemaugh River, Nanty Glo, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $1,000,000 to complete construction of the Nanty Glo, Pennsylvania, Environmental Restoration project.

South Central Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $15,000,000 for environmental improvement in South Central Pennsylvania. When executing this program, the Corps of Engineers is encouraged to consider the needs of Pleasantville, Pennsylvania; Union Township, Pennsylvania; Juniata Terrace Borough, Pennsylvania; and the Industrial Park in Mifflin County, Pennsylvania.

Southeastern Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $750,000 to continue work on the Cobbs Creek and Mill Creek watersheds in West Philadelphia, as authorized by section 566 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Black Fox, Murfree, and Oaklands Springs Wetlands, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.—The bill includes $1,072,000 to complete all remaining authorized work at the Black Fox, Murfree, and Oaklands Springs Environmental Restoration project in Murfreesboro, Tennessee.

Dallas Floodway Extension, Texas.—The Committee has provided $9,280,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Dallas Floodway Extension project in Texas.

San Antonio Channel Improvement Project, Texas.—Consistent with existing project authorities for the San Antonio Channel Improvement Project in Texas, with specific reference to Section 335 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, which modified the project to include environmental restoration and recreation as project purposes, the Committee directs the Secretary of Army to designate all components of the project for flood control, environmental restoration and recreation as one integral and combined project. The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to continue construction of such project. Subject to the Secretary's approval of the General Reevaluation Report, the Secretary of Army is directed to use a portion of these funds and subsequent funding appropriated for the San Antonio Channel Improvement Project to design and subsequently construct these combined improvements.

James River, Virginia.—The bill includes $1,150,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for improvements to the turning basin on the James River, Virginia, navigation project.

Roanoke River Upper Basin, Virginia.—The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to use open and unrestricted bidding in prosecuting all construction of the Roanoke River Upper Basin, Virginia, project.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky.—The Committee has provided a total of $50,400,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project. This amount includes $17,000,000 for the City of Grundy, Virginia, element of the project; $1,500,000 for the Bell County, Kentucky, element of the project; $3,500,000 for the City of Cumberland, Kentucky, element of the project; $6,500,000 for the Clover Fork, Harlan County, Kentucky, element of the project; $2,000,000 for the Levisa Fork in Floyd County, Kentucky, element of the project; $4,500,000 for the Harlan County, Kentucky, element of the project; $900,000 for the Johnson County, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,000,000 for the Knox County, Kentucky, element of the project; $4,300,000 for the Tug Fork in Martin County, Kentucky, element of the project; $200,000 for the Levisa Basin in Pike County, Kentucky, element of the project; $4,000,000 in the Tug Fork in Pike County, element of the project; and $5,000,000 in the Town of Martin, Floyd County, element of the project.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—Within the amount provided for the Aquatic Plant Control program, $200,000 is for aquatic plant control at high priority sites in Texas, and $100,000 is for the control of Hydrilla in the Potomac and Tributaries, Virginia, Maryland, and District of Columbia. The Committee is aware of the growing aquatic invasive plant infestation problem around the country and supports efforts of the Corps, and the private sector, to develop new management and control technologies. The Committee further believes that success in the management of these invasive species is dependent upon a strong, stable research program.

Emergency Streambank and Erosion Control (Section 14).—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 for the Section 14 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $100,000 for construction of the Addison Creek, North Riverside, Illinois, project; $200,000 for construction of the Village of Riverside (Groveland Avenue Berm), Illinois, project; $60,000 to complete the planning and design analysis for the Ohio River, Rockport, Indiana, project; $200,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Ohio River, South Harrison County, Indiana, project; $100,000 for planning and design of the U.S. Highway 83 Bridge project in Garden City, Kansas; $330,000 for construction of the Nicholas County, Licking River, Kentucky, project; $31,000 for completion of plans and specifications for the Holmes Bay, Whiting, Maine, project; $24,000 for completion of plans and specifications for the Narraguagus River, Milbridge, Maine, project; $100,000 to initiate construction of the Belle Isle Park, Michigan, project; $61,000 to complete planning and design of the Belle Isle South Shore, Michigan, project; $750,000 to initiate construction of the Marquette,

Michigan, project; $150,000 to initiate and complete construction of the County Road 228 Bridge, Hubble Creek, Missouri, project; $40,000 for planning and design of the Borough of Rumson bulkhead replacement project in New York; $300,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Newton Creek, Bainbridge, New York, project; $250,000 to complete the feasibility study and plans and specifications for the Northport, Huntington, New York, project; $100,000 for planning and design for the Engel Park, Town of Ossining, New York, project; $40,000 for plans and specifications for the Losee Park, Village of Tarrytown, New York, project; $40,000 for plans and specifications for the Scarborough Park, Village of Briarcliff Manor, New York, project; $75,000 for plans and specifications for the Ottawa River, Shoreland Drive project in Toledo, Ohio; $40,000 for plans and specifications for the Hocking River, Athens, Ohio, project; $40,000 for plans and specifications for the Green River, Waynesboro, Tennessee, project; $40,000 for plans and specifications for the Hurricane Creek Road, Waynesboro, Tennessee, project; $175,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Hollywood Interceptor project in Memphis, Tennessee; $293,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction for the Mount Moriah Culvert project in Tennessee; $100,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Terminal Road, Chattanooga, Tennessee, project; $100,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Town of Dandridge, Tennessee, project; $100,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Bogachiel River, Clallam County, Washington, project; and $40,000 for planning and design of the Concordia University, City of Mequon, Wisconsin, project.

Shoreline Protection Project (Section 103).—The Committee has provided $3,500,000 for the Section 103 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $100,000 to complete the initial appraisal report for the City of Solano Beach, California, project; $100,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Whiting Shoreline, Indiana, project; $100,000 to complete plans and specifications and execute a project cooperation agreement for the Nantasket Beach, Hull, Massachusetts, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Lake Erie Islands project in Ottawa County, Ohio; and $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Sandusky, Ohio, Lakefront Restoration project.

Small Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The Committee has provided $8,000,000 for the Section 107 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $200,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Point Mallard Park, Decatur, Alabama, project; $640,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Blytheville Harbor, Arkansas, project; $850,000 for construction of the Russellville Slackwater Harbor project in Arkansas; $2,825,000 to complete construction of the Port Hueneme, California, project; $100,000 for the feasibility study for the Port Tobacco River/Goose Creek, Maryland, project; $50,000 to complete design and execute a project cooperation agreement for the Bass Harbor, Tremont, Maine, project; $20,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Bucks Harbor, Machiasport, Maine, project; $50,000 to continue the feasibility for the Lubec Harbor, Maine, project; $86,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Detroit River

project in Michigan; $75,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Mackinac Island Harbor, Michigan, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Grand Marais Harbor, Minnesota, project; $50,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Knife River Harbor, Minnesota, project; $500,000 to initiate construction of the Duluth (McQuade Road) Harbor, Minnesota, project; $500,000 to initiate construction of the Two Harbors, Minnesota, project; $583,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Tri-State Commerce Park, Iuka, Mississippi, project; $200,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Buffalo Inner—South Basin Navigation Project in New York; $225,000 to initiate and complete the feasibility study for the Oconto, Wisconsin, project; and $305,000 to initiate and complete the feasibility study for the Olde Stone Quarry Park, Door County, Wisconsin, project.

Mitigation Damages Attributable to Navigation Projects (Section 111).—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Section 111 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $125,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Grand River, City of Grand Haven, Michigan, project; and $100,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Mattituck Inlet, Southold, New York, project.

Beneficial Use of Dredge Material (Section 204).—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Section 204 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes $70,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Atchafalaya River, Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black, Louisiana, project; and $100,000 for plans and specifications for the Ottawa River, Ohio, project.

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: $50,000 to initiate a feasibility study for the Grubbs, Arkansas, project; $25,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Higginson, Arkansas, project; $500,000 to initiate construction of the Indian Bayou, Arkansas, project; $75,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Spring Creek, Arkansas, project; $100,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems in Yucca Valley, California; $460,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Anaverde Creek, Palmdale, California, project; $100,000 for the Santa Venetia, California, project; $250,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Flint River, City of Albany, Georgia, project; $1,000,000 to continue construction of the Deer Creek, Village of Ford Heights, Illinois, project; $1,500,000 to continue construction of the East Peoria, Illinois, project; $100,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Oak Forest and Midlothian (Natalie Creek), Illinois, project; $100,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction for the Stoney Creek, Oak Lawn, Illinois, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Olney, Illinois, project; $85,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Pankey Branch, Harrisburg, Illinois, project; $150,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Shelly Creek, Montgomery County, Indiana, project; $200,000 to continue work on the Kankakee River (Sumava Resorts), Indiana, project; $115,000 to complete the feasibility study for the

Cowskin Creek, Wichita, Kansas, project; $50,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Whitewater and Walnut Rivers project in Augusta, Kansas; $175,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Lockport to Larose, Louisiana, project; $125,000 to continue plans and specifications for the Rosethorn Basin, Jean Lafitte, Louisiana, project; $145,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Winchester, Massachusetts, project; $100,000 for a study of flooding problems in Benton County, Minnesota; $250,000 for a study of flooding problems in Delano, Minnesota; $50,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Ada, Minnesota, project; $100,000 for a feasibility study for the Borup, Minnesota, project; $325,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the City of Roseau, Minnesota, project; $100,000 for a feasibility study for the Marsh Creek, Site 6, floodwater retention project in Minnesota; $350,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Hidden Valley Storm Drainage project in Greene County, Missouri; $50,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Goose Creek, Missouri, project; $50,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Hubble Creek, Missouri, project; $75,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Lilbourn, Missouri, project; $200,000 to initiate construction of the Little River Diversion project in Dutchtown, Missouri; $50,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Williams Creek, Missouri, project; $200,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Greens Mill Run, Greenville, North Carolina, project; $500,000 to continue construction of the Wahpeton, North Dakota, project; $250,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Jackson Brook, New Jersey, project; $1,150,000 to complete construction of the McKeel Brook, New Jersey, project; $200,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Poplar Brook, Monmouth, New Jersey, project; $200,000 for plans and specifications for the Hatch, New Mexico, project; $100,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Hobbs, New Mexico, project; $300,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Fulmer Creek, New York, project; $45,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Great Gully Creek, Springport, New York, project; $300,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Moyer Creek, Village of Frankfort, New York, project; $238,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Steele Creek, Village of Ilion, New York, project; $100,000 for a study of flooding problems in Highland Falls, New York; $100,000 for a study of flooding problems along Moodna Creek in New Windsor, New York; $100,000 for a study of flooding problems in the Town of Warwick, New York; $100,000 for a study of flooding problems along Blind Brook in the City of Rye, New York; $200,000 for plans and specifications for the Irondequoit Creek, Monroe County, New York, project; $1,000,000 for the Zimber Ditch, Stark County, Ohio, project; $75,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Little Mill and Mill Creeks, Pennsylvania, project; $100,000 for a study of flooding problems in Surfside Beach, South Carolina; $115,000 to continue plans and specifications for the Beaver Creek, Bristol, Tennessee, and Bristol, Virginia, project; $165,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction for the Baxter Bottom, Tennessee, project; $55,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Dresden, Ten-

nessee, project; $70,000 for a study of flooding problems along Jones Creek in Jackson, Tennessee; $250,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems at the KellyUSA site in Bexar County, Texas; and $30,000 to continue coordination activities on the Estate La Grange, Estate Mon Bijou, Savan Gut, and Turpentine Run projects in the United States Virgin Islands.

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (Section 206).—The Committee has provided $18,050,000 for the Section 206 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $235,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Spring Creek, Tuscumbia, Alabama, project; $90,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Brownsville Branch, Arkansas, project; $100,000 to initiate the Ecosystem Restoration Report for the Carpinteria Creek Park, California, project; $60,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Upper Sulphur Creek restoration project in California; $300,000 for an Ecosystem Restoration Report for the City of Lodi, California, White Slough Water Pollution Control Facility; $100,000 for an Ecosystem Restoration Report for the Thompson Creek project in Santa Clara County, California; $200,000 for the Ecosystem Restoration Report for the Santa Paula Creek, California, project; $175,000 for the Ecosystem Restoration Report for the Sweetwater Reservoir Wetlands project in California; $100,000 for a Preliminary Restoration Plan for the English Creek, California, project; $200,000 for an Ecosystem Restoration Report for the Arroyo Los Positas, California, project; $360,000 for an Ecosystem Restoration Report for the St. Helena Napa River restoration project in California; $400,000 for the Ecosystem Restoration Report for the Upper York Creek Dam removal project in California; $40,000 for a Preliminary Restoration Plan for the South Boulder Creek, Colorado, project; $250,000 for plans and specifications for the Mill River, Stamford, Connecticut, project; $2,800,000 for the Stevenson Creek project in Pinellas County, Florida; $253,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Columbus Dam removal project in Georgia; $100,000 for a Preliminary Restoration Plan for the Mountain Park Dam project in Georgia; $200,000 to initiate construction of the Squaw Creek Basin project in Lake County, Illinois; $700,000 to continue construction of the Butler Lake, Illinois, project; $150,000 for plans and specifications for the Hofmann Dam, Illinois, project; $50,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Illinois and Michigan Canal, Willow Springs, Illinois, project; $111,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the State Line Kankakee River project in Illinois; $850,000 to initiate construction of the South Bend dam removal project in South Bend, Indiana; $300,000 to complete the detailed project report for the Cedar Lake, Indiana, project; $500,000 to initiate construction of the Wolf Lake, Indiana, project; $200,000 to initiate construction of the Grass Lake, Illinois, project; $100,000 for plans and specifications for the Buras Marina, Louisiana, project; $200,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Paint Branch fish passage and stream restoration project in Prince Georges County, Maryland; $125,000 for plans and specifications for the Mill Pond, Littleton, Massachusetts, project; $232,000 for plans and specifications for the Milford Pond, Milford, Massachusetts, project; $717,000 to initiate and complete construction of the

Nashawannuck Pond, Easthampton, Massachusetts, project; $50,000 for the planning and design of the New Boulevard, Detroit River, Michigan, project; $180,000 for plans and specifications for the Belle Isle Piers project in Detroit, Michigan; $72,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Secord and Smallwood Lakes project in Secord Township, Michigan; $296,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Wiswall Dam, New Hampshire, project; $110,000 for an Ecosystem Restoration Report for the Rogers Pond, Franklin Township, New Jersey, project; $100,000 to continue the feasibility phase of the Bottomless Lakes State Park project in New Mexico; $300,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction for the Las Cruces Wetlands Restoration, New Mexico, project; $50,000 for a Preliminary Restoration Plan for the Alley Creek, Queens, New York, project; $100,000 to continue the feasibility study phase of the Mud Creek, East Patchogue, New York, project; $100,000 to complete design and initiate construction of the Chenango Lake wetlands restoration project in Chenango County, New York; $300,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Oriskany Wildlife Management Plan in New York; $245,000 for construction of the Greenwood Lake project in the Village of Greenwood, New York; $10,000 for a Preliminary Restoration Plan for the Kowawese Area in New Windsor, New York; $200,000 for the feasibility study for the Echo Bay project in New Rochelle, New York; $200,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Sheldrake Lake/Goodlife Pond project in New York; $200,000 for the feasibility phase of the Concord Streams restoration project in Concord, North Carolina; $75,000 to continue work on the Little Sugar Creek, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, project; $100,000 to continue the feasibility phase of the West Cary Stream restoration project in North Carolina; $100,000 for a study of ecosystem restoration and other improvements along the Lake Erie waterfront in Cuyahoga County, Ohio; $65,000 for a Preliminary Restoration Plan for the Sandusky, Ohio, beach restoration project; $250,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Lake Carl Blackwell aquatic ecosystem restoration project in Oklahoma; $175,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Westmoreland Park, Oregon, project; $1,000,000 to initiate construction of the Springfield Millrace ecosystem restoration project in Oregon; $300,000 to initiate construction of the Southampton Creek, Pennsylvania, project; $250,000 for a feasibility study for the Canonsburg Lake, Pennsylvania, project; $90,000 to complete planning and design of the Sheraden Park Stream and Chartiers Creek restoration project in Pennsylvania; $100,000 for a Preliminary Restoration Plan for the Upper Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, project; $800,000 to complete construction of the Lonsdale Drive-In Wetlands project in Rhode Island; $200,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Town of Jonesborough, Washington County, Tennessee, project; $700,000 to continue construction of the Ely/Pucketts Creek project in Virginia; $100,000 for a Preliminary Restoration Plan for Lake Anna, Virginia; $200,000 to continue the Walla Walla River project in Washington; $112,000 for plans and specifications for the Lake Koshonong, Wisconsin, project; $50,000 each for the Pike River, Trinity Creek, and Wolf

River projects in Wisconsin; and $515,000 for the Cheat River Basin acid mine drainage project in West Virginia.

The Committee recognizes that innovative technologies can provide time and cost savings and encourages the use of the rapid dewatering system for the Stevenson Creek project in Florida.

Project Modifications for the Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135).—The Committee has provided $16,000,000 for the Section 1135 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $85,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Ditch 28 project in Arkansas; $85,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Horseshoe Lake, Arkansas, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Millwood, Grassy Lake, Arkansas, project; $2,000,000 to initiate construction of the Rillito/Swan Wetlands project in Pima County, Arizona; $300,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Sand Cove Park, Sacramento River, California, project; $1,000,000 to initiate construction of the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Illinois, second dispersal barrier; $50,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Indian Ridge Marsh project in Chicago, Illinois; $150,000 to complete the ecosystem restoration report and initiate plans and specifications for the Spunky Bottoms Ecosystem Restoration in Brown County, Illinois; $250,000 to complete the feasibility report and initiate plans and specifications for the Sand Creek Ecosystem Restoration project in Newton, Kansas; $500,000 to continue construction of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Plaquemine Lock, Louisiana, project; $50,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Houma Navigation Channel, Mile 12 to Mile 31.4, Louisiana, project; $200,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Broad Meadows Marsh, Quincy, Massachusetts, project; $50,000 for a feasibility study of restoration opportunities in Cohasset, Massachusetts; $200,000 to complete planning and design for the Nashua River, Fitchburg Urban Park, Massachusetts, project; $34,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Hennepin Marsh, Grosse Ile Township, Michigan, project; $50,000 for plans and specifications for the Duck Creek, Stoddard County, Missouri, project; $100,000 for a feasibility study of the Old Number 7 Chute, Missouri, project; $150,000 for the Kansas City Riverfront Habitat Restoration project in Missouri; $150,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Pecos River Restoration project in Chavez, New Mexico; $500,000 to initiate construction of the Whitney Point Lake, Broome County, New York, project; $200,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Northport, Huntington, New York, project; $25,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Times Beach, New York, project; $50,000 to continue the feasibility for the Conneaut Harbor, Ohio, project; $250,000 to continue the feasibility study for the East Harbor State Park project in Marblehead, Ohio; $50,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Sheldon's Marsh Nature Preserve project in Ohio; $125,000 to initiate construction of the Allin's Cove, Barrington, Rhode Island, project; $750,000 for construction of the Boyd's Marsh project in Portsmouth, Rhode island; $100,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Lower Obion River, Tennessee, project; $200,000 to complete the feasibility study of fish passage improvements on the

Walla Walla River in Washington; $80,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Lake Poygan, Wisconsin, project; and $533,000 for Sea Lamprey barriers at Black Mallard Creek, Michigan, Carp Lake River, Michigan, Kid's Creek, Michigan, Paw Paw River, Michigan, Schmidt Creek, Michigan, Conneaut Creek, Ohio, South Branch Galien River, Michigan, St. Marys River, Michigan, and Trail Creek, Indiana.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

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

Appropriation, 2003	$342,334,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	280,000,000
Recommended, 2004	301,054,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−41,280,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	+21,054,000

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

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
BAYOU METO, AR	---	500
SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	---	350
ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA	435	435
DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA	800	800
SPRING BAYOU, LA	500	500
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	185	185
FLETCHER CREEK, TN	120	120
GERMANTOWN, TN	51	61
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MEMPHIS, TN	---	200
MILLINGTON AND VICINITY, TN	84	84
MORGANZA TO THE GULF, LA	3,487	3,487
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	695	695
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	6,357	7,417
CONSTRUCTION		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	39,562	41,742
FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR	2,050	2,050
HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	2,180	1,680
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	42,919	45,939
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	2,365	5,985
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	7,768	7,768
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	14,075	14,075
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	3,200	3,200
ST. JOHNS BAYOU & NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	---	5,000
HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBUTARIES, MS & TN	---	200
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	890	890
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	205	205
YAZOO BASIN, UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	6,645	6,645
DELTA HEADWATERS PROJECT, MS (FORMERLY DEMONSTRATION E	---	5,000
NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS	2,618	3,018
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	---	100
WOLF RIVER (RESTORATION), TN	---	350
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	124,477	143,847
MAINTENANCE		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	69,688	69,688
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	370	370
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	466	466
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	6,340	11,690
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	7,505	7,505
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	2,400	2,400
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	1,290	1,290
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	50	50
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	35	35
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,450	2,450
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	13,335	13,335
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	15	15
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	85	85
BONNET CARRE, LA	1,975	1,975
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	550	550
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	2,207	2,207
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	910	910
OLD RIVER, LA	9,915	9,915
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	3,425	3,425
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	30	30
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	296	296
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	35	35

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
YAZOO BASIN:	(32,050)	(32,550)
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	6,300	6,300
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	170	670
ENID LAKE, MS	5,505	5,505
GREENWOOD, MS	650	650
GRENADA LAKE, MS	6,170	6,170
MAIN STEM, MS	1,480	1,480
SARDIS LAKE, MS	8,630	8,630
TRIBUTARIES, MS	1,135	1,135
WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	470	470
YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	730	730
YAZOO CITY, MS	810	810
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	167	167
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	4,265	5,765
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	101	101
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	1,010	1,010
MAPPING	1,235	1,235
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE	162,440	169,790
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-13,274	-20,000
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	280,000	301,054

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Southeast Arkansas, Arkansas.—The Committee has included $350,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the cost-shared feasibility study for the Southeast Arkansas, project to address flooding, agricultural water supply, and environmental problems and needs.

Germantown, Tennessee.—The bill includes $61,000 to complete the feasibility phase of the flood control study in Germantown, Tennessee.

Memphis Harbor, Memphis, Tennessee.—The bill includes $200,000 to continue the reformulation of the Memphis Harbor project.

CONSTRUCTION

Channel Improvement, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.—The Committee recognizes the critical need to provide navigation along the Mississippi river, and the efficiency in the construction of dikes for the reduction of dredging requirements. Therefore, the Committee has included $41,742,000 for the Channel Improvement program, including $80,000 for the Below Williams, Kentucky, dike; $500,000 for the Caruthersville-Linwood Bend, Missouri, dike; $200,000 for the Moore Island, Missouri, dike; and $1,400,000 for the Drivers Bar, Tennessee, dike.

Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.—The Committee recognizes the critical need of advancing much needed work in this project to ensure the integrity of the levee system and to protect people and property from flooding. Therefore the Committee has included $45,939,000 for Mississippi River Levees, including $500,000 for the initiation of Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, flowage easements; $450,000 to initiate St. Johns-New Madrid, Missouri, mitigation lands, box culverts, and levee closure; and $2,070,000 for Nash, Missouri, relief wells.

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee is aware of frequent and prolonged flooding along the uncompleted portions of the St. Francis Basin project. The bill includes $5,985,000 for this project, including $610,000 to continue 10 & 15 Mile Bayous, Arkansas, relocations; $400,000 to initiate construction on 10 & 15 Mile Channel improvement in Arkansas; $225,000 to construct Ditch 13 Channel Enlargement in Arkansas; $685,000 to complete construction on the Buffalo Island Outlet, Arkansas; $500,000 to initiate construction on Piggott Seepage, Item 1, Arkansas; $400,000 to construct Steele Bypass Weir, Missouri; and $800,000 to continue project engineering & design and supervision & administration.

Horn Lake Creek and Tributaries, Mississippi and Tennessee.—The bill includes $200,000 to continue the reevaluation phase of the Horn Lake Creek project.

Yazoo Basin Mississippi, Delta Headwaters Project, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the continuation of this project, formerly known as the Demonstration Erosion Control Program. The Committee continues to feel that this project offers great

value on the investment, and that its results represent some of the most effective seen in reduction of flood damages, decreased erosion and sedimentation, and improvements to the environment. The Committee once again urges the Administration to request adequate annual funding for this project until it is finished.

St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 to continue construction of the St. Johns Bayou-New Madrid Floodway in the vicinity of East Prairie, Missouri.

Nonconnah Creek, Tennessee and Mississippi.—The bill includes $3,018,000 for the Nonconnah Creek project. Additional funds are for the purpose of accelerating originally authorized work.

West Tennessee Tributaries, Tennessee.—The Committee has added $100,000 to initiate a reevaluation of an alternative demonstration project.

Wolf River, Memphis, Tennessee.—The bill includes $350,000 for continuation of the restoration work on this project.

MAINTENANCE

Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.—The Committee is aware of the backlog of critical maintenance items in this project and has included $11,690,000 in the bill. The additional funds include $750,000 to repair or replace culverts at Mound Creek, Illinois and New Madrid, Missouri; $500,000 to repair the Cairo, Missouri floodwall; $600,000 to provide gravel surfacing to selected levee-top roads in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana; $2,000,000 to provide levee crown surfaces in Louisiana, and $1,500,000 to repair the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, levee setback with lime injection.

Yazoo Basin, Big Sunflower River, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $670,000 for routine operation and maintenance and to continue preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on work to restore the project to design capacities.

Wappapello Lake, Missouri.—The bill includes $5,765,000 for Wappapello Lake, Missouri. Additional funds are for the continuation of road relocation work on Highway D.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 2003	$1,966,556,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	1,939,000,000
Recommended, 2004	1,932,575,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−33,981,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−6,425,000

Note: The FY 2003 amount includes $39,000,000 in emergency appropriations enacted in Public Law 108–11.

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	285	285
ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	2,961	2,961
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	2,000	2,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	22,100	22,100
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,000	5,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	50	50
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	5,429	5,429
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	19,040	22,540
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	5,726	5,726
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	100	100
TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	1,500	1,500
TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	21,500	21,500
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	6,892	6,892
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	2,969	2,969
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	3,259	3,259
CORDOVA HARBOR, AK	400	400
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	906	906
HOMER HARBOR, AK	370	370
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	41	41
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	239	239
NOME HARBOR, AK	285	285
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	533	533
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,563	1,563
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	87	87
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,498	1,498
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	35	35
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	184	184
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	4,297	4,297
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	6,126	6,126
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,751	1,751
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	5,180	5,180
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,319	5,319
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	7,103	7,103
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,567	1,567
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,131	1,131
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,531	1,531
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	6,391	6,391
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	25	25
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	192	192
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	29,493	29,493
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,503	1,503
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	5,559	5,559
NIMROD LAKE, AR	2,036	2,036
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,471	3,471
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	25	750
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	10,221	10,221
OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,917	3,917
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	6	6
WHITE RIVER, AR	200	1,200
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	15	126
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	2,269	2,269
BODEGA BAY, CA	---	900

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	2,526	2,526
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, VENTURA COUNTY, CA (DREDGING S	---	40
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,401	3,401
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,421	4,421
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	341	341
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	2,621	2,621
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	6,945	6,945
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,167	1,167
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,365	1,365
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	175	175
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	4,931	6,931
MARINA DEL REY (ENTRANCE CHANNEL), CA	---	100
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	280	280
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	282	282
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,460	1,460
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	---	900
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,789	2,789
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,697	1,697
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	6,785	6,785
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,160	1,160
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	---	1,000
PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	---	500
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,732	2,732
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,960	1,960
REDWOOD CITY, CA	---	500
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	6,250	6,250
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,106	2,106
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.	1,255	1,255
SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, CA	60	60
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,273	1,273
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (LTMS	---	2,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	2,189	2,189
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,092	2,092
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	2,065	2,065
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,815	3,815
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,905	1,905
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,447	1,447
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	2,132	2,132
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	5,172	5,172
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,818	1,818
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,910	2,910
YUBA RIVER, CA	66	66
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	282	282
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,690	1,690
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	839	839
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	92	92
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,338	2,338
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	292	292
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,441	1,441
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	343	343
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	459	459
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	252	252
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	857	857
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	81	81
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	406	406
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	330	330
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,303	1,303
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	353	353
THOMASTON DAM, CT	442	442
TREATMENT OF DREDGED MATERIAL FROM LONG ISLAND SOUND,	---	750

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	452	452
DELAWARE		
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	14,994	14,994
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	48	48
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	55	55
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	4,366	4,366
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	7	7
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL)	1,100	1,100
POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	---	320
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	35	35
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	50	50
FLORIDA		
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,800	3,800
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	13,005	13,005
ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	1,000	1,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	2,556	2,556
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	65	65
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	200	200
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	680	4,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	6,551	6,551
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	6,686	6,686
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	1,515	1,515
MIAMI RIVER, FL	5,850	5,850
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	4,316	4,316
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	1,916	1,916
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	500	500
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	1,500	1,500
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	1,255	1,255
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	1,000	1,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,400	3,400
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	3,985	3,985
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	6,000	6,000
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	1,500	5,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	178	178
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,993	3,993
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	9,100	9,100
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	10,012	10,012
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	13,964	13,964
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	41	41
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	11,747	11,747
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	7,746	7,746
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	12,540	12,540
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	154	154
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	6,600	6,900
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	176	176
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	191	191
MANELE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI	656	656
PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	90	90
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	485	485
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	2,202	2,202

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,271	2,271
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	72	72
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	2,167	2,167
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	394	394
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	3,985	3,985
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,410	4,410
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,319	2,319
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362	362
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	213	213
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	25,726	25,726
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,889	1,889
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	546	546
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,688	2,188
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	537	537
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,495	5,495
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	44,429	44,429
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	17,374	17,374
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	30	30
REND LAKE, IL	4,818	4,818
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	111	111
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	2,027	2,027
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	684	684
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	2,774	2,774
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	635	635
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	745	745
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	316	316
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	346	346
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	951	951
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	1,970	1,970
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,234	1,234
MONROE LAKE, IN	762	762
PATOKA LAKE, IN	687	687
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	55	55
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	681	681
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	115	115
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	3,037	3,037
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	190	190
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	157	157
MISSOURI RIVER - RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO	5,355	5,355
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE	2,260	2,260
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	3,438	3,438
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,663	3,663
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,223	4,223
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,857	1,857
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,760	1,840
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	939	939
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	650	650
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,385	1,385
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	759	759
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	2,025	2,100
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,269	1,269
MARION LAKE, KS	2,443	2,443
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,731	1,731
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,783	2,783

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	984	984
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,090	2,890
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,931	1,931
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	129	129
TORONTO LAKE, KS	464	464
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	1,839	1,839
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,377	1,377
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	8,902	8,902
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,484	2,484
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	35	35
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,394	1,394
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,448	1,448
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	819	819
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,636	1,636
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	25	480
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,681	1,681
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,241	1,241
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,205	1,205
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,359	2,359
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	97	97
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	17	17
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,572	1,572
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	583	583
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	92	92
NOLIN LAKE, KY	2,056	2,056
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	31,372	31,372
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH	4,560	4,560
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,030	1,030
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	6	6
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,848	2,848
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	981	981
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	10,670	10,670
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,082	1,082
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	19,367	19,367
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	286	286
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	864	864
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	133	133
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	31	31
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	165	165
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	35	35
BAYOU TECHE, LA	48	48
CADDO LAKE, LA	183	183
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	12,064	12,064
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,558	1,558
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	19,418	19,418
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	1,242	1,242
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	797	797
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	12,013	12,013
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	32	32
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	13	73
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,651	3,651
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,841	1,841
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	56,206	56,206
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	13,485	13,485
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80	80
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,000	2,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	312	312
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	7	7
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	37	37

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MAINE		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	17	17
KENNEBEC RIVER, ME	45	45
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,886	1,886
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
WELLS HARBOR, ME	50	50
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD & VA	68	68
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	18,416	18,416
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)	500	500
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSI	676	676
CHESTER RIVER, MD	930	930
CRISFIELD HARBOR, MD	---	30
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	165	165
DREDGING/SHOAL REMOVAL, ELK RIVER, CECIL COUNTY, MD	---	175
FISHING CREEK, MD	---	300
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	80	80
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	34	34
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,774	2,687
KNAPPS NARROWS, MD	651	651
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	960	960
PARISH CREEK, MD	---	80
POCOMOKE RIVER, MD	989	989
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	365	365
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	96	96
TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD	1,364	1,364
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	1,514	1,514
MASSACHUSETTS		
AUNT LYDIA'S COVE, CHATHAM, MA	300	300
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	486	486
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	450	450
BOSTON HARBOR, MA	3,000	3,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	447	447
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	7,772	7,772
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	227	227
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	171	171
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	301	301
GREEN HARBOR, MA	310	310
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	428	428
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	114	114
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	453	453
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	364	364
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	300	300
PLYMOUTH HARBOR & LONG BEACH DIKE, MA	---	100
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	1,316	1,316
TULLY LAKE, MA	412	412
WEST HILL DAM, MA	573	573
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	407	407
WEYMOUTH, FORE & TOWN RIVERS, MA	---	1,000
MICHIGAN		
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	20	80
BLACK RIVER, PORT HURON, MI	16	16
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	466	466
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	119	119
DETROIT RIVER, MI	3,458	3,458
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	3,112	3,112
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	810	810
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	618	618
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	153	153

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	428	428
LELAND HARBOR, MI	20	20
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	10	10
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	12	12
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	946	946
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	227	227
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	10	10
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	154	154
MONROE HARBOR, MI	138	138
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	21	21
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	473	473
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	45	170
PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI	20	20
PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	27	27
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	1,167	1,167
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	182	182
ROUGE RIVER, MI	177	177
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	2,001	2,251
SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	1,203	1,203
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	7	7
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,565	1,565
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	561	561
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	19,092	19,092
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,410	2,410
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	255	255
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	4,991	4,991
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	107	107
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	568	568
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	175	175
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	36,056	36,056
ORWELL LAKE, MN	1,045	1,045
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	67	67
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	99	99
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	4,196	5,196
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	273	273
MISSISSIPPI		
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	685	685
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	8	8
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	170	170
ENID LAKE, MS	682	682
GRENADA LAKE, MS	700	700
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,500	2,500
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	57	57
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	26	26
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,600	1,600
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	4,460	4,460
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	343	343
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	180	180
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	21	21
SARDIS LAKE, MS	545	545
YAZOO RIVER, MS	115	115
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	30	330
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	6,440	6,440
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	1,959	2,634
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	10,977	10,977
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	817	817
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	850	850
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	875	875

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	18,099	18,099
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	22	22
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,828	1,828
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	6	6
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	316	316
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,118	1,118
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MO	---	375
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	5,362	5,701
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	5,772	7,272
UNION LAKE, MO	10	10
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	234	234
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	5,413	5,413
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	12	12
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	1,453	1,453
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	87	87
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	8,422	8,422
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,486	1,486
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	122	122
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	350	350
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	564	564
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	708	708
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	43	43
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	552	552
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	288	288
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	461	461
COMPREHENSIVE UPLAND DREDGE DISPOSAL SITE EVALUATION,	---	250
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	481	481
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	500	500
HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	887	887
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	12	12
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	537	537
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	300	300
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	498	498
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,520	1,720
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	500	725
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	20	20
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	19,290	19,290
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,615	3,615
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	89	89
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	1,815	2,315
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	100	100
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	425	425
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	785	785
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	450	450
SANDY HOOK BAY AT LEONARD, NJ	70	70
SHARK RIVER, NJ	70	70
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,712	2,312
COCHITI LAKE, NM	2,569	2,569

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,560	1,560
GALISTEO DAM, NM	434	434
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	137	137
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	637	637
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,176	1,176
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	227	227
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	463	463
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	471	471
ARKPORT DAM, NY	275	275
BARCELONA HARBOR, NY	3	3
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	2,950	2,950
BROWNS CREEK, NY	80	80
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,263	1,263
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	300	300
CATTARAUGUS CREEK HARBOR, NY	5	5
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	305	305
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	140	140
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	500	500
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	2,350	2,350
FLUSHING BAY & CREEK, NY	---	2,000
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	100	100
GREAT SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	---	500
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	350	350
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	2,510	2,510
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	2,935	2,935
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	454	454
JAMAICA BAY, NY	140	140
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	2,000	2,000
MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	---	700
MORICHES INLET, NY	30	30
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	2,753	2,753
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	3,660	3,660
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	4,460	4,460
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	5,344	5,344
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSIT	750	750
OAK ORCHARD HARBOR, NY (POINT BREEZE)	---	200
OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	5	5
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY (MAINTENANCE DREDGING)	---	300
PLATTSBURGH HARBOR, NY	---	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,220	1,220
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	55	355
RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	150	150
SAG HARBOR, NY	100	100
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	416	516
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	774	774
STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	20	20
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	586	586
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	1,044	1,044
WILSON HARBOR, NY	3	3
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	831	3,831
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,993	1,993
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	400	400
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	866	866
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	803	803
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,088	1,088
FALLS LAKE, NC	2,113	2,113
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	33	33
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	1,017	1,017
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	6,390	6,390
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	50	50

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	12,917	12,917
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	839	839
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	665	665
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	219	219
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	75	75
ROANOKE RIVER, NC	178	178
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	2,853	2,853
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	6,906	6,906
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	163	163
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	12,664	12,764
HOMME LAKE, ND	921	921
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	68	68
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,944	1,944
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	461	461
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	113	113
SOURIS RIVER, ND	340	340
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	29	29
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	699	699
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,245	1,245
BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,690	1,690
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,490	1,490
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	888	888
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,235	3,235
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	579	579
COOLEY CANAL, OH	20	403
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	637	637
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	1,181	1,181
DILLON LAKE, OH	532	532
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	735	735
HURON HARBOR, OH	108	108
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	210	210
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	4,483	4,483
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25	25
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	793	793
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,176	1,176
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	7,799	9,399
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	185	185
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	788	788
PORT CLINTON HARBOR, OH	10	10
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	129	129
ROCKY RIVER, OH	3	3
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30	30
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	825	825
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	165	165
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	4,004	4,004
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	238	238
TOUSSAINT RIVER, OH	20	20
VERMILION HARBOR, OH	28	28
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	455	455
WEST HARBOR, OH	3	503
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	941	941
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	715	715
BIRCH LAKE, OK	482	482
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,684	1,684
CANDY LAKE, OK	20	20
CANTON LAKE, OK	2,302	2,302
COPAN LAKE, OK	707	707

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	5,889	5,889
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	6,463	6,463
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	846	846
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	514	514
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	612	612
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,638	1,638
HULAH LAKE, OK	1,230	1,230
KAW LAKE, OK	2,016	2,016
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	6,834	6,834
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,099	2,099
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	406	406
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	35	35
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	921	921
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,275	4,275
SARDIS LAKE, OK	1,096	1,096
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	387	387
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,353	1,353
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,217	3,217
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,241	1,241
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	6,551	6,551
WISTER LAKE, OK	948	948
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	666	666
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	261	261
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,849	4,849
CHETCO RIVER, OR	---	350
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	---	250
COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	16,674	18,274
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA	---	500
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	10,028	10,028
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	382	382
COOS BAY, OR	3,598	3,598
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	724	724
COUGAR LAKE, OR	3,577	3,577
DEPOE BAY (HARBOR WALL STABILIZATION), OR	---	350
DETROIT LAKE, OR	2,002	2,002
DORENA LAKE, OR	535	535
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	464	464
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	956	2,000
GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,545	2,545
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	4,895	4,895
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	161	161
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,038	4,038
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	2,027	2,027
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	5,154	5,154
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	5,484	5,484
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	200	200
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	60	60
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	---	100
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	134	134
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	---	500
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	---	350
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	259	459
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	58	58
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	599	599
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,228	1,228
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	4,596	4,596
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	712	712
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	254	254
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,095	1,095
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,810	2,810

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	962	962
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	3,118	3,118
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,369	1,369
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	743	743
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,057	1,057
ERIE HARBOR, PA	135	135
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	789	789
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	681	1,181
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	348	348
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	271	271
JOHNSTOWN, PA	997	2,497
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,437	1,437
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	885	885
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	820	820
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	15,158	15,858
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	22,504	22,504
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	488	488
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	21	21
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	455	455
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	17	17
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	5,674	6,074
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	57	57
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	1,360	1,360
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	1,829	1,829
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	385	385
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	79	79
TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	3,852	4,352
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,790	2,340
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	224	224
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	810	810
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	691	691
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	1,804	1,804
RHODE ISLAND		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	6	6
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	2,163	2,163
PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	21,000	21,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	269	269
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	9,740	9,740
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,380	3,380
FOLLY RIVER, SC	277	277
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	2,719	2,719
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	26	26
MURRELLS INLET, SC	45	45
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	229	229
TOWN CREEK, SC	419	419
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,715	6,715
CHEYENNE, RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX TRIBE,	---	2,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	238	238
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	192	192
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	6,873	6,873
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	21	21
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	907	907
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	410	410
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	13,768	13,768
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	48	48
TENNESSEE		

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	8,604	8,604
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,612	5,612
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	2,480	2,480
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,870	3,870
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	6,120	6,120
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	127	127
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,150	3,150
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	7,685	7,685
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	6	6
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	16,521	16,521
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	20	530
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	589	589
ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,262	1,262
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	659	659
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,598	1,598
BELTON LAKE, TX	3,299	4,613
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,038	2,038
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,413	2,413
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,770	2,770
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,650	6,650
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	8,500	8,500
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	3	3
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,660	2,660
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	4,500	4,500
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	4,676	4,676
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,568	1,568
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,596	2,596
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	21,329	21,329
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,223	1,223
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	13,539	13,539
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	256	256
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,141	1,141
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	626	626
LAKE KEMP, TX	487	487
LAVON LAKE, TX	3,312	3,312
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,124	3,124
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,690	4,690
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,597	1,597
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,711	1,711
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,419	1,419
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	794	994
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,683	1,683
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	50	50
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	689	1,460
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	8,849	8,849
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	5,618	5,618
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	190	190
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	3,323	3,323
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	2,487	2,800
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	100	100
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,946	2,871
WACO LAKE, TX	2,316	2,816
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	958	958
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	4,695	4,695
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	3,404	3,464
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	65	65
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	464	464
VERMONT		

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	651	651
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	42	42
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	50	50
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	582	582
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	621	621
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	595	595
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	545	545
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	---	150
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA	1,991	1,991
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA	1,033	1,033
BONUM CREEK, VA	705	705
CAPE CHARLES CITY HARBOR, VA	25	25
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	915	915
DEEP CREEK, NEWPORT NEWS, VA	---	500
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,756	1,756
HAMPTON CREEK, VA	733	733
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	1,200	1,200
HOSKINS CREEK, VA	1,479	1,479
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	111	111
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,107	3,107
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	10,839	10,839
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,341	1,341
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	200	200
MONROE BAY AND CREEK, VA	422	422
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	7,115	7,115
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS	200	200
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	343	343
OYSTER CHANNEL, VA	310	310
PAGAN RIVER, VA	---	400
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	3,854	3,854
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	750	750
QUINBY CREEK, VA	40	40
RUDEE INLET, VA	1,180	1,180
TYLER'S BEACH DREDGING PROJECT	---	100
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,285	1,785
YORK RIVER, VA	1,585	1,585
WASHINGTON		
BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	50	50
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	711	711
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK & THE HEAD OF SAND ISLA	---	500
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,579	1,579
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	8,377	9,377
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	2,050	2,050
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	7,770	7,770
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	295	295
LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR), WA	7	7
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,262	6,262
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,342	1,342
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,074	2,074
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,004	2,004
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	1,196	1,196
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	263	263
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	2,931	2,931
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	347	347
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	961	961
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	472	472
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	985	985
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	254	254
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	62	62
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	520	520
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	115	115

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	3,278	3,278
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	510	510
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,061	1,061
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,074	1,074
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,446	1,446
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,609	1,609
ELKINS, WV	18	18
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	106	106
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	7,655	7,655
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	24,270	24,270
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,366	2,366
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,457	1,607
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	836	836
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,469	1,469
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,785	3,910
TYGART LAKE, WV	4,195	4,195
WISCONSIN		
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	1,599	1,599
FOX RIVER, WI	3,929	3,929
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	3,492	3,492
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	47	47
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	178	178
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	120	120
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	63	63
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	781	781
PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI	170	170
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	96	96
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	991	991
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	317	317
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	472	472
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	1,200	1,200
WYOMING		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	11	11
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,217	1,217
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	86	86
MISCELLANEOUS		
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	725	725
AUTOMATED BUDGET SYSTEM (ABS)	285	285
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,750	3,050
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 PROGRAM	1,545	1,545
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	300	300
FACILITY PROTECTION	13,000	13,000
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS	1,000	1,500
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	675	675
HYDROPOWER MAINTENANCE	---	-49,000
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	4,120	4,120
LONG TERM OPTION ASSESSMENT FOR LOW USE NAVIGATION	1,000	---
MONITORING OF COMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,750	1,750
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	45	45
NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM	30	30
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP)	6,000	6,000
NATIONAL LEWIS AND CLARK COMMEMORATION COORDINATOR	310	310
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	815	815

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN 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).....	725	725
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS.....	4,745	4,745
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-13,491	-36,244
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.....	1,939,000	1,932,575

Mobile Harbor, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,500,000 to continue the environmental restoration project at Garrows Bend.

Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California.—The bill includes $6,931,000 for operation and maintenance of the Los Angeles County Drainage Area project, including $2,000,000 to support Corps of Engineers assistance in local activities to revitalize the project areas for public safety, environmental restoration, recreation, aesthetics, community improvement, and related purposes.

Pillar Point Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for 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 evaluation of the effects of mercury in wetland restoration projects using dredged material and preparation of the Regional Dredged Material Management Plan and accompanying National Environmental Policy Act documentation.

Treatment of Dredged Material from Long Island Sound, Connecticut.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the demonstration program for the use of innovative technologies for the treatment of dredged materials at Bridgeport, Connecticut, in Long Island Sound.

Potomac River Below Washington, District of Columbia.—The Committee has provided $320,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue investigations of alternatives for placement of dredged material including upland placement sites and beneficial uses of dredged material.

Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for operation and maintenance activities, including $3,500,000 for annual dredging of the river system.

West Point Dam and Lake, Georgia and Alabama.—The Committee has provided $6,900,000 for the West Point Dam and Lake, Georgia and Alabama, project. The additional funds will enable the Corps of Engineers to accomplish maintenance dredging of access channels and at recreational boat launch areas at the project in Troup County, Georgia.

Illinois Waterway (MVR portion), Illinois and Indiana.—The bill includes $25,726,000 for operation and maintenance of the Rock Island District portion of the Illinois Waterway, Illinois and Indiana, including $1,000,000 for the Sangamon River (Beardstown) Sediment Trap.

Kaskaskia River Navigation, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $2,188,000 for the Kaskaskia River Navigation, Illinois, project, including $500,000 for lock maintenance and maintenance dredging.

Council Grove Lake, Kansas.—The Committee is aware that the Council Grove reservoir is flooding privately owned land at several sites and that a beneficial land exchange with the owner has been proposed. The Committee has provided $1,840,000 for the Council Grove Lake, Kansas, project, including $80,000 for administrative and environmental costs associated with the land exchange or land transfer.

John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Kansas.—The bill includes $2,100,000 for the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Kansas, including $75,000 to complete the reallocation study of raising the conservation pool at the project.

Perry Lake, Kansas.—The Committee has provided an additional $800,000 for the completion of repairs to the four flood control gates at Perry Lake, Kansas.

Atchafalaya River, Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $19,367,000 operation and maintenance of the Atchafalaya River, Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black, Louisiana project. For the past two years, the Committee has included report language directing the Corps to "make the safe transit of this waterway a priority", however, the "fluff" issue remains and the Corps has failed to maintain the authorized depth. The Committee directs the Corps to utilize these funds to ensure the proper depth is maintained for access to the Port of Morgan City and other facilities throughout this fiscal year.

Mermentau River, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $3,651,000 for the Mermentau River, Louisiana navigation project, including $1,000,000 for dredging between Grand Cheniere and the Gulf of Mexico.

Jennings Randolph Lake, Maryland and West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $2,687,000 for Jennings Randolph Lake, including $913,000 for repair of the West Virginia access road and repair of the West Virginia outlet tunnel.

Parish Creek, Maryland.—The Committee has provided $80,000 to initiate engineering and design for maintenance dredging of the Parish Creek, Maryland, navigation project.

Reservoirs at Headwaters of Mississippi River, Minnesota.—The Committee has provided $5,196,000 for Reservoirs at Headwaters of Mississippi River, Minnesota, including $750,000 to continue the Reservoir Operating Plan Evaluation and $250,000 to continue rehabilitation of the stop log system at Winnibigoshish Dam.

Clearwater Lake, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $2,634,000 for Clearwater Lake Missouri, including $675,000 to prepare a new Water Control Plan for this reservoir project.

Stockton Lake, Missouri.—The bill provides an additional $339,000 for continued investigations of the pre-historic Big Eddy archeological site at Stockton Lake, Missouri.

Table Rock Lake, Missouri.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,500,000 to modernize boat launch facilities and day use areas at Cape Fair and Campbell Point Parks.

Comprehensive Upland Dredged Material Disposal Site Evaluation, New Hampshire.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for a study to identify and evaluate upland disposal sites for dredged material from Federal navigation channels in New Hampshire.

Albiquiu Dam, New Mexico.—The bill includes $2,312,000 for Albiquiu Dam, New Mexico, including $600,000 to address safety issues associated with bank stabilization at the dam.

Oak Orchard Harbor, New York.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for maintenance dredging at Oak Orchard Harbor (Point Breeze), New York.

Plattsburgh Harbor, New York.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate repair

of the remaining deteriorated segments of the breakwater in Lake Champlain, Plattsburgh, New York.

Rochester Harbor, New York.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 for maintenance dredging of the Rochester Harbor, New York project to improve access to Coast Guard facilities, and for other commercial users on the Genesee River.

Shinnecock Inlet, New York.—The Committee has provided $1,216,000 for the Shinnecock Inlet, New York, project. This includes funding to complete repairs to the western jetty and an additional $800,000 to initiate maintenance dredging of the navigation inlet.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,000,000 to accomplish maintenance dredging on the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, North Carolina, from the Neuse River to the South Carolina State line.

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

Muskingum River Lakes, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $9,399,000 for the operation and maintenance at all Muskingum River Lakes projects, including $1,600,000 to correct the seepage problem at the Magnolia Levee at Bolivar Dam to ensure the project's safety.

Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Washington, and Portland, Oregon.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,600,000 to complete the rehabilitation of the breakwater at the East Astoria Boat Basin.

Depoe Bay, Oregon.—The Committee has provided $350,000 to continue repair and stabilization of the harbor seawall and local landslide at Depoe Bay, Oregon.

Siuslaw River, Oregon.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to continue monitoring of the north and south jetties and to continue to study alternatives to repair these damaged structures.

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon.—The bill includes an additional $500,000 to initiate repair and restoration of the jetties at the Tillamook Bay and Bar project.

Francis E Walter Dam, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $1,181,000 for the operation and maintenance of Francis E Walter Dam, including $500,000 to continue relocation of the access road to improve safety and provide permanent access to vehicles.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $2,497,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the major rehabilitation of the Johnstown, Pennsylvania, local flood protection project.

Monongahela River, PA.—The bill includes $700,000 for additional maintenance at the Hildebrand, Morgantown, and Opekiska locks on the Monongahela River.

Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $6,074,000 for operation and maintenance of Raystown Lake, including $400,000 to install a data automation system.

Tioga-Hammond Lakes, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $4,352,000 for operation and maintenance of Tioga-Hammond Lakes, including $500,000 to complete engineering and design and initiate construction of a new access road to the Lambs Creek Recreation Area.

Tionesta Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $550,000 to complete campground and facility upgrades at Tionesta Lake, Pennsylvania.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and State of South Dakota Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the State and Tribes for approved cultural resource investigations and stewardship plans.

Belton Lake, Texas.—The Committee has provided $4,613,000 for operation and maintenance of the Belton Lake, Texas, project including $1,314,000 to refurbish and improve facilities at White Flint Park and for other backlog maintenance.

Town Bluff Dam, B.A. Steinhagen Lake, Texas.—The Committee has provided an additional $925,000 to modernize and renovate recreation facilities at Camper's Cove Park and to modernize and renovate recreation facilities and reduce shoreline erosion to protect existing recreation facilities at Sandy Creek Park.

Wright Patman Dam and Lake, Texas.—The bill includes $3,464,000 for scheduled operation and maintenance at Wright Patman Dam and Lake, Texas, including $60,000 to determine the feasibility of a second marina.

Appomattox River, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for an assessment of the suitability of the proposed dredged material placement site for the Appomattox River, Virginia, navigation channel.

Deep Creek, Newport News, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for maintenance dredging to remove hazardous shoals along the waterway.

Pagan River, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for preparation of plans and specifications to remove hazardous shoals along the waterway.

Tyler's Beach, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for an assessment of the suitability of the dredged material placement site.

Waterway on the Coast of Virginia, Virginia.—The bill includes $1,785,000 for continued maintenance dredging of the Waterway on the Coast of Virginia project, including $500,000 to remove additional shoals in the waterway.

Columbia River between Chinook and the Head of Sand Island, Washington.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for maintenance dredging for the Columbia River between Chinook and the Head of Sand Island, Washington.

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington.—The bill includes $9,377,000 for operation and maintenance of the Grays Harbor and Chehalis project in Washington, including $1,000,000 to further protect against breaching at the South Jetty near Half Moon Bay.

R. D. Bailey Lake, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided an additional $150,000 to relocate a permanent trash boom and construct a drift and debris staging area.

Coastal Inlet Research Program.—The Committee has provided $3,050,000 for the Coastal Inlet Research Program, including $300,000 to continue the development of applied hydrodynamic and sediment transport change models for existing navigation projects. Specifically, the Corps Engineering Research Development Center-

Coastal and Hydraulics Laboratory will use this additional funding to work with the Corps Portland District to apply these models to the Grays Harbor Navigation Study and identify operations and maintenance changes to reduce annual maintenance dredging costs. The Committee recognizes that high quality data of tidal inlet processes and the associated response are essential to development of these models and will maximize their utility for Corps navigation projects nationwide.

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 Waterway Navigation Charts.—The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to continue upgrades and conversions of electronic navigation charting for important secondary waterways in our nation's inland navigation system, such as the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, and related waterways, and the Illinois, Cumberland and Arkansas Rivers.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2003	$138,096,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	144,000,000
Recommended, 2004	144,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+5,904,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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 2004, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $144,000,000, the same as the budget request and $5,904,000 more than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003.

St. Charles Parish, Louisiana.—The Committee is aware of a reported lack of enforcement actions taken by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for barge fleeting permit violators in the vicinity of St. Charles Parish, Louisiana, and directs the Corps to immediately ensure barge fleeting activities in the vicinity of St. Charles Parish are consistent with permitted activities. Within 90 days from the enactment of this legislation, the Corps shall provide a report to the committee on enforcement actions taken in the most recent fiscal year for which complete data is available.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2003	$144,057,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	140,000,000
Recommended, 2004	140,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−4,057,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	

The Committee recommendation for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) is $140,000,000, the same as the budget request and $4,057,000 below fiscal year 2003 funding. 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, 2003	$14,902,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	70,000,000
Recommended, 2004	40,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+25,098,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−30,000,000

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

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee has recommended $40,000,000, $25,089,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003 and $40,000,000 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 continues to encourage the Corps of Engineers to invest in the Rapid Deployment Flood Wall

technology to evaluate the improvement in flood fighting that could be achieved through the use of this technology.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2003	$154,143,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	171,000,000
Recommended, 2004	164,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+9,857,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−7,000,000

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 $164,000,000, $7,000,000 below the budget request and $9,857,000 above the fiscal year 2003 amount.

The Committee is concerned that the budget request included $7,000,000 for an audit of the Corps of Engineers, and has not included the requested funds in the bill. The requirement that the Corps of Engineers be audited on an annual basis is not new; only the requirement that the audit be done be accomplished by expensive private-sector practitioners at a cost to the taxpayer of millions of dollars is new. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to continue to produce the same audit-ready reports as in previous years, and urges the Secretary of the Army to make every reasonable effort to arrive at a suitable arrangement for having the Corps audited by government auditors.

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.

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.

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 Administra-

tion 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 prohibiting the expenditure of funds related to a proposed landfill in Tuscarawas County, Ohio.

Sec. 103. The Committee has included language prohibiting the expenditure of funds related to a proposed landfill in Stark County, Ohio.

Sec. 104. The Committee has included language renaming Lock and Dam 3 on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2003	$35,992,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	44,191,000
Recommended, 2004	38,191,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+2,199,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−6,000,000

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 $39,191,000, $6,000,000 below the budget request and $2,199,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003.

Section 402(b)(3)(B) of the Central Utah Project Completion Act directed that the Secretary of Energy, out of funds appropriated to the Western Area Power Administration, contribute funds annually to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Fund. The amount to be contributed is currently $6,000,000. On May 9, 2003, the Administration submitted a budget amendment proposing to transfer that responsibility to the Secretary of the Interior and requesting an additional $6,000,000 in this account for that purpose. The Committee believes that this matter should be addressed by the appropriate authorizing committee and has not, therefore, included the proposed amendment to the Central Utah Project Completion Act. The Committee has also not included the additional funds requested by the Administration.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

In May of this year, the Secretary of the Interior announced a new initiative—Water 2025: Preventing Water Crises and Conflict in the West. The fiscal year 2004 budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation includes $11,000,000 to initiate this effort, the pur-

pose of which is to prevent water supply problems from reaching the crisis stage.

The Committee supports this effort and has provided the funds requested by the Administration. However, the Committee is troubled by other actions taken in the fiscal year 2004 budget request that seem to contradict the goals of the Water 2025 program.

One of the ways the Department proposes to meet the challenge of inadequate water supplies is through improved technology. The Department states, "Wastewater, salty and other impaired water can be purified to increase their utility." In fact, while additional research in this area is important, the technology already exists to make use of wastewater and other impaired waters. Title 16 of Public Law 102–575 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to "to undertake a program to investigate and identify opportunities for reclamation and reuse of municipal, industrial, domestic, and agricultural wastewater, and naturally impaired ground and surface waters, for the design and construction of demonstration and permanent facilities to reclaim and reuse wastewater, and to conduct research, including desalting, for the reclamation of wastewater and naturally impaired ground and surface waters." Under this program, 25 individual water reclamation and reuse projects have been authorized for construction. These projects directly accomplish the goals of the Water 2025 program by developing new sources of usable water through the use of state-of-the-art technology. In addition, the overwhelming majority of the cost of these projects is borne by local interests. However, for some reason, the Administration has determined that continued funding for these projects is not a high priority. For fiscal year 2004, the Administration has requested $12,680,000 for water reclamation and reuse projects, $17,770,000 below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003 in spite of the fact that the Administration recognizes that "these water reuse and recycling projects help expand water supplies in areas that routinely face severe water shortages, and are especially important in helping to shift California from its dependence on Colorado River water." While obviously not the solution to all of the water problems in the West, these projects make an important contribution, and the Committee urges the Administration to reconsider its lack of support for this program.

The Committee is also very troubled by the by the lack of funding requested for rural water supply projects. The purpose of the Water 2025 program is to address water supply problems before they reach the crisis stage; however, there are areas of the west, particularly in the upper Great Plains, where a crisis already exists because of the poor quality of available groundwater supplies. As the Department of the Interior has stated, "In some rural communities and Indian reservations, this salty groundwater is unusable for human consumption, limiting growth and prosperity." In fact, the poor quality groundwater does more than limit growth and prosperity, it causes significant health problems. To address this problem, the Congress has authorized Federal participation in a number of projects that will replace impaired groundwater with clean surface water supplies from a variety of sources. Some of these projects have been under construction for a number of years. The Committee is particularly concerned that the Administration's

budget request would essentially halt construction on those projects, resulting in increased costs, and more importantly, forcing people to continue to drink unhealthy water. Accordingly, the Committee has provided funds to allow ongoing projects to continue and urges the Administration to do the same in future budget requests.

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriation, 2003	$833,203,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	771,217,000
Recommended, 2004	817,913,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−15,290,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	+46,696,000

NOTE: The fiscal year 2003 amount includes $25,000,000 in supplemental appropriations enacted in Public Law 108–11.

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

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES				
ARIZONA				
AK CHIN INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT....	---	5,743	---	5,743
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER BASIN.....	34,009	78	34,009	78
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I	751	10,499	751	10,499
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM.....	3,500	---	4,500	---
FORT MCDOWELL SETTLEMENT ACT.....	1,000	---	1,000	---
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	325	---	325	---
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE PROJ...	250	---	250	---
SALT RIVER PROJECT.....	87	---	87	---
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJ.....	4,017	---	4,017	---
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	775	---	775	---
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION.....	630	---	630	---
YUMA AREA PROJECTS.....	1,552	21,120	1,552	21,120
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA PROJECT.....	751	665	751	665
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMS.....	215	---	215	---
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJECT..	700	---	1,400	---
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION.....	1,966	7,033	1,966	7,033
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.....	9,899	100	9,899	100

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
DELTA DIVISION	10,039	6,041	11,439	6,041
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,465	2,450	1,465	2,450
FRIANT DIVISION	2,393	3,782	4,393	3,782
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	13,284	1,087	18,684	1,087
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, & EXTRAORDINARY MAINT	---	24,000	---	14,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	4,215	1,808	8,115	1,808
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	745	---	745	---
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	383	---	383	---
SHASTA DIVISION	831	7,134	831	7,134
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	7,616	2,970	7,616	2,970
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	1,800	11,076	1,800	11,076
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	40,437	6,538	7,437	6,538
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	1,000	---	1,000	---
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	200	---	200	---
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	1,100	---	1,800	---
LONG BEACH DESALINATION RESEARCH/ DEVELOPMENT PROJ	---	---	700	---
NAPA-SOMOMA-MARIN AGRICULTURAL REUSE PROJECT	---	---	500	---
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	1,300	---	4,000	---
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WTR RECLAMATION PROJ, PHS 1	1,300	---	4,000	---
ORLAND PROJECT	41	445	41	445
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	1,000	---	5,500	---
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	4,300	---	4,300	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	1,300	---	1,300	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION PROJECT	---	---	10,000	---
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	1,000	---	4,000	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
SANTA MARGARITA RIVER CONJUNCTIVE USE PROJECT	---	---	500	---
SOLANO PROJECT	1,522	2,693	1,522	2,693
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	1,135	---	2,235	---
WATSONVILLE AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	---	---	2,000	---
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT	529	---	529	---
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP SECTIONS 5 & 8	58,000	---	58,000	---
COLLBRAN PROJECT	184	1,513	184	1,513
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	12	10,198	12	10,198
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT - HORSETOOTH DAM	---	3,153	---	3,153
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	77	---	77	---
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	206	546	206	546
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	52	2,050	52	2,050
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	69	145	69	145
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	---	5,443	---	5,443
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY	593	1,838	593	1,838
MANCOS PROJECT	88	57	88	57
PINE RIVER PROJECT	141	113	141	113
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT	356	4,237	356	4,237
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	181	124	181	124

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	2,637	4,047	2,907	4,047
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	19,000	---	15,000	---
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE	200	---	200	---
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	580	---	580	---
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,459	2,041	3,459	2,041
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT PROJECT	200	---	200	---
KANSAS				
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	143	---	143	---
WICHITA PROJECT	7	208	7	208
MONTANA				
FORT PECK DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	---	---	4,000	---
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	---	1,056	---	1,056
MILK RIVER PROJECT	1,045	558	1,045	558
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	533	---	533	---
NORTH CENTRAL MONTANA RURAL WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM	---	---	915	---
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	---	58	---	58

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	191	---	191	---
SANTEE SIOUX RESERVATION WATER SYSTEM	---	---	500	---
NEW MEXICO				
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER & RECLAMATION REUSE	---	---	1,360	---
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,036	1,056	2,036	1,056
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	6,467	10,921	6,467	10,921
NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	300	---	300	---
NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	391	---	500	---
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	---	127	---	127
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	796	3,186	796	3,186
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	179	---	179	---
SANTA FE-WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	---	---	500	---
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	104	4	104	4
NEVADA				
CITY ON NORTH LAS VEGAS WATER REUSE	---	---	1,000	---
HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY	100	---	---	---
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT (HUMBOLT, NEWLANDS, WASHOE)	6,467	2,446	6,467	2,446
LAKE MEAD /LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	1,408	---	1,408	---
SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	---	---	1,000	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
NORTH DAKOTA				
DAKOTAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	223	---	223	---
DAKOTAS TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	326	---	326	---
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM, GARRISON DIVERSION	13,928	3,386	17,000	3,386
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	---	205	---	205
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	---	460	---	460
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	---	267	---	267
NORMAN PROJECT	250	176	250	176
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	188	---	888	---
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	---	314	---	314
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	---	887	---	887
OREGON				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	212	465	212	465
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	500	---	1,000	---
DESCHUTES PROJECT	418	155	418	155
DESCHUTES PROJECT, TUMALO, BEND FEED CANAL	---	---	625	---
DESCHUTES PROJECT, WICKIUP DAM	---	3,000	---	3,000
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	781	280	781	280
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	100	---	100	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
KLAMATH PROJECT	20,041	776	23,541	3,376
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	620	---	620	---
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	554	172	554	172
TUALATIN PROJECT	287	127	287	127
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	200	---	200	---
UMATILLA PROJECT	601	2,101	601	2,101
SOUTH DAKOTA				
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	2,000	15	12,000	15
MNI WICONI PROJECT	6,717	6,254	20,000	6,254
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM	---	28	---	28
TEXAS				
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	---	117	---	117
EL PASO WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	---	---	370	---
LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES	---	---	3,000	---
NUECES RIVER	---	536	---	536
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	---	276	---	276
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	202	---	202	---
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT	128	62	128	62

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
MOON LAKE PROJECT	45	15	45	15
NEWTON PROJECT	61	24	61	24
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	280	---	280	---
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	373	40	373	40
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	843	355	843	355
SCOFIELD PROJECT	121	66	121	66
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	300	---	300	---
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	198	7	198	7
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,650	431	1,650	431
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	87	63	87	63
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	4,547	4,435	4,547	4,435
LOWER ELWHA KLALLAM WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	25	---	---	---
MAKAH INDIAN COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY	25	---	---	---
STORAGE DAM FISH PASSAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY	550	---	---	---
TULALIP TRIBES WATER QUALITY FEASIBILITY STUDY	50	---	---	---
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	525	---	525	---
YAKIMA PROJECT	1,179	6,066	1,179	6,066
YAKIMA PROJECT, KEECHELUS DAM, SOD	---	3,700	---	3,700
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	12,730	---	12,730	---
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER STORAGE	---	---	2,000	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT	6	4,048	6	4,048
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	10	1,038	10	1,038
SHOSHONE PROJECT	10	1,193	10	1,193
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I	9,198	---	9,198	---
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, (CRSP), SECTION 5	7,553	2,469	7,553	2,469
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8	4,914	---	4,914	---
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	450	---	450	---
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,700	---	1,700
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	---	40,900	---	40,900
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	---	18,000	---	18,000
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	---	500	---	500
DEPARTMENTAL IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	2,623	---	3,373	---
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE	1,120	---	3,120	---
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	3,265	---	3,515	---
EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	---	450	---	450
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	13,371	---	12,371	---
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,804	---	1,804	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,483	---	1,483	---
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	---	5,521	---	5,521

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,575	---	1,575
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	1,989	---	1,989	---
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	8,994	---	8,994	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	13,822	---	13,822	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	325	---	525	---
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	---	639	---	639
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	8,600	---	8,600	---
NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,571	---	1,571	---
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	344	1,029	344	1,029
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM, OTHER PROJECTS	2,998	34,709	2,998	34,709
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	991	250	991	250
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	565	---	565	---
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	4,491	---	4,491	---
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT	2,800	---	2,800	---
RECREATION AND FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMIN	1,720	---	1,720	---
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM:				
ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT DESALINATION PROGRAM	2,000	---	2,000	---
APPLIED SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT	4,190	---	5,190	---
DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	775	---	775	---
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION/ENHANCE	990	---	990	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	350	---	350	---
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,000	---	1,000	---
SITE SECURITY	---	28,583	---	28,583
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION	267	---	267	---
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	1,908	---	1,908	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
TITLE XVI, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM.....	1,430	---	3,930	---
WATER MANAGEMENT & CONSERVATION PROGRAM.....	6,639	---	6,639	---
WESTERN WATER INITIATIVE.....	11,000	---	11,000	---
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT.....	---	---	1,500	---
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIP DELAYS.....	-40,030	---	-44,888	---
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES.....	422,965	348,252	477,061	340,852

Central Arizona Project, Arizona.—The Committee is aware that under the proposed Gila River Indian Community Water Rights Settlement, the Federal government has agreed to forgo over $158 million in debt to agricultural subcontractors who voluntarily relinquish their long-term Central Arizona Project water contracts. The Committee believes that pending the enactment of the legislation to enact the settlement, those contractors should not be forced to repay that debt. As the bill moves through the appropriations process, the Committee will consider adding language to the bill which permits the Secretary of the Interior to extend, on an annual schedule, the repayment schedules for that debt.

Colorado River Front Work and Levee System, Arizona and California.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue planning and design of regulating reservoirs near the All-American Canal.

Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title I, Arizona.—The Committee is concerned that the Bureau of Reclamation is having to make excess releases of more than 100,000 acre-feet of water per year from storage in Colorado River reservoirs in order to meet the delivery requirements of the 1944 Treaty with Mexico. This is due to not counting Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District drainage flows that are bypassed to the Cienega de Santa Clara as part of the 1.5 million acre-feet required to satisfy the Treaty. This loss of water has become particularly acute due to the drought in the Colorado River Basin. The loss of more than 100,000 acre-feet per year robs all seven basin states of badly needed water.

Title I of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act identified construction and operation of the Yuma Desalting Plant as the solution to the agreement between the United States and Mexico preferred by all the parties. However, except for a six-month test period beginning in late 1992 when the plant was operated at one-third capacity, the plant has not been operated and has been maintained in a ready reserve status. The test operation identified a number of design deficiencies that need to be corrected in order for the plant to be placed in operation. In addition, certain environmental compliance activities would need to be undertaken before the plant can be operated. The Bureau of Reclamation currently estimates that one-third operation could be accomplished in 24 to 30 months and full operation could be accomplished in 60 months. The Committee believes the ability to operate the plant is critical and, therefore, directs the Bureau of Reclamation to expedite its modifications of the plant to accomplish state of the art operation, and accelerate the permitting and environmental compliance activities needed for operation of the plant. The Bureau of Reclamation is directed to report to the Committee on the status of those activities by December 31, 2003.

The artificial environmental conditions of the Cienega de Santa Clara are an inadvertent environmental benefit of the facilities constructed pursuant to Title I of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act. As noted above, delivery of water to the Cienega is not currently counted as the delivery of water under the Treaty. Using funds provided for this project, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to work with the United States Section of the Inter-

national Boundary and Water Commission, in consultation with the seven Basin states, to identify alternatives for operation of the Yuma Desalting Plant recognizing the need to maintain the unique ecology of the Cienega, including the capability of Mexico to maintain the Cienega with its share of Treaty waters. The Bureau of Reclamation should submit a joint report with the United States Section on the results of those investigations to the Committee on Appropriations by April 1, 2004.

Tres Rios Wetlands Demonstration, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $630,000 for the Tres Rios Wetlands Demonstration project in Arizona, the same as the budget request. The Committee believes that the data being generated by this program is essential to support construction of the Tres Rios environmental restoration project being undertaken by the Corps of Engineers, and directs the Bureau of Reclamation to continue its research and development activities at this project beyond fiscal year 2004.

Central Valley Project, American River Division, California.—The Committee is aware that there is a need to construct a temperature control device on the El Dorado Irrigation District water intake at Folsom Dam in California and that legislation has been introduced to provide the necessary increase in the authorized funding level that is needed for the project to be completed. Should the authorization be enacted, the Committee will consider funding for this project as the bill moves through the appropriations process. The Committee is also aware that legislation has been introduced to authorize the construction of a parallel water supply line from Folsom Dam to serve the City of Roseville and the San Juan Water District. The Committee will also consider providing funding for this project as the bill moves through the appropriations process.

Central Valley Project, Delta Division, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,400,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue work on the Delta Mendota Canal-California Aqueduct Intertie project.

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

Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs, California.—The bill includes an additional $400,000 to continue the Kaweah River Delta Corridor Enhancement study. The Committee has also provided an additional $5,000,000 for the continuation of work on the Natomas Mutual Water Company, Reclamation District 108, and Sutter Mutual Water Company fish screen projects.

Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, California.—Within the amount provided for the Sacramento River Division, $400,000 is to continue the Colusa Basin Integrated Resources Management Plan.

The Committee has also provided $2,422,000 for the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District fish passage improvement project, including an additional $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to reimburse the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District for costs incurred by the District in excess of its non-Federal cost-sharing requirement.

In addition, the Committee has provided $1,500,000 for the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District (GCID) and the Tehana-Colusa

Canal Authority to continue to carry out, in coordination with the Bureau of Reclamation, detailed, site specific environmental assessment and permitting work with respect to Sites Reservoir, including 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.

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

Long Beach Water Reclamation Project, California.—The Committee has provided $700,000 to continue work on the Alamitos Barrier Reclaimed Water Project unit of the Long Beach Water Reclamation Project.

Salton Sea Research Project, California.—The bill includes $5,500,000 for the Salton Sea Research Project, including $1,000,000 to continue environmental restoration efforts at the New and Alamo Rivers, $1,000,000 to continue the Imperial Valley groundwater assessment in cooperation with the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and $2,500,000 for additional work needed to prepare for the construction of pilot desalination demonstration facilities.

San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund, California.—The bill includes language which provides that $10,000,000 of the funds appropriated for Water and Related Resources shall be deposited in the San Gabriel Basin 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.

Santa Margarita Conjunctive Use Project, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Santa Margarita Conjunctive Use Project, which will provide additional water supplies to Camp Pendleton, and the Fallbrook Public Utilities District.

Southern California Investigations Program, California.—The Committee has provided $2,235,000 for the Southern California Investigations Program, including $500,000 to continue the Chino Basin Conjunctive Use Project, and an additional $600,000 for the Los Angeles Basin Watershed Water Supply Augmentation study.

Boise Area Projects, Idaho.—The Committee has provided an additional $270,000 to offset costs associated with water service contract renewals from Lucky Peak Reservoir in Idaho. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to not seek reimbursement of these funds from water users.

Columbia and Snake Rivers Salmon Recovery Project, Idaho.—The budget request includes $19,000,000 for the Columbia and Snake Rivers Salmon Recovery Project. Of the total requested, $4,000,000 is for construction activities that require additional authorization. The Committee has not provided those funds.

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.

Fort Peck Dry Prairie Rural Water System, Montana.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Fort Peck Dry Prairie Rural Water System project in Montana. These funds will permit the completion of the pipeline which will bring treated water from Culbertson to Medicine Lake, where the existing treatment plant is inoperable.

North Central Montana Rural Water Supply System, Montana.—The bill includes $915,000 for the completion of the Final Engineering Report, Environmental Assessment, and Water Conservation Plan for the North Central Montana Rural Water Supply System project.

Santee Sioux Reservation Water System, Nebraska.—The Committee is aware that the Santee Sioux Tribe and the Bureau of Reclamation have completed a needs assessment of water resources on the Santee Sioux Reservation. The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to determine the most feasible method of developing a safe and adequate municipal, rural and industrial water system for the Santee Sioux Reservation and the surrounding communities.

Santa Fe Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the continuation of work on the Santa Fe Water Reclamation and Reuse project. The Committee supports the efforts by the City and County of Santa Fe to mitigate present drought effects and to achieve water supply reliability and sustainability for the future through comprehensive, regional water development and management. The funds provided are intended to help the City and County address short-term drought relief needs, and longer-term drought protection and water supply reliability and stenvironmental protection needs. The Committee expects the Bureau of Reclamation, to the greatest degree practicable, to build upon the design work and environmental evaluation currently being undertaken by the City and County to meet these objectives.

Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the continuation of work on the Tribal and State municipal, rural, and industrial water supply programs.

Oklahoma Investigations Program, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided an additional $700,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue studies of ways to better manage the resources of the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer.

Klamath Project, Oregon and California.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,000,000 for the Klamath Project water bank program, and an additional $500,000 for long-term planning for the Klamath and Tulelake Wildlife Refuges. In addition, the Committee has provided $2,600,000 for the reimbursement of operation and maintenance expenses incurred by those who did not receive project water.

Mni Wiconi Project, South Dakota.—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for the continued construction of the Mni Wiconi project in South Dakota, including additional funds for construction of the core pipeline system to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation.

El Paso Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, Texas.—The Committee has provided $370,000 to continue the Haskell Street feature of the El Paso Water Reclamation and Reuse Project in Texas.

Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement, Texas.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 to continue work on the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Program authorized by Public Laws 106–576 and 107–351.

Yakima River Basin Water Storage, Washington.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue work on the feasibility study of options for additional water storage in the Yakima River Basin, with an emphasis on the feasibility of the storage of Columbia River water in the potential Black Rock Reservoir.

Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program.—The Committee has provided an additional $750,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue to participate with the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users Association in a project to reduce salinity and selenium loading to the Colorado River.

Drought Emergency Assistance Program.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for drought emergency assistance in Nebraska and an additional $1,000,000 for drought emergency assistance on the Navajo Nation in Arizona and New Mexico.

Efficiency Incentives Program.—The bill includes $350,000 for the continued work on the Ganado Irrigation Water Conservation Project in Arizona. The Committee understands that these funds will complete the Bureau of Reclamation's participation in this effort.

Endangered Species Recovery Implementation Program.—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue to participate in an endangered species recovery implementation program for the Platte River Basin in Wyoming, Colorado, and Nebraska, $1,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee is very concerned about the lack of clear authority for the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in this large, multi-year effort. Although the cost of the first increment of this program is currently estimated at $75,000,000, the Bureau of Reclamation indicates that costs could be as much as $150,000,000. In addition, there are no estimates of the cost of the program beyond the first increment. However, the budget states that the only authority for the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in this effort is the Endangered Species Act, which would seem to limit Reclamation's participation to addressing impacts of operation of its projects on the species at risk. In response to a question from the Subcommittee, the Commissioner of Reclamation testified that a specific authorization for the program would provide clearer guidance for the expenditure of funds. The Committee agrees with that assessment and urges the Administration to work with the states and other Federal agencies to develop a specific authorization for this multi-year, multi-million dollar undertaking.

Lower Colorado River Investigations Program.—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 directs the Bureau of Reclamation to act as the 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 in conducting this study. The Committee has provided $200,000 for this purpose.

Science and Technology Program.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to enter into a strategic alliance with the International Center for Water Resources Management at Central State University in Ohio, the Ohio View Consortium, and Colorado State University for the development of advanced remote sensing technologies for use in operational decisions to deal with the current drought conditions, and to develop optimal strategies for managing water resources to deal with future constraining events.

Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program.—The Committee has provided $3,930,000 for the Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program. The amount provided includes $2,500,000 to continue support to the WateRuse Foundation's research program.

Western Water Initiative.—The Committee has provided $11,000,000, the same as the budget request, for the Western Water Initiative proposed by the Administration. Within the Enhanced Water Management and Conservation program element, the Committee encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake a pilot project for innovative water conservation measures within the Klamath Basin Project.

Wetlands Development.—The bill includes $1,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue work on the East Wetlands Restoration project in Yuma, Arizona.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2003	.....
Budget Estimate, 2004	$200,000
Recommended, 2004	200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+200,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee has provided $200,000 for the administration of existing loans, the same as the budget request.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

Appropriation, 2003	.....
Budget Estimate, 2004	$15,000,000
Recommended, 2004	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	.....
Budget Estimate, 2004	−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, 2002, and 2003 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 2004, the Committee has again recommended no funding in the absence of authorizing legislation for this multi-year, multi-billion dollar effort. Should this program be reauthorized, the Committee reconsider funding as the bill moves through the appropriations process.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 2003	$48,586,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	39,600,000
Recommended, 2004	39,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−8,986,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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 2004, the Committee has provided $39,600,000, the same as the budget request, and $8,986,000 below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003.

Within the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, the Committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to use $500,000 to participate with the Orange Cove Irrigation District to evaluate fishery restoration opportunities in the Mill Creek watershed.

The Committee has included language in the bill which provides that none of the funds made available from the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund may be used for the acquisition or leasing of water for in-stream purposes if the water is already committed to in-stream purposes by a court adopted decree or order.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2003	$54,513,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	56,525,000
Recommended, 2004	56,525,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+2,012,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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 2004, the Committee recommends $56,525,000, the same as the budget request, and $2,012,000 above the fiscal year 2003 amount.

The Committee is concerned that the Bureau of Reclamation is not adhering to its guidelines, described in the "Corrosion Prevention Criteria and Requirements", with respect to the use of ductile iron pipe and steel pipe. With respect to both products, the Bureau of Reclamation should be attempting to establish good engineering practices which address the long-term value and cost effectiveness of facilities constructed over time. The Committee recognizes that additional work is needed to develop a more definitive corrosion standard on which to decide the best product for a particular application. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Commissioner of Reclamation to conduct a study on the current corrosion criteria and to report to the Committee on Appropriations by March 1, 2004, on its recommendations for a more definitive standard. Until a more appropriate standard is in place, which reflects the basic principle of long-term cost effectiveness, the current criteria should continue to be used.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

(RESCISSION)

Appropriation, 2003	.....
Budget Estimate, 2004	−$4,525,000
Recommended, 2004	−4,525,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−4,525,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

For fiscal year 2004, the Administration has proposed a one-time cancellation of $4,525,000 in unobligated balances available in the Working Capital Fund. These balances are the result of savings related to information technology reforms. The Committee has agreed with this proposal.

General Provisions

Department of the Interior

Section 201. 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.

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

Section 203. Section 206 of Public Law 101–514 authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior to enter into water supply contracts with the Sacramento County Water Agency and the San Juan Suburban Water District. The Committee has included language which amends Section 206 by removing the requirement that the contracts include an annual needs determination.

Section 204. The Committee has included language which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to amend the Central Valley Project water supply contracts for the Sacramento County Water Agency and the San Juan Suburban Water District by deleting a provision requiring a determination of annual water needs.

Section 205. The Committee has included language which provides that funds in the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund shall not be diverted to the General Fund of the Treasury pending the completion of an omnibus Arizona water rights settlement agreement.

Section 206. The Committee has included language which provides that funds provided to the Bureau of Reclamation may be used for the payment of claims not exceeding $5,000,000.

The Committee has not 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. The fiscal year 2003 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act made this provision permanent.

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 Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning, 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 generally supports the Administration's budget request for the Department of Energy and adjusts funding for some programs to reflect specific Congressional interests and priorities. Total funding for the Department of Energy is $22,016,347,000, an increase of $1,181,915,000 over fiscal year 2003 and $147,020,000 below the budget request.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

The Committee modifies the direction provided in House Report 107–681 requiring the Secretary to submit to the House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, a quarterly report on the status of all projects, reports, fund transfers, and other actions directed in this House bill and report, in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2004, and in the conference report accompanying that Act.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The fiscal year 2005 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).

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY FUNDING

Starting in fiscal year 2001, the Department began providing direct funding for safeguards and security costs by including a separate line item for these costs within the major programs, as opposed to the prior practice of funding these as an indirect cost within each program. This Committee was instrumental in encouraging

this change, believing that direct funding would provide increased visibility for safeguards and security funding and would prevent the programs from underfunding this important activity. However, safeguards and security costs have increased dramatically since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and these costs vary significantly as the threat level changes during the course of a fiscal year. Under these circumstances, direct funding of safeguards and security has functioned more like a funding ceiling, rather than a funding floor as originally intended. Having direct line item funding for safeguards and security requires frequent reprogramming actions to adjust to changing threat levels and security requirements.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to resume indirect funding of safeguards and security costs beginning in fiscal year 2005. The Department should include in the fiscal year 2005 budget request an addendum identifying the proposed funding levels for all safeguards and security activities by site, and the Department should establish a mechanism to ensure that the safeguards and security costs are tracked separately within the indirect accounts. Also, the Department is to inform promptly the House and Senate Appropriations Committees of any significant deviations (i.e., increases or decreases in excess of $1,000,000) from these estimates during the course of the fiscal year.

HOMELAND SECURITY-RELATED WORK

Many of the Department's contractors are performing homeland security-related activities and establishing centers for homeland security. The Committee wants to ensure that funds appropriated for Department of Energy missions are not diverted to homeland security activities. The Department is directed to provide a report to the Committee on March 31, 2004, and annually thereafter, on all homeland security activities being performed by the Department's contractors. This report should provide by contractor and facility, a brief description of each homeland security activity being performed, the annual cost of the activity, and the specific source of funds (including direct funding through Department of Energy programs, work for others from the Department of Homeland Security or other Federal or State agencies, laboratory directed research and development, or overhead charges).

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The National Research Council's Committee for Oversight and Assessment of U.S. Department of Energy Project Management recently completed its assessment of DOE's progress in improving project management. This report highlights the importance of DOE's Project Management Order 413.3 to changing the project management culture within DOE, and stated that "DOE needs to maintain the project management policies and procedures it has defined long enough to convince both DOE and contractor personnel that the changes are permanent." This report also recognizes the value of the Project Management Career Development Program (PMCDP) and recommends central funding of PMCDP training to ensure broad implementation of the PMCDP throughout DOE.

One of most salient points made in this National Research Council report deals with initial project selection and justification. According to the NRC committee, "[p]erhaps the most important single point that the committee has stressed, and continues to stress, is the absolute need for DOE management to develop the strategic plans that define the need for capital improvement projects." Several program offices in the Department have made significant improvements in this area in the last several years. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has issued its Future Years Nuclear Security Plan, its Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Plan, and its Construction Management Plan, all designed to provide a more rational basis for NNSA's future capital investments. Similarly, the Office of Science is preparing a Twenty Year Facility Outlook, and the Office of Environmental Management has revised its facility plans in conjunction with its accelerated cleanup initiative. There is room for improvement in the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science, and Technology, particularly now that it has responsibility for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory.

The Committee is pleased with the Department's issuance of the Project Management Manual 413.3–1 for capital asset acquisition, and strongly supports the principles and requirements this manual contains. The Committee expects all that elements of the Department, including the NNSA, will comply with the Manual's requirements. The Committee also urges all elements of the Department, including the NNSA, to apply the project planning and management principles identified in the Manual in the management of the entire programmatic portfolio in addition to specific capital assets.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee continues to be concerned about the deterioration of the Department's facilities and the Department's inability to evaluate and address the readiness and maintenance status of its facilities. The Committee strongly supports the efforts of the Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation to strengthen and standardize management of the Department's facilities and infrastructure (F&I) program and to improve management of all F&I assets. The Committee supports current efforts to develop a directive establishing requirements for Department-wide implementation of an F&I program, and expects all the elements of the Department to comply with such corporate guidance. 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 and decommissioned (D&D) 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.

The Committee renews its direction that funds provided for the disposal of excess facilities should be competed to the maximum ex-

tent practicable, so that contractors with experience in the efficient decontamination, decommissioning, and demolition of facilities have the opportunity to bid on this work. The Committee 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 eliminate the excess buildings that are being replaced. The Committee directs the Department to include the costs of D&D for the facilities that are being replaced in the costs of all construction projects and identify such D&D costs clearly in the construction project data sheets.

SAFETY AT DOE FACILITIES

Improving safety at the Department's laboratories, sites, and plants continues to be one of this Committee's top priorities. In fiscal year 2003, this Committee provided funding and directed a series of compliance audits to identify the backlog of safety deficiencies at the Department's non-defense Science laboratories; additional funding is provided in fiscal year 2004 to begin correcting these deficiencies. For DOE's defense facilities under the NNSA and the Environmental Management program, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) serves as the independent safety overseer. The involvement of the DNFSB gives the Committee greater confidence that safety problems will be identified early. Resolving those safety problems, however, remains the sole responsibility of the Department. The Committee is concerned to learn that the Department is unable to quantify the backlog of safety-related deficiencies in its defense facilities and sites. The Department tracks the number of DNFSB recommendations that still need to be addressed, but does not obtain detailed information on the estimated cost of the corrective actions. Beginning in fiscal year 2005, the Department is directed to collect the necessary information and report to Congress annually on the backlog of safety-related deficiencies at NNSA and defense cleanup sites, and present an estimate and schedule for the corrective actions.

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (LDRD)

The Committee recognizes the value of conducting discretionary research at DOE's national laboratories. Such research provides valuable benefits to the Department and to other Federal agencies, and is crucial to attracting and retaining scientific talent at the laboratories. However, the Committee continues to have concerns about the financial execution of this program. One concern centers on the manner in which DOE levies the LDRD "tax" on all DOE and Work for Other programs, and then accumulates the funds into an overhead pool. This Committee typically deals with defense and non-defense allocations within the Energy and Water Development bill, and the line between those two allocations is not easily crossed. Under LDRD, however, the laboratory directors are able to pool defense and non-defense appropriations at will. The only obvious solution to this concern is to require DOE to establish and track separate LDRD accounts for defense and non-defense funding sources, and the Committee is not yet ready to direct that change.

The other principal concern deals with the application of LDRD to work being performed for other agencies (Work for Others). The

conference report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002 (P.L. 107–66) directed the Secretary to "include in the annual report to Congress on LDRD activities an affirmation that all LDRD activities derived from funds of other agencies have been conducted in a manner that support science and technology development that benefits the programs of the sponsoring agencies and is consistent with the Appropriations Acts that provided funds to those agencies." The Department has implemented this guidance by including the following language into its standard project proposal and funding acceptance documents that it requires the funding WFO agencies to sign: "The Department of Energy believes that LDRD efforts provide opportunities in research that are instrumental in maintaining cutting edge science capabilities that benefit all of the customers at the laboratory. The Department will conclude that by providing funds to DOE to perform work, you acknowledge that such activities are beneficial to your organization and consistent with appropriations acts that provide funds to you." This is too facile a solution for the Department. According to a review conducted by this Committee's investigative staff, only a little more than half of the WFO customers indicated they could reliably certify that DOE's LDRD activities are consistent with the funding agencies' appropriations acts. Nevertheless, most agencies sign the required certification letter to DOE because they see no real alternative. The Committee fully expects that there are terms and conditions attached to the appropriations acts for these other agencies that are being ignored through this so-called "certification" process for LDRD work.

The Committee is considering changing the arrangement by which LDRD activities are funded to eliminate these concerns. The results of an ongoing General Accounting Office review will help to inform the Committee's choice. The Committee is receptive to streamlining the annual LDRD report to Congress, which is undoubtedly a significant burden for the Department to prepare and is of little value to this Committee in resolving the concerns identified above. The Department should work with Committee staff to develop a simpler and more useful LDRD report.

AUGMENTING FEDERAL STAFF

The Committee continues to believe there is too much reliance on support service contractors and other non-Federal employees throughout the Department of Energy, but particularly in the Department's Washington operations. The number of management and operating (M&O) contractor employees assigned to the Washington metropolitan area in fiscal year 2004 shall not exceed 220, the same as the fiscal year 2003 ceiling.

Report on M&O contractor employees.—The Department is to provide a report to the Committee at the end of fiscal year 2003 on the use of M&O contractor employees assigned to the Washington metropolitan area. The report is to identify all M&O contractor employees who work in the Washington metropolitan area, including the name of the employee, the name of the contractor, the organization to which he or she is assigned, the job title and a description of the tasks the employee is performing, the annual cost of the employee to the Department, the Headquarters program

organization sponsoring each M&O employee, the program account funding that employee, and the length of time the employee has been detailed to the Department or elsewhere in the Washington metropolitan area (e.g., the Congress, the Executive Office of the President, and other Federal agencies). The report should also include detailed information on the cost of maintaining each M&O office in the Washington metropolitan area. This report is to include actual data for the period October 1, 2002 through September 30, 2003, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2004.

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 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, 2002 through September 30, 2003, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2004.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVE AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

The Department's Inspector General recently completed an audit (DOE/IG–0601) of one DOE laboratory in which it found that the laboratory improperly used a Strategic Initiative Fund, financed as an indirect cost allocation on all direct-funded programs, to supplement Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) activities and to pay for advertising and marketing activities. The Committee shares these concerns regarding augmentation of LDRD funds and concurs with the Inspector General's recommendation that the Department needs to establish a clear policy defining the appropriate uses of mission development funds, segregating those funds from program funds, and prohibiting the use of such funds for advertising, marketing, and other activities designed to benefit the contractor rather than the Department.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

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

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

Criteria for Reprogramming.—A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises, and then only if delay of the project or the activity until the next appropriations year would result in a detrimental impact to an agency program or priority. Reprogrammings may also be considered if the Department can show that significant cost savings can accrue by increasing funding

for an activity. Mere convenience or 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 2004, 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, 2003	$696,858,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	748,329,000
Recommended, 2004	691,534,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−5,324,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−56,795,000

The Energy Supply account includes the following programs: Renewable Energy Resources; Nuclear Energy; and Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense). In support of the Secretary's decision to establish a separate office in the Department of Energy with responsibility for electricity transmission and distribution, the Committee provides a separate program line within the Energy Supply account dedicated to Electricity Transmission and Distribution activities. Also, in recognition of the assignment of landlord responsibilities for the Idaho site to the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, these landlord costs are now funded in the Energy Supply account and in the Other Defense Activities account. As in fiscal year 2003, 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 $330,144,000, a decrease of $114,063,000 compared to the budget request. Of this change, $77,047,000 is due to the transfer of activities to the new Electricity Transmission and Distribution program.

The National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) recently released its preliminary observations on the recent reorganization

of the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) and generally found the new organization to be a "reasonable structure for managing EERE." The Committee expects the Department to pay attention to the NAPA recommendations to facilitate full implementation of this new organizational model. The Committee also notes that the budget request for fiscal year 2004 includes estimates of the potential benefits of various renewable energy technologies, as required by the Government Performance and Results Act. These estimates, while falling short of the metrics that this Committee in House Reports 107–112 and 107–681 directed the Department to submit, are at least a step in the right direction. The Committee renews its guidance to the Department to submit with the next budget request a clear set of quantitative measures that can be used by the Congress and the Administration to compare the effectiveness of the federal investment in alternate energy sources. These metrics should include the Federal investment to date in each renewable energy technology and an estimate of the cost per kilowatt-hour that is forecast to be achievable with these technologies, with information on the comparable costs of other energy sources. Lastly, the Committee is appreciative of the efforts by the Assistant Secretary for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency and his staff to improve the execution of Congressionally directed projects during this fiscal year.

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 is $69,750,000, the same as the budget request. Within this amount, the Committee includes $2,000,000 for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research.

Geothermal technology development.—The Committee provides $25,500,000 for geothermal technology development, the same as the budget request. The Department is directed to maintain funding for university research at the fiscal year 2003 funding level.

Hydrogen research.— The FY2004 budget request proposes a new initiative to focus on the infrastructure for the generation, storage, and delivery of hydrogen. The Administration's budget request proposes $87,982,000 for hydrogen research, more than double the funding level provided in fiscal year 2003. The Committee recommends $67,982,000 for hydrogen research, a decrease of $20,000,000 from the budget request but an increase of $28,242,000 over fiscal year 2003 funding. The Committee reminds the Department that the requirements for competition and industry cost sharing, as specified in the Hydrogen Future Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–271, 42 U.S.C. 12403), apply to this research. The Committee is troubled by the Department's stated intent to engage in "pre-competitive R&D carried out by national laboratories" and directs the Department to compete the hydrogen research program to the fullest extent possible.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommends $5,489,000 for hydropower research, $2,000,000 less than the budget request for fiscal

year 2003. As directed in the previous fiscal year, the Department should focus its efforts on completing a limited program of testing and demonstration of new turbine technologies and then transfer these technologies to other federal agencies and private sector firms for deployment.

Solar Energy.—Solar energy technologies include: concentrating solar power; photovoltaic energy systems; and solar building technology research. As in fiscal year 2003, these subprograms are combined into a single account for solar energy. The total Committee recommendation for solar energy in fiscal year 2004 is $79,683,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee notes that the Department recently commissioned an outside energy consultant to prepare an independent analysis to reconcile conflicting forecasts of the potential for Concentrating Solar Power (CSP) technologies. This independent analysis found that Concentrating Solar Power (CSP) is a proven technology for energy production that can be cost-competitive with other technologies. Given the potential for CSP as a source of hydrogen as well as a source of electricity, the Committee expects the Department to take this latest information into account and to fund the CSP research program at no less than the fiscal year 2003 funding level. The control level for fiscal year 2004 continues at the solar energy program account level.

Zero energy buildings.—The Committee recommendation does not include the requested $4,000,000 for this activity. The Committee believes this activity should be funded as part of the Building Technologies program under the Interior and Related Agencies appropriation.

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

Electricity reliability.—The Department requested $76,866,000 for Electricity Reliability in fiscal year 2004; this program had been titled Electric Energy Systems and Storage in previous fiscal years. In support of the Secretary's decision to establish a new office for Electricity Transmission and Distribution, the Committee transfers $72,866,000 of the requested $76,866,000 into a new program line entitled Electricity Transmission and Distribution, under the Energy Supply account. The remaining $4,000,000 of the requested funds is for the Renewable Energy Production Incentive (REPI) program; these funds are transferred to the Intergovernmental Activities program.

Intergovernmental activities.—The Committee recommends $16,500,000 for intergovernmental activities. This amount includes the requested $6,500,000 for the international renewable energy program, including $2,000,000 for the International Utility Electricity Partnership (IUEP) program, the requested $6,000,000 for tribal energy, and $4,000,000 for the Renewable Energy Production Incentive (REPI) transferred from the Electricity Reliability program.

DEPARTMENTAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation for Departmental Energy Management is $2,300,000, the same as the budget request.

NATIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE

The Department requested $15,000,000 for the Renewable Energy Resources portion of the Department's National Climate Change Technology Initiative (NCCTI). This funding was to be coupled with $2,279,000 from Nuclear Energy and $22,700,000 from the Interior and Related Agencies appropriation to issue a competitive solicitation for new technologies to address climate change. The Committee supports the competitive approach to acquiring innovative climate change technologies from academia and the private sector, but does not support the pooling of funds from two separate appropriations bills into a single new program. The Committee does not provide any funds for NCCTI activities in fiscal year 2004, but does direct the Department to apply the competitive approach to the other funding already being spent on climate change within the Department. The Department's request for fiscal year 2004 includes over $1.6 billion for research and development activities related to climate change, of which over $1.1 billion is funded in the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. The Committee directs the Department to report on the amount of Energy and Water-funded climate change work that was competitively awarded in fiscal year 2003, and to increase that amount by $100 million for fiscal year 2004.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommendation for renewable energy Facilities and Infrastructure is $9,100,000, an increase of $4,150,000 over the budget request. The Committee funds the recommended amount of $4,200,000 for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) in Golden, Colorado, and includes an additional $4,900,000 to initiate construction of the new Science and Technology facility at NREL (project 02–EERE–001), for which project engineering and design is to be completed in the third quarter of the current fiscal year. The budget request of $750,000 for a new Energy Reliability and Efficiency Laboratory (project 04–E–TBD) at Oak Ridge National Laboratory is funded but is transferred to the new program line entitled Electricity Transmission and Distribution, under the Energy Supply account.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation for program direction is $12,230,000, a reduction of $4,347,000 from the budget request reflecting the reduction in Renewable Energy program activities and a transfer of $3,431,000 to the new program line entitled Electricity Transmission and Distribution, under the Energy Supply account.

ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION

The Secretary recently decided to establish a new office for Electricity Transmission and Distribution to serve as a focal point for these issues within the Department. Because this decision was made subsequent to the fiscal year 2004 budget submission, the Department has proposed adjustments to the fiscal year 2004 request to provide a total of $77,377,000 for this new office. The Committee recommendation provides the requested amount,

$77,377,000, drawn from the following accounts and programs: $72,866,000 from electric reliability in Renewable Energy Resources, $750,000 for the new Energy Reliability and Efficiency Laboratory (project 04–E–TBD) at Oak Ridge National Laboratory from the facilities and infrastructure account within Renewable Energy Resources, $3,431,000 for program direction drawn from the program direction account within Renewable Energy Resources, and an additional $330,000 for program direction from policy and international affairs within the Departmental Administration account. The Committee recommendation removes the requirement for a fifty percent industry partner cost share for the Energy Reliability and Efficiency Laboratory at Oak Ridge as proposed in the budget request. The Committee interprets the National Transmission Grid Study language on industrial cost share as intended for research only and directs future budget requests to provide full funding for design, construction, and operation of this facility. Within available funds, the Department is directed to use up to $4,000,000 to continue field testing of aluminum matrix composite conductors.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy programs is $268,016,000, a decrease of $9,109,000 from the budget request. The budget request for nuclear energy programs increased significantly compared to the fiscal year 2003 enacted level, but much of this increase is tied to the designation of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology as the lead office with landlord responsibilities for the Idaho site. Note that $112,306,000 of the funding proposed in the Nuclear Energy request represent costs allocated to the 050 budget function (i.e., defense activities); these costs are direct funded under the Other Defense Activities account.

UNIVERSITY REACTOR FUEL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT

The Committee recommends $19,500,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee remains concerned about the need for more graduates specializing in nuclear science and engineering, and provides additional funding to increase DOE's ability to support existing university reactors and for grants and fellowships that support nuclear science and engineering education. The Committee is also aware of proposals for a DOE laboratory or site to host a next-generation research reactor to serve the university community, and encourages the Department to continue exploration of such an option.

NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee supports research and development to make the current generation of nuclear power plants safer and more efficient, to assist with the development of the next generation of reactor designs, and to develop advanced fuel cycles to minimize waste and proliferation concerns. However, the Committee continues to believe that this country will not build another nuclear power plant until the Yucca Mountain repository is licensed and operational, and the Committee has focused its limited resources to keeping the

nuclear waste repository program on schedule. The total Committee recommendation for nuclear energy research and development is $117,746,000, a decrease of $9,279,000 from the budget request. The Committee also notes that the Secretary has recently designated the Idaho National Environmental and Engineering Laboratory (INEEL) as the Nation's leading laboratory for nuclear energy research and development. To be consistent with this designation, the Committee expects the Secretary will re-align the distribution of fiscal year 2004 funding by site under the Nuclear Energy Research and Development program so that the majority of laboratory-expended funds for nuclear energy research and development will be allocated to INEEL.

Nuclear Energy Plant Optimization.—As in the previous fiscal year, the Committee does not concur with the Administration's proposal to terminate funding for the nuclear energy plant optimization (NEPO) program in fiscal year 2004. For NEPO, the Committee provides $4,000,000, $4,000,000 more than the budget request. The Committee recognizes the improvements to the safety of existing reactors that have resulted from application of the Mechanical Stress Improvement Process (MSIP) in Russia, and provides $1,000,000 for AEA technology to expand the transfer of MSIP to other countries in the former Soviet Union.

Nuclear Energy Research Initiative.—The Committee recommendation for the nuclear energy research initiative (NERI) is $10,000,000, a decrease of $2,000,000 from the budget request due to funding constraints.

Nuclear energy technologies.—The Committee provides $42,721,000 for nuclear energy technologies, $5,279,000 less than the budget request. The Committee generally supports the Nuclear Power 2010 and Generation IV Nuclear Energy initiatives under nuclear energy technologies, subject to having the repository operational in 2010. As noted in the discussion under Renewable Energy Resources, the Committee does not support the pooling of funds from different appropriations bills for the National Climate Change Technology Initiative, and does not provide the requested $2,279,000 for this activity.

Nuclear hydrogen initiative.—The Committee provides $2,500,000 for the nuclear hydrogen initiative, a reduction of $1,500,000 from the budget request. The requirements for competition and industry cost sharing, as outlined above in the discussion of the Hydrogen program under Renewable Energy Resources, should apply here as well.

Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative.—The Committee recommendation for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative (AFCI) is $58,525,000, a reduction of $4,500,000 from the budget request but comparable to the amount provided in fiscal year 2003. Within the funds available for AFCI, the Department is directed to provide $3,000,000 for the Idaho Accelerator Center. Of the funding requested for transmutation science education, the Committee recommendation funds only the $3,000,000 requested for the competitive award of fellowships in advanced fuel cycle research. The Committee is still awaiting the detailed program plan for the treatment of sodium-bonded spent fuel presently stored at the Idaho National Environmental and Engineering Laboratory, which the Department was directed

to submit to Congress by March 31, 2003. The Committee is also awaiting the annual AFCI comparison report, which was due May 31, 2003. Absent these two reports, the Committee has no basis to provide an increase in funds for the AFCI effort.

RADIOLOGICAL FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The purpose of the Radiological Facilities Management program is to maintain the critical infrastructure necessary to support users from the defense, space, and medical communities. The outside users fund DOE's actual operational, production, and research activities on a reimbursable basis.

Space and defense infrastructure.—The Committee recommendation is $36,230,000, the same as the budget request. This includes the requested amounts for the transfer of radioisotope power systems capabilities from Mound to the Idaho National Environmental and Engineering Laboratory, the Pu–238 facilities at Los Alamos National Laboratory, and the Np–237 storage facilities at Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Medical isotopes infrastructure.—The Committee recommendation is $26,425,000, the same as the budget request. Included within this program amount is the requested funding for Phase I of the U–233 project at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and for various facility costs at Brookhaven, Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, and Sandia national laboratories.

IDAHO FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

This program funds the activities at the Idaho National Environmental and Engineering Laboratory (INEEL), including ANL-West operations and Test Reactor Area Landlord activities, as well as the Idaho landlord activities previously funded under the Environmental Management program. The Committee provides $44,145,000 for Idaho Facilities Management, the same as the budget request. This amount represents the portion of Idaho Facilities Management that is allotted to the 270 budget function; the balance, allotted to the 050 function, is funded under Other Defense Activities.

ANL-West operations.—The Committee recommends $31,615,000, the same as the budget request, for ANL-West operations.

INEEL Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends $10,190,000, the same as the budget request. An additional $21,415,000 is provided under Other Defense Activities.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $2,340,000 for Idaho facilities construction, the same as the budget request. This includes the requested amounts of $500,000 for project 95–E–201 and $1,840,000 for project 99–E–200, both at the Test Reactor Area.

IDAHO SITEWIDE SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

Consistent with the budget request, this activity is funded at the requested level of $56,654,000 as an 050 defense activity under the Other Defense Activities account..

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends a total funding level of $58,207,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 from the budget request due to reduced program levels. The requested amount increased significantly over the fiscal year 2003 funding level because the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology is assuming lead responsibility for the Idaho site and the Idaho Operations Office. Of this amount, $23,970,000 is funded here under budget function 270, and $34,237,000 is funded as budget function 050 under Other Defense Activities.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation is $24,000,000, a reduction of $6,000,000 from the budget request but an increase of approximately $1,500,000 over the fiscal year 2003 funding level. Within this amount, the Department is directed to transfer $2,000,000 to OSHA for the costs of OSHA regulation of worker health and safety at the Department's non-nuclear facilities not covered under the Atomic Energy Act and to complete the compliance audits of the ten Science laboratories that were initiated in fiscal year 2003. It is the Committee's intention that the funds appropriated in FY03 and transferred to OSHA and NRC for these compliance audits shall remain available until expended. Based on the results of the audits completed to date, NRC and OSHA should focus their efforts in the remaining audits on identifying major hazards that would require significant capital investments to remedy. Given the late start on these audits in fiscal year 2003, the Committee revises the completion date for the audits and associated cost estimates to May 31, 2004.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

A general reduction of $5,000,000 has been applied to the Energy Supply account, and the recommendation includes an offset of $3,003,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work, as proposed in the budget request.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The Non-Defense Environmental Management program includes funds to manage and clean up sites used for civilian, energy research, and non-defense related activities. These past activities resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination that requires remediation, stabilization, or some other type of action. The Department has restructured its budget for Non-Defense Environmental Management to focus on activities that support the primary goals of site cleanup and closure. Activities that had previously been funded under the Non-Defense Environmental Management account are now funded in two separate accounts: Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion for accelerated cleanup and closure activities, and Non-Defense Environmental Services for those activities that indirectly support and closure activities, or that support other missions of the Department. Activities previously funded under the Other Uranium Activities subaccount of the Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation, including

the depleted uranium hexaflouride plants at Portsmouth and Paducah, are also transferred into the new Non-Defense Environmental Services account.

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

NON-DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION

Appropriation, 2003	$158,846,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	170,875,000
Recommended, 2004	170,875,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+12,029,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

The committee recommendation for Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion is $170,875, the same as the budget request.

2006 Accelerated Completions.—The recommendation provides $48,677,000, the same as the budget request, including $38,840,000 for soil and water remediation and graphite research reactor decommissioning at Brookhaven National Laboratory, $3,272,000 for soil and water remediation at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and $2,416,000 for soil and water remediation at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. The budget request indicates that the spent nuclear fuel presently stored at the West Valley Demonstration Project will be shipped to the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory by the end of fiscal year 2004; the Committee expects the Department to adhere to this schedule with no further slippages.

2012 Accelerated Completions.—The recommendation provides $119,750,000, the same as the budget request, including $99,558,000 for solid waste stabilization and disposition and nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning at the West Valley Demonstration Project, and $18,467,000 for nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning for the Energy Technology Engineering Center.

2035 Accelerated Completions.—The recommendation provides $2,448,000, the same as the budget request. This amount includes the requested $2,000,000 to continue stabilization measures and complete the Environmental Impact Statement for remediation of the former Atlas uranium mill tailings site at Moab, Utah, and $448,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of the Tritium System Test Assembly Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Appropriation, 2003	$144,510,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	292,121,000
Recommended, 2004	320,468,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+175,958,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	+28,347,000

The committee recommendation for Non-Defense Environmental Services is $320,468,000 an increase of 28,347,000 above the budget request. This amount includes the requested funding of

$12,394,000 for East Tennessee Technology Park, $45,000,000 for the depleted uranium hexaflouride conversion facility and $4,267,000 for nuclear material stabilization and disposition at Paducah, $45,000,000 for the depleted uranium hexaflouride conversion facility and $16,523,000 for nuclear material stabilization and disposition at Portsmouth, $20,000,000 for accelerated decontamination and decommissioning of the GCEP facilities at Portsmouth, and $102,082,000 to maintain the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant in cold standby and to continue with deposit removal. The Committee recognizes the additional cleanup needs at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant to support deployment of an advanced uranium enrichment technology and will work with the Senate in conference to determine if additional funding can be made available for this purpose. The committee recommendation also includes the requested funding of $43,842,000 for decontamination and decommissionings of the Fast Flux Test Facility. The additional $28,347,000 in the Committee's recommendation represents the nondefense share for legacy management, the balance of which is funded under Other Defense Activities.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriation, 2003	$338,117,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	418,124,000
Recommended, 2004	392,002,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+53,885,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−26,122,000

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

The Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund was established by the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (P.L. 102–486) to carry out environmental remediation at the nation's three gaseous diffusion plants, at the East Tennessee Technology Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, at Portsmouth, Ohio, and at Paducah, Kentucky. Title X of the 1992 Act also authorized use of a portion of the Fund to reimburse private licensees for the Federal government's share of the cost of cleaning up uranium and thorium processing sites.

The Committee recommends $392,002,000 for activities funded from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, a reduction of $26,122,000 from the budget request. This amount includes $341,002,000 for decontamination and decommissioning activities at the gaseous diffusion plants and $51,000,000 for uranium and thorium reimbursements. In fiscal year 2003, the Administration proposed, and Congress agreed to,

an accelerated cleanup initiative for DOE sites. Sites would receive additional funding in the near term in order to accelerate cleanup and reduce funding requirements in the outyears. The Department's fiscal year 2004 budget request assumed that it would reach agreement with all of the involved State regulators on accelerated cleanup plans. Where such agreement has not been reached, the Committee does not provide the additional increment of funding that was requested for accelerated cleanup. The $26,122,000 reduction reflects the failure to reach agreement on accelerated cleanup for the Paducah site.

SCIENCE

Appropriation, 2003	$3,272,328,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	3,310,935,000
Recommended, 2004	3,480,180,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+207,852,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	+169,245,000

The Science account funds the Department's work on high energy physics, nuclear physics, biological and environmental sciences, basic energy sciences, advanced scientific computing, maintenance of the laboratories' physical infrastructure, fusion energy sciences, safeguards and security, science workforce development, and science program direction. The Committee recommendation is $3,480,180,000, an increase of $169,245,000 compared to the budget request.

The Committee has provided additional funding for the Office of Science to address the following Committee priorities: high performance computing; additional operating time, equipment upgrades, and staffing to support increased research opportunities at the Office of Science user facilities; remediation of safety deficiencies at DOE Science laboratories; and restoration of domestic fusion funding displaced by the new international fusion initiative. The Committee also provides additional funding to perform essential research and development and preconcept design for one new project (i.e., the Rare Isotope Accelerator). The Committee may consider different or additional priorities for new research facilities once the Office of Science releases its Twenty Year Facility Outlook.

External Regulation of DOE Science Laboratories.—In July 2002, the Department produced a Committee-directed implementation plan for external regulation. The Department identified several key unresolved questions about external regulation, specifically the unknown costs of transitioning to external regulation and the unknown cost savings that might result from such a transition. However, the Department stated that it "believes that these issues can be resolved" and "favors the prospect of a transition to external regulation . . ." The Committee has subsequently taken steps to resolve these questions, tasking the General Accounting Office (GAO) to identify the current costs of DOE's self-regulation of the Science laboratories and the potential savings that might result under external regulation. In its report (GAO–03–633R), the GAO found that the Department could save as much as $41 million annually by shifting to external regulation of its Science laboratories.

To address the question of transition costs, the Committee in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2003, directed the transfer of funds from the Department of Energy to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) to conduct compliance audits of the ten DOE Science laboratories. The audits are to be completed for four laboratories by September 30, 2003, and for all ten labs by March 31, 2004. Upon completion of these audits, the laboratories are also to prepare estimates of the costs to correct the identified deficiencies and bring these ten laboratories into compliance with NRC and OSHA safety standards. In recognition of the late start on these audits in fiscal year 2003, the Committee revises the completion date for the audits and associated cost estimates to May 31, 2004.

In response to the Committee's concerns about continued self-regulation, the Office of Science in November 2002 directed its ten laboratories to conduct their own assessment of the potential costs of bringing those laboratories into compliance with NRC and OSHA standards. The Committee recognizes the crude nature of this estimate, particularly as it was conducted without the participation of the NRC and OSHA. Nevertheless, this self-assessment by the Science laboratories represents the only existing estimate of the costs of transitioning the laboratories to external regulation. These laboratories estimated their transition costs to be approximately $75 million. This estimate, approximate as it is, reveals the existence of a significant backlog of safety deficiencies at these laboratories. The existence and persistence of such a backlog is one of the unfortunate consequences of the Department's adherence to its current scheme of self-regulation. The Department is able to identify safety problems but is unable or unwilling to dedicate the necessary resources to correct these problems.

The Committee believes it is important to the health and safety of laboratory employees, of visiting researchers, and of the population in the surrounding communities that these safety deficiencies be corrected expeditiously. Therefore, the Committee has transferred $25,000,000 from the Departmental Administration account to the Science Laboratories Infrastructure subaccount to address these safety deficiencies at the ten Science laboratories; these funds may not be reprogrammed for other purposes. In addition, the Committee directs the Department to request sufficient funding in the budget requests for fiscal years 2005 and 2006 to correct the remainder of these safety deficiencies over the next two fiscal years. The completion of the NRC and OSHA compliance audits should permit the preparation of a more accurate estimate of these costs. Regardless of whether the Department continues to regulate itself or makes the overdue transition to external regulation, this backlog of unresolved safety deficiencies must be addressed promptly.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The Committee recommends a total of $747,978,000 for high energy physics, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. The control level is at the High Energy Physics level. The additional funds are provided to increase operating time and enhance

user support at the user facilities located at the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory and the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. The Committee recommendation includes the requested amount, $12,500,000, for construction of the Neutrinos at the Main Injector project at Fermilab. The Committee recognizes the efforts of the staff from the Office of Science, Fermilab, and the other laboratories to bring the Tevatron luminosity upgrade back on schedule. The Committee also encourages the Department to accelerate progress on the Supernova/Accelerator Probe (SNAP), which will provide an important tool to advance our understanding of the history of the universe.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee recommendation for nuclear physics is $399,430,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. An additional $7,500,000 is provided to increase operating time and enhance user support at the user facilities located at the Brookhaven National Laboratory and the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility. The Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 for research and development and pre-conceptual design activities in support of the Rare Isotope Accelerator, an increase of $2,500,000 over the requested amount for this project. The Committee strongly encourages the Department to make a prompt CD0 decision for the 12 GeV upgrade to the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility at the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility and to include adequate PED funding for this project in the fiscal year 2005 budget request.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation for biological and environmental research is $562,035,000, an increase of $62,500,000 over the budget request. The additional funds are provided to increase operating time and enhance user support at the user facilities located at various DOE laboratories that support the biological and environmental sciences user community, and to provide for additional university research grants for biological and environmental research.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for basic energy sciences is $1,016,575,000, an increase of $8,000,000 over the budget request. For purposes of reprogramming during fiscal year 2004, the Department may allocate funding among all operating accounts within Basic Energy Sciences.

Research.—The Committee recommendation includes $575,711,000 for materials sciences and engineering, and $220,914,000 for chemical sciences, geosciences, and energy biosciences. The additional $8,000,000 in the material sciences and engineering account is provided to increase operating time and enhance user support at Basic Energy Sciences user facilities. Also included within this account is $7,673,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR), the same as the budget request.

Construction.—The Committee recommendation includes $219,950,000 for construction, the same as the requested amount. The Committee recommendation provides the requested funding of $124,600 for the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS), $35,000,000 for the Molecular Foundry, $29,850,000 for the Center for Integrated Nanotechnologies, $20,000,000 for the Center for Nanophase Material Sciences, $7,500,000 for PED for the Linac Coherent Light Source, and $3,000,000 for PED for the Center for Functional Nanomaterials at Brookhaven National Laboratory.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee continues to support efforts to advance U.S. supercomputing technology and is encouraged that the President's fiscal year 2004 budget identifies supercomputing as a critical component of its Networking and Information Technology Research and Development program. The Committee views the Department of Energy as a key player in the Federal government's efforts in supercomputing. At the same time, the Committee recognizes that a number of other Federal agencies are involved with the development of, and have critical needs for, more advanced computing capabilities. The Committee notes that the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) has recently established the multi-agency High End Computing Revitalization Task Force (HEC RTF). This task force, of which the Department is a participant, has been charged with developing a coordinated, interagency plan for supercomputing research and development that addresses issues of capability, capacity, and accessibility for scientific applications. The Committee strongly supports this interagency HEC RTF effort, and expects the Department to participate fully and to follow the HEC RTF plan for ongoing and future research and development, facility operations, and hardware procurement of its advanced scientific computing resources.

The Committee recommendation is $213,490,000, an increase of $40,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee provides these funds for the Department to acquire additional advanced computing capability to support existing users in the near term and to initiate longer-term research and development on next generation computer architectures. The Committee directs the Department to use these funds in a manner fully consistent with the recommendations of the HEC RTF. The Committee also expects that, to the maximum extent practicable, these funds will be awarded using a merit-based, competitive process.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $71,535,000 for Science Laboratories Infrastructure, an increase of $27,945,000 over the budget request. The majority of this increase, $25,000,000, is transferred from the Departmental Administration account to correct safety deficiencies at the Science laboratories. The funding provided for Science Laboratory Safety Measures may not be reprogrammed for other purposes. The Committee recommendation also provides an additional $2,945,000 for excess facilities disposition, bringing this account total to $8,000,000, comparable to the fiscal year 2003 enacted level. The Committee is disappointed that the

Department's budget request recommended closing the 88–inch cyclotron at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory yet failed to provide any funding for the decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) of this facility. Once a particular Science facility is no longer useful, the Department should take prompt action to reduce its landlord costs and make that space available for other purposes. The added increment of funding for excess facilities is to be applied to D&D of the 88-inch cyclotron. The Committee recommendation provides the requested funding of $1,520,000 for infrastructure support, $5,079,000 for Oak Ridge landlord costs, $2,000,000 for Science Laboratories Infrastructure 04–SC001, specifically to initiate PED for project MEL–001–36 at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, and $29,936,000 for construction of various subprojects under the MEL–001 infrastructure project.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is $268,110,000, an increase of $10,800,000 over the budget request. The Committee is cautiously supportive of the Administration's proposal to re-engage in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) project, but is disappointed that the budget request provides $12,000,000 in funding for the U.S. ITER effort only at the expense of displacing ongoing domestic fusion research. The additional $10,800,000 includes $4,000,000 for burning plasma experiments, including support for ITER and for the domestic FIRE project, $5,200,000 for fusion technology, and $1,600,000 for advanced design and analysis work. If the Department intends to recommend ITER participation in the fiscal year 2005 budget request, the Committee expects the Department will do so without harm to domestic fusion research or to other programs in the DOE Science budget.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $51,887,000, an increase of $3,760,000 over the budget request, to meet additional safeguards and security requirements.

SCIENCE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

The Department requested $6,470,000 for Science Workforce Development in fiscal year 2004, including $1,000,000 to initiate a pilot program at Argonne National Laboratory providing intensive, hands-on training for approximately 60 science, engineering, and mathematics teachers. The Committee is very supportive of this initiative, but would like to see it applied at all five multiprogram Science laboratories. The Committee recommendation provides $7,470,000, including $2,000,000 for the Laboratory Science Teacher Professional Development initiative, to be distributed among all five multiprogram laboratories.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation is $147,053,000 for Science program direction. This amount includes: $80,102,000 for program direction at DOE field offices, $58,157,000 for program direction at

DOE headquarters, $7,774,000 for Technical Information Management; and $1,020,000 for Energy Research Analyses. The request for program direction for field offices was reduced by $3,720,000 and the amount transferred to the Safeguards and Security line. The control level for fiscal year 2004 is at the program account level of Science Program Direction.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes an offset of $4,383,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work, as proposed in the budget request. A general reduction of $1,000,000 has been applied to the Science account.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 2003	$144,058,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	161,000,000
Recommended, 2004	335,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+190,942,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	+174,000,000

The Federal government has a clear statutory responsibility, assigned by Congress in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, to provide for the permanent disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. The Department of Energy was required by statute to accept commercial spent nuclear fuel for disposal beginning on January 31, 1998, and entered into legally enforceable contracts with utilities to execute that obligation. Unfortunately, the Department has been unable to meet that deadline, resulting in a number of lawsuits over the Department's failure to meet its statutory and contractual obligation and a growing financial liability over that failure. The Court of Federal Claims has found the Department to be in breach of its contractual obligations and is proceeding to determine the extent of damages.

The primary consequence of the Department's failure to begin accepting spent nuclear fuel is not, however, the existence of lawsuits and damage claims; it is that vast quantities of commercial spent nuclear fuel remain in temporary storage at reactor sites scattered around the country, many located near major population centers. The Committee is not questioning the current safety and security of spent nuclear fuel stored at commercial sites in accordance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission criteria. The Committee does, however, believe that the safety and security of these materials will be enhanced the sooner they are placed in the underground repository at Yucca Mountain. After the events of September 11, 2001, the Committee believes it is more essential than ever to move aggressively to get the Yucca Mountain repository licensed, built, and operating at the earliest possible date.

Chronic funding shortfalls, however, have starved the program of the resources necessary to keep the repository program on schedule. The Department's latest schedule calls for opening the repository and beginning to accept spent fuel in 2010 at the earliest, over 12 years behind schedule. Most recently, the Department requested a total of $591,000,000 for the nuclear waste disposal program in fiscal year 2003, yet received only $457,000,000, a funding shortfall

of $134,000,000. Such funding shortfalls have forced the Department to concentrate its limited resources on preparing the repository License Application, which is presently scheduled for submission to the NRC in December 2004. The Department's emphasis on the License Application has meant that other activities, especially those relating to the transportation of materials to the repository to support initial operations in 2010, have suffered major delays.

The Committee recommends $335,000,000 for nuclear waste disposal, an increase of $174,000,000 over the budget request of $161,000,000. The intent of this funding level is to make sure that the Department has the necessary funds to support a timely and technically robust License Application, and to provide additional funds for activities related to initial repository operations in 2010, primarily for development of a safe and secure transportation system in Nevada. Combined with the appropriation of $430,000,000 from the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, this provides a total of $765,000,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal activities in fiscal year 2004, an increase of $174,000,000 over the budget request.

The Committee is also concerned about a number of delays in the repository program that have been caused, not by shortfalls in funding provided by Congress, but by internal legal and policy decisions made within the Department. The Secretary, the General Counsel, and the Director of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management are reminded that Congress expects the Department to take all the actions necessary to keep this repository on schedule for initial operations in 2010. Delaying the resolution of pending litigation and avoiding potential future litigation are not the objectives of this program. The Department cannot minimize its legal exposure simply by taking no new actions; the Department must make the decisions and take the actions necessary to execute its nuclear waste disposal responsibilities as mandated by law, and accept the legal consequences of those actions. The Committee strongly believes that the best way to minimize the liability of the Federal government for spent nuclear fuel is to get on with the repository program in an expeditious manner.

License application.—The Department is directed to submit the License Application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission not later than December 31, 2004. Any delays in this submission will cause unacceptable delays in the start of repository operations, which 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. The Committee has provided sufficient resources to ensure that the License Application can be submitted on schedule by the Department and can withstand the technical and legal challenges it will face in the licensing process.

License support network.—The Committee directs the Department that Congressional communications between the Members and staffs of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Department are not to be included in documentation posted on the License Support Network.

Nevada transportation and site preparation activities.—The Committee notes the concerns of the State of Nevada about the selection of a transportation corridor within the State, particularly about any corridor that runs through or near the Las Vegas metropolitan area. The Secretary's continued delay in issuing the Record of Decision to designate a preferred transportation corridor within the State of Nevada has not been helpful in resolving these concerns. The Committee does not approve of any further consideration of alternative rail routes that would transport spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste through the environs of metropolitan Las Vegas. Therefore, the Committee includes bill language providing that none of the funds in this or any other appropriations Act may be used for the planning or development of the Valley Modified Corridor and the Jean Corridor, and variations thereof, as those corridors are delineated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada, dated February 2002. Of the remaining alternatives that avoid the Las Vegas Metropolitan Area, the information provided from the Department leads the Committee to believe that the Caliente Corridor, though not the cheapest, is the most feasible rail corridor to implement. The Committee allows the Secretary discretion in selecting the preferred rail corridor, as long as the selected corridor does not pass through the Las Vegas Metropolitan Area. The Committee includes bill language requiring the Secretary to designate rail as the preferred mode of transportation within Nevada and to select a Nevada rail corridor within 60 days after enactment, and then to conduct the full scale environmental and engineering analysis to select a specific rail alignment within the selected rail corridor and issue a final Record of Decision on the Nevada transportation system designating the specific rail alignment by June 30, 2005.

The Committee directs the Department to focus its efforts on accelerating the development of a rail line in Nevada, with the objective of being ready to begin physical construction of the rail line immediately after receipt of the construction authorization for the repository, which is presently scheduled for 2007. This means the Department should have all planning, design, right-of-way acquisition, and land withdrawal actions complete in time to support such a 2007 construction start. If the Secretary selects the Caliente corridor as the preferred rail corridor, the Secretary may spend up to $3,000,000 to initiate planning and design activities to support the construction of a rail-to-truck intermodal transfer facility to be located at Caliente, Lincoln County, Nevada, to support limited legal-weight truck transportation until the rail system is fully operational. These funds for the Caliente intermodal transfer facility are separate from the external oversight funds provided to affected units of local government. The Committee recommendation provides a total of $70,000,000 for Nevada transportation activities. Development of this Nevada rail corridor for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste will also benefits the safe transportation of low level waste and transuranic waste to and from the State of Nevada.

Without prejudging the outcome of the NRC licensing process, and recognizing that the repository might not be licensed, the Secretary should perform all the necessary planning, site preparation, and preliminary construction needed to assure that, if construction authorization is received from NRC on schedule in 2007, the construction of the underground repository as well as the aboveground facilities and supporting infrastructure can proceed on a schedule to support the start of repository operations by 2010. The Committee views this "at-risk" planning, site preparation, and preliminary construction as necessary to support initial operations in 2010 if the NRC authorizes repository construction. The Committee recommendation provides a total of $20,000,000 to initiate site preparation activities.

To the maximum extent practicable, the Department shall ensure that funds provided for the development of infrastructure in the State of Nevada shall be spent through contracts awarded to contractors and subcontractors who are party to labor agreements applicable to all of its employees who are residents of that State and who perform manual labor and other work pursuant to such contract or subcontract.

Local Impact Assistance.—Section 116 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, authorizes financial assistance to the State of Nevada and affected units of local government to mitigate any potential economic, social, public health and safety, and environmental impacts of the repository. With the repository siting decision having been made last year and Nevada transportation decisions in process as directed in the preceding paragraph, the Committee believes the time has come to begin providing this impact assistance to the State and affected local governments along the selected rail corridor. The Committee recommendation makes available a total of up to $30,000,000 for such impact assistance, contingent upon submission of a plan and approval of the plan by the Director of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. The Committee considers the transportation, emergency response, and medical services measures proposed in the plan already prepared by Nye County, Nevada, the "Nye County, Nevada, Community Protection Plan," dated August 2001, to be representative of the kind of impact assistance contemplated under this section.

Comprehensive national acceptance and transportation plan.—The Committee has previously expressed concerns about the Department's inadequate preparation for waste acceptance, storage, and transportation to the repository. Although the Committee recognizes that funding shortfalls have forced the Department to concentrate its limited resources on the License Application, the Committee believes the Department must maintain its focus on the actions necessary to support the start of repository operations in 2010. The Department has already stated that it will issue a National Transportation Strategic Plan later this year to serve as a framework for having a national transportation system operational by 2010. While the Committee looks forward to receiving this National Transportation Strategic Plan, the Committee believes the Department should be working more actively with the contract holders and the DOE sites that will be shipping spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste to the repository to develop a detailed and

comprehensive acceptance and transportation plan for the years 2010–2020. The Department should submit this comprehensive plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not later than December 31, 2004. This plan should be developed to maximize efficient transportation and minimize the costs of continued on-site storage at contract holder and DOE sites. DOE should not allow the existence of ongoing litigation over DOE's failure to begin accepting commercial spent fuel on the statutorily mandated date to preclude having the essential discussions with contract holders. DOE should negotiate with contract holders to reach a timely decision on the schedule for acceptance of spent nuclear fuel stored in existing NRC-licensed storage and transport systems. In addition, the Department should either ensure that the detailed acceptance criteria that will be part of the license application will include appropriate criteria and specifications for greater-than-class-C waste, or present Congress with a separate plan proposing an alternative disposal path for greater-than-class-C waste. The comprehensive acceptance and transportation plan shall ensure that spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste from those reactor sites that are undergoing decommissioning, including the Dairyland Power Cooperative La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor, shall be accepted and transported as soon as practicable to facilitate the closure of these sites. Finally, the Committee expects the Department to commence the institutional coordination and procurement actions necessary to support a national transportation campaign to begin shipping spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste to the repository beginning in 2010. The Committee recommendation provides $35,000,000 for comprehensive national acceptance and transportation activities. The Committee directs the Department to provide not less than $20,000,000 to the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) to use the expertise developed at INEEL on the handling, packaging, and transportation of spent fuel and high-level waste to execute the tasks outlined in this section.

Updated Project Decision Schedule.—The Committee directs the Department to submit an updated Project Decision Schedule (PDS) as required by subsection 114(e) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended. Not later than December 31, 2003, the Department shall submit the updated PDS to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Energy and Commerce Committee, and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The updated PDS shall identify all steps required to initiate repository operations in 2010, including but not limited to: all waste acceptance, storage, and transportation elements; all surface and subsurface actions at the repository, including supporting infrastructure; all actions and decisions relating to federal and nonfederal casks; and all training and emergency response assistance necessary for transportation of spent nuclear fuel. The updated PDS shall be fully resource-loaded and shall identify the budgetary resources required in each fiscal year to support the start of repository operations in 2010. As provided in subsection 114(e) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, the PDS shall include a description of the objectives and a sequence of deadlines for all Federal agencies to take required actions related to repository con-

struction and operations. The PDS shall identify those actions by the Department and by other Federal agencies that are on the critical path and for which a delay in completion will cause a delay in the start of repository operations. The Committee expects the Department to use the updated PDS to move aggressively to implement the provisions of paragraph (2) of subsection 114(e) to identify and resolve differences with other Federal agencies that could cause delays in the start or conduct of repository operations. The Committee also directs the Department to submit as part of its budget request for fiscal year 2005 a comprehensive legislative package that identifies all statutory language that will be necessary for repository operations to begin in 2010, including but not limited to: a proposal to ensure the availability of long-term funding for the repository program; land withdrawal and right-of-way acquisition for the repository site and for all supporting infrastructure, including the Nevada rail corridor and the Caliente intermodal transfer facility, and any other required legislative actions. The Committee recommendation provides $6,000,000 for the preparation of an updated and resource-loaded project decision schedule.

Early acceptance of spent nuclear fuel.—Since the last time that Congress considered authorizing the early acceptance of spent fuel, there have been two major changes in national circumstances. First, a majority of Members in both chambers of Congress voted in 2002 to confirm Yucca Mountain as the site of the nuclear repository. Second, the events of September 11, 2001, made clear that facilities we once assumed to be safe from terrorist attack may no longer be so. The Committee believes that the continued storage of spent nuclear fuel at reactor sites around the country, while in compliance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission standards, poses a greater safety and security risk than previously assumed. The Committee further believes that safety and security would be improved if this spent fuel could be moved to a centralized surface storage facility, located at the Yucca Mountain repository site, at the earliest possible date. The Committee directs the Department to prepare a plan for early acceptance of commercial spent nuclear fuel presently stored at commercial power plants and storage sites, and for early shipment of such spent fuel to a surface storage facility at the Yucca Mountain repository site. This plan should identify the budgetary resources needed and provide the draft statutory language that would be required to initiate such early shipments upon receipt of the construction authorization for the underground repository. This plan should also address the possibility of early shipment of spent fuel and high-level waste presently stored at a variety of DOE sites. The early acceptance plan should include a thorough analysis of the casks that will be required for transport and interim storage at the repository site, and should propose an aggressive cask procurement strategy to allow for the movement of significant quantities of spent nuclear fuel beginning in 2007, assuming the timely receipt of the construction authorization. The plan should analyze the potential cost savings that could result from placing cooled fuel, presently stored in spent fuel pools, into dual use casks rather than separate storage and transportation casks. The Department is directed to submit this plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not later than December

31, 2003. The Committee recommendation provides $4,000,000 for early acceptance activities.

External oversight funds.—The fiscal year 2004 budget request did not include any external oversight funds for the State of Nevada or affected units of local government. The Committee recommendation provides an amount not to exceed $2,500,000 for the State of Nevada and an amount not to exceed $6,500,000 for the affected units of local government to conduct their respective external oversight responsibilities, essentially the same as provided in fiscal year 2003. The Committee is aware that the Department of Energy Inspector General conducted separate audits of the external oversight funds provided to the State of Nevada (DOE–IG Audit Report CR–C–02–01, dated August 2002) and to the affected units of local governments (DOE–IG Audit Report DOE/IG–0600, dated May 2003), and found irregularities in a number of expenditures. The Committee lacks sufficient information to offer guidance on whether the Department should seek to recover Federal funds used for questioned oversight expenses; that judgment remains with the Department. However, the Committee is concerned enough about the problems identified by the Inspector General to direct that the external oversight funds for fiscal year 2004 should not be released to the State of Nevada and affected units of local government until the Director of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management has reviewed and approved in advance the State and local government oversight plans for fiscal year 2004. The Department is reminded that it is required to audit these funds annually to ensure that they are spent consistent with the statutory restrictions and with the approved oversight plans.

Long-term program funding.—The Committee was disappointed that the Department failed to champion effectively the budget cap adjustment that was proposed in the fiscal year 2004 budget request. 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.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2003	$205,280,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	326,306,000
Recommended, 2004	224,329,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+19,049,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−101,977,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 2003	−$120,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−146,668,000
Recommended, 2004	−123,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−3,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	+23,668,000

The Committee recommendation for Departmental Administration is $224,329,000, a decrease of $101,977,000 from the budget request of $326,306,000. Funding recommended for Departmental Administration provides for general management and program support functions benefiting all elements of the Department of Energy including the National Nuclear Security Administration. The account funds a wide array of headquarters activities not directly associated with program execution.

After the changes in the use of prior year balances and the transfer from Other Defense Activities are factored out, the Department's gross budget request for Departmental Administration amounts to an increase of $44,347,000, or roughly 14 percent, over the fiscal year 2003 level. The Committee does not concur with this large increase for DOE headquarters functions and funds Departmental Administration at roughly five percent over fiscal year 2003 levels, applying the additional funds to other higher priority needs. In particular, the Committee believes these requested funds would be better applied to address the backlog of safety deficiencies at the ten Science laboratories, a backlog which developed under the nose of the DOE employees charged with establishing the policies and regulating safety at DOE laboratories. This backlog is an unfortunate byproduct of the Department's continued reliance on self-regulation of nuclear and worker safety at its Science laboratories. Therefore, the Committee recommends transferring $25,000,000 from Departmental Administration to the Science Laboratories Infrastructure subaccount within the Science appropriation to protect the health and safety of laboratory employees, visiting researchers, and the population of the communities surrounding these ten Science laboratories.

Within the available funds, the Department is directed to conduct a study on how to increase the proportion of small business participation in DOE contracts; the contract for such a study should be awarded to a qualifying small business.

Chief Information Officer.—The Committee is generally supportive of the I–MANAGE and cybersecurity initiatives of this office, but does not concur with all of the requested 46 percent increase for this office. The Committee recommendation provides an additional $6,000,000 over the fiscal year 2003 funding level for implementation of STARS and of the data warehouse for the Department's financial data.

General Counsel.—The Committee disagrees with a number of legal and policy positions taken recently by the Office of General Counsel, and is concerned that the Secretary, the Congress, and the American taxpayer are not being well-served by this office. The Committee recommendation is $20,000,000, a reduction of $2,879,000 from the budget request.

Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation.—The Committee believes that the Office of Engineering and Construction Management within the Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation continues to provide a strong focal point for the improvement of project management capabilities throughout the Department. The Committee recommendation transfers $5,000,000 from other accounts (i.e., Weapons Activities and Defense Site Acceleration Completion) to continue external independent reviews of proposed projects and programs. To continue to train and certify DOE project managers, the Committee directs the Department to make available not less than $2,500,000 from the Working Capital Fund to fund training under the Project Management Career Development Program.

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

Cost of Work for Others.—The recommendation for the cost of work for others program is $69,682,000, the same as in fiscal year 2003.

Use of Prior Year Balances.—The recommendation does not include the use of prior year funds to be carried over from fiscal year 2003 to offset the fiscal year 2004 funding requirements.

Revenues.—The recommendation for revenues is $123,000,000, consistent with the estimate of revenues provided by the Congressional Budget Office.

Transfer from Other Defense Activities.—For many years, full funding for all corporate and administrative activities of the Department has been provided in the energy portion of this bill despite the fact that the Department's funding is provided in the national security and defense-related cleanup programs account for approximately 75 percent of the Department's total budget. The Committee recommendation distributes these costs more equitably in fiscal year 2004 and transfers $86,679,000 from Other Defense Activities for national security programs, an increase of $61,679,000 over the budget request.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 2003	$37,426,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	39,462,000
Recommended, 2004	39,462,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+2,036,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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

The Committee recommendation is $39,462,000, the same as the budget request.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

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

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

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

The Committee recommendation for the NNSA is $8,508,184,000, a decrease of $326,391,000 from the budget request of $8,834,575,000, but an increase of $330,617,000 over fiscal year 2003.

Nuclear weapons budget requirements.—This Committee continues to believe that our nation's nuclear arsenal provides a vital deterrent to potential aggressors. In order to maintain a modern nuclear stockpile, the Nation needs to have a modern, efficient, and flexible nuclear weapons complex with the necessary design, production, testing, refurbishment, and dismantlement capabilities. Unfortunately, the country possesses neither a modern stockpile nor a modern nuclear weapons complex. Instead, both are largely carryovers from the Cold War era. After careful consideration, the Committee has concluded that much of the current situation results from a flawed budget process. Under the current process, the Department of Defense (DoD) establishes the military requirements for Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile (i.e., numbers and types of warheads), which in turn dictates the requirements that DOE must meet to ensure the safety, security, and reliability of those weapons. The size, capability and cost of DOE's weapons complex is a direct result of the specific requirements established by DoD for warhead refurbishments, design modifications, testing, and dismantlement. However, when DoD develops their requirements their decision process is not constrained by the normal types of budget trade-offs that an agency confronts in the process of formulating a budget request. In effect, DoD sets the requirements and

leaves it up to DOE to come up with the budget to support the nuclear weapons complex each year. If these costs were funded directly by DoD, the nuclear weapons activities would be considered against other national defense priorities, such as developing improved conventional weapons, procuring more of existing weapon systems, paying ever-increasing operational and training costs, and providing a better quality of life for our soldiers, sailors, and airmen. Similarly, if the costs of the nuclear weapons complex were solely determined by the DOE, they would be balanced against other DOE priorities, such as nonproliferation, science research, improving the Nation's energy supply, or accelerating the cleanup of contaminated sites. Instead, the weapons activities portion of the NNSA budget is effectively insulated from any such tradeoffs—DoD sets requirements that another agency has to fund, and DOE treats the weapons activities budget as untouchable because DoD set the requirements.

There needs to be a serious debate about whether the approximately $6 billion spent annually on DOE's nuclear weapons complex is a sound national security investment. Until that debate occurs and the DOE weapons budget request is subject to meaningful budget trade-offs, this Committee will not assume that all of the proposed nuclear weapons requests are legitimate requirements.

Future Years Nuclear Security Program.—The Committee expects the NNSA Administrator to continue to address the deficiencies noted by the Committee in the past so that the NNSA's Future Years Nuclear Security Program (FYNSP) can be used by both the Department and Congress as an effective multi-year programming and budgeting resource, which includes realistic resource constraints that force meaningful decisions on potential tradeoffs between programs. The Committee notes particular support for the ongoing effort of the NNSA to implement a Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Evaluation (PPBE) structure and a budgeting by weapons type budget process. The Committee will work with the Department to implement a budgeting by weapons type pilot in fiscal year 2004 and full implementation in fiscal year 2005 and urges the Department to maintain a management focus on this transition to ensure a successful implementation process.

The Committee notes that the DOE Inspector General is conducting an independent review of the NNSA's PPBE process and structure, including its comparability to that of the Department of Defense. The early indications from that review indicate that the NNSA has made significant progress in implementing their planning, programming, budgeting, and evaluation process. However, there are several areas where improvements need to be made before it is fully operational. Specifically, the NNSA needs to address independent cost validation of contractor cost estimates that form the basis for Department's budget estimates. The Committee will withhold any recommendations pending the final IG report.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2003	$5,981,409,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	6,378,000,000
Recommended, 2004	6,117,609,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+136,200,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−260,391,000

The goal of the Weapons Activities program is to ensure the safety, security, reliability and performance of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. The program seeks to maintain and refurbish nuclear weapons to sustain confidence in their safety and reliability under the nuclear testing moratorium and arms reduction treaties. The Committee's recommendation for Weapons Activities is $6,117,609,000, a decrease of $260,391,000 from the budget request of $6,378,000,000, but an increase of $136,200,000 over fiscal year 2003.

Within the total amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003 the wartime supplemental appropriations bill contained additional funding of $67,000,000 for weapons activities. An additional $47,000,000 was provided for increased safeguards and security requirements and $20,000,000 for activities of the Office of Secure Transportation Asset.

Availability of funds.—Consistent with the provisions of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, the funds in this account are available until September 30, 2006.

Stockpile Review.—The Committee is still waiting for the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile report required in the Conference Report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2003 (Pub. L. 108–7). This stockpile review is to present a revised nuclear weapons stockpile plan structured to support the President's announcement on November 13, 2001, to draw down our nuclear forces toward the goal of 1,700–2,200 operationally deployed strategic nuclear warheads between now and 2012. As the Committee noted in the FY 2003 House Report 107–681, "The National Nuclear Security Administration has not been able to reconcile the recently announced dramatic reductions planned for deployed operational nuclear warheads to its strategic weapons modernization plans, some of which will cost billions of dollars each, and which are currently structured to upgrade the maximum number of warheads." One year later, the situation has not changed. The Department of Defense (DoD) is responsible for establishing the military requirements that are incorporated into the Presidentially approved Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Plan (NWSP). Until a revised NWSP is finalized, the NNSA continues to plan and budget for a weapons program that maintains the nuclear weapons stockpile in accordance with the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) active and inactive stockpile quantities. The fiscal year 2004 budget request is the second budget request delivered to the Committee that is loosely justified on the requirements of the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) policy document but lacking a formal plan that specifies the changes to the stockpile reflecting the President's decision. The Committee was hopeful that the outcome of the Administration's review would provide a definitive inventory objective for each weapons system to allow the NNSA to plan and execute a pro-

gram to support defense requirements based on what is needed rather than the continuation of a nuclear stockpile and weapons complex built to fight the now defunct Soviet Union. While the conventional forces in the Defense Department go through a 21st-Century transformation to meet the challenges of a new era, the NNSA is forced, through inertia and indecision, to maintain all contingencies regardless of how unlikely the threat. The Department of Defense needs to determine the composition of the stockpile required to support the President's announced stockpile reductions, and then coordinate with DOE to establish the nuclear weapons complex requirements based on deliberate, timely, well-justified decisions supported by Congress. Because the results of the stockpile review will not be provided to Congress in time to justify the fiscal year 2004 budget request, the Committee has to view the significant budget growth proposed for the current program with skepticism.

W80 life extension project.—The Committee has had a special interest in the W80 warhead stockpile life extension project (W80 LEP) and has consistently asked for unambiguous answers from the NNSA and the Air Force, the military user of the W80 weapons system, justifying the significant budget increases and the aggressive schedule for the W80 LEP. In fiscal year 2000, the Nuclear Weapons Council agreed to a W80 LEP schedule assuming a W80 LEP First Production Unit (FPU) in fiscal year 2006. However, the Committee understands that both NNSA and the Defense Department are currently reviewing the Air Force requirement for the W80 FPU and the NNSA is rebaselining the W80 LEP program to meet a revised delivery date to the Air Force in fiscal year 2008 or fiscal year 2009. However, the existing fiscal year 2006 FPU baseline continues to drive the budget request and the Committee has yet to receive an acceptable military justification for supporting such an aggressive W80 LEP program. Until a revised W80 LEP baseline has been finalized and justified to Congress, the Committee will continue to view the large proportion of the NNSA budget proposed for accelerated W80 LEP activities as unnecessary. As a result, the Committee has reduced the weapons activity budget for the W80 LEP.

Stockpile Life Extension Program budget request.—The General Accounting Office is currently conducting a review of the NNSA's Stockpile Life Extension Program (SLEP) addressing the comprehensiveness and reliability of the SLEP budget requests for each of the four specific warhead life extension projects: W87, W80, W76, and the B61. The Department's life extension activities are designed to extend the service life of the existing nuclear weapons stockpile by providing new subsystems and components for each warhead thereby extending the operational service life. Preliminary results from the GAO review identify concerns that question the reliability of the SLEP fiscal year 2004 budget request. The Committee is particularly concerned that the NNSA has yet to develop a managerial cost accounting system that provides the full cost of the refurbishments programs and validates the cost estimates that are used to develop the budget requests. The Committee has consistently requested comprehensive cost estimates for the individual weapon type SLEPs. While the NNSA is making progress in budg-

eting by weapons type, the weapons activities campaign costs are still unassigned by weapon type even though the budget justifications for many of the proposed campaigns activities are tied to the life extension requirements. The Committee will withhold any recommendations pending the final GAO report.

Life-of-Program buys.—The Committee notes that the W76 and W80 life extension programs include procurement actions referred to in the Selected Acquisition Reports as "Life-of-Program buys." Such procurements assume the purchase of sufficient units to supply the entire inventory of weapons (i.e., every Block) to be refurbished during the life extension program. The purpose of the "life of program buy" concept is to ensure the availability of commercial parts and minimize the scope of required qualifications and surveillance programs. The Committee appreciates the potential program efficiencies of a "life-of-program buy" including a simplified qualification process and subsequent surveillance program. However, if the NNSA's current planning assumes refurbishing the entire START I stockpile and the ongoing Administration's review of the stockpile results in significant changes to the number of warheads required for the relevant weapon system, such procurements risk buying significantly more units than are necessary. This is another instance where the continued delay in the decision-making and implementation of a revised stockpile plan risks wasting resources. The Administrator is directed to include all "life-of-program buy" procurements for each currently planned LEP in the Selected Acquisition Reports submitted with the fiscal year 2005 budget request, including the number of warheads to be refurbished assumed in procurement, how much is budgeted for each procurement, the procurement schedule and the specific rationale for proposing a Life-of-Program buy.

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.

The Department must notify Congress within 15 days of the use of this reprogramming authority. Transfers during the fiscal year which would result in increases or decreases in excess of $5,000,000 or which would 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's recommendation is $1,343,786,000, a decrease of $21,000,000 from the budget request, but an increase of $117,343,000 over fiscal year 2003.

The Committee notes an increase of over $138,343,000 in the fiscal year 2004 request over the fiscal year 2003 enacted level in the Directed Stockpile Work account. Because of the still undefined outyear DOD requirements for the W80 weapons system, the Committee is reducing DSW workload concerning the W80 Life Extension Program a total of $20,000,000. The Committee notes that the Selected Acquisition Report for the W80 shows a growth of $42,000,000 in DSW from fiscal year 2003 to fiscal year 2004. However, the Committee recognizes a portion of this increase is associated with the "first user concept" under which funding is assigned to a specific weapons type on the basis of first required utilization of facilities or activities on the part of a specific weapon refurbishment. The Committee agrees with this cost accounting concept and expects the NNSA to continue to use it for budgeting by weapons system. The Committee expects the NNSA to maintain the fiscal year 2003 level of effort as it rebaselines the W80 LEP to be consistent with revised Air Force plans and requirements. DSW Stockpile Research and Development is reduced $13,000,000 to slow activity consistent with the W80 LEP rebaselining. The Committee's recommendation increases Stockpile Maintenance a net $9,000,000 by reducing W80 LEP activities by $6,000,000 and increasing funding by $15,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant in Tennessee to complete and closeout the W87 LEP activities in fiscal year 2004. Stockpile Evaluation is reduced $1,000,000 to slow activity consistent with the W80 LEP rebaselining.

Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and Advanced Concepts research.—The Committee notes that the National Nuclear Security Administration has requested $21,000,000 in DSW Stockpile R&D to explore advanced weapons concepts, including $15,000,000 to continue feasibility and cost studies for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) and $6,000,000 for other advanced concepts definition studies. The Committee provides $5,000,000 for RNEP and eliminates funding for additional advanced concepts research in favor of higher priority current mission requirements. The Committee is concerned the NNSA is being tasked to start new activities with significant outyear budget impacts before the Administration has articulated the specific requirements to support the President's announced stockpile modifications. Under current plans, the NNSA is attempting to modernize the industrial infrastructure of the weapons complex and restore production plant capability in order to refurbish the entire START I stockpile, reengineer the federal management structure of the complex and downsize the workforce by 20 percent by the end of fiscal year 2004, while struggling to successfully demonstrate its core mission of maintaining the ex-

isting stockpile through the Stockpile Stewardship Program. Before any of the existing program goals have been successfully demonstrated, the Administration is now proposing to spend millions on enhanced test readiness while maintaining the moratorium on nuclear testing, aggressively pursue a multi-billion dollar Modern Pit Facility before the first production pit has even been successfully certified for use in the stockpile, develop a robust nuclear earth penetrator weapon and begin additional advanced concepts research on new nuclear weapons. It appears to the Committee the Department is proposing to rebuild, restart, and redo and otherwise exercise every capability that was used over the past forty years of the Cold War and at the same time prepare for a future with an expanded mission for nuclear weapons. Nothing in the past performance of the NNSA convinces this Committee that the successful implementation of Stockpile Stewardship program is a foregone conclusion, which makes the pursuit of a broad range of new initiatives premature. Until the NNSA has demonstrated to the Congress that it can successfully meet its primary mission of maintaining the safety, security, and viability of the existing stockpile by executing the Stockpile Life Extension Program and Science-based Stewardship activities on time and within budget, this Committee will not support redirecting the management resources and attention to a series of new initiatives.

The Committee directs that funding provided for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) be used for research on the problem of deep earth penetration through hard or hardened surfaces, including modeling and simulation of the use of advanced materials, and varied trajectories and speeds. The Committee further directs that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) coordinate the RNEP research program with ongoing programs at the Department of Defense relating to research on earth penetration to maximize the dual-use applicability for both conventional and nuclear weapons.

The fiscal year 2004 budget request identified specific funding amounts by weapons system in the Selected Acquisition Reports that accompanied the submission of the President's budget request. The Committee is to be notified in advance if the proposed funding levels for any weapons system change from the estimate provided in the Selected Acquisition Reports submitted with the fiscal year budget justification. Congressional approval will be required before any actual RNEP 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 $2,268,455,000, a decrease of $127,000,000 below the budget request of $2,395,455,000.

In order to facilitate review of the President's annual budget request, the Committee continues to direct the Department to provide project baseline data for each campaign to include a brief description of the campaign with planned completion dates, the total estimated cost of each campaign, the costs by fiscal year for each

major component of the campaign, and a list of major milestones by year. The Committee expects the Department to provide detailed project baseline data for each campaign showing the annual and five-year costs, schedule, scope, and deliverables for individual project activities as part of the fiscal year 2005 budget request.

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

Science campaigns.—The Committee recommendation for science campaigns is $236,548,000, a reduction of $33,000,000 from the budget request. The dynamic materials properties campaign is reduced by $5,000,000 because of slower progress than anticipated in Atlas experiments in fiscal year 2003, and the advanced radiography campaign is reduced by $20,000,000 due to reduction in the level of R&D work in the development of the multi-axis multi-time radiography. The primary certification campaign was reduced $8,000,000 by limiting the increase in the Boost Physics activity to $5,000,000 over current year and limiting the Materials Science Integration and Analysis increase to $3,516,000 over current year consistent with W80 LEP rebaselining.

Inspector General report.—The Committee is very concerned about the recent DOE Inspector General report (DOE/IG–0599) on the Dual Axis Radiographic Hydrodynamic Test Facility (DARHT) project that included findings that, notwithstanding the NNSA announcement that DARHT construction project had been completed on time and within budget, the facility would not be fully operational until June 2004. In addition to the 15–month delay from the projected completion date of March 2003, the IG noted a lack of a viable baseline and the shifting of at least $57.5 million of additional costs that were transferred to other work elements but should have been identified with the DARHT total project cost. The Committee has consistently urged the NNSA to strengthen its federal project management oversight expertise and reviews such as the DARHT audit reinforces the Committee's position on that recommendation.

Engineering campaigns.—The Committee recommendation for engineering campaigns is $298,187,000, a decrease of $33,000,000 from the budget request. The enhanced surety campaign is reduced $5,000,000 to slow down the level of effort identified for advanced use denial elements and options for the W80 Block 2, which under current W80 LEP schedule is not scheduled to start until fiscal year 2011. The Committee reduces the large increase for the enhanced surveillance campaign by $3,000,000 within the nonnuclear components, nonnuclear materials, and systems work activities.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommends $36,800,000 a reduction of $25,000,000 from the budget request, for Project 01–D–108, Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, New Mexico, to rebalance the current financial state of the construction project. The Committee is supportive of the MESA project, however, the significant uncosted balances associated with the project in addition to the significant increases over the requested budget levels provided over the past two years represent a serious project management challenge for the NNSA and a serious concern for the Committee.

Inertial Confinement Fusion.—The Committee recommends $511,769,000 for the inertial confinement fusion program, an increase of $45,000,000 over the budget request of $466,769,000. Consistent with the recommendation of the House-passed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, the Committee recommendation provides $58,337,000 for Experimental Support Technologies, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the request, but an increase of $27,975,000 over current year. The Committee recognizes the recent successes on the NIF project and expects NNSA to focus on the core NIF project to maintain cost and schedule performance. The recommendation includes $25,000,000 to continue development of high average power lasers and supporting science and technology. The Committee recommendation also includes the budget request of $10,467,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory, and $68,132,000 for the University of Rochester, an increase of $25,000,000 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 $150,000,000 for construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF), the same as the budget request.

Advanced simulation and computing.—The Committee recommendation for Advanced Simulation and Computing is $715,626,000, a reduction of $35,000,000 below the budget request of $750,626,000, but an increase of $15,763,000 over the current year. Within the ASCI campaign, the Committee provides $52,102,000 for Simulation Support, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request; $135,000,000 for Physical Infrastructure and Platforms, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request; $61,534,000 for Computational Systems, reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request; $10,000,000 for PathForward, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request; $2,250,000 for ASCI Integration, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request; and $37,600,000 for University Partnerships, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request.

Pit Manufacturing and Pit Certification.—The Committee recommendation for pit manufacturing and certification campaign is $273,228,000, a reduction of $47,000,000 from the budget request, but an increase of $12,228,000 over the current year budget. The Committee strongly supports the progress the NNSA and the Los Alamos National Laboratory have demonstrated in turning around the performance in the pit manufacturing and certification activities. The Committee urges the Department to continue to concentrate its management attention on meeting the fiscal year 2007 schedule for a certified pit and challenges the NNSA to reduce the total estimated cost required to meet the fiscal year 2007 certification goal. The Committee provides $116,773,000 for W88 Pit Manufacturing and $98,592,000 for W88 Certification. The Department is requesting $19,700,000 for pit manufacturing capability to develop manufacturing technologies for pits other than the W88. The Committee has determined this level of technology development for manufacturing capability in a facility that is a minimum of 15 years away from planned operational capability is premature.

The Committee recommendation is $4,700,000 in FY 2004, an increase of $2,000,000 over the current year program level.

The Committee recommendation is $10,810,000 for the modern pit facility (MPF), a reduction of $12,000,000 from the request. The Committee supports the budget request in fiscal year 2004 for continued conceptual design work on a Modern Pit Facility, but urges the NNSA to look diligently at ways to more effectively utilize TA–55 at Los Alamos National Laboratory to address Stockpile Stewardship Program pit manufacturing requirements in the near term and take a less aggressive planning approach for a new multi-billion dollar facility. The Committee feels the Department's rush to commit to an MPF design and siting decision is premature without the development of a detailed analysis of outyear pit production capacity requirements tied to the 2012 stockpile.

The Committee provides the budget request for Pit Campaign support activities at the Nevada Test Site.

Readiness campaigns.—The Committee recommendation for Readiness Campaigns is $233,097,000, a reduction of $24,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommends $45,158,000, for Stockpile Readiness. The Committee reduces the Establish Near-Term Process Capability $10,000,000 to reduce the growth in procurements for capital equipment associated with the W80 LEP to be consistent with W80 LEP rebaselining. The Committee recommends $19,649,000 for High Explosives Manufacturing & Weapons Assembly/Disassembly, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request to slow the growth of high explosive manufacturing, product requalification, and science-based manufacturing activities consistent with W80 LEP rebaselining. The Committee recommends $33,397,000 for Nonnuclear Readiness, a reduction of $4,000,000 from the budget request, to reduce the level of effort associated with the W80 readiness of production operations. The Committee recommends $134,893,000 for Tritium Readiness, the same as the budget request.

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 $1,511,080,000, a reduction of $102,391,000 below the budget request of $1,613,471,000.

Operations of facilities.—The Committee recommendation for Operations of facilities is $997,773,000, an increase of $25,000,000 over the budget request. Additional funding of $20,000,000 has been provided for the Pantex plant in Texas and $5,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant in Tennessee to meet facility needs.

Program Readiness.—The Committee recommends $106,202,000, a reduction of $24,891,000 from the budget request for Program Readiness. The budget request proposes $24,891,000 for enhanced test readiness activities. The increase over the base program for Nevada site readiness is proposed to fund the transition from the current 24 to 36 month time-to-test requirement to an 18–month test readiness posture at the Nevada Test Site. The Committee is concerned with the open-ended commitment to increase significantly funding for the purpose of Enhanced Test Readiness without

any budget analysis or program plan to evaluate the efficiency or effectiveness of this funding increase. Recent reports done by the DOE Inspector General and two NNSA management studies done at the Committee's request all identified significant problems with the current test readiness program, but the Department's proposal does not address the fundamental difficulties in maintaining test readiness during a testing moratorium.

The September 2002 Office of Inspector General audit (DOE/IG–0566) identified several problem areas impacting the ability to resume testing within the existing 24 to 36 month requirement: decline in the number of employees with testing experience; the deterioration of necessary systems and equipment; the inability to keep pace with new technology; and a delay in conducting required safety studies. The Committee notes that the IG identified these problems assuming the current 24 to 36 month test readiness posture rather than the proposed test readiness time frame of 18 months. As the IG audit noted, if the current testing infrastructure and personnel resources are moribund due to eleven years of inactivity, the Committee fails to see how the NNSA's enhanced test readiness proposal puts in place a program that precludes a similar state of disarray ten years into the future. Neither past performance nor any program or planning documentation provided to the Committee supports the Department's contention that an additional $100 million over three years and a $45 million increment every year thereafter is likely to result in a consistent 6 to 12 month improvement in test readiness posture when the current requirement has not been successfully maintained.

The Department's rationale for the change to an 18–month posture was included in the April 2003 Report to Congress on Nuclear Test Readiness, "An 18 month posture is appropriate because this is the minimum time we would expect it would take, once a problem was identified, to assess the problem, develop and implement a solution, and plan and execute a test that would provide the information needed to certify the fix." The NNSA's July 2002 Enhanced Test Readiness Cost Study stated that even during the Cold War era of routine testing, the national labs required 18–24 months to design and field a nuclear test with full diagnostics. The Committee questions a proposal to move to and attempt to indefinitely maintain a test readiness state that is the absolute minimum amount of time necessary to conduct a test designed to produce meaningful diagnostic results. The proposal reflects a disturbing "cost is no object" perspective in the Department's decision-making process.

The Committee supports the continued maintenance of the Nevada Test Site as a valuable resource for the NNSA nuclear weapons complex. Indeed, the Committee provides significant resources every year to fund a wide variety of activities at NTS that support the overall Stockpile Stewardship program. However, the Committee will not spend money on a perceived problem when the Department has not provided a rationale or a plan that addresses the underlying problems inherent in maintaining a testing capability during a testing moratorium. The Department's report states, "The NNSA has made a deliberate decision, in consultation with DOD and other agencies with the Administration, to move to an 18–

month nuclear test readiness posture by the end of fiscal year 2005." The Committee does not recognize the NNSA declaring a revised test readiness posture as a new requirement nor is it convinced that the decision can be successfully implemented based on the planning information provided to date. The Committee challenges the NNSA to work within the significant funding provided each year for its site readiness activities to demonstrate the ability to meet its current requirements before additional funds are added to meet a more problematic goal.

The Committee provides no funds for Enhanced Test Readiness as proposed by the Department in fiscal year 2004 pending better definition of the national security requirement.

Special Projects.—The Committee recommendation for Special Projects is $34,975,000, a reduction of $8,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee concurs with the concerns identified in the Report accompanying the House-passed Fiscal Year 2004 National Defense Authorization Act and recommends the elimination of the $8,000,000 of funding assistance for the Los Alamos School District.

The Committee recommendation for material recycle and recovery is $76,189,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation for containers is $16,006,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation for storage is $11,365,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation for nuclear weapons incident response is $89,694,000, the same as the budget request.

Construction projects.—

Project 04–D–101, Test capabilities revitalization, SNL, Albuquerque, NM. The Committee recommends $36,450,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee notes the importance of the test capabilities being available for the out year stockpile life extension programs.

Project 04–D–102, Exterior Communications Infrastructure Modernization, SNL, NM. The Committee recommends the modernization of the exterior communications infrastructure at Sandia National Lab be delayed until fiscal year 2005 and redirects the funds to higher priorities.

Project 04–D–104, National Security Sciences building, LANL, NM. The Committee recommends the LANL office building, Project 04–D–104, be delayed until fiscal year 2005 and redirects the funds to higher priority requirements.

Project 04–D–125, Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Facility Replacement (CMR–R)—LANL. The Committee recommends no funding for Project 04–D–125 in fiscal year 2004. Due to the complexity of this project, the Committee directs the completion of the project management decision process for the CMR–R in fiscal year 2004 prior to actual start of construction in fiscal year 2005. The Committee notes the Department has not completed the project engineering steps concerning CMR–R, including reaching critical decision one (CD–1) to commence the acquisition strategy or any baseline cost validation. The current cost estimate is based on pre-conceptual planning while the baseline cost validation will not be completed until reaching critical decision two. Although the Committee continues to be a strong adherent of the Department's new project

management process, the Committee must question the actual commitment of the Department to its own process by allowing this project to go forward in the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

Project 03–D–121, Gas Transfer Capacity Expansion, Kansas City, The Committee recommends $11,300,000, a reduction of $4,000,000 from the request. The construction activity is slowed consistent with the W80 life extension program FPU rebaselining.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION

The Committee recommendation for Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP) is $255,123,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request, but an increase of $14,187,000 over the current year. The Committee remains encouraged by the execution of this program and holds the NNSA to its commitment to ensure the results of this funding are quantifiable and provide measurable improvements at each site.

FIRP is a corporate program to restore, rebuild, and revitalize the physical infrastructure of the nuclear weapons complex. Its purpose is to stem the deterioration of the complex and address the backlog of maintenance, repair, and upgrade projects. The Committee directs NNSA to ensure that funds for recapitalization are not diverted to fund ongoing maintenance and programmatic needs while at the same time guarding against the inefficiency of large uncosted balances. The Committee recognizes the effort to revitalize the physical infrastructure of the weapons complex is in its early phases however, the Committee cannot continue to support such significant budget increases for FIRP unless the funds are being utilized efficiently.

The Committee directs that at least $50,000,000 of the facilities and infrastructure funding in fiscal year 2004 be used to dispose of excess facilities. The Committee encourages continuation of the strides made during the first two years of this program to reduce the overall facilities footprint of the complex. The use of new and innovative decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) practices must continue to be implemented to reduce costs and expedite site cleanups. The Committee continues to expect that services for D&D and demolition of excess facilities services be procured through open-competition where such actions provide the best return on investment for the federal government. The Committee directs the NNSA to continue a free and open competition process for at least 70 percent of the funds provided for disposing of excess facilities.

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 $182,400,000, 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

$585,750,000, the same as the budget request. Consistent with the recommendation of the House-passed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, the Committee recommends no funding in the weapons activities safeguards and security for the new research and development initiatives in cyber and physical security. The Committee notes that security R&D activities are more appropriately funded within the Department's Office of Security. The Committee directs an additional $10,000,000 for Y–12 National Security Complex to implement available security technologies to minimize additional manpower increases to meet new security requirements. As the Committee noted last year 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 budget request included an offset of $28,985,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriation, 2003	$1,168,860,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	1,340,195,000
Recommended, 2004	1,280,195,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+111,335,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−60,000,000

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; Accelerated Materials Disposition; Fissile Materials Disposition; and Program Direction. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

Risk based priority setting.—The Committee concurs with a recent DOE Inspector General audit (DOE/IG–0603) wherein the IG noted that the NN program had not established a formal, risk-based approach to allocating program funding. Despite several requests from the Committee, the Department has yet to produce any sort of qualitative or quantitative analysis that compares the costs of various nonproliferation initiatives against the presumed benefits in terms of reduced risk. The Committee acknowledges that such a comparison, especially on a quantitative basis, is not simple, nor can it be the sole decision making rationale. However, for the purpose of evaluating budget requests and making funding decisions the Committee requires a stronger analytical decision-making justification to determine the appropriate use of the marginal budget dollar for nonproliferation activities. The Committee directs the NNSA to submit as part of its fiscal year 2005 budget request for nonproliferation activities a budget justification including a pro-

gram analysis applying a risk-based evaluation of different activities proposed in the budget request.

Availability of funds.—Consistent with the provisions of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, as passed by the House of Representatives, the funds in this account are available until September 30, 2006.

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 counter nuclear smuggling effort and the entire Chemical and Biological National Security component formerly a part of the nonproliferation and verification research and development office were transferred to the Department of Homeland Security on March 1, 2003.

The Committee recommendation is $203,873,000, the same as the budget request, and includes $108,536,000 for proliferation detection; $89,277,000 for nuclear explosion monitoring, of which $25,000,000 is for ground-based systems for treaty monitoring; and $6,333,000 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 around in search of potential 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 improvements to existing products, not long-term research and development projects. The need to bring incrementally improved technologies to the marketplace quickly has never been more urgent.

Competitive Research.—The capability of the Department to develop and apply technology rapidly to meet growing nonproliferation and terrorism challenges is a continuing concern of the Committee. The Technical Support Working Group (TSWG) is the focal point in the federal government to conduct the national interagency research and development program for combating terrorism requirements. TSWG seeks technology solutions that address operational and technological shortfalls identified by government agency users. Using a solicitation format called a Broad Agency Announcement (BAA), TSWG solicits industry, academia, and government laboratories for innovative research and development solutions to these requirements, including nuclear, radiological, chemical, and biological countermeasures. The Committee directs the Department to use the TWSG BAA process for all nonproliferation and verification research and development activities during fiscal year 2004. The Committee believes that TSWG will help the De-

partment identify and prioritize requirements and develop technology solutions more quickly.

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 2005 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 $105,734,000, an increase of $4,000,000 from the budget request to fund the accelerated activities in Reduced Enrichment for Research and Test Reactors (RERTR) and the HEU Research Reactor Fuel Purchase proposed under the AMD initiative.

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 proposes to complete this activity by 2009. The recommendation includes $8,860,000, an increase of $3,000,000 from the budget request to fund the accelerated activities in Reduced Enrichment for Research and Test Reactors (RERTR) proposed under the Accelerated Materials Disposition initiative.

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 $9,691,000.

Also in the nonproliferation policy program is the Kazakhstan Spent Fuel Disposition initiative to secure three tons of weapons-grade plutonium in the BN–350 reactor spent fuel at Aktau, Kazakhstan. The recommendation includes the budget request of $8,270,000. The Committee has serious reservations concerning the baseline plan, which assumes transporting the spent fuel out of its secure location in Aktau, across the country, to an as-yet-unbuilt storage facility in eastern Kazakhstan. The Department is directed to conduct an updated vulnerability analysis (VA) applying the revised Postulated Threat statement to the existing VA data to evaluate the costs and risks of transporting the material to the storage site area assumed in the baseline compared to securing the material in a dry storage option on site at the BN–350 reactor in Aktau. None of the funds provided for this activity in fiscal year 2004, or previous fiscal years, may be obligated for transportation equipment or activities without first notifying the Committee.

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 Committee remains concerned that the Department is not putting a high enough management priority on ensuring as much of the funds appropriated for the Russian programs as practical, be spent in Russia rather than at the Department's own national laboratories in the U.S. The Department's contracting mechanisms are resulting in excess funds going to pay laboratories for contract administration and oversight that would be better performed by Federal personnel. The Committee expects more direct contracting will be a result of the Nuclear Nonproliferation office achieving its Federal staffing goals in FY 2004. 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 35 percent of the funding for Russian programs may be spent in the United States. The Department's failure to review the types of administrative and programmatic guidance that are needed for these programs and to choose the proper contractual mechanism leads to excessive costs for administration and less funding going to Russia. The Department should report to the Committee by December 15, 2003, on the steps being taken to meet the 35 percent limitation.

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS PROTECTION, CONTROL AND COOPERATION

The International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation 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 $255,000,000, an increase of $29,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for accelerating the Material Consolidation and Conversion (MCC) program as proposed under the Accelerated Materials Disposition initiative. The Committee continues to direct 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.

Megaports initiative.—The fiscal year 2003 wartime supplemental included $84,000,000 for developing and deploying radiation detectors at mega seaports. The Megaports initiative is a new activity in fiscal year 2003 intended to install radiation detection equipment at the top 20 major overseas seaports to detect and interdict special nuclear material prior to arrival in the U.S. The top 20 foreign seaports identified in the Megaports initiative as pri-

ority upgrades are the source of 70% of the container traffic from all overseas ports destined for U.S. ports. The Committee is fully supportive of the Megaports concept of interdicting source material for a weapon of mass destruction as far from the U.S. border as feasible and directs the department to expand this new program in fiscal year 2004. The Committee provides $28,000,000 within International Materials Protection, Control and Cooperation, Second Line of Defense, for Megaports. The Department did not include funding for Megaports activities in the department's budget request for fiscal year 2004; however, the Committee expects the Department to request funding for this high priority activity in the fiscal year 2005 budget request.

Standards for Cleanup after RDD Event.—The Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003, provided $17,000,000 to expand efforts under the International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation program to secure materials that may be used to construct a radioactive dispersal device (RDD) and to develop standards for the cleanup of contamination resulting from a potential RDD event. In its efforts to help develop appropriate cleanup standards for an RDD event, the Committee expects the Department to coordinate fully with the other Federal agencies that have responsibility for setting radiation standards in the United States, namely the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency.

RUSSIAN TRANSITION INITIATIVE

The Committee recommendation for the Russian Transition Initiative program is $40,000,000, 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 $18,000,000, the same as the budget request.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR SAFETY AND COOPERATION

With the completion of the Soviet-designed reactor safety program in fiscal year 2003, the international nuclear safety and cooperation program should plan to complete all ongoing activities by the end of fiscal year 2004. The Committee does not support an expanded mission for the program beyond the original mandate of the Soviet-designed reactor safety program. The Committee notes that the security of nuclear materials and facilities is the mission of

other offices within the Office of Nuclear Nonproliferation, and that other Federal and international entities already have nuclear safety as a primary mission. The Committee recommendation is $6,083,000, a reduction of $8,000,000 from the budget request of $14,083,000. The Committee reallocates the funds to continue and accelerate the Megaports initiative in fiscal year 2004.

ELIMINATION OF WEAPONS-GRADE PLUTONIUM PRODUCTION

The Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production Program (EWGPP) was transferred from the Department of Defense to the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2003. This is a cooperative effort with the Federation of Russia to stop plutonium production at three nuclear reactors still in operation in Russia, two located at Seversk and one at Zheleznogorsk. The three reactors have approximately 15 years of remaining lifetime and could generate an additional 25 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium. They also provide heat and electricity required by the surrounding communities. The current approach is to 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 $50,000,000, the same as the budget request.

The Committee appreciates that the Administrator of the NNSA choose to complete the EWGPP fossil fuel construction projects in accordance with the direction of the Committee and expects to be kept informed of program progress.

ACCELERATED MATERIAL DISPOSITION

The Department has proposed a new initiative to augment activities currently conducted under the 1993 HEU/LEU Purchase Agreement with the Russian Federation to reduce weapons useable high enriched uranium (HEU) to low enriched uranium (LEU) for fuel to be used in civilian power producing reactors in the U.S. The Accelerated Material Disposition initiative proposes to directly purchase HEU and HEU converted to LEU material from the Russia Federation for storage and use by the U.S. government. The Accelerated Material Disposition initiative has a ten-year projected cost estimate of $710 million to $1.13 billion in order to eliminate an additional 15 Metric Tons (MT) of excess HEU in Russia. Under the existing 1993 HEU/LEU Purchase Agreement, 30 MT per year are presently being eliminated by downblending to low enriched uranium at no cost to the taxpayer.

The Committee is disappointed that the Administration's highest profile nonproliferation initiative imposes a government solution at significant cost to the taxpayer for a nonproliferation issue that has been successfully addressed for nearly a decade using a free market approach under the HEU/LEU Purchase Agreement. At a time of constrained resources when the Department is ignoring an obvious unmet need such as nuclear material detection at foreign seaports, the Committee cannot support such a significant commitment of outyear budgets for what is a marginal nuclear nonproliferation gain. The Committee concurs with the recent DOE Inspector General audit (DOE/IG–0603) wherein the IG noted that the NN pro-

gram had not established a formal, risk-based approach to allocating program funding. A proposal such as the AMD initiative demonstrates that the NN program requires a stronger analytical decision-making model to determine the appropriate use of the marginal budget dollar.

The Committee notes that the $14,000,000 provided for fiscal year 2003 will most likely remain uncosted, as the implementing agreement negotiations with the Russians have not been completed. Considering the ongoing concern of the Committee regarding the large uncosted balances in the Nonproliferation programs the request for AMD has been reduced pending conclusion of negotiations with the Russians. Consistent with the direction provided in the House-passed Fiscal Year 2004 National Defense Authorization Act the Committee provides $5,000,000, a reduction of $25,000,000 for the Accelerated Material Disposition proposal.

The Committee recommended funding for accelerated Reduced Enrichment for Research and Test Reactors (RERTR) and the HEU Research Reactor Fuel Purchase and the Material Consolidation and Conversion (MCC) program in the appropriate NN program account where the existing base programs are funded.

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 $656,505,000, the same as the budget request. Funding of $193,805,000 is provided for U.S. surplus materials disposition and $47,100,000 for the Russian plutonium disposition program.

The U.S. portion of the fissile materials disposition program is not to be counted in the 35 percent limitation on funds for Russian programs to be spent in the U.S.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommendation includes $402,000,000 for Project 99–D–143, the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication facility project. Funding of $13,600,000 is provided for Project 99–D–141, the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility project.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $60,000,000 of prior year balances. The Committee reiterates its concern over the ever-increasing uncosted balances in the Nuclear Nonproliferation program. The Department estimates that the end of fiscal year 2003 uncosted balances for NN will be over $1,000,000,000. The Committee questions whether the program is achieving its program goals with uncosted balances at such levels. These balances represent a serious management challenge for the NNSA and the Committee expects these funds will be efficiently utilized in a timely manner.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriation, 2003	$702,196,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	768,400,000
Recommended, 2004	768,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+66,204,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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 $768,400,000, the same as the budget request.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriation, 2003	$325,102,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	347,980,000
Recommended, 2004	341,980,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+16,878,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−6,000,000

The Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) provides corporate planning and oversight for Defense Programs, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Naval Reactors, including the NNSA field offices in New Mexico, Nevada, and California. The Committee recommendation is $341,980,000, a reduction of $6,000,000 from the budget request to reflect the reduction in overall program activities.

The NNSA formally delivered to Congress a management reengineering plan on December 20, 2002, with a goal of consolidating functions, clarifying lines of authority and reducing federal employment levels by 20 percent throughout the complex by the end of fiscal year 2004. The Committee fully supports the successful implementation of the NNSA reengineering effort and will work with the Administrator to achieve the fiscal year 2004 goal. The Committee expects regular updates on the reengineering implementation progress throughout fiscal year 2004.

The Committee directs the Administrator of NNSA to provide at least $5,000,000 for the Office of Engineering and Construction Management for External Independent Reviews (EIRs) of NNSA projects and continue to provide financial support for training and mentoring programs to improve the skills of NNSA project managers.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.—The Committee provides $58,000,000 for the Federal employees in the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation to allow greater management flexibility for that office in hiring Federal employees. The Committee continues to identify the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation separately to maintain the transparency and management attention on achieving the FY 2004 goal of 244 on-board Federal employees.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 2003	$6,723,090,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	6,809,814,000
Recommended, 2004	6,748,457,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+25,367,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−61,357,000

The Defense Environmental Management program is responsible for identifying and reducing risks and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out defense-related nuclear research and production activities that resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination requiring remediation, stabilization, or some other type of cleanup action. These responsibilities include facilities and areas at 114 geographic sites. These sites are located in 30 states and one territory and occupy an area equal to that of Rhode Island and Delaware combined-or about two million acres.

The Department has restructured its Defense Environmental Management budget for fiscal year 2004 to focus on accelerated cleanup and closure. The former Defense Environmental Management accounts (Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, Defense Facilities Closure and Defense Privatization) have been collapsed into the new Defense Site Acceleration Completion and Defense Environmental Services accounts. Defense Site Acceleration Completion, by far the largest account at a request of $5.8 billion, has as its primary mission the closure of cleanup sites centered on three timeframes: 2006, 2012 and 2035. Defense Environmental Services are those activities that support closure (e.g. federal salaries, and payments to States and communities) and non-mission environmental work (e.g. storage of spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste, management of newly generated low level radioactive waste for other programs).

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Management totals $6,748,457,000, a reduction of $61,357,000 from the budget request of $6,809,814,000. Details of the recommended funding levels follow below for the specific Defense Environmental Management accounts.

The Committee continues to support the Department's efforts to reform the Environmental Management program and realize significant cost and schedules savings and accelerate risk reduction. The Department should focus on reducing risk, accelerating cleanup, eliminating activities that do not contribute to risk reduction and cleanup, and improving the structure, scope, and management of cleanup contracts. The Committee does have several significant concerns about the execution of the accelerated cleanup initiative, as detailed below.

Lack of Agreement for Accelerated Performance Management Plans.—As noted above in the discussion for the Uranium Enrich-

ment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, Congressional support for accelerated cleanup, specifically in the form of additional near-term funding for accelerated cleanup, is predicated on the concurrence of the involved State regulators to the accelerated Performance Management Plans (PMPs). Where the Department has not been able to reach agreement with State regulators for specific accelerated PMPs, the Committee does not provide the additional increment of funding requested to support accelerated cleanup. The Committee encourages the Department to continue working with these State regulators so that the funds to support accelerated cleanup may be restored in a future fiscal year. The Committee is watching closely the negotiations between the Department and the State of Washington regarding accelerated cleanup at Hanford. For the present, the Committee recommendation includes the requested accelerated cleanup funds for Hanford because the Committee believes the Department and the State are making substantial progress toward agreement. However, if the Department is not able to resolve its differences with the State in the next several months, the Committee reserves the right at conference to redirect the additional funds to other sites that are more committed to accelerated cleanup.

Review of Cost and Schedule Baselines.—The Department recently notified the Committee that the total estimated cost for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (project 01–D–416) at Hanford has increased from $4.35 billion to $5.78 billion. This represents an increase of $1.43 billion, or roughly 33 percent. Some of this increase is a result of changes to the project scope resulting from the accelerated cleanup schedule at Hanford, but much of this increase stems from the dubious quality of the previous estimate. The Office of Engineering and Construction Management has completed an External Independent Review (EIR) on this latest project baseline cost and schedule and confirmed it to be reasonable, and the Committee has no real alternative but to accept that judgment. However, the dramatic cost increase for this one project does call into question the reliability of the baselines for the other major projects within the accelerated cleanup program. The Committee directs the Department to review the baseline cost and schedule estimates for all of the line item construction projects included in the fiscal year 2004 budget request. To fund these reviews, $2,500,000 should be provided from within funds made available for the appropriate Defense Environmental Management accounts.

Statutory Changes Required for Accelerated Cleanup.—The Department's contractor for the cleanup of the Fernald, Ohio, site recently proposed a statutory change to allow the material stored in the Fernald silos to be treated as 11(e)(2) material for purposes of disposal in a commercial disposal facility. Such a statutory change is not required to meet the current cleanup baseline, but apparently is necessary if the contractor is to achieve the maximum possible schedule acceleration and receive the maximum possible performance fee from the Department. The Committee does not disagree with the merits of this proposal regarding the classification of the Fernald silo material for disposal purposes. However, the Committee strongly objects to the Department sending forth its contractors to advocate for legislative changes that are necessary to

execute accelerated cleanup plans. If these statutory changes are responsible and for the benefit of the Government and the taxpayer, then the Department should submit such changes as part of a formal legislative proposal from the Administration to the Congress. The Committee directs the Department to review its current PMPs and cleanup contracts and identify any other instances where statutory changes are required to execute accelerated cleanup. The Department is directed to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 60 days after enactment of this Act with the results of this review, and to submit a comprehensive legislative proposal with the fiscal year 2005 budget request including all such proposed changes to existing law.

Legacy Management.—A recent report by the National Research Council on the status of Long-Term Stewardship of DOE legacy waste sites raised concerns that departmental cleanup planning and decision making was decoupled from long-term stewardship planning. The Committee expects the department to consider explicitly the long-term stewardship requirements when implementing its accelerated cleanup plans to ensure that long-term stewardship is not used as a substitute for complete and effective site cleanup. The PMPs should identify the resources that will be required to execute legacy responsibilities at each site.

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

DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION

The Defense Site Acceleration Completion account is a new account largely incorporating the programs, projects, and activities from the previous site/project completion and post–2006 completion subaccounts within the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management account, the site closure activities within the Defense Facilities Closure Projects account, and the Defense Environmental Management Privatization account, as well as the Environmental Management Cleanup Reform initiative proposed by the Department in fiscal year 2003. The Committee recommendation for defense site acceleration completion in fiscal year 2004 is $5,758,278,000, a reduction of $56,357,000 from the budget request of $5,814,635,000.

Reprogramming Authority.—The Committee continues to support the need for flexibility to meet changing funding requirements at sites which are undergoing accelerated cleanup activities. In fiscal year 2004, each site manager may transfer up to $5,000,000 between Defense Site Acceleration Completion subaccounts (i.e., accelerated completions 2006, accelerated completions 2012, accelerated completions 2035, and line item construction projects) to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increased or decreased by more than $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.

Accelerated Completions, 2006.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,242,751,000, a reduction of $2,420,000 from the budget request to reflect the lack of regulatory agreement on accelerated 2006 cleanup activities for the Sandia National Laboratories. This funding supports the closure by the year 2006 of the Rocky Flats, West Jefferson, Fernald, Miamisburg, and Ashtabula sites, and the completion of significant cleanup projects at various other sites such as Melton Valley.

Accelerated Completions, 2012.—The Committee recommendation provides $2,216,587,000, a reduction of $11,727,000 from the budget request to reflect the lack of regulatory agreement on accelerated 2012 cleanup activities for the Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Pantex site. This amount includes the requested funding of $23,500,000 for project engineering and design of two projects at the Savannah River Site (SRS) and the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) (project 04–D–414), $1,134,000 for construction of container surveillance capability at SRS (project 04–D–423), $1,126,000 for construction of the INTEC cathodic protection system expansion project at INEEL (project 02–D–402), and $690,000,000 for construction of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant at Hanford (project 01–D–416).

Accelerated Completions, 2035.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,961,387,000, a reduction of $17,210,000 from the budget request to reflect the lack of regulatory agreement on accelerated 2035 cleanup activities for the Los Alamos National Laboratory. This amount includes the requested funding of $13,954,000 for construction of the Immobilized High Level Waste Interim Storage Facility at Hanford (project 03–D–403), $51,500,000 to continue design of the Salt Waste Processing Facility Alternative at SRS (project 03–D–414), and $20,259,000 for construction of Glass Waste Storage Building #2 at SRS (project 04–D–408).

Safeguards and Security.—The Committee recommendation provides $299,977,000, the same as the budget request.

Technology Development and Deployment.—The Committee recommendation provides $63,920,000, the same as the budget request. Within available funds, the Committee provides $5,000,000 to continue the five-year international agreement with AEA Technology, and $7,000,000 to continue the five-year agreement with Florida International University's Hemispheric Center for Environmental Technology.

Funding adjustments.—The Committee recommendation includes an offset of $1,344,000, the same as the budget request, for the security costs associated with reimbursable work, and a general reduction of $25,000,000 to be applied primarily to activities with the least impact on near-term cleanup and closure.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

The Defense Environmental Services account is a new account incorporating the activities that indirectly support the cleanup and closure of contaminated sites. These include activities such as the management of non-legacy spent nuclear fuel and newly-generated waste and the recovery and disposal of sealed radioactive sources, as well as community and regulatory support, the Federal contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommis-

sioning Fund, and program direction for the Department's environmental management efforts. The Committee recommendation for Defense Environmental Services in fiscal year 2004 is $990,179,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request.

Community and Regulatory Support.—The Committee recommendation is $61,337,000, the same as the budget request.

Federal Contribution to Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.—The Energy Policy Act of 1992, Public Law 102–486, created the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund to pay for the cost of cleanup of the gaseous diffusion facilities located in Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Paducah, Kentucky; and Portsmouth, Ohio. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $452,000,000 for the Federal contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund as authorized in Public Law 102–486.

Non-Closure Environmental Activities.—The Committee recommendation is $189,698,000, the same as the budget request, including the requested amounts for spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and Savannah River Site, and solid waste stabilization and disposition of newly generated waste at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The Department is to fund the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program at the fiscal year 2003 level from within available funds.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $292,144,000, the same as the budget request.

Funding adjustments.—The Committee recommendation includes a general reduction of $5,000,000.

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

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2003	$515,659,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	636,154,000
Recommended, 2004	666,516,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+150,857,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	+30,362,000

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 operational component of this office was transferred to the Department of Homeland Security on March 1, 2003. The remaining Department of Energy component will be maintained as an office for the purpose of advising the Secretary of Energy in the development of policy to ensure the reliability of the nation's energy

infrastructure. The Committee recommendation for energy security and assurance is $2,472,000, a reduction of $1,800,000 from the budget request. The Committee notes the FTE level dropped from 22 to 8 from fiscal year 2003 to 2004.

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 $211,757,000, the same as the budget request.

In fiscal year 2004, the Department of Energy will spend over $1 billion on safeguards and security activities at Headquarters and field locations. The $211,757,000 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.

The Committee notes that safeguards and security is not a mission of the Department of Energy; instead it is a requirement that must be met when conducting activities to meet the actual defense, science, and environmental clean up missions of the Department. When implementing the needed security enhancements to meet increased requirements, the Committee will look to the Department's use of improved technology and the efficient restructuring and consolidation of material and facilities requiring the highest levels of security with the goal of improving S&S and reducing the percentage of the budget that must be used for safeguards and security.

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 $39,823,000, 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, and cyber security. The Committee recommendation is $22,575,000, the same as the budget request.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Office of Environment, Safety and Health develops programs and policies to protect the workers and the public, conducts independent oversight of performance, and funds health effects studies. The Committee recommendation is $107,686,000, the same as the budget request. 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 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 $15,000,000, the same as the budget request. Funding has remained stable or increased in many Departmental programs, and there are no significant contractor reductions requiring additional funds in fiscal year 2004. The Committee has provided $1,400,000 from within available funds for the Pinellas Community Reuse Organization to complete the STAR Center transition. 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 and fiscal year 2004 at NNSA and environmental cleanup sites, the Committee sees no need to increase funding for severance benefits above the budget request for fiscal year 2004.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation of $2,679,000 for program direction, the same as the budget request.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The fiscal year 2004 budget request proposes to establish the Office of Legacy Management to manage the long-term stewardship responsibilities at the Department of Energy clean up sites after remediation activities are completed. The functions of the Office will include long-term surveillance and maintenance of DOE facilities where remediation measures are substantially completed and

the management of the post-closure benefits of former contractor employees. The Committee expects the Department's legacy management plans and activities will be coordinated with the Office of Environmental Management to ensure clean up and long term stewardship is appropriately integrated. The Committee recommendation for the Office of Legacy Management activities includes $47,525,000, the same as the budget request, of which $19,178,000 is provided in Other Defense Activities and the balance is provided in nondefense Environmental Services. The Committee directs the Legacy Management appropriation account line to continue to be identified separately in future departmental budget requests.

FUNDING FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES IN IDAHO

The Committee recommendation includes $112,306,000 to fund the defense-related (050 budget function) activities at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) and associated Idaho cleanup sites. This amount includes $21,415,000 for INEEL infrastructure, the same as the budget request, for activities at this site previously funded under the Defense Environmental Management account; 56,654,000 for Idaho sitewide safeguards and security, the same as the budget request; and $34,237,000 for program direction to support Headquarters and Idaho Field Office personnel previously funded under Defense Environmental Management.

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $86,679,000, to provide administrative support for programs funded in the atomic energy defense activities accounts. This will fund Departmental activities performed by offices such as the Secretary, Deputy Secretary and Under Secretary, the General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer, Human Resources, Congressional Affairs, and Public Affairs, which support the organizations and activities funded in the atomic energy defense activities accounts.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

The Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) is responsible for all of the Department's adjudicatory processes, other than those administered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommendation is $3,797,000, the same as the budget request.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation for funding adjustments includes an offset of $712,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work, the same as the budget request.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 2003	$312,952,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	430,000,000
Recommended, 2004	430,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+117,048,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

Since passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, the Nuclear Waste Fund has incurred costs for activities related to the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel generated from the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy. At the end of fiscal year 2002, the balance owed by the Federal government to the Nuclear Waste Fund was $1,212,000,000 (including principal and interest). The Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriation was established to ensure payment of the Federal government's contribution to the nuclear waste repository program. Through fiscal year 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 $430,000,000, the same as the budget request. Combined with the funding recommended for Nuclear Waste Disposal, this will provide a total of $765,000,000 for nuclear waste disposal activities in fiscal year 2004.

CERRO GRANDE FIRE ACTIVITIES

The Committee has included language proposed by the Administration canceling $75,000,000 of remaining available balances from the Cerro Grande Fire activities. The Committee directs the Secretary of Energy to deobligate the funds to be cancelled.

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 2004 does not support the Administration proposal to continue the phase-out of federal financing of the customers' purchase power and wheeling expenses for the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration. Also, the Committee recommendation does not at this time incorporate the Administration proposal for the Power Marketing Administrations to fund directly from revenues the costs of operation

and maintenance of federal hydropower facilities at Corps of Engineers dams, 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 finds no compelling reason to continue the phase out of purchase power and wheeling, particularly since this activity is budget neutral. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2004 maintains purchase power and wheeling activities at approximately 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, and exchanges and markets surplus power with Canada and California.

The Committee continues to have concerns about Bonneville's financial situation, particularly in light of the $700 million in additional borrowing authority provided to Bonneville in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2003. At the same time that the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations were conferencing the fiscal year 2003 appropriations bill and deciding whether to provide this additional borrowing authority, Bonneville realized that it had a 74 percent probability that it would miss its loan repayment to the Federal Treasury in fiscal year 2003. Unfortunately, Bonneville neglected to inform Congress of this critical change in its financial circumstances until after the fiscal year 2003 appropriations conference was completed.

The Committee has asked the General Accounting Office (GAO) to conduct a thorough review of the Bonneville Power Administration. The GAO has provided the following preliminary findings and observations: (1) increasing borrowing authority for the transmission side of BPA will increase BPA's overall costs but will not resolve its current financial difficulties on the power generation side of BPA (i.e., low cash reserves and poor bond rating); (2) BPA is currently overextended as a result of committing to provide more power than it can generate from the Federal hydropower system, creating greater volatility in costs and revenues; (3) stakeholders see a lack of sufficient oversight and a lack of incentives to control costs; and (4) the present rate structure insulates customers from natural fluctuations in hydropower availability, thus eliminating any price signal when electricity is scarce. The net result is that Bonneville continues to operate at significant financial risk, which

impacts both ratepayers in the region and taxpayers in the rest of the country.

The Committee directs the Secretary to conduct an independent review of Bonneville's mission, management, and financial condition to address the GAO findings and conclusions. The Committee expects the Secretary to make specific recommendations to Congress to show how Bonneville might focus its mission on delivering the electricity generated by the Federal hydropower system and reduce the risk to the ratepayers in the region and to the Federal Treasury. The Secretary should submit this report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not later than December 31, 2004.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2003	$4,505,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	5,100,000
Recommended, 2004	5,100,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+595,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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

The Committee recommendation for the Southeastern Power Administration is $5,100,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Southeastern in fiscal year 2003 is $39,100,000, with $34,000,000 for purchase power and wheeling and $5,100,000 for program direction. The purchase power and wheeling costs will be offset by collections of $34,000,000. The offsetting collections total of $34,000,000 includes $15,000,000 made available in Public Law 106–377 for use in fiscal year 2004, plus an additional $19,000,000 provided in this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2003	$27,200,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	28,600,000
Recommended, 2004	28,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+1,400,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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

The Committee recommendation for the Southwestern Power Administration is $28,600,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Southwestern in fiscal year 2004 is $30,400,000, including $4,663,000 for operating expenses,

$1,800,000 for purchase power and wheeling, $19,205,000 for program direction, and $4,732,000 for construction. The offset of $1,800,000 from collections for purchase power and wheeling 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 2004, plus an additional $1,512,000 provided in this Act. The Committee recommendation also provides authority for Southwestern to accept advances from non-Federal entities to provide interconnections to Southwestern's transmission system.

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

Appropriation, 2003	$167,760,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	171,000,000
Recommended, 2004	171,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+3,240,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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 $171,000,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Western in fiscal year 2003 is $360,992,000, which includes $12,200,000 for construction and rehabilitation, $36,204,000 for system operation and maintenance, $186,000,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and $126,588,000 for program direction. Consistent with the budget request, no funds are provided for Utah mitigation and conservation. Offsetting collections for purchase power and wheeling total $186,000,000; with the use of $3,992,000 of offsetting collections from the Colorado River Dam Fund (as authorized in P.L. 98–381), this requires a net appropriation of $171,000,000. The offsetting collections for purchase power and wheeling includes $20,000,000 made available in Public Law 106–377 for use in fiscal year 2004, plus an additional $166,000,000 provided in this Act.

Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $4,825,000 for upgrades of the Phoenix substation.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriation, 2003	$2,716,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	2,640,000
Recommended, 2004	2,640,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−76,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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 Adminis-

tration. 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 $2,640,000, the same as the budget request.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2003	$192,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	199,400,000
Recommended, 2004	192,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	.....
Budget Estimate, 2004	−7,400,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 2003	−$192,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−199,400,000
Recommended, 2004	−192,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	.....
Budget Estimate, 2004	+7,400,000

The Committee recommendation for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is $192,000,000, the same as the fiscal year 2003 funding level and a decrease of $7,400,000 compared to the fiscal year 2004 budget request. Revenues for FERC are established at a rate equal to the budget authority, resulting in a net appropriation of $0.

The Committee has concerns regarding the integration of various Midwestern companies into a regional transmission organization (RTO) under the FERC order issued July 31, 2002. To protect consumers in the Midwestern States, the Committee expects FERC will require that the conditions of its July 31, 2002, order be met before proceeding with any irreversible integration of transmission systems. The Committee may address this issue in more detail at conference, pending receipt of a report from FERC on the status of this integration.

The Federal Power Act requires FERC to establish and collect reasonable annual charges for the use of federal lands for non-federal hydropower projects. Since 1987, FERC has charged land rents for hydropower projects based on a system used by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management for linear rights-of-way (e.g., power lines, pipelines, etc.) The General Accounting Office (GAO), in response to a request from this Subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, conducted an analysis of these land rents charged by FERC for non-federal hydropower projects located on federal lands. In its completed report (GAO–03–383), GAO concludes that FERC is collecting only two percent of the fair market value of these Federal lands used for non-federal hydropower. This represents a significant loss of revenues to the Treasury and also a significant subsidy for non-Federal hydropower projects.

Based on preliminary results from this GAO review last year, in House Report 107–681 the Committee directed FERC to submit in its fiscal year 2004 budget request a proposal to revise the existing fee schedule to capture more of the real market value of these federal lands. The Committee did not direct FERC to make a change to the existing fee schedule, and certainly did not suggest that these land rents should be increased overnight by a factor of 50 or more. However, the Committee did expect to receive a serious proposal from FERC on how the current land rent fees could be revised over time to capture more of the real value of these lands for the U.S. Treasury. Instead, FERC submitted a 2-page letter report explaining its reservations about adopting the GAO net benefits methodology (which the Committee did not direct FERC to do), noting that a shift to a more complex methodology will require additional resources (which the Appropriations Committee already realized), and stating that FERC intends to wait until the Forest Service revises its right-of-way index before it will consider making any changes to the FERC methodology.

The Committee considers this FERC response to be wholly inadequate. The Committee does not support increased budget authority for FERC at this time. Further, the Committee strongly recommends that the House Budget Committee and the Office of Management and Budget take a closer look at the revenues being foregone by FERC's continued use of the existing fee schedule for land rents.

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 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
ENERGY SUPPLY			
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES			
Renewable energy technologies			
Biomass/biofuels energy systems	89,415	69,750	69,750
Geothermal technology development	29,805	25,500	25,500
Hydrogen research	39,740	87,982	67,982
Hydropower	5,266	7,489	5,489
Solar energy	94,383	79,693	79,693
Zero energy building	---	4,000	---
Wind energy systems	43,714	41,600	41,600
Intergovernmental activities	---	12,500	16,500
Electricity reliability	---	76,866	---
Total, Renewable energy technologies	302,323	405,380	306,514
Electric energy systems and storage	84,448	---	---
Renewable support and implementation			
Departmental energy management	1,490	2,300	2,300
International renewable energy program	3,974	---	---
Renewable energy production incentive program	4,968	---	---
Renewable Indian energy resources	5,961	---	---
Renewable program support	4,968	---	---
Total, Renewable support and implementation	21,361	2,300	2,300
National climate change technology initiative	---	15,000	---
Facilities and infrastructure			
National renewable energy laboratory	4,669	4,200	4,200
Construction			
02-E-001 Science and technology facility, NREL Golden, CO	795	---	4,900
Total, National renewable energy laboratory	5,464	4,200	9,100
Oak Ridge national laboratory			
Construction			
04-E-TBD Plant engineering and design (PED), energy reliability and efficiency laboratory	---	750	---
Total, Facilities and infrastructure	5,464	4,950	9,100
Program direction	15,896	16,577	12,230
Subtotal, Renewable Energy Resources	429,492	444,207	330,144
Use of prior year balances	-10,000	---	---
TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES	419,492	444,207	330,144
ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION			
Research and development	---	---	70,807
Electricity restructuring	---	---	2,059
Program direction	---	---	3,761
Construction			
04-E-TBD Plant engineering and design (PED), energy reliability and efficiency laboratory	---	---	750
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION	---	---	77,377

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
Radiological facilities management			
Space and defense infrastructure	28,762	36,230	36,230
Medical isotopes infrastructure	---	26,425	26,425
Isotope support and production	25,331	---	---
Construction			
99-E-201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	1,710	---	---
Subtotal, Isotope support and production	27,041	---	---
Offsetting collections	-6,358	---	---
Subtotal, Medical isotopes infrastructure	20,683	26,425	26,425
Total, Radiological facilities management	49,445	62,655	62,655
University reactor fuel assistance and support	18,380	18,500	19,500
Research and development			
Nuclear energy plant optimization	4,968	---	4,000
Nuclear energy research initiative	24,837	12,000	10,000
Nuclear energy technologies	44,708	48,000	42,721
Nuclear hydrogen initiative	---	4,000	2,500
Advanced fuel cycle initiative	---	63,025	58,525
Total, Research and development	74,513	127,025	117,746
Idaho facilities management			
ANL-West operations	31,410	31,615	31,615
INEEL infrastructure	---	10,190	10,190
Test reactor area landlord	8,758	---	---
Construction			
99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Lab, ID	1,828	1,840	1,840
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Lab, ID	497	500	500
Subtotal, Construction	2,325	2,340	2,340
Subtotal, INEEL infrastructure	11,083	12,530	12,530
Total, Idaho facilities management	42,493	44,145	44,145
Advanced fuel cycle initiative	57,833	---	---
Program direction	23,287	24,800	23,970
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy	265,951	277,125	268,016
Use of prior year balances	-5,961	---	---
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	259,990	277,125	268,016

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)	6,796	10,000	7,400
Program direction	15,757	20,000	16,600
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	22,553	30,000	24,000
Subtotal, Energy supply	702,035	751,332	699,537
General reduction	-5,177	---	-5,000
Less security charge from reimbursable work	---	-3,003	-3,003
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	696,858	748,329	691,534
NON-DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION			
Accelerated completions, 2006	---	48,677	48,677
Accelerated completions, 2012	---	119,750	119,750
Accelerated completions, 2035	---	2,448	2,448
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION	---	170,875	170,875
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT			
Site closure	94,383	---	---
Site/project completion	57,052	---	---
Post 2006 completion	22,541	---	---
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	35,865	---	---
Long-term stewardship	14,088	---	---
Excess facilities	1,829	---	---
Subtotal, Non-Defense Environmental Management	225,758	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-12,134	---	---
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	213,624	---	---
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECOMTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and decommissioning	322,221	367,124	341,002
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	15,896	51,000	51,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT D&D FUND	338,117	418,124	392,002
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES			
Community and regulatory support	---	1,034	1,034
Environmental cleanup projects	---	43,842	43,842
Office of Legacy Management (non-defense)	---	---	28,347
Non-closure environmental activities	---	160,445	160,445
Construction			
02-U-101 Depleted uranium hexafluoride conversion project, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH	---	86,800	86,800
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES	---	292,121	320,468

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION			
Other Uranium Activities			
Maintenance and pre-existing liabilities	140,292	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-25,000	---	---
TOTAL, URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION	115,292	---	---
SCIENCE			
High energy physics	702,302	---	---
Proton accelerator-based physics	---	399,494	404,494
Electron accelerator-based physics	---	159,486	164,486
Non-accelerator physics	---	43,000	43,000
Theoretical physics	---	42,256	42,256
Advanced technology R&D	---	81,242	81,242
Subtotal,	702,302	725,478	735,478
Construction			
98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	19,962	12,500	12,500
Total, High energy physics	722,264	737,978	747,978
Nuclear physics	381,872	389,430	399,430
Biological and environmental research	506,685	499,535	562,035
Basic energy sciences			
Research			
Materials sciences and engineering research	547,794	567,711	575,711
Chemical sciences, geosciences and energy biosciences	220,111	220,914	220,914
Subtotal, Research	767,905	788,625	796,625
Construction			
04-R-313-Nanoscale science research center, the molecular foundry	---	35,000	35,000
04-R-314 Nanoscale science research center, the center for integrated nontechnologies, SNL/LASL	---	29,850	29,850
03-SC-002 Project engineering & design (PED) SLAC	5,961	7,500	7,500
03-R-312 Center for nanophase materials sciences, ORNL	23,844	20,000	20,000
03-R-313 Center for Integrated Nenotechnology	4,471	---	---
02-SC-002 Project engineering and design (VL)	11,922	3,000	3,000
99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	209,202	124,600	124,600
Subtotal, Construction	255,400	219,950	219,950
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,023,305	1,008,575	1,016,575
Advanced scientific computing research	168,455	173,490	213,490
Science laboratories infrastructure			
Infrastructure support	1,013	1,520	1,520
Oak Ridge landlord	5,046	5,079	5,079

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
Excess facilities disposal	7,948	5,055	8,000
Safety-related corrective actions	---	---	25,000
Construction			
04-SC-001 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	---	2,000	2,000
03-SC-001 Science laboratories infrastructure project engineering and design (PED), various loc.	3,333	---	---
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	28,043	29,936	29,936
Subtotal, Construction	31,376	31,936	31,936
Total, Science laboratories infrastructure	45,383	43,590	71,535
Fusion energy sciences program	248,375	257,310	268,110
Safeguards and security	48,448	48,127	51,887
Science workforce development	5,425	6,470	7,470
Science program direction			
Field offices	71,932	83,802	80,102
Headquarters	55,620	58,217	58,157
Technical information management program	6,954	7,774	7,774
Energy research analyses	993	1,020	1,020
Total, Science program direction	135,499	150,813	147,053
Subtotal, Science	3,285,711	3,315,318	3,485,563
General reduction/use of prior year balances	-20,000	---	-1,000
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-4,383	-4,383	-4,383
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	11,000	---	---
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,272,328	3,310,935	3,480,180
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Repository program	84,448	85,830	249,830
Program direction	59,610	75,170	85,170
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	144,058	161,000	335,000
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations			
Salaries and expenses			
Office of the Secretary	4,251	4,624	4,251
Board of contract appeals	735	653	653
Chief information officer	28,377	42,214	34,377
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,449	4,724	4,449
Economic impact and diversity	4,940	4,701	4,701
General counsel	21,572	22,879	20,000
Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation	101,854	104,210	104,210
Policy and international affairs	13,822	17,777	13,822
Public affairs	3,854	4,465	3,854
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	183,854	206,247	190,317

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
Program support			
Minority economic impact	1,192	1,400	1,192
Policy analysis and system studies	397	1,000	397
Energy security and assurance	1,490	2,000	1,490
Environmental policy studies	596	1,500	596
Engineering and construction management reviews	4,968	---	---
Cybersecurity and secure communications	29,878	26,432	26,432
Corporate management information program	14,902	37,632	20,902
Subtotal, Program support	53,423	69,964	51,009
Total, Administrative operations	237,277	276,211	241,326
Cost of work for others	69,682	75,095	69,682
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	306,959	351,306	311,008
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	-15,000	---	---
Funding from other defense activities	-86,679	-25,000	-86,679
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	205,280	326,306	224,329
Miscellaneous revenues	-120,000	-146,668	-123,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	85,280	179,638	101,329
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	37,426	39,462	39,462
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	37,426	39,462	39,462
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Directed stockpile work			
Stockpile research and development	464,113	433,150	404,150
Stockpile maintenance	398,549	405,746	414,746
Stockpile evaluation	195,902	202,885	201,885
Dismantlement/disposal	24,220	37,722	37,722
Production support	136,811	278,113	278,113
Field engineering, training and manuals	6,848	7,170	7,170
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,226,443	1,364,786	1,343,786
Campaigns			
Science campaigns			
Primary certification	46,852	65,849	57,849
Dynamic materials properties	87,025	82,251	77,251
Advanced radiography	72,451	65,985	45,985
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins	47,479	55,463	55,463
Subtotal, Science campaigns	253,807	269,548	236,548

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
Engineering campaigns			
Enhanced surety	31,792	37,974	32,974
Weapons system engineering certification	26,831	28,238	28,238
Nuclear survivability	23,242	23,977	23,977
Enhanced surveillance	76,653	94,781	91,781
Advanced design and production technologies	73,659	79,917	79,917
Engineering campaigns construction activities	---	4,500	4,500
Construction			
01-D-108 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM	---	61,800	36,800
Subtotal, Engineering campaigns & construction	---	66,300	41,300
Subtotal, Engineering campaigns	232,177	331,187	298,187
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield	288,361	316,769	361,769
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL	212,654	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	501,015	466,769	511,769
Advanced simulation and computing	644,782	713,326	678,326
Construction			
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	13,219	12,300	12,300
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	34,802	25,000	25,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	6,954	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	54,975	37,300	37,300
Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing	699,757	750,626	715,626
Pit manufacturing and certification	220,557	320,228	273,228
Readiness campaigns			
Stockpile readiness	60,630	55,158	45,158
High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness	12,014	29,649	19,649
Non-nuclear readiness	22,252	37,397	33,397
Tritium readiness	47,757	59,893	59,893
Construction			
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	69,709	75,000	75,000
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	117,466	134,893	134,893
Subtotal, Readiness campaigns	212,362	257,097	233,097
Total, Campaigns	2,119,675	2,395,455	2,268,455
Readiness in technical base and facilities			
Operations of facilities	1,020,108	972,773	997,773
Program readiness	218,533	131,093	106,202
Special projects	49,178	42,975	34,975
Material recycle and recovery	103,141	76,189	76,189
Containers	17,606	16,006	16,006
Storage	14,498	11,365	11,365

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
Nuclear weapons incident response.....	90,409	89,694	89,694
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac.....	1,513,473	1,340,095	1,332,204
Construction			
04-D-101 Test capabilities revitalization, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM.....	---	36,450	36,450
04-D-102 Exterior communications infrastructure modernization, Sandia National Laboratories.....	---	20,000	---
04-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations.....	---	2,000	2,000
04-D-104 National security sciences building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM.....	---	50,000	---
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM.....	---	20,500	---
04-D-126 Building 12-44 production cells upgrade, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX.....	---	8,780	8,780
04-D-127 Cleaning and loading modifications, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC.....	---	2,750	2,750
04-D-128 TA-18 mission relocation project, Los Alamos Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM.....	---	8,820	8,820
03-D-101 Sandia underground reactor facility			
03-D-102 LANL Administration Building (LANL).....	11,922	---	---
03-D-103 Project engineering and design various locations.....	11,067	10,570	10,570
03-D-121 Gas transfer capacity expansion, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO.....	3,974	15,300	11,300
03-D-122 Purification facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN.....	28,001	---	---
03-D-123 Special nuclear materials requalification, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX.....	6,577	7,628	7,628
02-D-103 Project engineering and design, various locations.....	17,194	10,950	10,950
02-D-105 Engineering technology complex upgrade, LLNL, CA.....	9,935	9,776	9,776
02-D-107 Electrical power systems safety communications and bus upgrades, NV.....	7,451	2,887	2,887
01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PE&D), various locations.....	---	1,600	1,600
01-D-107 Atlas relocation, Nevada test site, NV...	4,096	---	---
01-D-108 Microsystems and engineering sciences applications complex (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM.	112,265	---	---
01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN.....	24,837	45,000	45,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	8,594	2,838	2,838
01-D-800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL, CA	9,549	---	---
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	3,985	---	---
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,877	3,500	3,500
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	29,706	12,475	12,475
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	404	---	---
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	10,413	---	---
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations	993	1,552	1,552
Subtotal, Construction	306,840	273,376	178,876
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,820,313	1,613,471	1,511,080
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	240,936	261,404	251,404
Construction			
04-D-203 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), project engineering design (PED), various locations	---	3,719	3,719
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	240,936	265,123	255,123
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	100,207	123,605	123,605
Program direction	51,787	58,795	58,795
Total, Secure transportation asset	151,994	182,400	182,400
Safeguards and security	513,991	582,067	582,067
Construction			
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	8,842	3,683	3,683
Total, Safeguards and security	522,833	585,750	585,750
Subtotal, Weapons activities	6,082,194	6,406,985	6,146,594
Use of prior year balances	-138,800	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-28,985	-28,985	-28,985
Subtotal, Weapons activities	5,914,409	6,378,000	6,117,609
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	67,000	---	---
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	5,981,409	6,378,000	6,117,609

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	202,482	203,873	203,873
Nonproliferation and international security	92,066	101,734	105,734
Nonproliferation programs with Russia			
International materials protection, control, and cooperation	225,601	226,000	255,000
Accelerated highly enriched uranium (HEU) disposition	13,909	---	---
Russian transition initiative	39,078	40,000	40,000
HEU transparency implementation	17,117	18,000	18,000
International nuclear safety	11,501	14,083	6,083
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	49,018	50,000	50,000
Accelerated materials disposition	---	30,000	5,000
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus materials disposition	197,083	193,805	193,805
Russian surplus materials disposition	97,363	47,100	47,100
Construction			
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC	23,474	---	---
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility Savannah River, SC	34,772	13,600	13,600
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	92,396	402,000	402,000
Subtotal, Construction	150,642	415,600	415,600
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	445,088	656,505	656,505
Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia	801,312	1,034,588	1,030,588
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,095,860	1,340,195	1,340,195
Use of prior year balances	-75,000	---	-60,000
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	148,000	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,168,860	1,340,195	1,280,195
NAVAL REACTORS			
Naval reactors development	666,927	724,600	723,100
Construction			
03-D-201 Cleanroom technology facility, Bettis atomic power lab, West Mifflin, PA	7,153	300	300
01-D-200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY	2,086	---	---
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	1,987	18,300	18,300
Subtotal, Construction	11,226	18,600	18,600
Total, Naval reactors development	678,153	743,200	741,700

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
Program direction	24,043	25,200	26,700
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	702,196	768,400	768,400
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR			
Office of the Administrator	268,473	347,980	283,980
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	56,629	---	58,000
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	325,102	347,980	341,980
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	8,177,567	8,834,575	8,508,184
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	967,576	---	---
Construction			
03-D-414, Preliminary project engineering and design (PE&D), Aiken, SC	8,743	---	---
02-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, INEEL, Idaho Falls, ID	1,112	---	---
02-D-420 Plutonium packaging and stabilization, Savannah River	1,987	---	---
01-D-414 Preliminary project, engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	5,092	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	16,934	---	---
Total, Site/project completion	984,510	---	---
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,166,336	---	---
Construction			
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	14,773	---	---
Office of River Protection			
Operation and maintenance	452,297	---	---
Construction			
03-D-403 Immobilized high-level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA	6,322	---	---
01-D-416 Hanford waste treatment plant, Richland, WA	614,976	---	---
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	25,259	---	---
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	20,809	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	667,366	---	---
Subtotal, Office of River Protection	1,119,663	---	---
Total, Post 2006 completion	3,300,772	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	439,127	---	---
Science and technology	117,407	---	---
Excess facilities	4,968	---	---
Multi-site activities	63,934	---	---
Safeguards and security	266,861	---	---
Program direction	336,498	---	---
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,514,077	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-80,924	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-4,347	---	---
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	6,000	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	5,434,806	---	---
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS			
Site closure	1,075,616	---	---
Safeguards and security	55,299	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS	1,130,915	---	---
DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION			
Accelerated completions, 2006	---	1,245,171	1,242,751
Accelerated completions, 2012	---	1,512,554	1,500,827
Construction			
04-D-414 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	---	23,500	23,500
04-D-423 Container surveillance capability in 235-F, Savannah River	---	1,134	1,134
02-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, INEEL, Idaho Falls, ID	---	1,126	1,126
01-D-416 Hanford waste treatment plnt, Richland WA	---	690,000	690,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	715,760	715,760
Total, Acclerated completions, 2012	---	2,228,314	2,216,587
Acclerated completions, 2035	---	1,892,884	1,875,674
Construction			
04-D-408 Glass waste storage building #2, Savannah River	---	20,259	20,259
03-D-403 Immobilized high-level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA	---	13,954	13,954
03-D-414 Project enginnering and design (PED), various locations	---	51,500	51,500
Subtotal, Construction	---	85,713	85,713
Total, Accelerated completions, 2035	---	1,978,597	1,961,387
Safeguards and security	---	299,977	299,977
Technology development and deployment	---	63,920	63,920
Subtotal, Defense site acceleration completion	---	5,815,979	5,784,622

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
Less general reduction	---	---	-25,000
Less security charge for reimbursable work	---	-1,344	-1,344
TOTAL, DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION	---	5,814,635	5,758,278
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	157,369	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION	157,369	---	---
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES			
Community and regulatory support	---	61,337	61,337
Federal contribution to the uranium enrichment	---	452,000	452,000
Non-closure environmental activities	---	189,698	189,698
Program direction	---	292,144	292,144
Less general reduction	---	---	-5,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES	---	995,179	990,179
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	6,723,090	6,809,814	6,748,457
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Other national security programs			
Energy security and assurance			
Energy security	20,864	---	---
Program direction	4,247	4,272	2,472
Subtotal, Energy security and assurance	25,111	4,272	2,472
Office of Security			
Nuclear safeguards and security	90,510	104,713	104,713
Security investigations	45,572	54,554	54,554
Program direction	48,227	52,490	52,490
Subtotal, Office of Security	184,309	211,757	211,757
Intelligence	40,978	39,823	39,823
Counterintelligence	45,656	45,955	45,955
Independent oversight and performance assurance	22,284	22,575	22,575
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	86,137	87,276	87,276
Program direction - EH	17,038	20,410	20,410
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	103,175	107,686	107,686
Worker and community transition	19,058	12,321	12,321
Program direction - WT	1,987	2,679	2,679
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	21,045	15,000	15,000
Office of Legacy Management (defense)	---	47,525	19,178
National Security programs administrative support	86,899	25,000	86,679
Defense activities at INEEL	---	113,476	112,306
Office of hearings and appeals	2,914	3,797	3,797
Subtotal, Other defense activities	532,371	636,866	667,228
Use of prior year balances	-20,000	---	---
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-712	-712	-712

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	4,000	---	---
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	515,659	636,154	666,516
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	312,952	430,000	430,000
CERRO GRANDE FIRE ACTIVITIES			
Cerro Grande fire activites (rescission)	---	-75,000	-75,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	15,729,268	16,635,543	16,278,157
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Purchase power and wheeling	34,438	15,000	34,000
Program direction	4,602	5,100	5,100
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	39,040	20,100	39,100
Offsetting collections	-14,463	---	-19,000
Carryover offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	-20,000	-15,000	-15,000
Use of prior year balances	-72	---	---
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	4,505	5,100	5,100
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	3,791	4,663	4,663
Purchase power and wheeling	1,788	288	1,800
Program direction	17,826	19,205	19,205
Construction	5,995	4,732	4,732
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	29,400	28,888	30,400
Offsetting collections	-1,512	---	-1,512
Carryover offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	-288	-288	-288
Use of prior year balances	-400	---	---
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	27,200	28,600	28,600
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction and rehabilitation	17,668	12,200	12,200
System operation and maintenance	37,550	36,204	36,204
Purchase power and wheeling	186,124	20,000	186,000
Program direction	107,682	126,588	126,588
Utah mitigation and conservation	6,060	---	---
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	355,084	194,992	360,992
Offsetting collections	-156,124	---	-166,000
Carryover offsetting collections (P.L. 98-381)	---	-3,992	-3,992
Carryover offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	-30,000	-20,000	-20,000
Use of prior year balances	-1,200	---	---
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	167,760	171,000	171,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House Recommended
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	2,716	2,640	2,640
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	202,181	207,340	207,340
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	192,000	199,400	192,000
FERC revenues	-192,000	-199,400	-192,000
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	20,834,432	22,163,367	22,016,347

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Contract Competition.—The Committee is very concerned that the Department continues to maintain a number of management and operating (M&O) contracts that have never been competed, some since their inception over 60 years ago. The general provision carried in previous Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts, requiring competition of these contracts but allowing the Secretary to waive the requirement upon notification to Congress, has not been effective in changing the Department's continued reliance on noncompetitive contract awards and contract extensions. Therefore, this Committee has included bill language barring the use of appropriated funds to continue to pay for M&O contracts that have not been competitively awarded within the past fifty fiscal years (i.e., since fiscal year 1954). For M&O contracts that have not been competitively awarded within that time period, the Department may continue to fund such contracts only if the Secretary announces his intent to compete these contracts when their current terms expire. The Secretary must publish such notification in the Federal Register, and must submit a written notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, within 60 days of enactment of this Act. The specific reference to section 303(c)(1) of the Title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c)(3)) in included to ensure that the Department does not continue to use the status of DOE laboratories as federally funded research and development centers (FFRDCs) as an excuse for not competing these laboratory contracts.

It is not the Committee's intent to disrupt contracts that have been competitively awarded in recent years (e.g., Brookhaven, NREL, Sandia), nor to undo decisions the Secretary has already made to extend non-competitively the existing contracts at Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. However, the Committee does intend to change the Department's contracting practice going forward. The Committee is hopeful that the Secretary's Blue Ribbon Commission on the Use of Competitive Procedures for DOE Laboratories will be able to provide the Secretary with specific guidance on how to evaluate the performance of the incumbent contractors, how to structure a full and open competition that is fair to incumbents and competitors alike, and how to compete the contracts for those laboratories situated on university property. The Committee also expects that these changes will help to stimulate a larger pool of qualified for-profit, non-profit, and academic contractors to compete for these M&O contracts.

To the Department's credit, it has recently announced its intent to compete the M&O contracts for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) and for the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), and has made significant improvements in competing the contracts for the cleanup of Environmental Management sites. However, the Secretary has imposed several conditions on the competition of the LANL contract that this Committee believes will unduly bias any competition in favor of the incumbent LANL contractor. Specifically, the Secretary has directed

that any competition of the LANL contract must protect all of the existing workforce and all of the pension benefits of the existing workforce. In addition, the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has recently suggested that the incumbent contractor for LANL may be able to charge its proposal preparation costs to the existing contract. Any incumbent contractor already enjoys enormous advantages over potential competitors in proposal preparation, both in terms of having a known record of performance and of having inside knowledge of lab operations that other competitors will not have. The Department should not offer to pay the incumbent's proposal costs unless the Department is prepared to offer the same benefit to all competitors, an obviously expensive and impractical solution. Therefore, the Committee includes bill language prohibiting the inclusion of any condition to an M&O contract that has the effect of biasing the competition in favor of the incumbent contractor or otherwise establishing something less than full and open competition. The prohibition on such conditions does not extend to defining the scope of the contract, for which the incumbent enjoys a natural advantage, or to crediting the incumbent's past performance when evaluating its qualifications for a future contract.

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, 2003.

Limitation on Funding for Section 3161 Benefits.—Section 303 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to augment the $15,000,000 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, 2003.

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, 2003.

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, 2003.

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, 2003.

User Facilities.—Section 307 establishes certain notice and competition requirements with respect to the involvement of universities in Department of Energy user facilities. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2003. The detailed guidance on the application of this provision was provided in House Report 107–681 and continues to apply.

Research, Development and Demonstration Activities.—Section 308 provides authority for up to 2 percent of national security funding at the Kansas City, Pantex, and Y–12 plants, the Savannah River Plant, and the Nevada Test Site to be used for research, development, and demonstration activities. This provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2003.

Authorization of Intelligence Activities.—Section 309 authorizes intelligence activities of the Department of Energy for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 during fiscal year 2004 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2004.

Authorization for Continued External Regulation Analyses.—Section 310 provides that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Energy shall proceed with planning and analyses for external regulation of the Department's laboratories under the Office of Science.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2003	$70,827,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	33,145,000
Recommended, 2004	33,145,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−37,682,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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 $33,145,000, the same as the budget request.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2003	$18,876,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	19,559,000
Recommended, 2004	19,559,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+683,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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 $19,559,000, the same as the budget request.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 2003	$7,948,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	2,000,000
Recommended, 2004	2,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−5,948,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Delta Regional Authority for fiscal year 2004, the same as the budget request.

The conference report accompanying the fiscal year 2003 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act directed the Authority

to submit a detailed budget justification if funds were requested in fiscal year 2004. The Authority did not comply with this requirement. If no budget justification is submitted with the fiscal year 2005 budget request, the Committee will not provide funding for the Authority.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2003	$47,688,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	9,500,000
Recommended, 2004	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−47,688,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−9,500,000

The Committee has recommended no funding for the Denali Commission in fiscal year 2004 due to funding constraints.

The conference report accompanying the fiscal year 2003 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act 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. The Committee again directs the Commission to submit a detailed budget justification if funds are requested in fiscal year 2005.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2003	$577,806,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	618,800,000
Recommended, 2004	618,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+40,994,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2003	$−520,087,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−538,844,000
Recommended, 2004	−538,844,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−18,757,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2003	$57,719,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	79,956,000
Recommended, 2004	79,956,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+22,237,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) salaries and expenses is $618,800,000, the same as the budget request. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $538,844,000, resulting in a net appropriation of $79,956,000. The recommendation includes the requested amount of $33,100,000 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 2004 to recover 92 percent

of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the Nuclear Waste Fund, by assessing license and annual fees. Of the $618,800,000 gross appropriation, $33,100,000 is drawn from the Nuclear Waste Fund, 92 percent of the balance of $585,700,000 (i.e., $538,844,000) is funded by fees collected from NRC licensees, and the remaining eight percent (i.e., $46,856,000) is funded from the General Fund of the Treasury. This amount funded from the General Fund is available to fund those activities, such as NRC corporate homeland security expenses, that may not be appropriate to assess to NRC licensees.

Repository Licensing.—The Committee is concerned about the extent of documentation that the Department of Energy may be required to post as part of the License Support Network (LSN). The Committee has provided guidance in Title III of this report directing DOE that Congressional communications between the Members and staffs of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Department are not to be included in documentation the Department posts on the LSN. The Committee encourages the Commission to review its regulatory requirements and guidance regarding the LSN to ensure they do not require duplication of information otherwise easily obtainable, focus on information that is truly relevant to substantive decisions that will have to be made, and establishes a timeframe in accord with the traditional conduct of an adjudicatory proceeding. The Committee expects the Commission to work with the Department to ensure that all significant and relevant documents are made available in the License Support Network to support sound decisionmaking on the License Application, but to also ensure that the care and feeding of the License Support Network does not expand to consume a disproportionate amount of DOE and NRC resources.

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

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2003	$6,797,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	7,300,000
Recommended, 2004	7,300,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+503,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2003	$ −6,392,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	−6,716,000
Recommended, 2004	−6,716,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−324,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2003	$405,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	584,000
Recommended, 2004	584,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	+179,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,300,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $503,000 over fiscal year 2003. The Commission is required by law to recover 92 percent of this budget authority in fiscal year 2004 through the assessment of license and annual fees. Therefore, the revenue estimate is $6,716,000, resulting in a net appropriation for the NRC Inspector General of $584,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriation, 2003	$3,179,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	3,177,000
Recommended, 2004	3,177,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2003	−2,000
Budget Estimate, 2004	.....

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,179,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, the same as the budget request and a decrease of $2,000 from fiscal year 2003 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.

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 Commission of the United States of America which states:

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

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

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

[In millions of dollars]

	302(b) allocation		This bill	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	27,080	27,211	27,080	27,173
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 OUTLAYS 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	27,080
Outlays:	
2004	17,975
2005	7,786
2006	1,285
2007	22
2008 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	32
Fiscal year 2004 outlays resulting therefrom	3

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 $57,330,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $33,570,000 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 $10,000,000 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 Ener-

gy's accounting and financial systems to track National Nuclear Security Administration costs by weapon system.

Under Title III, Environmental 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 has also been included under General Investigations providing credit for work done by local interests on the Ohio Riverfront, Cincinnati, Ohio, project.

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 included under Construction, General, directing the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the New York Harbor Deepening project under certain conditions and placing a limitation on the use of funds for activities related to restoration of the Everglades.

Language has been included under Operation and Maintenance, General stating that funds may be used for providing security at facilities owned and operated by or on behalf of the Corps of Engineers, including the Washington Aqueduct.

Language has been included under Operation and Maintenance, General, stating the following:

> * * * for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency that serve needs of general commerce * * *

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 has been included under the Regulatory Program regarding the regulation of navigable waters and wetlands.

Lanaguage 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.

Lanaguage has been included under Administrative Provision providing that funds are available for purchase and hire of motor vehicles.

Language is included under General Provisions as follows:

Sec. 101. The Committee has included language proposed by the Administration which places a limit on credits and reimbursements allowable per project and annually for all projects.

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

Sec. 103. The Committee has included language prohibiting the expenditure of funds related to a proposed landfill in Stark County, Ohio.

Sec. 104. The Committee has included language renaming Lock and Dam 3 on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania.

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 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 also included permitting the use of funds available for the Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program for site remediation on a nonreimbursable basis. Language is included under Water and Related Resources providing that $10,000,000 shall be deposited in the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund. Language is included under

Water and Related Resources amending the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act.

Language has been included under the Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund.

Language has been included under the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund directing the Bureau of Reclamation to assess and collect the full amount of additional mitigation and restoration payments authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102–575. Language is included under the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund providing that none of the funds provided may be used for the acquisition or lease of water for in-stream purposes if the water is already committed to in-stream purposes be a court adopted decree or order.

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

Language has been included under the Working Capital Fund rescinding unobligated balances.

Language has been provided under General Provisions as follows:

Section 201. 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.

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

Section 203. The Committee has included language which amends Section 206 of Public Law 101–514 regarding water supply contracts for the Sacramento County Water Agency and the San Juan Suburban Water District by removing the requirement that the contracts include an annual needs determination.

Section 204. The Committee has included language which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to amend the Central Valley Project water supply contracts for the Sacramento County Water Agency and the San Juan Suburban Water District by deleting a provision requiring a determination of annual water needs.

Section 205. The Committee has included language which provides that funds in the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund shall not be diverted to the General Fund of the Treasury pending the completion of an omnibus Arizona water rights settlement agreement.

Section 206. The Committee has included language which provides that funds provided to the Bureau of Reclamation may be used for the payment of claims not exceeding $5,000,000.

Language has been included under Energy Supply providing for the purchase of not to exceed 12 passenger motor vehicles of replacement only, including 2 buses.

Language has been included under Science providing for the purchase of not to exceed 15 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including not to exceed one ambulance.

Language has been included under Nuclear Waste Disposal providing that none of the funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act may be used for the planning, design, or development of the rail corridors that pass near the Las Vegas Metropolitan Area, specifically the Valley Modified Corridor and the Jean Corridor, and providing that $65,000,000 of the $70,000,000 made available in this Act for Nevada rail transportation shall be available only if the Secretary designates rail as the preferred mode of transportation within Nevada and selects a Nevada rail corridor within 60 days of enactment of this Act and commences the necessary environmental and engineering analysis to develop and issue a record of Decision for a specific rail alignment within the selected rail corridor by June 30, 2005.

Language has been included under the 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 Naval Reactors providing for the purchase of not to exceed one bus.

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 Naval Reactors providing for the purchase of not to exceed one ambulance for replacement only.

Language has been included rescinding $75,000,000 previously appropriated for Cerro Grande Fire activities.

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 in fiscal year 2004.

Language has been included under Southwestern Power Administration providing that, notwithstanding 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, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as offsetting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

Language has been included under Southwestern Power Administration providing that notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, beginning in fiscal year 2004 and thereafter such funds as are received by the Southwestern Power Administration from any state, municipality, corporation, association, firm, district, or individual as advance payment for work that is associated with Southwestern's transmission facilities, consistent with that authorized in section 5 of the Flood Control Act, shall be credited to this account and be available until expended.

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 appropriate acts.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, providing that no funds may be used to pay for management and operating contracts that have not been competitively awarded within the past fifty fiscal years unless the Secretary, within 60 days of enactment, announces his intent to compete those contracts when the current contract term expires.

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 establish 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, providing the manager of a nuclear weapons production plant or the Nevada Test Site 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, providing that, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary may proceed with planning and analyses for external regulation of the Department's Science laboratories.

Language 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 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 extend 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 the 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 appropriate not more than $90,000,000 in total for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, [and 2003] *2003, and 2004.*

The accompanying bill would amend subsection 206(b) of Public Law 101–514 as follows:

> (b)(1) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to enter into the following contracts: (A) a municipal and industrial water supply contract with the Sacramento County Water Agency, not to exceed 22,000 acre-feet annually, to meet the immediate needs of Sacramento County and a municipal and industrial water supply contract with the San Juan Suburban Water District, not to exceed 13,000 acre-feet annually, for diversion from Folsom Lake[, with annual quantities delivered under these contracts to be determined by the Secretary based upon the quantity of water actually needed within the Sacramento County Water Agency service area and San Juan Suburban Water District after considering reasonable efforts to: (i) promote full utilization of existing water entitlements within Sacramento County, (ii) implement water conservation and metering programs within the areas served by the contract, and (iii) implement programs to maximize to the extent feasible conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater]; and (B) a municipal and industrial water supply contract with the El Dorado County Water Agency, not to exceed 15,000 acre-feet annually, for diversion from Folsom Lake or for exchange upstream on the American

River or its tributaries, considering reasonable efforts to implement water conservation programs within areas to be served by the contracts. The contracts required by this subsection are intended as the first phase of a contracting program to meet the long-term water supply needs of Sacramento and El Dorado Counties. The Secretary shall promptly initiate the necessary analysis for the long-term water supply contracts. The Secretary shall include in these contracts terms and conditions to ensure that the contracts may be amended in any respect required to meet the Secretary's obligations under applicable State law and the Federal environmental laws.

The accompanying bill would amend subsection Public Law 102–377 as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation in this Act or in subsequent Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts shall hereafter be available for payment of claims for damages to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, *not to exceed $5,000,000 for each causal event giving rise to a claim or claims; * * **

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Agency/program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriations in last year of authorization	Appropriations in this bill
Corps of Engineers:				
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	(1)	(1)	(1)	140,000
Department of Energy:				
Energy Supply:				
Biomass/Biofuels	1993	(2)	(4)	69,750
Geothermal Energy	1993	23,000	(4)	25,500
Hydrogen	2001	40,000	27,000	67,982
Hydropower	1982	11,700	(4)	5,489
Solar Energy	1993	(2)	(4)	79,693
Wind Energy Systems	1993	(2)	(4)	41,600
Intergovernmental activities Renewable Energy Production Incentive	1995	(7)	(4)	16,500
Renewable Energy Production Incentive				
International Renewable Energy Program	1996	(3)	(4)	.....
Electricity Transmission and Distribution	1994	(3)	(4)	77,377
Departmental Energy Management	1984	(3)	(4)	2,300
Renewable Program Support	1984	(3)	(4)	2,059
National Renewable Energy Laboratory	1984	(3)	(4)	9,100
Program Direction	1984	(3)	(4)	12,230
Nuclear Energy:				
Space and defense infrastructure	1992	(2)	(4)	36,230
Isotopes	1974	(2)	(4)	26,425

[In thousands of dollars]

Agency/program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriations in last year of authorization	Appropriations in this bill
University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support	1974	(2)	(4)	19,500
Research and Development	1994	(7)	(4)	117,746
Radiological Facilities Management	1974	(2)	(4)	62,655
Program Direction	1992	(2)	(4)	23,970
Environment, Safety and Health	1974	(2)	(4)	24,000
Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion	1984	(5)	(5)	170,875
West Valley Demonstration Project	1981	5,000	5,000	99,558
Non-Defense Environmental Services (including Other Uranium Activities)	.....	.....	.....	292,121
Science	1984	500,000	635,417	3,480,180
High Energy Physics	1984	(3)	477,947	747,978
Nuclear Physics	1984	(3)	155,220	399,430
Biological and Environmental Research	1994	(3)	388,298	562,035
Basic Energy Sciences	1994	(3)	743,590	1,016,575
Advanced Scientific Computing Research	1996	169,000	111,068	213,490
Science Laboratories Infrastructure	1994	(3)	39,327	71,535
Fusion Energy Sciences	1994	380,000	322,277	268,110
Science Program Direction	1984	(2)	(4)	147,053
Energy Research Analysis	1994	(3)	3,507	1,020
Technical Information Management	1981	(2)	(4)	7,774
Nuclear Waste Disposal	(8)	(2)	190,654	335,000
Departmental Administration	1984	246,963	185,682	101,329
Office of the Inspector General	1984	(2)	14,670	39,462
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:				
National Nuclear Security Administration:				
Weapons Activities	2002	5,343,567	5,901,641	6,117,609
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2002	776,886	1,104,130	1,280,195
Naval Reactors	2002	688,445	706,790	768,400
Office of the NNSA Administrator	2002	312,596	325,929	341,980
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	2002	6,022,415	4,510,133	.....
Defense Environmental Cleanup Reform	(6)	(6)	(6)	.....
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	2002	1,080,538	1,109,314	
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	2002	153,537	158,399	.....
Defense site acceleration completion	.....	.....	.....	5,758,278
Defense environmental services	.....	.....	.....	990,179
Other Defense Activities	2002	499,663	462,664	694,863
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	2002	280,000	315,000	430,000
Power Marketing Administrations:				
Southern Power Administration	1984	24,240	39,463	39,100
Southwestern Power Administration	1984	40,254	29,288	30,400
Western Area Power Administration	1984	259,700	237,037	360,992
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund	1995	(2)	2,663	2,640
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	1984	275,000	175,200	192,000
Independent Agencies:				
Defense Nuclear Facilities Study Board	2002	18,500	18,459	19,559
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	1985	460,000	448,200	618,800
Nuclear Regulatory Commission—Office of Inspector General	1985	(9)	(9)	7,300

(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 of 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 appropriations for the NRC.

The Commission notes that the annual authorizing legislation for many of these programs is in various stages of the legislative proc-

ess. It is anticipated these authorizations will be enacted into law later this year.

RESCISSIONS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the rescissions recommended in the accompanying bill:

RESCISSIONS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

Department or Activity	*Amount*
Bureau of Reclamation: Working Capital Fund	$4,525,000
Department of Energy: Cerro Grande Fire Activities	75,000,000

FULL COMMITTE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the results of each rollcall vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

There were no rollcall votes.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	134,141	100,000	117,788	-16,353	+17,788
Construction, general	1,744,598	1,350,000	1,642,911	-101,687	+292,911
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	342,334	280,000	301,054	-41,280	+21,054
Operation and maintenance, general	1,927,556	1,939,000	1,932,575	+5,019	-6,425
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	39,000	---	---	-39,000	---
Regulatory program	138,096	144,000	144,000	+5,904	---
FUSRAP	144,057	140,000	140,000	-4,057	---
Flood control and coastal emergencies	14,902	70,000	40,000	+25,098	-30,000
General expenses	154,143	171,000	164,000	+9,857	-7,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	4,638,827	4,194,000	4,482,328	-156,499	+288,328
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	23,489	27,040	27,040	+3,551	---
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	11,186	15,423	9,423	-1,763	-6,000
Subtotal	34,675	42,463	36,463	+1,788	-6,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Program oversight and administration	1,317	1,728	1,728	+411	---
Total, Central Utah project completion account	35,992	44,191	38,191	+2,199	-6,000
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	808,203	771,217	817,913	+9,710	+46,696
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	25,000	---	---	-25,000	---
Loan program	---	200	200	+200	---
Central Valley project restoration fund	48,586	39,600	39,600	-8,986	---
California Bay-Delta restoration	---	15,000	---	---	-15,000
Working capital fund (rescission)	---	-4,525	-4,525	-4,525	---
Policy and administration	54,513	56,525	56,525	+2,012	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	936,302	878,017	909,713	-26,589	+31,696
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	972,294	922,208	947,904	-24,390	+25,696
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	696,858	748,329	691,534	-5,324	-56,795
Non-defense site acceleration completion	---	170,875	170,875	+170,875	---
Non-defense environmental management	213,624	---	---	-213,624	---
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	---	418,124	392,002	+392,002	-26,122
Non-defense environmental services	---	292,121	320,468	+320,468	+28,347
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation	453,409	---	---	-453,409	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Science	3,261,328	3,310,935	3,480,180	+218,852	+169,245
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	11,000	---	---	-11,000	---
Nuclear Waste Disposal	144,058	161,000	335,000	+190,942	+174,000
Departmental administration	205,280	326,306	224,329	+19,049	-101,977
Miscellaneous revenues	-120,000	-146,668	-123,000	-3,000	+23,668
Net appropriation	85,280	179,638	101,329	+16,049	-78,309
Office of the Inspector General	37,426	39,462	39,462	+2,036	---
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	5,914,409	6,378,000	6,117,609	+203,200	-260,391
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	67,000	---	---	-67,000	---
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,020,860	1,340,195	1,280,195	+259,335	-60,000
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	148,000	---	---	-148,000	---
Naval reactors	702,196	768,400	768,400	+66,204	---
Office of the Administrator	325,102	347,980	341,980	+16,878	-6,000
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	8,177,567	8,834,575	8,508,184	+330,617	-326,391
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	5,428,806	---	---	-5,428,806	---
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	6,000	---	---	-6,000	---
Defense facilities closure projects	1,130,915	---	---	-1,130,915	---
Defense site acceleration completion	---	5,814,635	5,758,278	+5,758,278	-56,357
Defense environmental management privatization	157,369	---	---	-157,369	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Defense environmental services	---	995,179	990,179	+990,179	-5,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	6,723,090	6,809,814	6,748,457	+25,367	-61,357
Other defense activities	511,659	636,154	666,516	+154,857	+30,362
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Defense nuclear waste disposal	312,952	430,000	430,000	+117,048	---
Cerro Grande fire activities (rescission)	---	-75,000	-75,000	-75,000	---
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	15,729,268	16,635,543	16,278,157	+548,889	-357,386
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	4,505	5,100	5,100	+595	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	27,200	28,600	28,600	+1,400	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	167,760	171,000	171,000	+3,240	---
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,716	2,640	2,640	-76	---
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	202,181	207,340	207,340	+5,159	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	192,000	199,400	192,000	---	-7,400
Revenues applied	-192,000	-199,400	-192,000	---	+7,400
Total, title III, Department of Energy	20,834,432	22,163,367	22,016,347	+1,181,915	-147,020
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	70,827	33,145	33,145	-37,682	---
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,876	19,559	19,559	+683	---
Delta Regional Authority	7,948	2,000	2,000	-5,948	---
Denali Commission	47,688	9,500	---	-47,688	-9,500
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	577,806	618,800	618,800	+40,994	---
Revenues	-520,087	-538,844	-538,844	-18,757	---
Subtotal	57,719	79,956	79,956	+22,237	---
Office of Inspector General	6,797	7,300	7,300	+503	---
Revenues	-6,392	-6,716	-6,716	-324	---
Subtotal	405	584	584	+179	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	58,124	80,540	80,540	+22,416	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.....	3,179	3,177	3,177	-2	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies.....	206,642	147,921	138,421	-68,221	-9,500
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	26,652,195	27,427,496	27,585,000	+932,805	+157,504
Appropriations.....	(26,652,195)	(27,507,021)	(27,664,525)	(+1,012,330)	(+157,504)
Rescissions.....	---	(-79,525)	(-79,525)	(-79,525)	---