Calendar No. 213

108TH CONGRESS, *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 108–105

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 2004

JULY 17, 2003.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1424]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1424) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2004

Budget estimates considered by Senate	$26,946,164,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	27,313,000,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Above the budget estimate, 2004	1,236,805,000
Over enacted bill, 2003	366,836,000

CONTENTS

TITLE I

TITLE II

TITLE III

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2004 beginning October 1, 2003, and ending September 30, 2004, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, Delta Regional Authority, Denali Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 2004 budget estimates for the bill total $26,946,164,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $27,313,000,000. This is $366,836,000 above the budget estimates and $1,236,805,000 over the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

The bill, as recommended, is in compliance with the subcommittee allocation agreed to by the Committee and entered into the Congressional Record on June 20, 2003.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held four sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2004 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

The subcommittee received numerous statements and letters from Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life throughout the United States. Information, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 2004 therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of 29 to 0 the Committee on July 17, 2003, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The Committee remains concerned about the level of the budget requests for the water resources programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The budget request for fiscal year 2004 is about $450,000,000 less than the amount appropriated to the Corps in fiscal year 2003. The budget request is extraordinarily unbalanced. Eight projects account for 29 percent of the proposed Construction, General budget with the remainder of the projects severely underfunded. The proposed General Investigations budget, which provides funding for studies of water resources needs, is decimated. Only studies in their final year were adequately funded, the remainder were severely underfunded. The proposed Operations and Maintenance budget appears to show an increase, however, when accounting for inflation and proposed funding transfers that are unlikely to be enacted, the final total is less than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003. The budget proposed for the Mississippi River and Tributaries project, is equally inadequate.

If the proposed budget request were enacted, the Corps would be forced to terminate on-going construction contracts costing the government some $200,000,000 in termination fees, demobilization costs, and delays in project schedules.

As has been the practice for the last several years, the budget proposal contained no new construction "starts". The budget proposal stated that this was done in order to only fund the backlog of on-going work (estimated at $23,000,000,000 in the budget proposal) and that within 10 years, this backlog would be reduced to zero. Followed to conclusion, that would mean that within 10 years the Corps would only be an operation and maintenance agency to oversee past constructed work. Since there are no other nationwide agencies that address water resource problems and needs, one can only assume that all water resource problems will be solved in the next 10 years or that the Federal Government intends to no longer fund water resource development.

The Committee does not share the views in the budget proposal and remains concerned about the huge and increasing backlog of infrastructure development, maintenance, and repair over which the Corps has jurisdiction. The proposed budget causes the backlog of unconstructed projects to increase from $44,000,000,000 to $52,000,000,000 and ignores an accelerating critical maintenance backlog which increases from $960,000,000 to $1,100,000,000. This maintenance backlog will soon become entirely unmanageable under the weight of an aging and crumbling inventory. Proposing

no new discretionary construction starts, underfunding on-going projects, and providing minimal O&M funding for completed projects leads the Committee to believe that the budget preparation may have been influenced by very narrow interest groups as opposed to providing for a robust national water resources development program. The situation that the proposed budget poses to the Nation's economy and quality of life leave the Committee no option but to step forward in support of these vital projects.

The Committee recommendation for the Corps of Engineers totals $4,426,700. This is $232,700,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 2003, and is $212,127,000 below the appropriation for the current year.

BUILDING AND SITE SECURITY

The Committee is aware of the heightened threat of terrorist activity since the events of September 11, 2001, and the subsequent financial burden this places on the Corps of Engineers in managing the security of the many public assets and critical infrastructure within its control. In order to offset some of the financial burden of the Corps of Engineers, the Committee provided $139,000,000 in the fiscal year 2003 supplemental appropriations bill to defray some of these costs. The Committee encourages the administration to include funding for specific security related costs in future budget submissions for the Corps of Engineers, as many of these costs are recurring.

CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE

The Committee is concerned that Corps of Engineers technical and planning capabilities have diminished over the past decade. This diminished capability has been evident in recent controversial studies such as the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System Navigation Study and the Delaware River Deepening Study. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to review ways in which it can improve its capability, to include concentrating its technical and planning expertise in regional centers. The Committee believes that there is much the Corps can do to leverage its highly skilled workforce in an effort to better utilize their expertise on a national level. With constrained budgets and ever-changing technology, the current work environment lends itself well to the movement of knowledge and information across great distances in a matter of minutes. Therefore, the Committee remains committed to the concept of the regional centers because they will enable the Corps to maximize its expertise across the country over a wide variety of projects and problems just by tapping its own resources. Though many problems are regionalized many of their solutions are not. With the implementation of regional centers the Corps will be able to manage the Agency's workload across the Nation rather than just in a district or division.

BUDGET CONSTRAINTS

The budget allocation for non-Defense discretionary programs contained in the Energy and Water Development bill for fiscal year 2004 are constrained below what is necessary for a robust, bal-

anced national water resources program. Faced with these budget realities, the Committee has had to make tough decisions and choices in the development of the Corps of Engineers' budget request for fiscal year 2004. However, while the budget resources for non-Defense discretionary programs have remained flat or have declined in real terms, the number of requests of the Committee continue to increase. This year the Committee received more than 1,200 requests for funding for water projects within the Corps' Civil Works program. Many supported the funding level in the budget request, but a majority of the requests made of the Committee sought increases over the budgeted amounts or items not contained in the President's budget for both fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2004.

EXPENDITURE RATES

The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers has exercised its existing authorities to take advantage of a good construction season and as a result, has been executing its construction program at an increased rate using funds available from under-performing projects. This occurrence has compounded over the last 2 years and has resulted in the Corps executing construction projects at a rate which far outpaces their respective appropriated amount. The Committee is very concerned that this practice has led to a situation where the Corps, despite Congressional intent expressed in the appropriations Act, makes the decision on where to put its scarce resources to the best use. Though the Committee understands that the Federal government yields project benefits and cost savings when a project is completed ahead of schedule or on time, opposed to later, the Committee is not in favor of projects proceeding at a faster rate than Congress intended without its concurrence. The intent of Congress, with respect to water projects, is very clear, specifically outlined in the detail tables on a project by project basis.

Therefore, instead of retracting the Corps' reprogramming authority, a privilege granted to the Corps, the Committee expects the Corps, within 3 months of enactment of this Act, to submit a report to the Senate Appropriations Committee on its management plan for its appropriations and how it intends to rectify the situation. Should the Corps not reign in its expenditures to reflect the Congressional intent; the Committee will seek to retract the Corps reprogramming authority.

TRUST FUND ACCOUNT USAGE

For fiscal year 2004, the administration proposes to expand the use of both the Inland Waterways and the Harbor Maintenance trust funds. In the case of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, a fuel-tax fund which offsets construction costs of certain inland waterways projects, the administration proposes to use revenues to pay for one-quarter of the operations and maintenance costs for all "high use" Federal inland waterways, in addition to one-half the operating and maintenance costs for all other Federal inland waterways. During fiscal year 2004, this proposal would translate to $110,000,000 in additional revenue tapped by the Corps. If the Congress were to enact this proposal, it would effectively raise the

inland waterways users' diesel fuel tax from 20 cents to 34 cents per gallon.

As for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, revenue is derived from receipts from an *ad valorem* tax imposed on commercial users of specified U.S. ports. The administration proposes to use the fund to finance not only 100 percent of the Federal share of the operation and maintenance costs for ports and harbors, but also all Federal costs associated with coastal port and channel construction.

If the Committee were to enact these two proposals, the burden placed upon both trust funds would be so great that the funds would likely be bankrupt within a few years' time. The Committee believes that the changes contemplated by the administration will dilute the funds' target for resources: specific construction projects in the inland waterways system and the maintenance of certain ports and harbors. Therefore, the Committee dismisses the trust fund proposals and encourages the administration, if it is indeed as concerned with the funding needs of the Corps in these two areas, to increase the budget request for direct appropriations for the Corps.

BASIS OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

In development of the fiscal year 2004 funding recommendation for the Corps of Engineers, the Committee is not able to include any new construction starts, and has recommended only a limited number of new study starts in an effort to restore balance to the water resource program of the Corps, and to address high priority requests made to the Committee. The limited resources available have been focused on on-going projects where the Corps has contractual commitments. While the Committee has not been able to fund all projects at the optimum level, it has endeavored to provide sufficient funding on each project to mitigate delays and increased costs, to the greatest extent possible, across the entire Corps' Civil Works program. One issue of great concern to the Committee is that the fiscal year 2004 budget request only funded 18 of the projects in the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase. The Committee believes that this was done by the administration as a means to constrict the future pressure on construction. However, the administration did not responsibly take into account the fact that for fiscal year 2003, the Congress included funding for 84 of these projects, the majority of which have Design Agreements signed, which are legally binding contracts. As a result of the administration not funding these projects, the Committee used its constrained resources to avoid the Government breeching these contracts.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2003	$134,141,000
Budget estimate, 2004	100,000,000
Committee recommendation	131,700,000

This appropriation funds studies to determine the need, engineering feasibility, economic justification, and the environmental and social suitability of solutions to water and related land resource problems; and for preconstruction engineering and design

work, data collection, and interagency coordination and research activities.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	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				
ADAK, AK			100	
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	100		100	200
ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK	50		200	
BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	200		1,000	
COFFMAN COVE, AK			200	
CRAIG HARBOR, AK	50		200	
DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK	200		566	
EKLUTNA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	100		300	
HAINES HARBOR, AK	100		100	200
HOMER HARBOR, AK			100	
KAKTOVIK BEACH EROSION STUDY, AK			200	
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK	50		200	
KLAWOCK HARBOR, AK			100	
KNIK BRIDGE CROSSING, AK			200	
KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	50		250	
LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK	50		200	
MATANUSKA, AK			100	
MCGRATH BANK STABILIZATION, AK			300	
MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK	50		100	
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	100		100	100
REGIONAL PORT STUDY, AK			300	
SAINT GEORGE NAVIGATION IMPROVEMETS, AK	50		400	
SKAGWAY, AK			100	
UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK	50		200	
UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	150		500	
VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	50		50	
WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK	50		50	
AMERICAN SOMOA				
TUTUILA HARBOR, AS	46		46	
ARIZONA				
AGUA FRIA RIVER, AZ	150		150	
CANADA DEL ORO WASH, AZ	100		100	
NAVAJO NATION, AZ, NM AND UT	130		130	
PIMA COUNTY, AZ	300		300	
RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	300		300	
RIO SALADO OESTE, SALT RIVER, AZ	250		250	
SANTA CRUZ RIVER, GRANT RD TO FT LOWELL RD, AZ	100		100	
SANTA CRUZ RIVER, PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS, AZ	152		152	
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT, AZ	370		370	
ARKANSAS				
ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEES, AR				300
ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, AR AND OK	1,070		1,270	
HOT SPRINGS CREEK, AR			32	
MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR				200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
NORTH LITTLE ROCK, DARK HOLLOW, AR	.....	.....	.....	200
PINE MOUNTAIN DAM, AR	.....	.....	.....	300
RED RIVER NAVIGATION, SWAR, AR AND LA	.....	.....	.....	150
WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR AND MO	300	.....	500	.....
WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOWS, AR	.....	.....	.....	100
WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION, AR	.....	.....	.....	100
CALIFORNIA				
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MINI-RAISE), CA	.....	.....	4,000	.....
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	.....	150	.....
BOLINAS LAGOON, CA	.....	.....	200	.....
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	141	.....	141	.....
COAST OF CALIFORNIA, (STORM AND TIDAL), CA	.....	.....	700	.....
COYOTE DAM, CA	100	.....	100	.....
DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CA	.....	.....	200	.....
GRAYSON AND MURDERER'S CREEKS, CA	400	.....	400	.....
HUMBOLDT BAY LONG TERM SHOAL MANAGEMENT, CA	.....	.....	100	.....
CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CA	.....	.....	300	.....
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, CA	.....	.....	.....	200
LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, CA	.....	.....	.....	200
LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	.....	.....	.....	200
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	150	.....	150	.....
MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	270	.....	270	.....
MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	150	.....	150	.....
MATILIJA DAM, CA	300	.....	731	.....
MIDDLE CREEK, CA	.....	.....	.....	100
MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	250	.....	250	.....
MUGU LAGOON, CA	150	.....	150	.....
N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	200	.....	200	.....
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	200	.....	200	.....
NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	150	.....	150	.....
NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA	186	.....	186	.....
OCEAN BEACH, CA	100	.....	100	.....
ORANGE COUNTY SHORELINE, LOWER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSH	100	.....	100	.....
ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	150	.....	150	.....
PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	.....	.....	.....	200
PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA	100	.....	100	.....
PINE FLAT DAM, FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT, CA	.....	.....	.....	50
POSO CREEK, CA	300	.....	300	.....
PRADO BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	100	.....	100	.....
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	.....	100	.....
SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA	100	.....	215	.....
SAN DIEGO SHORELINE, CA	.....	.....	.....	200
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	420	.....	420	.....
SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK, CA	100	.....	100	.....
SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA	100	.....	100	.....
SAN JOAQUIN RB, W STANISLAUS, DEL PUERTO AND SALADO CREE	50	.....	50	.....
SAN JOAQUIN RB, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, ORESTIMBA CREE	300	.....	300	.....
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES AND MOKELUMNE RIVERS,	200	.....	200	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA	100		100	
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-ENCINITAS SHORELINE FEASIBILITY STUDY, CA			400	
SONOMA CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	150		150	
STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	50		50	
SUTTER COUNTY, CA	200		200	
TAHOE BASIN, CA AND NV	1,000		1,000	50
TIJUANA RIVER VALLEY, CA	100		100	
UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER,CA				200
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	
WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA				200
WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	100		100	
COLORADO				
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		
CHRISTINA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, DE			100	
FLORIDA				
HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL	340		340	
LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	370		370	
LIDO BAY, SARASOTA COUNTY, FL				200
LITTLE TALBOT ISLAND, FL				100
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL				100
ST. JOHNS COUNTY. FL			100	
ST. PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL				200
WALTON COUNTY BEACH AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORE, FL			300	
WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FL	340		340	
GEORGIA				
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	150		150	
ARABIA MOUNTAIN, GA	150		150	
AUGUSTA, GA	300		300	
INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS,	175		175	
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	150		150	
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION,GA				615
SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA	150		150	
SAVANNAH HARBOR SEDIMENT CONTROL WORKS, GA AND SC	100		100	
SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA AND SC	200		200	
UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA	100		100	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
HAWAII				
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	100		100	
BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	100		100	
KAHUKU, HI	100		100	
KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI	100		150	
KIHEI AREA EROSION, HI	100		100	
NAWILIWILI HARBOR MODIFICATION, KAUAI, HI	100		100	
WAIKIKI EROSION CONTROL, HI				250
WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, HI				300
GUAM				
HAGATNA RIVER, GUAM			100	
IDAHO				
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	110		110	
LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, ID	100		100	100
ILLINOIS				
ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	103		103	
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	278		500	
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	504		700	
ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	148		200	
PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL		600		600
ROCK RIVER, IL AND WI	48		48	
UPPER MISS AND ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO AND WI	3,216		4,216	
UPPER MISS RVR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN AND WI	494		2,600	
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL				100
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL				150
INDIANA				
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	150		150	
JOHN T. MYERS LOCK AND DAM, IN AND KY				2,000
IOWA				
DAVENPORT, IA		159		159
DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	565		565	
FORT DODGE, IA	23		217	
LOWER DES MOINES RIVER, IA AND MO	50		50	
KANSAS				
BRUSH CREEK BASIN STUDY, KS AND MO			100	
TOPEKA, KS	125		125	50
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND 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 AND 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		225	
OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	1,350		1,350	
DEWEY LAKE WATER REALLOCATION, KY			125	
LOUISIANA				
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	50		50	
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BAYOU MANCHAC, LA	100		300	
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	150		1,150	
BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA		707		707

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
BOSSIER PARISH LEVEE AND FLOOD CONTROL, LA	.....	.....	100	.....
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	100	.....	100	.....
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	50	.....	50	.....
CALCASIEU RIVER PASS SHIP CHANNEL ENLARGEMENT, LA	.....	.....	200	.....
GIWW ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	100	.....	100	.....
HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA	100	.....	100	.....
JEFFORSON PARISH, LA	.....	.....	.....	25
LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	.....	645	.....	645
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	848	.....	1,900	.....
ORLEANS PARISH, LA	.....	.....	.....	25
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	.....	300	.....
WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	.....	.....	.....	100
WEST SHORE-LAKE PONTCHARTAIN, LA	.....	.....	.....	400
MAINE				
SEARSPORT HARBOR, ME	.....	.....	100	.....
MARYLAND				
ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD AND DC	194	.....	194	.....
BALTIMORE METRO, GWYNN FALLS, MD	.....	.....	.....	500
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE EROSION, MD, VA AND DE	200	.....	500	.....
EASTERN SHORE, MID CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND, MD	351	.....	500	.....
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S, MD	200	.....	200	.....
MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN, MD	100	.....	100	.....
MASSACHUSETTS				
BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA AND RI	50	.....	50	.....
BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA	500	.....	500	.....
COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA	170	.....	170	.....
SOMERSET AND SEARSBURG DAMS, MA AND VT	.....	.....	.....	100
MICHIGAN				
GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	740	.....	1,000	.....
DETRIOT RIVER MASTERPLAN, MI	.....	.....	100	.....
DETRIOT RIVER SEAWALLS, MI	.....	.....	.....	200
LANSING, MI	.....	.....	100	.....
ROUGE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI	.....	.....	25	.....
ROUGE RIVER SUPP PLAN, MI	.....	.....	100	.....
MINNESOTA				
MINNEHAHA CREEK WATERSHED, UMR LAKE ITASCA TO L&D 2, M	250	.....	250	.....
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD AND MANITOBA, C	1,200	.....	1,200	.....
SOUTH WASHINGTON CTY WATERSHED, UMR LAKE ITASCA TO L&D	250	.....	250	.....
MISSISSIPPI				
GULFPORT AND HARRISON COUNTY WATERSHED STUDY, MS	100	.....	100	.....
HANCOCK COUNTY SEAWALL RESTORATION, MS	150	.....	150	.....
PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS	400	.....	660	.....
MISSOURI				
CHESTERFIELD, MO	.....	439	.....	439
JORDAN CREEK, MO	.....	.....	300	.....
KANSAS CITYS, MO AND KS	316	.....	650	.....
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 AND R460-471, MO	150	.....	150	.....
RIVER DES PERES,MO	.....	.....	.....	100
SPRINGFIELD, MO	230	.....	330	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
ST. LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	.....	.....	.....	100
ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO	.....	.....	.....	100
SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	.....	.....	.....	500
ST. LOUIS MISSISSIPPI RIVERFRONT, MO AND IL	151	.....	151	.....
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
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	.....
TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	.....	.....	.....	2,115
WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	100	.....	100	.....
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
CONNECTICUT RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NH AND VT	115	.....	115	.....
MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN, NH	400	.....	400	.....
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA TURNING BASIN, NH	.....	.....	100	.....
NEW JERSEY				
BARNEGAT BAY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NJ	.....	.....	.....	200
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, NJ, NY, DE AND PA	50	.....	50	.....
GOFFLE BROOK, BOROUGH OF HAWTHORNE, NJ	25	.....	100	.....
GREAT EGG INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ	.....	539	.....	539
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	100	.....	100	.....
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	25	.....	25	.....
MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLE, NJ	.....	.....	.....	100
MID-DELAWARE BASIN COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, NJ	.....	.....	100	.....
NJIWW ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NJ	.....	.....	.....	200
NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLE	100	.....	100	.....
NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT	100	.....	100	.....
LOWER PASSAIC RIVER NJ ENVIRO REST, NJ	25	.....	100	.....
PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ	.....	.....	.....	200
PECKMAN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	200	.....	200	.....
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, PORT MONMOUTH, NJ	.....	.....	.....	200
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK UNION BEACH, NJ	.....	.....	.....	100
SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	150	.....	150	.....
SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	.....	.....	.....	100
STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ	200	.....	200	.....
UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	.....	.....	.....	200
UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, NJ	441	.....	441	.....
WOODBRIDGE RIVER BASIN, NJ	150	.....	200	.....
NEW MEXICO				
EAST MESA, LAS CRUCES, NM	.....	.....	130	.....
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	50	.....	510	20
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE BOSQUE, NM	225	.....	300	.....
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO AND TX	125	.....	125	.....
SANTA FE, NM	225	.....	300	.....
SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTIONS STUDY, NM	.....	.....	.....	250

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
NEW YORK				
BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY	50		50	
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	52		52	
FLUSHING BAY CREEK, NY				25
FREEPORT CREEK, VILLAGE OF FREEPORT, NY	25		25	
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, GOWANUS CANAL, NY AND NJ	255		255	
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, NY AND NJ	685		785	
HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	25		25	25
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	147		147	
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	85		85	
NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY				50
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY	134		134	
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	170		170	
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	307		307	
SAW MILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	50		50	
SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	250		250	
UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	50		50	
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON RESTORATION, NY	200		200	
NORTH CAROLINA				
BOGUE BANKS, NC	400		400	
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	150		150	
DARE COUNTY BEACHES, HATTERAS AND OCRACOKE ISLANDS, NC	150		200	
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC				100
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	100		100	
SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC	200		200	
TAR RIVER BASIN, NC	100		100	
OHIO				
ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH		250		640
COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	365		365	
DUCK CREEK WATERSHED, OH			100	
HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH	40		40	200
MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH AND PA	450		642	300
MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH	357		357	
WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH, IN AND MI	130		130	
WHEELING CREEK, OH			131	
OKLAHOMA				
MIAMI AND VICINITY, OK	231		231	
GRAND LAKE COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, OK			100	
MOUNTAIN FORK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, OK			100	
OOLOGAH LAKE WATERSHED, OK AND KS	259		259	
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK	50		50	
SPAVINAW CREEK, OK			100	
WASHITA RIVER BASIN, OK			100	
WISTER LAKE WATERSHED, OK			200	
OREGON				
AMAZON CREEK, OR	250		250	
EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD WATERWAYS AND FERN RIDGE DAM, OR			200	
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA	250		250	
TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR	43		43	475
WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR AND WA	439		500	
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 AND MD	50		50	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
EMS, DASH AND MONT & DAMS UPPER OH RIVER NAV, PA	.....	.....	800	.....
SCHUYKILL ESTUARINE RIVER BASIN, PA	.....	.....	250	.....
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, WISSAHICKON, PA	50	.....	50	.....
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, PA (PHASE II)	180	.....	180	.....
RHODE ISLAND				
RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	20	.....	20	.....
SOUTH CAROLINA				
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	430	.....	430	.....
BROAD RIVER BASIN, SC	100	.....	100	.....
EDISTO ISLAND, SC	.....	.....	100	.....
PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	.....	.....	.....	125
REEDY RIVER, SC	170	.....	170	.....
SANTEE DELTA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, SC	75	.....	75	.....
WACCAMAW RIVER, SC	50	.....	50	.....
SOUTH DAKOTA				
JAMES RIVER, SD AND ND	150	.....	500	.....
WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	.....	.....	.....	473
TENNESSEE				
DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	243	.....	300	.....
TEXAS				
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINSTEM), TX	.....	.....	.....	500
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	100	.....	100	.....
CEDAR BAYOU, TX	.....	.....	.....	374
COLONIAS-LWR RIO ALONG TX AND MEXICO BORDER, TX	.....	.....	.....	325
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	.....	.....	.....	800
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, 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	.....	150	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	600	.....	1,600	.....
MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	50	.....	250	.....
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL (PORT LAVACA), TX	.....	.....	500	.....
NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	300	.....	300	.....
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	100	.....	100	.....
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	.....	.....	.....	800
RESACAS AT BROWNSVILLE, TX	300	.....	300	.....
RIVERSIDE OXBOW, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, FT WORTH, TX	.....	350	.....	350
SABINE—NECHES WATERWAY, TX	300	.....	350	.....
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	450	.....	450	.....
SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	.....	.....	.....	300
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX	235	.....	235	.....
SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX	50	.....	50	.....
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX	.....	.....	.....	1,500
TRI-COUNTY FLOOD STUDY, SAN ANTONIO RIVER, TX	100	.....	100	.....
UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	400	.....	600	.....
UTAH				
PARK CITY WATER SUPPLY, UT	.....	.....	500	.....
PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	100	.....	100	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
VIRGINIA				
AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	.....	694	.....	1,184
ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENV RESTORATION, VA (PHASE II)	200	.....	200	.....
ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA	.....	75	.....	75
FOURMILE RUN, VA	150	.....	150	.....
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	.....	.....	.....	200
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (SECTION 216)	250	.....	250	.....
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	300	.....	300	.....
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	56	.....	56	.....
POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	197	.....	197	.....
WASHINGTON				
CENTRALIA, WA	.....	.....	.....	100
CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	310	.....	310	.....
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	.....	.....	.....	500
ELLIOT BAY SEAWALL, WA	.....	.....	500	.....
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	446	.....	446	.....
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	350	.....	350	.....
SKAGIT RIVER, WA	350	.....	500	.....
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	.....	.....	.....	200
WHITE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, W	250	.....	250	.....
WEST VIRGINIA				
LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV	65	.....	65	.....
NEW RIVER BASIN, WV, NC AND VA	130	.....	130	.....
WISCONSIN				
BARABOO RIVER, WI	500	.....	500	.....
FOX RIVER, WI	100	.....	100	.....
MISCELLANEOUS				
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	2,500	.....	2,500	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	100	.....	100	.....
EX POST FACTO NATIONAL STUDY	2,000	.....	2,000	.....
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	300	.....	300	.....
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	7,500	.....	7,500	.....
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	400	.....	400	.....
INDEPENDENT REVIEW NATIONAL STUDY	3,000	.....	3,000	.....
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	400	.....	400	.....
NATIONAL SHORELINE	500	.....	500	.....
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	4,850	.....	4,850	.....
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	6,000	.....	6,340	.....
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	300	.....	300	.....
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	200	.....	200	.....
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	22,000	.....	22,500	.....
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	.....	−40,428	.....
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	89,989	10,011	99,181	32,519

Akutan Harbor, AK.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $200,000 for planning, engineering, and design.

Barrow Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, AK.—The Committee recommendation provides optimum funding to continue the critical Barrow Storm Damage Reduction project in Alaska.

Haines Harbor, AK.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $200,000 for planning, engineering, and design.

Port Lions Harbor, AK.—The Committee recommendation includes necessary funding for preconstruction, engineering, and design work for the Port Lions Harbor, Alaska project.

Arkansas River Navigation Study, AR & OK.—The Committee has provided funding for the completion of the Phase I Report and for the continuation of Phase II of the feasibility study. In addition, the funds provided advance the completion of this needed study.

May Branch, Ft. Smith, AR.—The Committee has provided funding for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of the project.

North Little Rock, Dark Hollow, AR.—The Committee has included follow-on funding of this ongoing study for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase.

Pine Mountain Dam, AR.—The Committee recommendation includes funding for the continuation of the General Reevaluation Report, the Environmental Impact Statement, and plans and specifications for the Pine Mountain Dam, AR project.

American River Watershed, CA.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for continuing analyses on the American River Watershed Long-Term Study. The Congress has methodically authorized and funded improvements in the Sacramento region to reduce flooding and these efforts should continue without further delay. The Committee believes it is time to provide Sacramento with much needed and deserved flood protection. Further the Committee believes that it is inexcusable to allow tens of thousands of citizens in the Sacramento, California region to remain in jeopardy from catastrophic flooding while narrow interest groups continue to debate competing flood control proposals. The Committee strongly urges these competing groups to resolve their differences before another flood event strikes the area, potentially resulting in catastrophic losses.

Bolinas Lagoon, CA.—The Committee has included funding for the Corps to complete the reformulated feasibility phase of the project.

Coast of California Storm and Tidal, CA.—The Committee has included funding for field data collection, beach transect, wage gage deployment and analysis of coastal processes.

Humboldt Bay Long Term Shoal Management, CA.—The Committee has included a $100,000 for the initiation of a reconnaissance study to evaluate long-term solutions to shoaling in this Federal channel.

City of Inglewood, CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for the Corps to continue to provide the City of Inglewood technical assistance.

Solana-Encinitas Shore Projection, CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $400,000 for this study which was not included in the President's budget request.

Tahoe Basin, CA & NV.—The Committee has included additional funds to initiate the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of the project.

Zuni and Sun Valley Reaches, South Platte River, CO.—The Committee has fully funded the administration's request for this project.

St. Johns County Shore Protection, FL.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the continuing study of this project.

Walton County Shore Protection, FL.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for the continued study of the Walton County Shore Protection project.

Savannah Harbor Deepening, GA.—The Committee has provided $615,000 for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this project.

Waikiki Shore Projection, HI.—The Committee has provided $250,000 in the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this project.

Wailupe Stream Flood Control Study, HI.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for the planning, engineering, and design phase of the Wailupe study.

Des Plaines River, IL (Phase II).—The Committee has included $500,000 to advance the hydraulic and economic damage modeling, development of environmental modeling, and formulation of alternative solutions.

Illinois River Ecosystem Restoration, IL.—The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 for the preparation and review of the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Upper Mississippi and Illinois Navigation Study, IL, IA, MN, MO, & WI.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 above the administration's request for this critical study.

Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan, IL, IA, MO, MN, & WI.—The Committee has included $2,600,000 for this study, for development of an integrated strategy and plan for systematic flood protection and flood damage reduction in the Upper Mississippi River Watershed.

John T. Myers Locks Improvements, IN.—The Committee has included $2,000,000 to continue the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this necessary lock replacement.

Davenport, IA.—The Committee has included the administration's request for the Davenport, Iowa flood control study. The Committee is pleased that the City of Davenport has decided to embrace a flood damage reduction project, particularly after three significant flood events in the last 10 years.

Fort Dodge, IA.—The Committee recommendation includes $217,000 for the Fort Dodge study.

Brush Creek Basin Study, KS & MO.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate a reconnaissance study to examine the full range of structural and nonstructural measures to reduce recurring flooding in the basin.

Turkey Creek Basin, KS & MO.—The Committee has provided $205,000, the administration's request, for this project.

Greenup Locks and Dam, Ohio River, KY & OH.—The Committee has provided $2,895,000, the administration's full request for this project.

Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $1,000,000 to advance this study.

Louisiana Coastal Area Ecosystem Restoration, LA.—The Committee has included $1,900,000 for this study which allows for the initiation of project implementation reports. The Committee remains very concerned about the progress of this study and that the Corps may not be maintaining the rigor required for such a study, as is its tradition. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps to provide a report no later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act, on the study's progress and how it plans to refocus this critical effort.

Port of Iberia, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $1,000,000 for this project.

West Shore, Lake Pontchartrain, LA.—The Committee has included $400,000 for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this project, an on-going study which the administration did not include in its budget request.

Baltimore Metro, Gwynn Falls, MD.—The Committee has included $500,000 for preconstruction, engineering, and design work related to this project.

Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Erosion, MD, VA & DE.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for this study, which is $300,000 above the budget request.

Eastern Shore, Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island, MD.—The Committee has included an additional $149,000 for this study.

Great Lakes Navigation System Study, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA & WI.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to continue the work on the supplement to the reconnaissance report for determination of the Federal interest.

Detroit River Masterplan, MI.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 to initiate feasibility.

Detroit River Seawalls, MI.—The Committee has included $200,000 for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this project.

Pearl River Watershed, MS.—The Committee has included $660,000 for the continuation of the feasibility study. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to investigate all potentially feasible alternatives, including plans similar to the plan currently referred to as LeFleur Lakes Flood Control Project.

Kansas Citys, MO & KS.—The Committee has included $650,000 for the continuation of this feasibility study.

Missouri River Levee System, Units L455 & R460–471, MO & KS.—The Committee recommendation includes $150,000 for continuation of the feasibility study.

Springfield, MO.—The Committee has included an additional $100,000 for the Springfield feasibility study.

St. Louis Harbor, MO.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this ongoing project which was not included in the budget request.

Swope Industrial Park, MO.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to complete the design phase of this project which was not included in the budget request.

Missouri River Sedimentation, ND.—The Committee has provided $50,000 for this project. The Committee's understands that the Corps will use the funds provided along with previously appropriated funds to continue the required assessment study.

Sand Creek Watershed, Wahoo, NE.—The Committee has included $546,000 for the Sand Creek Watershed study, as requested by the administration.

Western Sarpy and Clear Creek, NE.—The Committee has included $318,000 for the Western Sarpy and Clear Creek project, as requested by the administration.

Truckee Meadows, NV.—The Committee has included $2,115,000 for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this project which was not included in the budget request.

Portsmouth Harbor & Piscataqua River, Upper Turning Basin, NH & ME.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the initiation of a reconnaissance study to examine the viability of increasing the size of the current turning basin.

Goffle Brook, Borough of Hawthorne, NJ.—The Committee has included $75,000 above the budget request for this study.

Lower Passaic River, NJ.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $75,000 above the budget request for this study.

Passaic River, New Jersey Environmental Restoration, NJ.—The Committee understands that there exists some confusion regarding this study and the Hudson Raritan Estuary-Lower Passaic River, NJ study. The Passaic River, New Jersey Environmental Restoration, in the past, has been referred to as the Lower Passaic, NJ study and should be referred to by its name, Passaic River, New Jersey Environmental Restoration. This study should not be confused with the Hudson Raritan Estuary-Lower Passaic River, NJ study.

Upper Passaic River and Tributaries, NJ.—The Committee has included $200,000 for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this project, which was not included in the budget request.

East Mesa, Las Cruces, NM.—The Committee recommendation includes funds for the completion of the reconnaissance phase of the study and the initiation of the feasibility phase.

Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction Study, NM.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this project which was not included in the budget request.

Dare County Beaches, Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands, NC.—The Committee has included $200,000 for this study. Additional funds are to be used for geotechnical and economic investigations related to this project.

Ashtabula River Environmental Dredging, OH.—The Committee has included $640,000 for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this project.

Duck Creek Watershed, OH.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Duck Creek Watershed project which was not included in the budget request.

Hocking River Basin Environmental Restoration, Monday Creek, OH.—The Committee has included not only the $40,000 for the completion of the feasibility phase of this study but also $200,000 for the initiation of the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this project.

Mahoning River Environmental Dredging, OH & PA.—The Committee has included an additional $492,000 for the completion of

the feasibility study and the initiation of preconstruction, engineering, and design phase.

Mountain Fork River Watershed, OK.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for the continued feasibility study for water storage options in the watershed that was not included in the budget request.

Spavinaw Creek, OK.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the continuation of this feasibility study which was not included in the budget request.

Wister Lake Watershed, OK.—The Committee has included $200,000 for the continuation of this feasibility study which was not included in the budget request.

Tillamook Bay and Estuary Ecosystem Restoration, OR.—The Committee has included funds for the completion of feasibility and the initiation of the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase.

Walla Walla River Watershed, OR & WA.—The Committee has included an additional $61,000 for this study.

Schuylkill River Estuarine Study, PA.—The Committee has included $250,000 for the continuation of the feasibility study which was not included in the budget request.

Upper Ohio River Navigation System Study, PA.—The Committee has included $800,000 for the continuation of this critical study, which was not included in the budget request.

Edisto Island, SC.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the initiation of a reconnaissance study to examine erosion problems of portions of Edisto Island.

Pawley's Island, SC.—The Committee has included $125,000 for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase for this ongoing project, which was not included in the budget request.

James River, SD & ND.—The Committee included $500,000 for the continuation of the feasibility study for the James River project.

Davidson County, TN.—The Committee has included $300,000 for the continuation of this feasibility study.

Lower Colorado River Basin, TX.—The Committee has included an additional $1,000,000 for the initiation of two additional interim studies.

Matagorda Ship Channel, TX.—The Committee has funded $500,000 of the preconstruction, engineering, and design portion of the study, which was not included in the administration's request.

Middle Brazos River, TX.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $250,000 for the acceleration of the schedule for the System Assessment Interim Feasibility Study.

Sabine-Neches Waterway, TX.—The Committee has included additional funding to continue work on the Environmental Impact Statement for the Sabine-Neches Waterway study.

Texas City Channel, TX.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 for the preconstruction, engineering, and design phase of this study, which was not included in the budget request.

Upper Trinity River Basin, TX.—The Committee has included an additional $200,000 for this regional flood control study.

Park City Water Supply Infrastructure, UT.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the continuation of this feasibility study which was not included in the budget request.

Elliot Bay Seawall, WA.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the Elliot Bay Seawall project.

Coastal Field Data.—Within the funds provided, $500,000 is provided for the Southern California Beach Process Study, $500,000 is provided for the Hurricane Evaluation Studies in the State of Hawaii and U.S. Territories.

Flood Plain Management Services.—Within the funds provided, $200,000 is for the continuation of the foundational GIS system in East Baton Rouge, LA and $200,000 is provided for the Corps to assist the Pacific Islands in their response measures regarding hurricanes and typhoons.

Planning Assistance to States.—Within the funds provided, $40,000 is for the Urban Streambank Erosion Control, City of Lincoln, NE planning effort, $100,000 is for the Salt Marsh Habitat Inventory, RI effort to develop an inventory of degraded coastal habitat sites, and $200,000 is provided for planning assistance to the Riverfront Development Corporation, for the Memphis Riverfront Development, TN project.

Salcha, AK.—The Committee is concerned about continued flooding in the Salcha area that has forced repeated evacuation of homes and businesses. The Corps is directed to provide assistance to Salcha in developing a plan to address the flooding, in consultation with the Natural Resource Conservation Service and report back to the Committee on Appropriations no later than Februrary 15, 2004.

Research and Development.—Within the funds provided for the Corps of Engineers Research and Development Program, $1,000,000 is provided for innovative technology demonstrations for urban flooding and channel restoration. These demonstrations shall be conducted in close coordination and cooperation with the Urban Water Research Program of the Desert Research Institute of Nevada. The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to continue its work in the area of Submerged Aquatic Vegetation or "seagrasses" and restoration efforts in the Chesapeake Bay, MD.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2003	$1,744,598,000
Budget estimate, 2004	1,350,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,538,000,000

This appropriation includes funds for construction, major rehabilitation and related activities for water resources development projects having navigation, flood control, water supply, hydroelectric, environmental restoration, and other attendant benefits to the Nation. The construction and major rehabilitation projects for inland and costal waterways will derive one-half of the funding from the Inland Waterway Trust Fund. Funds to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund will be applied to cover the Federal share of the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities Program.

The appropriation provides funds for the Continuing Authorities Program (projects which do not require specific authorizing legislation), which includes projects for flood control (Section 205), emergency streambank and shoreline protection (Section 14), beach erosion control (Section 103), mitigation of shore damages (Section 111), navigation projects (Section 107), snagging and clearing (Sec-

tion 208), aquatic ecosystem restoration (Section 206), beneficial uses of dredged material (Section 204), and project modifications for improvement of the environment (Section 1135).

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA		
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	2,003	2,003
WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL AND GA (MAJOR REH	12,035	13,479
WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL AND GA (MAJOR REHAB)	3,000	3,000
ALASKA		
DILLINGHAM EMERGENCY BANK, AK		4,000
DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAK, AK		3,000
KAKE DAM, AK		4,000
NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	6,000	6,000
SAND POINT,AK		1,000
SEWARD, AK		1,000
SITKA, AK		1,000
ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	3,826	3,826
WRANGELL, AK		10,000
ARIZONA		
RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ		3,500
RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ	11,600	11,600
TRES RIOS, AZ		7,000
TUSCON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ		5,000
ARKANSAS		
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	3,300	3,300
MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	20,000	27,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR (POWERHOUSE, MAJOR REHAB), AR		3,000
RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, AR, LA AND TX		750
RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK, AR AND LA		1,250
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), C	4,000	4,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	4,000	4,000
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	13,000	13,000
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	2,000	3,000
HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING, CA		4,000
IMPERIAL BEACH,(IMPERIAL BEACH-SILVER STRAND BEACH)		200
KAWEAH RIVER, CA	8,400	8,400
MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	500	500
MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	500	500
NAPA RIVER, CA	7,500	10,000
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	7,000	20,000
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	2,000	
PORT OF LOS ANGELES, MAIN DEEPENING, CA		15,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	2,000	2,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	15,700	15,700
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	2,100	2,100
STOCKTON METROPOLITIAN FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSEMENT, CA	500	
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	1,000	1,000
TULE RIVER, CA	1,600	1,600
UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	1,000	1,000
DELAWARE		
DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISL, DE		214
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, PORT MAHON, DE		500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES BEACH	2,008	2,008
DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	285	285
DELAWARE COAST, REHOBOTH BEACH TO DEWEY BEACH, DE	5,768	5,768
FLORIDA		
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	2,000	2,000
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	112,498	90,000
EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	14,835	14,835
FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS, FL	.....	1,000
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (MAJOR REHAB)	1,000	1,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	2,000	2,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL AND GA (MAJOR R	873	873
KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	17,706	17,706
MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	2,700	2,700
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	.....	500
GEORGIA		
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	4,500	6,000
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 AND SC	4,328	8,178
THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	5,500	5,500
HAWAII		
HAWAII WATER MANAGEMENT, HI	.....	1,000
LAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, HI	.....	175
KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	3,633	3,633
KAUMALAPAU HARBOR, LANAI, HI	.....	2,500
MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	191	191
ILLINOIS		
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	2,300	2,300
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	500	500
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	24,000	25,000
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	815	815
LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	13,000	17,000
LOVES PARK, IL	5,785	5,785
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	18,000	18,000
MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL AND MO	600	600
NUTWOOD LEVEE, IL	.....	100
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL AND KY	73,000	53,000
UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO	33,320	20,000
INDIANA		
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS, (ENVIRO INFRA.), IN	.....	500
INDIANA HARBOR (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY), IN	5,700	5,700
INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	2,600	2,600
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	3,800	3,800
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	21,000	21,000
OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	1,000	1,000
IOWA		
DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA	.....	500
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	1,313	1,313
LOCK AND DAM 19, IA	.....	750
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	22,000	22,000
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS AND MO	7,000	13,600
PERRY CREEK, IA	2,200	2,200
KANSAS		
ARKANSAS CITY, KS	2,600	2,600

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
KENTUCKY		
DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	1,946	1,946
KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	24,866	34,866
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY AND IN	26,100	40,000
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	1,400	1,400
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	2,500	2,500
LOUISIANA		
ASCENSION PARISH, LA	.....	500
COMITE RIVER, LA	2,000	4,000
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, EI, LA	.....	500
GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	.....	200
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	7,000	12,000
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	13,700	15,000
LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	3,000	6,000
LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	461	461
LIVINGSTON PARISH, LA	.....	500
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	.....	200
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	35,000
WEST BANK AND VICINITY, NEW ORLEANS, LA	35,000	28,500
MARYLAND		
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	1,003	1,003
ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	500	500
CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRO. RES. AND PROTECTION, MD AND VA	.....	1,600
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD AND VA	3,000	4,500
CUMBERLAND, MD	.....	4,000
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	14,101	14,101
MASSACHUSETTS		
CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	9,895	9,895
MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MA	.....	1,000
MICHIGAN		
GENESSE COUNTY (ENVIRONMENTAL INFRA), MI	.....	200
NEGAUNEE, MI	.....	250
SAULT STE MARIE LOCK REPLACEMENT, MI	.....	2,000
TWELVE TOWNS DRAIN RETENTION FACILITY, MI	.....	388
MINNESOTA		
BRECKENRIDGE, MN	.....	1,000
CROOKSTON, MN	1,043	1,043
LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	600	600
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MISSISSIPPI PLACE, ST PAUL, MN	.....	250
MISSISSIPPI		
DESOTO COUNTY, MS	.....	10,955
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	.....	2,500
MISSISSIPPI ENVIRON INFRA, SEC. 592, MS	.....	8,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,989	2,989
MISSOURI		
BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	2,000	2,500
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	6,000	10,000
BOIS BRULE LEVES, AND DRAINAGE, MO	.....	500
MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	2,000	3,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	1,700	1,700
MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT, MO	.....	3,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
STE GENEVIEVE, MO	150	150
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO AND AR (DAM SAFETY)	5,000	5,500
MONTANA		
FORT PECK FISK HATCHERY, MT	.....	8,000
RURAL MONTANA, MT	.....	3,000
NEBRASKA		
ANTELOPE CREEK, NE	.....	1,500
SAND CREEK WATERSHED, NE	.....	500
WESTERN SARPY AND CLEAR CREEK, NE	.....	500
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD	1,000	1,000
WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	1,082	1,082
NEVADA		
RURAL NEVADA, NV	.....	10,000
TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	23,300	26,300
NEW JERSEY		
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET (ABSECON ISLAND),	1,000	1,000
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG (BRIGANTINE ISLAND), NJ	.....	500
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	1,728	1,728
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA AND DE	300	10,000
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	7,355	7,355
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	1,841	2,500
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD MANAGEMENT, NJ	.....	500
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	1,000	500
PASSAIC RIVER STEAMBANK RESTORATION, (MINISH PARK), NJ	.....	500
RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, NJ	.....	250
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	100	100
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	6,488	7,000
SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	3,000	3,000
TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	9,200	10,000
NEW MEXICO		
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	1,800	2,500
ALAMOGORDO, NM	3,500	4,100
CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM	.....	6,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, NM	.....	600
RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	.....	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	2,700
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	3,800	3,800
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ	115,000	100,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	2,040	2,040
CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	3,510	3,510
DARE COUNTY BEACHES, BODIE ISLAND, NC	.....	1,000
WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER (TOPSAIL BEACH), NC	.....	200
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	9,650	20,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION,	1,518	2,000
GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	6,500	6,500
GRAFTON, PARK RIVER, ND	.....	1,000
GRAND FORKS, ND-EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	23,496	37,000
MO RIVER RESTORATION, ND	.....	50

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	3,367	3,367
OHIO		
HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH		2,000
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	8,500	3,000
MILL CREEK, OH	3,900	1,000
WEST COLUMBUS, OH	1,800	500
OKLAHOMA		
CANTON LAKE (DAM SAFETY), OK		2,000
LAWTON, OK		2,500
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	4,400	4,400
OREGON		
BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR AND WA (MAJOR REHAB)	3,363	6,363
COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR AND WA		5,000
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR AND WA	2,900	2,900
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	500	500
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA	2,000	2,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	10,000	10,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	35,000	35,000
PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	600	600
SCHUYKILL RIVER PARK, PA		1,000
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	3,000
RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	1,100	1,100
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	16,500	5,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING AND WIDENING)	5,000	5,000
FOLLY BEACH, SC		200
LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC		350
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	6,000	6,000
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	2,800	9,000
MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, SD		500
PIERRE, SD	4,300	6,000
TENNESSEE		
BLACK FOX, OAKLANDS AND MURFREE SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN		1,070
CUMBERLAND COUNTY WATER SUPPLY, TN		1,700
TEXAS		
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	4,700	6,000
CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	2,966	2,966
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TX		9,280
EL PASO, TX	2,800	2,800
HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	18,726	40,000
JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	2,200	2,200
NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	4,108	4,108
NORTH PADRE ISLAND, PACKERY CHANNEL, TX		5,000
RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX AND OK		2,000
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	12,000	12,000
VERMONT		
LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED INITIATIVE, VT		500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
VIRGINIA		
AIWW, BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	9,706	9,706
EMBREY DAM, VA	.....	3,000
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (MAJOR REHAB)	6,000	6,000
LAKE MERRIWEATHER, LITTLE CALFPASTURE, VA	.....	3,000
NORFOLK CHANNEL HARBOR AND DEPENING,VA	.....	4,000
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	3,000
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR AND ID	95,000	85,000
HOWARD HANSON DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA	9,500	9,500
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	2,000	2,000
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	200	900
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	1,400	1,400
PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS, WA	.....	1,500
SHOALWATER BAY SHORELINE EROSION, WA	.....	1,000
THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA AND OR (MAJOR REH	250	500
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	2,600	4,300
GREENBRRIAR RIVER, WV	.....	3,000
LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	15,000	23,400
MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	52,154	65,200
ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV AND OH	2,500	2,500
WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	2,000	2,000
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE, WY	.....	500
MISCELLANEOUS		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	10,000	15,000
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	3,000	3,500
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL	3,000	3,000
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	8,000	14,000
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM	7,000	7,000
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	7,000	9,000
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	19,130	19,130
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	20,000	30,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE	45	45
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE	185	185
NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)	500	1,500
NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	6,000	9,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	14,000	17,000
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	−241,730
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL	1,350,000	1,538,000

Sand Point, AK.—The Committee has included a provision directing the Corps to proceed with construction of the Sand Point Harbor in accordance with the Chief of Engineers Report.

Sitka Harbor, AK.—The Committee notes that in designing the Sitka Harbor breakwater, the Corps failed to take into account the severity of the wave activity. As a result, the breakwater has failed to prevent wave action, particularly during stormy weather. There-

fore, the project must be redesigned and modifications installed. The Committee has included a provision to hold the City of Sitka harmless for any additional cost sharing requirements that would otherwise be mandated because of the Corps' design deficiency.

Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, AZ.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,500,000 for the Rio de Flag project to continue construction.

Rio Salado, Phoenix and Tempe Reaches, AZ.—The Committee recommendation includes the full budget request by the administration. The Committee is pleased that this unique project is gaining the attention and interest of the business community and the environmental community alike.

Tres Rios, AZ.—The Committee has included $7,000,000 for this project in fiscal year 2004, which was not included in the administration's budget request. The funds are for the continuation of this project, including the flood control levee and design of the pump stations for the wetlands.

Tuscon Drainage Area, AZ.—The Committee has included $5,000,000 for this project, which was not included in the budget request.

Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, AR & OK.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the continued construction of this project.

Ozark-Jeta Taylor (Powerhouse, Major Rehab), AR.—During calendar year 2001, the Ozark-Jeta Taylor turbines were down 63 percent of the time resulting in a revenues lost to the General Fund of the Treasury. To address this, the Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 to continue this much-needed rehabilitation project.

Harbor/South Bay Water Recycling, CA.—The Committee has included $4,000,000 for this project with the expectation that it will allow for the continued construction of the Madrona Marsh Lateral and other related elements. As this project was not included in the budget request, the Committee has included scarce resources for its continued construction.

Imperial Beach (Imperial Beach-Silver Strand), CA.—The Committee has included $200,000 for the continued design of the Imperial Beach project.

Oakland Harbor (50 Foot Project), CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $20,000,000 for this critical harbor project. The Committee regrets that it cannot provide optimum funding, efforts which are hampered because the administration only requested $7,000,000 for this project. Given that this project is already under construction, the Committee encourages the administration to include realistic project funding in future budget submissions.

Port of Los Angeles (Main Channel Deepening), CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000 for this project. Despite the fact this project is already under construction, the administration did not propose any funding for this project. The Committee expects the administration to budget for a project of this scope more responsibly in the future.

South Sacramento County Streams, CA.—The Committee is aware that there are hydrologic project design issues which could

impact the cost and schedule of the project. Therefore, the Committee has only provided the budget request.

Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Fenwick Island, DE.—The Committee recommendation includes $214,000 for the continued construction of this project begun in fiscal year 2003.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Port Mahon, DE.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the continuation of construction begun last fiscal year.

Central and Southern Florida, FL.—The Committee recommendation includes $90,000,000 to continue the Everglades Restoration projects, the same level of funding as fiscal year 2003. This should be in no way considered any diminution of interest or support by the Committee for these vitally important ecosystem restoration projects. The Committee also encourages the Corps to respond to current concerns regarding implementation of the restoration project.

Everglades and South Florida Restoration, FL.—The Committee has included a provision that conditions expenditure of funds appropriated in this Act for the purpose of construction of the projects for the Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem Restoration. The Committee directs that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency certify by September 30, 2003 and every 12 months thereafter until September 30, 2006 to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee indicating that the water entering A.R.M. Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge and Everglades National Park meets all applicable State water quality standards and numeric criteria adopted for phosphorus throughout A.R.M. Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge and Everglades National Park, as well water quality requirements set forth in the Consent Decree entered in *United States* v. *South Florida Water Management District* and that the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations respond in writing to the report indicating that the funds are available for expenditure.

Florida Keys Water Quality Improvements, FL.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for the implementation of the wastewater and stormwater improvements. The Committee believes these efforts need to be carried out in concert with the ongoing Everglades restoration work.

Tampa Harbor, FL.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the continuation of the General Reevaluation Report examining navigation improvements for the Federal portion of this project.

Brunswick Harbor, GA.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 for this project. The Committee is aware that the bids for this project greatly exceeded the Government estimate, and though there was a low bidder, there is a pending protest. Therefore, the Committee encourages the Corps to resolve this issue and reevaluate the cost of the project, seeking additional authority if necessary.

Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake Wildlife Mitigation, GA & SC.—The Committee has included $3,850,000 to complete the execution of the Memorandum of Agreement and the documentation

and payment of the mitigation lands to the State of South Carolina.

Hawaii Water Management, HI.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for continuation of the construction phases of this project for the water systems on the drought-plagued portions of the State of Hawaii.

Iao Stream Flood Control, HI.—The Committee recommendation includes $175,000 to complete the DDR and NEPA documentation, and initiate the design phase.

Kaumalapau Harbor, Lanai, HI.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,500,000 to continue the construction of this project.

Olmsted Locks and Dam, Ohio River, IL & KY.—The Committee recommendation includes $53,000,000 for the Olmsted Locks and Dam project. This reduced funding level should in no way be considered any diminution of interest or support for the project, but instead reflects the very limited resources of the Committee. None of the funds provided for the Olmsted Locks and Dam Project are to be used to reimburse the Claims and Judgment Fund.

Nutwood Drainage and Levee District, IL.—The Committee is aware of induced flooding issues which must be resolved prior to the award of the construction contract, the completion of plans and specifications, and the granting of a 404 permit. The Committee is also aware of issues regarding credit for work completed by the non-Federal sponsor. The Committee encourages the Corps to resolve these issues expeditiously but expects that any credit provided to the non-Federal sponsor shall not be precedent setting.

Mississinewa Lake, IN.—The Committee has included $21,000,000 for the completion of this project.

McAlpine Lock and Dam, IN & KY.—The Committee has included $40,000,000 for the McAlpine Lock and Dam project. The Committee has included additional funding because of the project's critical nature.

Lock and Dam 19, Mississippi River, IA (Major Rehabilitation).—The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 to continue construction work begun in fiscal year 2003.

Missouri River Levee System, L–385 IA, NE, KS, & MO.—The Committee has included sufficient funding to avoid work stoppages and interest penalties; as well as completing the project this fiscal year. The Committee has also included funds to complete the final levee contract for L–15.

Comite River, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funds to award the Phase II construction contract for the Lilly Bayou Control Structure.

Grand Isle and Vicinity, LA.—The Committee has included $200,000 for the completion of the General Reevaluation Report and expects the Corps to resolve any remaining issues so the project may proceed.

Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, LA.—The Committee has included additional funds to complete the demolition of eastside businesses on schedule and to initiate two levee construction contracts, as well as continuing the engineering and design work for the project.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000 to continue construction of nec-

essary navigation channel refinements, land purchases, and development for mitigation of project impacts, and construction of project recreation and appurtenant features.

Ouachita River Levees, LA.—The Committee has included funds for the completion of Levee Item 2 and to begin work on Levee Item 3, which is to include gravel surfacing.

Southeast Louisiana, LA.—The Committee has included $35,000,000 for the Southeast Louisiana project. Though the Committee has included the additional funds, it remains very concerned with the increasing scope and cost of this project. Though the Federal Government has a responsibility to mitigate the impacts of Federal channels and waterways on our communities, the Committee is concerned that this project has no foreseeable completion. Therefore, the Committee encourages the Corps to better define the project's scope of work and plan the construction's progression in order for the project to fully realize its designed benefits as soon as is practicable.

Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program, MD, VA, & PA.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,600,000, which was not included in the budget request. These funds are for the completion of the Preconstruction, Engineering and Design phase and the initiation of the Marsh Creation Project.

Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery, MD & VA.—The Committee has included $4,500,000 for this continuing construction project. The Committee remains concerned that the benefits of the project will not be fully realized until the issue of agricultural effluents is resolved.

Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, MA.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 for the continued construction of the project.

Twelve Towns Drain Retention Facility, MI.—The Committee recommendation includes $388,000 for the completion of plans and specifications.

DeSoto County, MS.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,955,000 for the completion of this project.

Pascagoula Harbor, MS.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,989,000, which is equal to the administration's request.

Blue River Channel, Kansas City, MO.—The Committee has included $10,000,000 to continue construction on the railroad bridge alterations, complete plans and specifications, and the General Reevaluation Report.

Bois Brule Levee and Drainage, MO.—The Committee has included $500,000 for this project. The Committee is aware that the project sponsor decided to proceed only with the deficiency correction portion of the project and place the levee raise on hold.

Rural Montana, MT.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the development of the Project Cooperation Agreements, Project Management Plans, and necessary NEPA documentation for the Conrad, Belgrade, Drummond, Wisdom, Melston, and Manhattan projects, as well as and other qualified participants.

Antelope Creek, NE.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 for the continued construction of this flood damage reduction project.

Rural Nevada, NV.—The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for the Rural Nevada Project. Within the funds provided the Corps

is directed to give consideration to projects at Boulder City, Lyon County, (Carson River Regional Water System) Gerlach, Incline Village, Round Hill, Mesquite, Moapa, Spanish Springs, Battle Mountain, Virgin Valley, Lawton-Verdi, Esmeralda County, and Searchlight. Other communities that meet the program criteria should be considered as funding allows.

Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, NV.—The Committee has provided $26,300,000 to continue construction of this flood control project. The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for work performed in accordance with section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor, Absecon Island, NJ.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funding for the beachfill construction effort.

Delaware Mainstem Channel Deepening, NJ, DE & PA.—The Committee has included $10,000,000 for this project which has undergone a rigorous cost-benefit reanalysis. The Corps is to be commended for initiating this effort, and, as expected, the project has been validated by both the General Accounting Office and outside auditors as having a cost-benefit ratio which exceeds the mandated Federal standards.

Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-Basin, NJ.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funds to initiate Segment U levee and floodwall.

Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, NJ.—The Committee has included an additional $800,000 to initiate the construction of the Hereford Inlet portion of the project.

Acequias Irrigation System, NM.—The Committee has included an additional $700,000 for additional construction contract awards. The Committee supports the program for rehabilitating acequias in New Mexico, and feels that it is of historical and cultural significance to the State. There is concern however, that the process for determining environmental impacts of each acequia project is disproportionately time consuming and expensive. The Committee therefore directs the Corps to seek ways to streamline the NEPA process, including the use of "programmatic" assessments addressing multiple projects where practicable.

Central New Mexico, NM.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the completion of the construction work on the Double Eagle II Infrastructure Upgrade, the Bosque Farms Plant, the Tijeras Water System upgrade and the Bernalillo plant. In addition, the Committee has included $1,000,000 for the Black Mesa Area Flood Management project.

Middle Rio Grande Flood Damage Reduction, NM.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the completion of the General Reevaluation Report.

New York and New Jersey Harbor, NY & NJ.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000,000 for the Harbor project. This reduced funding level should in no way be considered any diminution of interest or support for the project, but instead it reflects the very limited resources of the Committee.

Dare County Beaches, Bodie Island, NC.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 to continue preconstruction monitoring and real estate acquisition.

Wilmington Harbor, NC.—The Committee has included $20,000,000 for this critical harbor project. The Committee regrets that it cannot provide optimum funding at this time. The Committee notes that the administration only requested $9,650,000 for a project of this size, and encourages the administration to request more realistic funding in future fiscal years.

Buford-Trenton Irrigation District Land Acquisition, ND.—The Committee recommendation includes funds for the purchase of additional easements.

Devils Lake, ND.—The Committee continues to support the construction of the Devils Lake outlet and notes that $5,000,000 of previously appropriated funds for construction remain available until expended. The Committee also urges the Corps to request sufficient funding in future budget requests to construct this project.

Grand Forks, ND–East Grand Forks, MN.—The Committee has provided $37,000,000 for this project to continue construction.

Missouri River Sedimentation, ND.—The Committee has provided $50,000 for this project. The Committee understands that the Corps will use the funds provided, along with previously appropriated funds, to continue the required assessment study.

Holes Creek, West Carrollton, OH.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the Holes Creek project, which was not included in the budget request. The Committee expects that these funds will be sufficient to complete the construction of additional floodwalls and relocations.

Canton Lake (Dam Safety), OK.—The Committee has included $2,000,000 for the Canton Lake project. The Committee is aware that there are improvements needed on the dam, including stabilizing the existing spillway.

Lawton, OK.—The Committee has included $2,500,000 for this project and expects the Corps to continue construction.

Columbia River Channel Improvements, OR & WA.—The Committee has included $5,000,000 for this project, which includes ecosystem restoration efforts. The Committee expects that this effort will further improve the Corps' "no jeopardy" biological opinion standings. Therefore, the Committee expects that the administration should budget for this project in a responsible manner.

Schuylkill River Park, PA.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 for this project and expects the Corps to negotiate and execute the Project Cooperation Agreement.

Charleston Harbor, SC.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for this widening and deepening project, which is the full capability of the Corps.

Lakes Marion and Moultrie, SC.—The Committee has provided $350,000 for this project, which is all that can be provided under the current project authorization.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, SD.—The Committee notes that Title VI of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, as amended, authorizes funding to pay administrative expenses, implementation of terrestrial wildlife plans, activities associated with land transferred or to be transferred, and annual expenses for operating recreational areas. Within the funds provided, the Committee directs that not more than $1,000,000 shall be provided for administrative expenses, and that the Corps is to dis-

tribute remaining funds as directed by Title VI to the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and Lower Brule Sioux Tribe.

Missouri River Restoration, SD.—The Committee has included $500,000, the full Corps capability, to complete the assessment and initiation of the implementation plan for the basin.

Pierre, SD.—The Committee has included $6,000,000 for the Pierre, South Dakota flood damage reduction project.

Black Fox, Oaklands and Murfree Springs Wetlands, TN.—The Committee has provided $1,070,000 for the continued construction of this project, which was not included in the budget request.

Cumberland County Water Supply, TN.—The Committee has included funds for the continued construction of this project.

Brays Bayou, TX.—The Committee has included $6,000,000 for this project related to flood damage reduction.

Dallas Floodway Extension, TX.—The Committee has provided funds and legislative language to continue plans and specification development, real estate activities and resume project construction, including the Cadillac Heights segment of the project.

Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, TX.—The Committee has included $40,000,000 for this high priority project which is needed for the safe and cost-effective movement of cargo.

Red River Chloride Control Project, TX & OK.—The Committee has included $2,000,000 for the continued construction of this project.

Embrey Dam, VA.—The Committee has included $3,000,000 for this continuing construction project.

Lake Merriweather, Little Calfpasture (Goshen Dam), VA.—The Committee has included $3,000,000 for the continuation of this project.

Norfolk Harbor and Channels (Deepening), VA.—The Committee has included $4,000,000 for the continuation of this necessary navigation project.

Chief Joseph Dam Gas Abatement, WA.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for the continued construction of this project. The additional funds are provided for the award of construction contracts related to the right abutment, staging area and cofferdam fabrication.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, WA, OR & ID.—The Committee has provided $85,000,000 for the Fish Mitigation project. This reduced funding level should in no way be considered any diminution of interest or support for the project, but instead it reflects the very limited resources of the Committee.

Mt. St. Helens Sediment Control, WA.—The Committee recommendation includes $700,000 above the administration's request. These funds are for the initiation of a sensitivity analysis to Cowlitz River tributaries as a result of elevating river stages and proceeding with the analysis of alternatives to find a permanent solution to the sediment control. In addition, the Committee expects the Corps to initiate a General Reevaluation Report.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, WV, KY, & VA.—The Committee has provided $23,400,000 for continuation of the project. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommendation includes $17,000,000 for the

Buchanan County, Dickenson County, and Grundy, VA elements. Further, the Committee recommendation includes $6,400,000 for Kermit, Lower Mingo County, McDowell County, Upper Mingo and Wayne County, WV.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—The Committee has included $3,500,000 for the Aquatic Plant Control program's base research and development activities. The Committee is aware of the growing aquatic invasive plant infestation problem around the county and supports the efforts of the Corps, and private sector, to develop new management and control technologies. Currently, the Committee is aware that approximately 25 Federal agencies are involved in invasive species activities and that the estimated economic impacts from all invasive species totals as much as $137,000,000,000. The Committee further believes that success in the management of these invasive species is dependent upon a strong, stable research program. In an effort to maximize limited funding for eradication and harvesting, the Committee strongly recommends that these efforts be undertaken only where a local sponsor agrees to provide 50 percent of the cost of the work. Within the funds provided, $300,000 is for a cost shared effort with the State of South Carolina and $400,000 is for a cost shared effort with the State of Vermont. The Committee urges the Corps to establish a cost shared program with the State of Hawaii.

Dam Safety and Seepage/Stability Correction Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $14,000,000 for the program. Within the funds provided, $6,000,000 is provided for the Corps to continue work on Waterbury Dam in Vermont.

Ability to Pay.—Section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended, requires that all project cooperation agreements for flood damage reduction projects, to which non-Federal cost sharing applies, will be subject to the ability of non-Federal sponsors to pay their shares. Congress included this section in the landmark 1986 Act to ensure that as many communities as possible would qualify for Federal flood damage reduction projects, based more on needs and less on financial capabilities. The Secretary published eligibility criteria in 33 CFR 241, which requires a non-Federal sponsor to meet an ability-to-pay test. However, the Committee believes that the Secretary's test is too restrictive and operates to exclude most communities from qualifying for relief under the ability-to-pay provision. For example, 33 CFR 241.4(f) specifies that the test should be structured so that reductions in the level of cost-sharing will be granted in "only a limited number of cases of severe economic hardship," and should depend not only on the economic circumstances within a project area, but also on the conditions of the state in which the project area is located. While within the letter of the law, the Secretary's policies do not appear to be keeping the spirit of the law. The Secretary is directed to report to the Appropriations Committees within 90 days of enactment of this Act on a proposal intended to be published in the Federal Register to revise 33 CFR 241 eligibility criteria to allow a more reasonable and balanced application of the ability-to pay provision.

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM

The continuing project authorities listed below, allow the Corps great flexibility to respond to various, limited-scope, water resource problems facing communities throughout the Nation. This program has proven to be remarkably successful in providing a quick response to serious local problems. These problems range from flood control and navigation to bank stabilization and environmental restoration. The Committee has provided funds in excess of the budget request for virtually all of these accounts. As a general rule, once a project has received funds for the initial phases of any of these authorities, the project will continue to be funded as long as it proves to be environmentally sound, technically feasible, and economically justified, as applicable. With this in mind, the Committee has chosen to limit explicit direction of these project authorities.

The Committee is aware that there are funding requirements for ongoing, continuing authorities projects that may not be accommodated within the funds provided for each program. It is not the Committee's intent that ongoing projects be terminated. If additional funds are needed to keep ongoing work in any program on schedule, the Committee urges the Corps to reprogram the necessary funds.

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (Section 206).—The Committee has provided $15,000,000 for the Section 206 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $200,000 for Tamarisk Eradication, CO for plans and specifications; $200,000 for Yampa River/Hayden restoration project (Upper Yampa Water Conservancy District), CO; $200,000 for Sqauw Creek, IL ecosystem restoration for plans and specifications; $250,000 for Chariton River/Rathburn Lake Watershed, IA to complete plans and specifications; $192,000 for Duck Creek-Fairmont Park Wetlands restoration, Scott County, IA for planning and design analysis; $304,000 for Lemay Wetlands, MO to initiate and complete restorations; $200,000 for Bottomless Lake State Park, NM; $100,000 for James Wallace Memorial Dam, Santa Rosa, NM; $100,000 for Jemez River Aquatic and Riparian Habitat, NM; $200,000 for Concord Streams Restorations, Concord, NC; $75,000 for the design phase of Little Sugar Creek, NC aquatic ecosystem restoration; $100,000 for project modifications to East Harbor State Park, OH; $100,000 for Cherokee Creek Aquatic ecosystem restoration, OK for a feasibility study; $100,000 for Crow Creek Aquatic ecosystem restoration, OK; $100,000 for Alsop Brownwood, Johnson Creek, OR for a feasibility study; $100,000 for Oaks Bottom, OR for a feasibility study; $100,000 for Brush Neck Cove, Warwick, RI for a feasibility study; $150,000 for Ninigret and Cross Mills Ponds, Charlestown, RI for construction; $300,000 for Mad Island Aquatic ecosystem restoration, TX; and $50,000 for Underwood Creek restoration, Milwaukee, WI.

Navigation Mitigation Projects (Section 111).—The Committee has provided $1,500 for the Section 111 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes $1,280,000 to continue construction of the Saco River and Camp Ellis Beach, ME project to mitigate shoreline damages caused by the Federal navigation project.

Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135).—The Committee has provided $17,000,000 for the Section 1135 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $170,000 for Big Creek Spillway, IA for a modifications project; $550,000 for construction of the Honey Creek Wetlands, Greenville Marsh, Lucas County, IA; $310,000 for Lower Rouge River restoration, Wayne County, MI for a feasibility study; $320,000 for Rouge River Oxbow restoration, MI for a feasibility study; $100,000 for Upper Rouge River restoration, Wayne County, MI for a feasibility study; $700,000 for riparian and wetland restoration, Pueblo of Santa Ana, NM; $200,000 for Joe Creek habitat restoration, OK; $250,000 for Lower Columbia Slough, OR for construction; and $100,000 for Lake Champlain Sea Lamprey barriers, VT.

Emergency Streambank & Shoreline Protection Projects (Section 14).—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 for the Section 14 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $60,000 for the planning and design analysis at Beaver Creek, Ackley, IA; $341,000 for Iowa River, Sac and Fox Settlement, Tama County, IA; $40,000 for planning and design analysis for Red Duck Creek, KY; $300,000 for Ramsay, Bessemer, Township, Gogebic County, MI for planning and design analysis and construction; $100,000 for planning and design analysis at Sturgeon River, Baraga County, MI; $800,000 for Rio Puerco, NM; and $250,000 for Burlington, VT.

Flood Control Projects (Section 205).—The Committee has provided $30,000,000 for the Section 205 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $75,000 for a feasibility study at Bono, AR; $155,000 for Oak Creek, Florence, CO for a feasibility study; $225,000 for plans and specifications at East Boyer River, Denison, IA; $150,000 for a feasibility study at Kitty Creek and Maquoketa River, City of Monticello, IA; $200,000 for Olive Hill, KY for a feasibility study; $60,000 for a feasibility study at Red Duck Creek, KY; $100,000 to investigate flooding problems along Bayou Choupique in the vicinity of the Chitimacha Reservation in St. Mary Parish, LA; $40,000 for Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana Flood Control Project, LA for a feasibility study; $350,000 for plans and specifications and to initiate construction at Granite Falls, MN; $800,000 for Little Puerco River, Gallup, NM; $200,000 for Hobbs, NM; $200,000 for Hatch, NM; $500,000 to continue the Spanish Springs Valley, NV flood prevention project; $1,000,000 for construction of the Wahpeton, ND, flood control project; $100,000 for Cane Creek, TN for a feasibility study; $100,000 for Jones Creek, TN for a feasibility study; and $100,000 for Jamestown Island Seawall, VA for plans and specifications.

Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material (Section 204).—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Section 204 Program. Within the amount provided the recommendation includes $212,000 for Blackbottoms, Des Moines County, IA,

Shoreline Protection Projects (Section 103).—The Committee has provided $3,500,000 for the Section 103 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes $75,000 for Luna Pier, MI for a feasibility study.

Small Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 for the Section 107 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $750,000 for Aun'u Harbor, American Samoa for a preliminary study; $200,000 for Ta'u Harbor, American Samoa; $350,000 for Horseshoe Bend erosion project, KY; $100,000 for Detroit River navigation improvements, MI; $75,000 for Ontonagon Harbor, MI for a feasibility study; and $60,000 for Charlestown Breachway navigation study, RI.

Snaging and Clearing for Flood Control (Section 208).—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 for the Section 208 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes $25,000 for Deer Creek, Webster County, KY for a planning, design and analysis.

Tribal Partnership Program.—The Committee acknowledges the serious impacts of coastal erosion and flooding due to continued climate change in Alaska. The Committee expects the Corps to continue its work in this area.

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

Appropriations, 2003	$342,334,000
Budget estimate, 2004	280,000,000
Committee recommendation	329,000,000

This appropriation funds planning, construction, and operation and maintenance activities associated with water resource projects located in the lower Mississippi River Valley from Cape Girardeau, Missouri to the Gulf of Mexico.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA	435	435
DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA	800	900
SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	.....	100
SPRING BAYOU, LA	500	500
TENSAS RIVER BASIN, LA	.....	200
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	185	350
FLETCHER CREEK, TN	120	120
GERMANTOWN, TN	51	51
MILLINGTON AND VICINITY, TN	84	84
MORGANZA TO THE GULF, LA	3,487	5,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	695	695
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	6,357	8,435
CONSTRUCTION		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	39,562	41,000
FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR	2,050	2,050
HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	2,180	2,180
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	42,919	47,000
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	2,365	3,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	7,768	8,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	14,075	15,000
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	3,200	3,200
HORN LAKE CREEK, MS	.....	395
BACKWATER PUMP, MS	.....	12,000
MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS	.....	30
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	890	1,000
DALTA HEADWATERS PROJECT, MS	.....	17,000
MAIN STEM, MS	.....	25
REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	.....	500
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	205	205
YAZOO BASIN, UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	6,645	12,000
ST. JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	.....	1,000
NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS	2,618	3,200
WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	.....	1,600
Subtotal, CONSTRUCTION	124,477	170,385
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	7,000
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	7,505	9,000
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	281
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	250
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	296	296
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	35	345
YAZOO BASIN:	(32,050)	(40,645)
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	6,300	7,500
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	170	2,800
ENID LAKE, MS	5,505	6,200
GREENWOOD, MS	650	850
GRENADA LAKE, MS	6,170	7,000
MAIN STEM, MS	1,480	3,480
SARDIS LAKE, MS	8,630	9,500
TRIBUTARIES, MS	1,135	1,135
WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	470	470
YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	730	900
YAZOO CITY, MS	810	810
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	167	167
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	4,265	4,265
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	173,986

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−13,274	−23,806
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	280,000	329,000

The Committee believes that it is essential to provide adequate resources and funding to the Mississippi River and Tributaries program in order to protect the large investment in flood control facilities. Although much progress has been made, considerable work remains to be done for the protection and economic development of the rich national resources in the Valley. The Committee expects the additional funds to be used to advance ongoing studies, initiate new studies, and advance important construction and maintenance work. In conjunction with efforts to optimize use of the additional funding provided, the Committee expects the Corps to make the necessary adjustments in lower priority activities and non-critical work in order to maximize the public benefit within the Mississippi River and Tributaries program.

General Investigations

Southeast Arkansas, AR.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the continued study of the Southeast Arkansas project.

Tensas River Basin, LA.—The Committee has included $200,000 to continue the feasibility phase of the Tensas River Basin study.

Construction

Mississippi River Levees, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, & TN.—The Committee has included $47,000,000 for the continuation of the construction on the Mississippi River Levees project, including the plans and specifications and initiation of construction on the Lower Mississippi River Museum and Riverfront Interpretive Site.

Yazoo Basin, Mississippi, Yazoo Backwater Project (Pumping Plant and Nonstructural Features), MS.—The Committee has included $12,000,000 and statutory language directing the Corps to complete the design of the pumping plant, real estate acquisition and the initiation of the pump supply contract.

Yazoo Basin, Mississippi, Mississippi Delta Headwaters Project, MS.—The Committee has included $17,000,000 for this essential project which consists of sixteen watersheds with efforts including bank stabilization to grade control structures and channel modifications.

Maintenance

Mississippi River Levees, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, & TN.—The Committee recommendation includes $7,000,000 which includes funds for gravel surfacing at selected locations.

St. Francis River and Tributaries, AR & MO.—An additional $1,495,000 has been provided above the budget request for maintenance items in Missouri.

Grand Prairie Region, AR.—The Committee has included bill language directing the Corps, using previously appropriated funds, to continue construction of the water withdrawal features associated with the project as directed in the conference report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2003	$1,927,556,000
Budget estimate, 2004	1,939,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,949,000,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
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	23,100
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,000	5,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	50	50
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM	.....	5,429
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	19,040	22,040
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 AND MS	21,500	22,500
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA	6,892	6,892
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	2,969	2,969
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	3,259	3,259
COOK INLET SHOALS, AK	.....	1,000
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	1,285
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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,531	1,531
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	6,391	6,391
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	25	400
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	192	192
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	29,493	35,493
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 AND 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	200
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	15	126
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	2,269	2,269
BODEGA BAY, CA	.....	2,800
BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	2,526	2,526
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	4,931
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	280	280
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	282	282
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,460	1,460
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,789	2,789
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,697	1,697
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	6,785	9,285
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,160	1,160
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	.....	1,250
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,732	2,732
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,960	1,960
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 HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	2,189	2,189
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,092	2,092
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	2,065	3,000
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	2,023
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	839	1,172
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	92	92

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,338	2,338
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	292	292
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,441	1,775
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
LONG ISLAND SOPUND, TREATMENT OF DREDGE MATERIAL, CT	.....	500
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	406	406
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	330	330
NORWALK HARBOR, CT	.....	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,303	1,303
SOUTHPORT HARBOR, CT	.....	500
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	353	353
THOMASTON DAM, CT	442	442
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
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	1,880
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	6,551	6,551
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL AND 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	4,709
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 AND SC	13,964	13,964

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	41	41
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA AND SC	11,747	11,747
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	7,746	8,746
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	12,540	12,540
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	154	154
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL	6,600	6,600
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
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,271	3,271
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 AND 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 AND IN	25,726	25,726
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL AND IN	1,889	1,889
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	546	546
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,688	1,688
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	537	537
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,495	5,495
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	44,429	45,429
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	17,374	18,374
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	3,700
FORT MADISON, IA	.....	50
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	190	190
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	157	157

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MISSOURI RIVER—RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS AND MO	5,355	6,000
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA AND NE	2,260	2,260
MUSCATINE, IA	.....	205
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	3,438	3,438
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,663	5,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,223	4,223
SCHELDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, IA	.....	334
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,857	1,857
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,760	1,760
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	939	939
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	650	650
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,385	1,500
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	759	759
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	2,025	2,025
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,269	1,269
MARION LAKE, KS	2,443	3,000
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,731	1,731
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,783	2,783
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 AND 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	.....
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 AND OH	31,372	31,852
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN AND 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	20,367
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	286	3,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	864	864
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	133	1,200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BAYOU LACOMBE, LA	.....	315
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	31	31
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	165	1,300
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	35	35
BAYOU TECHE, LA	48	354
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	15,013
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	32	421
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	13	80
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,651	2,651
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,841	5,116
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	247
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	37	237
MAINE		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	17	17
KENNEBEC RIVER, ME	45	45
NARRAGUAGUS, ME	.....	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,886	1,886
SCARGOROUGH RIVER, ME	.....	500
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
WELLS HARBOR, ME	50	50
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD AND 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
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	165	165
FISHING CREEK, MD	.....	300
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	80	1,500
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	34	34
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV	1,774	1,774
KNAPPS NARROWS, MD	651	651
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	960	960
POCOMOKE RIVER, MD	989	989
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	365	365
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	96	96
TILGHMAN ISLAND HARBO, MD	.....	555
TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD	1,364	1,364
UPPER THOROFARE, SOMERSET, MD	.....	792
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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
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
NEW BEDFORD AND FAIRHAVEN HARBOR, MA	.....	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	1,316	1,316
TULLY LAKE, MA	412	412
WEST HILL DAM, MA	573	573
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	407	407
MICHIGAN		
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	20	20
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
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	428	428
LELAND HARBOR, MI	20	170
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	10	10
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	12	208
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	946	946
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	227	227
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	10	10
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI AND WI	154	154
MONROE HARBOR, MI	138	138
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	21	21
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	473	473
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	45	45
PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI	20	214
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	2,501
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 AND SD	255	255
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN AND 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	4,196

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	273	273
MISSISSIPPI		
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	685	685
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	.....	1,250
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	8	87
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	51
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,600	1,600
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	4,460	4,460
PEARL RIVER, MS AND LA	343	343
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	180	180
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	21	604
SARDIS LAKE, MS	545	545
WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS, MS	.....	1,000
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	1,959
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
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	18,099	18,099
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	22	340
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
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	5,362	5,362
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MO	.....	374
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	5,772	5,772
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 AND 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 AND CA	552	552
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	288	368
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	461	461

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
COCHECO RIVER, NH	.....	1,000
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
NEW HAMPSHIRE UPLAND DISPOSAL SITE	.....	300
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	1,520
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	500	500
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	20	20
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA AND DE	19,290	20,800
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,615	3,715
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	89	89
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	1,815	1,815
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	100	100
MANAQUAN RIVER, NJ	.....	175
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
SALEM RIVER, NJ	.....	825
SHARK RIVER, NJ	70	70
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,712	3,882
COCHITI LAKE, NM	2,569	7,079
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,560	2,460
GALISTEO DAM, NM	434	634
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	137	137
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	637	3,287
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,176	1,646
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	227	227
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	463	463
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL, NM	.....	1,500
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
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	100	100
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
MORICHES INLET, NY	30	630
MT. MORRIS LAKE, NY	2,753	2,753

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	3,660	3,660
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	4,460	4,460
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY AND NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	5,344	5,344
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSIT	750	750
OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	5	5
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,220	1,220
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	55	55
RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	150	150
SAG HARBOR, NY	100	100
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	416	1,500
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	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
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	12,964
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	1,500
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	879
COOLEY CANAL, OH	20	20
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	637	637
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	1,181	1,181
DILLON LAKE, OH	532	532
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	735	735

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
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	7,799
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	503
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	528
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
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	4,495
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 AND WA	4,849	4,849
CHETCO RIVER, OR		300
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA AND PORTLA	16,674	16,674
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA	10,028	10,028
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	382	382
COOS BAY, OR	3,598	3,598

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	.....	300
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	724	724
COUGAR LAKE, OR	3,577	3,577
DEPOE SLOUGH, OR	.....	400
DETROIT LAKE, OR	2,002	2,002
DORENA LAKE, OR	535	535
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	464	464
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	956	956
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 AND WA	4,038	4,538
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	2,027	2,027
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	5,154	5,154
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	5,484	5,484
PORT ORFORD, OR	.....	300
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	200	200
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	60	60
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	.....	200
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	134	134
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, WA	.....	300
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	259	259
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
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	1,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	348	348
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	271	271
JOHNSTOWN, PA	997	997
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	15,158
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH AND WV	22,504	22,504
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH AND WV	488	488
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	21	21
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	455	455
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	17	17
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	5,674	5,674
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	3,852
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,790	1,790
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	224	224

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	810	810
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	691	691
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND 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	1,432
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	9,740	10,500
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,380	3,380
FOLLY RIVER, SC	277	452
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, SD	.....	5,000
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 AND MN	907	907
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	410	410
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD AND ND	13,768	13,768
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	48	48
TENNESSEE		
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	18,826
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	20	510
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	3,299
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	8,800
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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
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	794
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,683	1,683
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	50	50
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	689	689
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	2,487
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	.....	1,000
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	100	100
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,946	1,946
WACO LAKE, TX	2,316	2,316
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	958	958
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	4,695	4,695
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	3,404	3,404
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	65	65
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	464	464
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	651	651
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	42	42
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT AND 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
WINHALL BROOK, VT	.....	830
VIRGINIA		
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
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,756	1,756
HAMPTON CREEK, VA	733	733
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK AND 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 AND 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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
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
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
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,285	1,285
YORK RIVER, VA	1,585	1,585
WASHINGTON		
BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	50	50
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	711	711
COLUMBIA RIVER BTN CHINOOK AND HEAD, WA		500
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,579	1,579
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	8,377	8,377
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
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA AND 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 AND OH	24,270	24,270
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY AND OH	2,366	2,366
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,457	1,457
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	836	836
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,469	1,469
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,785	1,785
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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
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	1,025
AUTOMATED BUDGET SYSTEM (ABS)	285	285
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,750	2,750
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	1,545	1,545
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	8,000	8,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,180	1,180
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	6,755	6,755
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,545	1,545
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	300	300
FACILITY PROTECTION	13,000	13,000
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS	1,000	1,000
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	675	675
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	4,120	4,120
LONG TERM OPTION ASSESSMENT FOR LOW USE NAVIGATION	1,000	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
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	1,795
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675	675
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	650
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS)	725	725
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,745	4,745
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−13,491	−102,538
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,933,571	1,949,000

The Committee continues to believe that it is essential to provide adequate resources and attention to operation and maintenance requirements in order to protect the large Federal investment. Yet, current and projected budgetary constraints require the Committee to limit the amount of work that can be accomplished in the fiscal year. In order to cope with the current situation, the Corps has had to defer or delay scheduled maintenance activities.

Maintenance backlogs continue to grow, with much of the backlog being essential maintenance dredging needed to keep the Nation's ports, harbors, and waterways open and able to efficiently handle important national and international trade activities. Yet, the Committee is aware that out-year budget planning guidance for

the Corps of Engineers projects that the current appropriations for their critical operation and maintenance activities will continue to decline for the foreseeable future. If additional resources are not made available, the Committee will be forced to cut back on services, and begin to terminate and close many projects and activities.

The Committee is aware of the Corps' efforts to stretch the limited resources to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of means. With an increasing number of projects entering the inventory, and budgetary constraints increasing, it is clear that the Corps will have to find innovative ways of accomplishing required maintenance work, while reducing operational and other costs. Adjustments in lower-priority programs and noncritical work should optimize limited resources while maximizing the public benefit.

The budget request has proposed that no navigation project with less than one billion ton-miles of cargo be eligible for maintenance dredging. The Committee believes that this is in direct conflict with the way projects are analyzed. Project analysis is based upon Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies (1983), the Corps of Engineers Planning Guidance Notebook (2000), and other polices and procedures. For navigation studies, the analysis centers on transportation savings to the Nation considering the ultimate origins and destinations of commodities to be moved. Operation and maintenance costs are considered as a part of this analysis and are figured into the benefit to cost ratio utilized to make the investment decision. By applying an arbitrary ton-mile figure to determine O&M funding decisions, the budget request has essentially obviated the need for any of the previous studies undertaken to determine the investment decision.

The Committee is concerned about the annual proposals for reductions of maintenance funding for "low use waterways and ports". These tributary waterways naturally do not enjoy the same level of relative efficiencies as mainstem waterways. The Mississippi and Ohio Rivers handle tremendous volumes of traffic over long distances and so generate impressive ton-mile statistics. Tributaries, by nature, provide generally short, smaller channels with lower traffic densities. Consequently, "ton-mile" statistics for tributary waterways are dwarfed by statistics for the mainstem waterways. It is important to recognize that the commerce on the tributaries is usually only a small part of the total journey between producer and consumer. When these statistics are compared on a system basis, nearly all of these waterways appear to "pay their way" and are performing as the economic analysis indicated when they were originally authorized.

Uncertainties in maintenance funding for lower use projects, seriously impact their abilities to compete and become higher use facilities. Without funding to provide a stable channel and authorized depths and widths, industries and shippers are reluctant to make the necessary investments in using these projects. The Committee believes that proposed elimination of maintenance funding for authorized projects is not only a serious disservice to the public, but is demonstrates a profound lack of respect for the congressional

oversight committees that have jurisdiction for authorization and deauthorization of such projects.

The Committee is not in favor of funding projects which are no longer economically viable nor environmentally sustainable. Unfortunately, the administration has chosen a path of under-funding, or an entire lack of funding, for projects in an effort to achieve de facto deauthorization through the appropriations process by utilizing the billion-ton-mile model. Therefore, the Committee has determined, in the best interest of the Corps, to deauthorize projects which are listed as "inactive" by the Corps, those projects which are authorized to which no funds have been obligated.

Further, the Committee believes much could be learned by the open exchange of how "low use" waterways and ports are calculated, for the billion-ton-mile does not adequately reflect the flow of commerce today. The Committee remains concerned about the economic impacts of not maintaining all of our waterways and ports at their authorized depths. As a result of waterways not being maintained at the authorized depths, shippers are forced to divide their cargo and place it on a number of smaller ships in order to make passage to the final destination, with an approximate cost to industry of $1,000,000,000 a year. This adds significantly to the cost and time of the movement of products in and around our waterways, something which the administration does not appropriately take into account when formulating the budget for the Corps. Therefore, the Committee strongly encourages the administration to put forth a proposal for a model which better reflects the flow of goods along all of our ports and waterways, including lightering. Until then, however, the Committee believes the administration has the responsibility to budget for each and every project such that the authorized widths and depths are maintained.

MANAGEMENT OF OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS

The Committee is concerned that current and projected budgetary constraints will only exacerbate the increasing impact of inadequate funding necessary for the effective protection of the Federal investment in Corps of Engineers facilities. With that in mind, the Committee feels it imperative that careful consideration be given to the disposition of appropriated funds such that they are applied effectively. It is the feeling of the Committee that too often, surplus O&M funding is held and reprogrammed in one part of the organization, while shortages in other parts of the organization slow the execution of vital operation and maintenance of facilities. Though the Committee has considered retracting the 100 percent reprogramming authority, a privilege granted to the Corps, it instead requests that the Corps, within 3 months of enactment of this Act, report back to the Senate Appropriations Committee with a plan for ensuring effective management and expenditure of O&M funds.

CORPS HOPPER DREDGE FLEET

During fiscal year 2002, the Committee requested the General Accounting Office [GAO] to review the benefits and effects of current and proposed restrictions on the Corps' hopper dredge fleet. The Committee faces significant future investments in the Corps

hopper dredge fleet, as it is rapidly aging. The Committee believes that the investment decisions must take into consideration the subsequent use of the fleet. The final GAO report, released March, 2003, reviewed the impacts of operational changes to the fleet since fiscal year 1993. GAO's findings made it clear to the Committee that additional costs have been imposed upon the Corps with the decreased use of the fleet, but that the benefits have not been realized. Additionally, the GAO found that the Corps' contracting process for hopper dredges was not effective. Most importantly, the GAO reported that the Corps of Engineers' did not have even a limited system to evaluate the costs and benefits of the varying operational levels of its hopper dredge fleet, nor did it have a means to make maintenance and repair decisions of the fleet taking operational use into consideration. The Committee remains concerned that since 2000, the Corps has provided a report to Congress which has been found to have no analytical basis, thus calling into question the ready reserve policy.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to report to the Committee within 6 months of enactment of this Act, with a detailed plan of how it intends to rectify the current situation. The plan is to include how the Corps intends to establish a baseline for determining the appropriate use of the Corps' hopper dredge fleet in the future. Finally, the Corps shall include a comprehensive analysis of the costs and benefits of the existing and proposed restrictions on the use of the fleet. Overall, the Committee expects the Corps to put in place measures by which better investment decisions regarding the fleet can be made.

Alabama-Coosa River, AL.—The Committee has included an additional $2,961,000 for annual maintenance dredging of the Alabama-Coosa River and for work at Swift Creek Park.

Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, AL.—The Committee has included an additional $1,000,000 for the removal of materials from the upland disposal site and repairs to lock gates at Holt Lock. Within the funds available, the Committee directs the Corps to begin the relocation, process of office warehouse, shop, and dock facilities in Tuscaloosa, AL.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, AL & MS.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $22,500,000. Within the funds provided, $1,500,000 is provided to maintain mitigation on State managed lands.

McClellan-Kerr Navigation System, AR & OK.—The Committee has included additional funding for Tainter gate replacement, bridge pads and gate seals, and additional funding is provided for Tar Creek, OK.

Bodega Bay, CA.—The Committee has provided funds for the preparation of the upland disposal site for the dredging of Bodega Bay.

Oakland Harbor, CA.—The Committee has included an additional $2,500,000 for maintenance dredging of Oakland Harbor to its authorized depth.

San Joaquin River, CA.—The Committee has included funds for additional maintenance dredging.

Cherry Creek, Chatfield and Trinidad Lakes, CO.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 over the budget request for these

three lakes. Frequent inundation of recreation areas are causing health and safety concerns requiring repair or replacement of the facilities. This action in no way is intended to alter the Corps of Engineers' lease and property accountability policies. It is the Committee's understanding that the State of Colorado has agreed to cost share this project on a 50–50 basis. It is also the understanding of the Committee that the Secretary is not to assume, nor share in the future cost of the operation and maintenance of these recreation facilities.

Treatment of Dredge Material from Long Island Sound, CT.—$500,000 is provided to continue the demonstration program for the use of innovative technologies for the treatment of dredge material from Long Island Sound. The Committee also expects the Corps to initiate work on the Environmental Impact Statement for open water disposal of dredge material from Long Island Sound.

Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, DE & MD.—The Committee recommendation is $14,994,000. Funds are provided for routine operation and maintenance activities and for immediate reimbursement to the State of Delaware for normal operation and maintenance costs incurred by the State for the SR–1 Bridge, from station 58 +00 to station 293 +00, between October 1, 2003 and September 30, 2004. The reimbursable costs include electric lighting and associated late fees, power sweeping, drainage cleaning, snow removal, surface deicing, and periodic bridge inspections. The Corps shall initiate necessary repairs to the SR–1 Bridge once repair recommendations resulting from the bridge inspections are received.

Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, GA, AL, & FL.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,709,000 which includes annual dredging of the river channel, annual operations and maintenance of the George W. Andrews Lock, spot dredging of shoals, continuation of slough mouth restorations, continuation of restoration efforts at Corley Slough, and routine operations and maintenance of the project.

Richard B. Russell Dam, GA & SC.—The Committee has included an additional $1,000,000 for the mandated mitigation payment related to turbine operations at Richard B. Russell Dam.

Dworshak Reservoir, ID.—The Committee has included an additional $1,000,000 for critical work at the Dworshak Reservoir.

Mississippi River Between Missouri River and Minneapolis, (MVR & MVS Portions), IL, IA, MN, MO, & WI.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 above the budget request for each portion for ongoing major maintenance items. The Corps should give consideration to Tow Haulage Unit Replacement and the conservation of the endangered Higgins Eye Mussel.

Coralville Lake, IA.—The Committee has included an additional $663,000 above the budget request for needed repairs at Coralville Lake.

Missouri River-Rulo to the Mouth, IA, NE, KS, & MO.—The Committee has included an additional $645,000 above the budget request for maintenance dredging.

Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock, IA.—The Committee has included additional funds for stabilizing rim erosion, rebuilding of pumps, and levee repairs at Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock.

Fall River Lake, KS.—Additional funds are provided for needed repairs at Fall River Lake.

Marion Lake, KS.—The Committee has included an additional $557,000 for needed repairs at Marion Lake.

Perry Lake, KS.—The Committee has included additional funds to complete the repair of the flood gates at Perry Lake.

Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black, LA.—The Committee has provided additional funds for maintenance dredging.

Barataria Bay Waterway, LA.—The Committee has included additional funds for maintaining the authorized depth of the project, construction of a necessary breakwater, and dredging in the bar channel.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA.—Funds provided above the budget request are for bank stabilization repairs, dredging entrances to oxbow lakes, routine operation and maintenance activities, annual dredging requirements, and backlog maintenance.

Narraguagus River, ME.—$1,000,000 has been provided for the dredging of the Narraguagus River to the authorized depth and width.

Scarborough River, ME.—$500,000 has been provided for the dredging of the Scarborough River.

Saginaw River, MI.—The Committee has included funding to initiate preparations for the maintenance dredging of the Saginaw River.

Cocheco River, NH.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for the construction of the dredge disposal site.

Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton, NJ.—Of the funds provided, the Committee has included additional funds for needed maintenance dredging.

Cochiti Lake, NM.—The recommendation includes full funding to complete the necessary Environmental Impact Statement work regarding the lowering of water levels at Cochiti in response to the requirements of the pending biological opinion on the Rio Grande. Also funds are included for the alternative Al Black area.

Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, ND.—The Committee has included funding for limited facility improvements and mosquito control.

Alum Creek Lake, OH.—The Committee has included an additional $801,000 above the budget request to repair spillway gates at Alum Creek Lake.

Conneaut Harbor, OH.—The Committee has included additional funding for the dredging of Conneaut Harbor.

Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam, OK.—The Committee has included an additional $220,000 above the budget request for the repair of the lock's mitre gates.

Tar Creek, OK.—The Committee is aware of the significant environmental, economic, and human health impacts caused by the abandoned mining operations in the Tar Creek and Spring River watersheds, located in Ottawa County, Oklahoma. The Committee is aware of the extent and complexity of the problems which require a coordinated effort from multiple Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding among the Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental Protection

Agency, and the Department of Interior signed May 2003. Further, the Committee expects the Corps to pursue efforts at Tar Creek as its authorities allow.

Bonneville Lock and Dam, OR and WA.—Within available funds, the Corps should begin repairs to the Washington Shore Visitor Center's Fish Viewing Building.

John Day Lock and Dam, OR and WA.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for serious safety repairs for this vital link in the Columbia-Snake Waterway system. The Committee believes that the budget request does not adequately address the serious nature of the problems at this structure and has accordingly provided funds above the budget request. The problems being experienced at this structure are indicative of the way maintenance of structures in the Federal inventory has been shortchanged. Timely, adequate maintenance funding would have likely prevented the costly measures that must now be undertaken to correct the problems. The Committee strongly encourages that adequate funding for maintenance be included in future budget submissions.

Tillamook Bay and Bar, OR.—The Committee has included $300,000 to begin the repairs in Tillamook Bay.

Francis E. Walter Dam, PA.—The Committee has included an additional $319,000 above the budget request for the needed road repair/relocation work.

Providence River and Harbor, RI.—The Committee has included $21,000,000 to continue the Providence River and Harbor project, which is the same as the administration's request.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, SC.—The Committee has included additional funds to complete maintenance dredging from Charleston to Winyah Bay began in fiscal year 2003.

Charleston Harbor, SC.—The Committee has included an additional $760,000 above the budget request for the dredging of the entrance channel of Charleston Harbor.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, SD.—The Committee notes that Title VI of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, as amended, requires that funding to inventory and stabilize cultural and historic sites along the Missouri River in South Dakota, and to carry out the terrestrial wildlife habitat programs, shall be provided from the Operation and Maintenance account. The Committee has provided $5,000,000 to protect cultural resource sites and provide funding to the State and Tribes for approved restoration and stewardship plans and in compliance with the requirements of Title VI, directs the Corps to contract with or reimburse the State of South Dakota and affected Tribes to carry out these duties.

Tennessee River, TN.—The Committee expects that of the funds provided, $275,000 shall be made available to dredge Florence Port, Alabama.

Denison Dam (Lake Texoma), TX.—The Committee has included additional funding for the replacement of gate seals at Denison Dam.

Texas City Ship Channel, TX.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for maintenance dredging of the Texas City Ship Channel.

Lower Granite Lock and Dam, WA.—The Committee has provided $2,074,000 for this project. Within available funds assessments and improvements should be undertaken to prepare for the Confluence Project in Asotin County, WA.

Aquatic Nuisance.—The Committee has included an additional $300,000 above the budget request for the Corps to address the hydrilla at Lake Ouachita, AR and aquatic nuisance on the Tangipahoa River, LA.

Facility Protection.—The Committee has provided $13,000,000. The Committee has been informed that this is the average annual cost for guards at critical facilities.

Lewis and Clark Commemoration.—The Committee has provided the budget request for the Lewis and Clark Commemoration Coordinator. The Committee expects the Corps, within available funds, to continue to perform maintenance and repair of the recreation facilities related to the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commemoration. The Committee is aware of the lead-time required to repair and rehabilitate recreational facilities for the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commemoration. Therefore, the Corps of Engineers may, within available funds, perform maintenance and repair these facilities as is considered necessary to accommodate the anticipated visitor population.

Regional Sediment Management Demonstration Program.—Additional funds have been provided to initiate a demonstration project at Benson Beach, WA.

Removal of Sunken Vessels.—The Committee has included an additional $150,000 for the Corps to perform a detailed examination of the remains of the vessel "State of Pennsylvania" located in the Christina River in an effort to assess the cost and method of removal to this impediment to navigation.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2003	$138,096,000
Budget estimate, 2004	144,000,000
Committee recommendation	139,000,000

An appropriation of $139,000,000 is recommended for the regulatory program of the Corps of Engineers.

This appropriation provides for salaries and costs incurred administering regulation of activities affecting U.S. waters, including wetlands, in accordance with the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, the Clean Water Act of 1977, and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972.

The appropriation helps maintain program performance, protects important aquatic resources, and supports partnerships with States and local communities through watershed planning efforts.

The Committee is aware that in approving the certificate of public convenience and necessity for the Islander East Pipeline project, the FERC adopted a specific project purpose for the pipeline. In the course of its 404 evaluations, the Committee understands the Corps may have undertaken to alter that project purpose. The Committee directs the Corps to rely exclusively on the project purpose as established by the FERC and conduct their analysis of alternatives accordingly.

The Committee urges the Corps to take into account the geographical and/or hydrological conditions and criteria necessary for determining jurisdiction, including such regulatory terms as adjacent, isolated, and tributary while formulating its proposed rule which responds to the Supreme Court's decision in *Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County* v. *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers No. 99–1178.*

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2003	$144,057,000
Budget estimate, 2004	140,000,000
Committee recommendation	140,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $140,000,000 to continue activities related to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] in fiscal year 2004.

The responsibility for the cleanup of contaminated sites under the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program was transferred to the Army Corps of Engineers in the Fiscal Year 1998 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Public Law 105–62.

FUSRAP is not specifically defined by statute. The program was established in 1974 under the broad authority of the Atomic Energy Act and, until fiscal year 1998, funds for the cleanup of contaminated defense sites had been appropriated to the Department of Energy through existing appropriation accounts. In appropriating FUSRAP funds to the Corps of Engineers, the Committee intended to transfer only the responsibility for administration and execution of cleanup activities at eligible sites where remediation had not been completed. It did not intend to transfer ownership of and accountability for real property interests that remain with the Department of Energy.

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

REVOLVING FUND

Business Process and Computer Modernization

The Committee is aware that the Corps has undertaken an effort to modernize its business processes and systems and understands the efficiencies that may be gained through such an effort. However, the Committee remains very concerned that, to date, the Project Management Business Plan [PMBP] and its associated computer modernization (P2) have not been deployed. In addition, the Committee is concerned that this effort may be outside the realm of expertise and experience possessed within the Corps. Further, the Committee is concerned that too much emphasis is being placed on the process of their work, and that accomplishment of the Corps mission is suffering at the hands of developing complicated

business processes and upward reporting systems that are as yet unproven. By its own acknowledgement, it is of utmost importance to the Corps to attract and maintain high quality project management expertise. Therefore the Committee is greatly concerned that imposing a prescriptive project management system will undermine the Corps' ability to attract and maintain such expertise. In order to ensure that desirable results are achieved, the Committee directs the Corps' to provide, within 45 days of enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter, a progress report on the implementation of the Project Management Business Plan [PMBP], and computer modernization (P2) to the Committee. The report shall include milestones for achieving desired goals, cost accounting describing sunk costs and cost to complete, as well as results and cost savings realized or expected. Notwithstanding the Committees desire to see this effort expedited, the Corps is cautioned that the systems should not be deployed until they are fully functional, and capable of completely serving their intended purposes. Lastly, the Committee understands that the Corps has undertaken a survey of how the Project Management Business Process is being received in the field, and would be very interested in seeing the results of that survey.

Replacement of Corps of Engineers Aircraft

The Committee realizes that reliable and readily available transportation is necessary for the Corps of Engineers to effectively perform many of its missions, especially those related to emergencies, and that the Corps division offices support these missions in the geographic regions for which they are responsible. The Committee found the report required as part of the fiscal year 2003 appropriations activities lacking and therefore directs the Corps to re-evaluate the costs and benefits of the Corps maintaining its own aircraft. This reanalysis must include all other options for air transportation, including the use of military aircraft. With constricted budgets, the Committee is skeptical that the possession and maintenance of an aircraft by any division or district is both cost-effective and mission-essential when compared to alternatives, such as use of military aircraft and leasing. Therefore, the Corps must present to the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development a justification that includes a complete and thorough economic analysis for approval before any additional aircraft are acquired. The Corps is directed to submit, within 6 months, a justification and economic analysis to support the continued maintenance of aircraft by the Corps as an asset.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2003	$154,143,000
Budget estimate, 2004	171,000,000
Committee recommendation	160,000,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommendation is $160,000,000.

Executive Direction and Management.—The Office of the Chief of Engineers and eight division offices supervise work in 38 district offices.

Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity.—This support center provides administrative services (such as personnel, logistics, information management, and finance and accounting) for the Office of the Chief of Engineers and other separate field operating activities.

Institute for Water Resources.—This institute performs studies and analyses amd develops planning techniques for the management and development of the Nation's water resources.

United States Army Corps of Engineers Finance Center.—This center provides centralizes support for all Corps finance and accounting sites.

Office of Congressional Affairs.—The Committee has included statutory language for the past several years prohibiting any funds from being used to fund an Office of Congressional Affairs within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers. The Committee believes that an Office of Congressional Affairs for the Civil Works Program would hamper the efficient and effective coordination of issues with the Committee staff and Members of Congress. The Committee believes that the technical knowledge and managerial expertise needed for the Corps headquarters to effectively address Civil Works authorization, appropriation, and Headquarters policy matters resides in the Civil Works organization. Therefore the Committee strongly recommends that the office of Congressional Affairs not be a part of the process by which information on Civil Works projects, programs, and activities is provided to Congress.

The Committee reminds the Corps that the General Expenses Account is to be used exclusively for executive oversight and management of the Civil Works Program.

In 1998, The Chief of Engineers issued a Command Directive transferring the oversight and management of the General Expenses account, as well as the manpower associated with this function, from the Civil Works Directorate to the Resource Management Office. General Expense funds are appropriated solely for the executive management and oversight of the Civil Works Program under the direction of the Director of Civil Works.

The Committee is pleased with the efforts of the Corps to restructure the management of general expense funds. It continues to believe that the general expense dollars are ultimately at the discretion of the Chief of Engineers and are intended to be utilized in his effort to carry out the Corps' mission. The new controls put in place to manage the general expense dollars and evaluate the needs of the Corps address the Committee's previous concerns. The Committee requests the Corps provide biannual written notification of the dispersal of general expense funds.

General Accounting Office Audit

The Committee is aware that there has been a change in which entity conducts the financial audits of the Army Corps of Engineers. Traditionally, audits on the Corps have been performed by the Army Audit Agency [AAA] pursuant to the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990. Since fiscal year 1993, AAA has audited the

Corps' at the direct delegation and oversight of the Department of Defense Inspector General, which has concurred on each AAA audit of the Corps. The Committee is further aware that AAA issued an unqualified opinion of the Corps' statements for the Southwest Division in fiscal year 1997. Disclaimers were received elsewhere within the Corps' financial statements that year primarily due to automation of the Corps' financial accounting systems. By fiscal year 2000, most issues were resolved with regard to the outstanding areas of AAA's concerns and in fiscal year 2001, the Corps received a qualified opinion on its balance sheets. This was done with the full knowledge and concurrence of the Department of Defense Inspector General.

The Committee understands that the fiscal year 2002 audit is uncompleted because AAA was abruptly relieved of its audit responsibilities of the Corps, now being handled by the Department of Defense Inspector General. As a result of this change in auditors, the Committee believes it is an opportune time to establish a baseline for future audit work of the Corps, including audit standards and procedures as required by the CFO Act of 1990. Therefore, the Committee requests that a full financial audit be conducted by the General Accounting Office in an effort to establish a baseline for future audit work. This audit is to include the financial evaluation information from both the Defense Inspector General that has assumed the work of AAA, as well as the work previously conducted by AAA. The Committee strongly believes that this review will establish transparent goals and measures by which future audits of the Corps will be conducted.

Corps Reevaluation and Transformation

The Committee applauds the Corps' effort of reevaluating its functions and responsibilities over the last year. This effort has been done both internally and externally within the Corps and has included a wide variety of stakeholders. The Committee is pleased that the Corps has taken the initiative to address the many issues facing them and their stakeholders, particularly given the many recent controversies regarding cost/benefits analysis of Corps' projects. The Committee supports the Corps' efforts to transform itself into a more effective, more responsive agency through the "2012" initiative, and hopes that the Corps will be able to implement needed changes. However, until that roadmap is complete, the Committee is reluctant to fund the full increase sought for the "General Expense" account. Therefore, the Committee has included $160,000,000 for the Corps, an increase over this year's budget by $6,000,000, approximately a 4 percent increase to cover inflation. The Committee also directs the Corps of Engineers to continue with this important effort and report regularly to the Committee on the progress made and the impediments to change.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 2003	$14,902,000
Budget estimate, 2004	70,000,000
Committee recommendation	40,000,000

The Committee has included $40,000,000 for the FCCE account, $30,000,000 over the previous fiscal year. The funds provided are

less than the request and have been provided without prejudice. The Committee believes that the amount provided better reflects the constrained budget environment.

This account provides funds for preparedness activities for natural and other disasters, response, and emergency flood fighting and rescue operations, hurricane response, and emergency shore protection work. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean water where the source has been contaminated or where adequate supplies of water are needed for consumption.

RAPID DEPLOYMENT FLOOD WALL

The Committee is aware of the successful testing of the Rapid Deployment Flood Wall at the Engineering Research and Development Center in Vicksburg, Mississippi. This technology has proven to be promising in the effort to fight floods, cost-effective, quick to deploy and successful in protecting property from flood damage, damages which total millions each year. The Committee therefore encourages the Corps to pursue the use of this technology in its efforts to fighting floods.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Language included under Section 101 restates language contained in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60 which places a limit on credits and reimbursements allowable per project and annually.

SEC. 102. The Committee has included a provision which prohibits the reorganization or change of the Corps and its statutory mission without a subsequent Act of Congress.

SEC. 103. The Committee has included a new provision regarding the Alamogordo, NM flood control project.

SEC. 104. The Committee has included a new provision regarding the continuing contracts of the General Investigations Appropriation.

SEC. 105. The Committee has provided a new provision making technical corrections to the Kake Dam Replacement, Kake, Alaska project.

SEC. 106. The Committee has included a new provision for the deauthorization of inactive Corps projects.

SEC. 107. The Committee has included a general provision regarding the deauthorization of some components of the Federal Channel in RI.

SEC. 108. The Committee has included a new provision regarding Tar Creek, OK.

SEC. 109. The $2,000,000 of the Construction, General funds appropriated in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2003, shall be used to provide, technical assistance at full Federal expense, to the Alaskan communities of Bethel, Dillingham, Shishmaref, Kakatovik, Kivalina, Unalakleet, and Newtok to address coastal erosion. Due to rapid erosion in Shishmaref, $1,000,000 of the technical assistance should be provided to that community.

SEC. 110. The Committee has included a new provision regarding the American and Sacramento Rivers, CA project.

The bill includes language in Section 111 which directs that none of the funds made available in fiscal year 2002 may be used to carry out any activity relating to closure or removal of the St. Georges Bridge across the Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland.

SEC. 112. The Committee has included language extending the date for which the Corps can except funds from non-Federal entities to process permits.

SEC. 113. The Committee has included a provision regarding Sec. 353 of Public Law 105–227.

SEC. 114. The Committee has included a new provision regarding special authority for emergency project restoration.

SEC. 115. Amends Sec. 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

SEC. 116. The Committee has included a provision regarding PMA receipts.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2003	$35,992,000
Budget estimate, 2004	44,191,000
Committee recommendation	44,191,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2004 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act totals $44,191,000. An appropriation of $36,063,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction; $9,423,000 for fish, wildlife, and recreation, mitigation and conservation. The Committee recommendation provides $1,728,000 for program administration and oversight.

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, 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.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2003	$808,203,000
Budget estimate, 2004	771,217,000
Committee recommendation	853,517,000

An appropriation of $853,517,000 is recommended by the Committee for general investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation. The water and related resources account supports the development, management, and restoration of water and related natural resources in the 17 Western States. The account includes funds for operating and maintaining existing facilities to obtain the greatest overall level of benefits, to protect public safety, and to conduct studies on ways to improve the use of water and related natural resources. Work will be done in partnership and cooperation with non-Federal entities and other Federal agencies.

BUDGET LIMITATIONS AND REDUCTIONS

Constrained spending limits have made it difficult for the Committee to formulate a balanced Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 2004. In order to adhere to the sub-

committee's allocations, address the critical ongoing activities, correct program imbalances contained in the President's fiscal year 2004 budget, and respond to the numerous requests of the Members, the Committee finds it necessary to recommend numerous adjustments to funding levels proposed in the budget. Finally, the Committee regrets that many worthwhile projects could not be recommended for funding because of the lack of authorization and the shortfall in resources.

The Committee is concerned with the way in which underfinancing is applied to the Water and Related Resources Account. Accordingly, the Committee has made changes to the Water and Related Resources line item for underfinancing. The Committee has divided underfinancing between the Resources Management Subaccount and the Facilities Operation and Maintenance Subaccount. The Committee directs that the underfinancing amount in each subaccount initially be applied uniformly across all projects within the subaccounts. Upon applying the underfinanced amounts, normal reprogramming procedures should be undertaken to account for schedule slippages, accelerations or other unforeseen conditions.

The amounts recommended by the Committee are shown on the following table along with the budget request.

BUILDING AND SITE SECURITY

The Committee is aware of the heightened threat of terrorist activity since the events of September 11, 2001, and the subsequent financial burden this places on the Bureau of Reclamation in managing the security of the many public assets and critical infrastructure within its control. In order to offset some of the financial burden of the Bureau, the Committee provided $25,000,000 in the fiscal year 2003 supplemental appropriations' bill to defray some of these costs, which were not included in the Bureau's fiscal year 2003 budget request. The Committee encourages the Administration to include funding for specific security related costs in future budget submissions for the Bureaus, as many of these costs are recurring.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
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	.....	4,250	.....
FORT MCDOWELL SETTLEMENT ACT	1,000	.....	1,000	.....
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	325	.....	325	.....
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER RECLAMATION AND 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	.....
TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,552	21,120	1,552	21,120

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA PROJECT	751	665	751	665
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMS	215	.....	215	.....
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJECT	700	.....	700	.....
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	1,966	7,033	1,966	7,033
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	9,899	100	9,899	100
DELTA DIVISION	10,039	6,041	11,539	6,041
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,465	2,450	1,465	2,450
FRIANT DIVISION	2,393	3,782	3,143	3,782
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	13,284	1,087	18,784	1,087
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT	.....	24,000	.....	18,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	4,215	1,808	6,715	1,808
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	745	.....	745	.....
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	383	.....	383	.....
SHASTA DIVISION	831	7,134	1,581	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	11,437	6,538
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	1,000	.....	1,000	.....
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	200	.....	1,500	.....
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	1,100	.....	1,100	.....
LONG BEACH DESALINATION RESEARCH/DEVELOPMENT PROJ	.....	.....	700	.....
MISSION BASIN BRACKISH GROUNDWATER DESALTING DEMO	.....	.....	.....	.....
NAPA-SOMOMA-MARIN AGRICULTURAL REUSE PROJECT	.....	.....	500	.....
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	1,300	.....	1,300	.....
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WTR RECLAMATION PROJ, PHS 1	1,300	.....	2,500	.....
ORLAND PROJECT	41	445	41	445
PASADENA RECLAIMED WATER PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	1,000	.....	2,000	.....
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	4,300	.....	4,300	.....
SAN DIEGO RIVER RESTORATION	.....	.....	.....	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	1,300	.....	1,300	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	1,000	.....	1,000	.....
SOLANO PROJECT	1,522	2,693	1,522	2,693
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	1,135	.....	1,135	.....
WATSONVILLE AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT	529	.....	529	.....
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP SECTIONS 5 AND 8	58,000	.....	57,000	.....
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	200	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
HAWAII				
HAWAIIAN RECLAIM AND REUSE STUDY	.....	.....	100	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	2,637	4,047	2,637	4,047
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	19,000	.....	19,000	.....
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 PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	.....	.....	8,000	.....
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	.....	1,056	.....	1,056
MILK RIVER PROJECT	1,045	558	1,045	558
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	533	.....	533	.....
ROCKY BOY'S/NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL WATER, MT	.....	.....	915	.....
NORTH DAKOTA				
DAKOTAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	223	.....	223	.....
DAKOTAS TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	326	.....	326	.....
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM, GARRISON DIVERSION	13,928	3,386	25,000	3,386
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	.....	58	.....	58
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	191	.....	191	.....
NEW MEXICO				
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER AND RECLAMATION REUSE	.....	.....	1,362	.....
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,036	1,056	2,036	1,056
CONCHAS PROJECT STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....
EASTERN NEW MEXICO WATER SUPPLY	.....	.....	250	.....
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	6,467	10,921	13,567	20,921
NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	300	.....	300	.....
NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	391	.....	391	.....
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	.....	127	.....	327
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	796	3,186	796	3,186
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	179	.....	179	.....
SANTA FE—WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	.....	.....	250	.....
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROG	.....	.....	.....	.....
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	104	4	104	4
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	.....
NEVADA				
CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS WATER REUSE, NV	.....	.....	1,000	.....
HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY	100	.....	600	.....
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	.....	.....	3,000	.....
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	.....	205	700	205
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	.....	460	.....	460
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	.....	267	.....	267
NORMAN PROJECT	250	176	250	176
NORTH FORK OF THE RED RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	150	.....
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	188	.....	188	.....
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	.....	314	.....	314
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	.....	887	.....	887

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
OREGON				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	212	465	212	465
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	500	.....	750	.....
DESCHUTES PROJECT	418	155	418	155
DESCHUTES PROJECT, TUMALO, BEND FEED CANAL	.....	.....	500	.....
DESCHUTES PROJECT, WICKIUP DAM	.....	3,000	.....	3,000
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	781	280	781	280
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	100	.....	100	.....
KLAMATH PROJECT	20,041	776	20,041	776
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	620	.....	620	.....
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, SAVAGE RAPIDS PUMPING PLNTS	.....	.....	.....	.....
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	554	172	554	172
TUALATIN PROJECT	287	127	287	127
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	200	.....	400	.....
UMATILLA PROJECT	601	2,101	601	2,101
WILLOW LAKE NATURAL TREATMENT SYSTEM, OR	.....	.....	300	.....
SOUTH DAKOTA				
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER PROJECT	.....	.....	20,000	.....
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	2,000	15	15,000	15
MNI WICONI PROJECT	6,717	6,254	20,217	6,254
PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER DISTRICT	.....	.....	1,000	.....
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM	.....	28	.....	28
TEXAS				
AUSTIN WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....
BALMORHEA PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	.....	117	.....	117
EL PASO WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	.....	.....	371	.....
LEON CREEK QUARRY/MITCHELL LAKE WATER REUSE PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....
LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES	.....	.....	6,000	.....
NUECES RIVER	.....	536	.....	536
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	.....	276	.....	276
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	202	.....	202	.....
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT	128	62	128	62
MOON LAKE PROJECT	45	15	45	15
NAVAJO SANDSTONE AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....
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	.....	100	.....
MAKAH INDIAN COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY	25	.....	200	.....
SALMON CREEK WATERSHED RESTORATION, WA	.....	.....	.....	.....
STORAGE DAM FISH PASSAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY	550	.....	550	.....
TULALIP TRIBES WATER QUALITY FEASIBILITY STUDY	50	.....	150	.....
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	525	.....	525	.....
YAKIMA PROJECT	1,179	6,066	1,179	6,066
YAKIMA PROJECT, KEECHELUS DAM, SOD	.....	3,700	.....	3,700

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	12,730	.....	12,730	.....
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER STORAGE	.....	.....	500	.....
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
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	.....
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	.....	3,992	.....
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	.....	3,623	.....
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE	1,120	.....	3,120	.....
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	3,265	.....	3,265	.....
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	.....	450	.....	450
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	13,371	.....	13,371	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,804	.....	1,804	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,483	.....	1,483	.....
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	.....	5,521	.....	5,521
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,575	.....	1,575
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	1,989	.....	2,089	.....
INITIATIVES	11,000	.....	7,400	.....
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	8,994	.....	8,994	.....
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	.....	.....	.....	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	13,822	.....	13,822	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	325	.....	325	.....
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	.....	639	.....	639
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	.....	.....	.....	.....
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	8,600	.....	8,600	.....
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,571	.....	1,571	.....
OPERATION AND 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	1,241	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 AND 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	.....	4,190	.....
DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	775	.....	7,375	.....
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	.....
TITLE XVI, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	1,430	.....	3,130	.....
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECHNICAL SUPPORT	.....	.....	.....	.....
WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM	6,639	.....	6,639	.....
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	.....	.....	.....	.....
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIP DELAYS	−40,030	.....	−38,945	−7,133

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
RESCISSION	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	422,965	348,252	508,198	345,319
LOAN PROGRAM				
VARIOUS				
LOAN ADMINISTRATION	200	.....	200	.....

Colorado River Front Work and Levee System, AZ.—The Committee has included an additional $750,000 for the All American Canal Regulating Reservoir under the Colorado River Front Work and Levee System.

Tres Rios Wetland Demonstration, AZ.—An amount of $630,000 has been provided for the Bureau for the Tres Rios Wetland Demonstration program. The Committee strongly supports this cost shared effort, and believes it is important that this wetland habitat and environmental research and development activities continue. This program provides essential data needed to support the development and success of the larger Tres Rios environmental restoration project, and the Rio Salado project being carried out by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Colusa Basin Integrated Resources Management Plan, CVP, Sacramento River Division, CA.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the completion of the feasibility study.

Glen Colusa Fish Screen, CVP, Sacramento River Division, CA.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,600,000 the fish screen project.

Arkansas Valley Conduit, CO.—The Committee has included an additional $200,000 to continue the reevaluation report. The Committee supports these efforts but believes that the project needs appropriate review by the authorizing committee, in particular, the Committee notes that the project, if authorized, should follow the standard Reclamation policy of an M&I project of the beneficiaries paying 100 percent of the allocated costs.

Carter Lake, CO.—The Committee is aware of the issues surrounding the Carter Lake, CO project and encourages the Bureau to continue working with the conservancy district.

Hawaii Resources Study, HI.—The Committee has included $100,000 for water recycling opportunities in the State of Hawaii.

Fort Peck/Dry Prairie Rural Water System, MT.—The Committee has included $8,000,000 for the continued construction of this mandated rural water delivery project. The Committee remains disappointed that the administration, despite the fact the project is in peak construction, chose not to budget for this project. The Committee understands that the Final Engineering Report is to sit before Congress 90 days before construction and that due to the delays within the fiscal year 2003 enactment, there was a reduced capability. The Committee expects that those funds will be made available for this project when needed, as intended by Congress.

Rocky Boy's/North Central Regional Water System, MT.—The Committee has included $915,000 for this project. The funds are provided to allow for completion of the Final Engineering Report, NEPA compliance documents, and a Water Conservation Plan for the system.

Garrison Diversion Unit, ND.—The Committee has provided $28,386,000 for the continued construction and operation of this project. This funding level should in no way be considered any diminution of interest or support for the project, but instead reflects the very limited resources of the Committee.

Middle Rio Grande Project, NM.—The Committee is aware of the current drought situation and the recent court decision relating to the Rio Grande Silvery Minnow. As a result of the decision, the Committee has determined that the ESA Workgroup, though well intentioned, has not produced the much needed results to further efforts to meet the Biological Opinion requirements. Therefore, the Committee has only provided $7,000,000 for this effort this year and has also included a new general provision which provides for increased oversight of the Workgroup and minnow efforts. Of the $7,000,000 provided, the Bureau of Reclamation is to fund the following activities: silvery minnow population management, fish passage activities, non-native species management, water management activities, and improvement of water quality. Prior to the obligation of funds, the Bureau is to submit the funding levels for each category, accompanied by a detailed spending plan, to the Committee for approval. The Committee reiterates that the cost-share requirements for this program are 75 percent Federal/25 percent non-Federal. The Committee has also included $100,000 for the Isleta Pueblo water planning studies.

Middle Rio Grande Project, Endangered Species Collaborative Program, NM.—The Committee is concerned that efforts on the part of the Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program Workgroup (Workgroup) have been protracted and inefficient. To that end, the Committee calls for the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, to establish an executive committee for purposes of streamlining and expediting the efforts of the Workgroup. For fiscal year 2004, the Committee requires that a detailed spending plan be submitted for approval prior to appropriated funds being obligated or expended. The Committee further requests that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service, within 45 days of enactment of this Act, appraise the current composition, structure, and decision-making processes of the Workgroup, identify any impediments to its' efficiency, and report back to the Committee with a remedial plan of improvement. Support of future appropriations by the Committee will be largely contingent on the success demonstrated by the executive committee in achieving the desired improvements.

Middle Rio Grande Project, Middle Rio Grande Levees, NM.—The Committee has provided an additional $10,000,000 for the repair of the Middle Rio Grande levees, work began in fiscal year 2003.

Pecos River Basin Water Supply Salvage Project, NM.—The Committee is aware that the Bureau of Reclamation carries out the Pecos River Basin Water Supply Salvage project in collaboration

with the State of New Mexico. The Committee directs that the Bureau of Reclamation, within funds appropriated for the Facilities and Maintenance and Rehabilitation, not to provide less than $200,000 for this eradication effort. Finally, the Committee is pleased that the Bureau and the State of New Mexico have forged a good working relationship with regard to the contentious issues relating to the Pecos River.

Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer, OK.—The Committee has included $700,000 to continue Phase One of the investigation assessing the hydrology of the aquifer and the future management of water resources.

North Fork of the Red River, OK.—The Committee has provided $150,000 to expand the scope of the current W.C. Austin Water Availability Study to develop a groundwater flow model on the North Fork of the Red River drainage and to investigate potential opportunities for augmenting water supply.

Deschutes Project, Tumalo, Bend Feed Canal, OR.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the continued construction of this project.

Umatilla Basin Phase III Feasibility Study, OR.—The Committee has included an additional $200,000 for the Bureau to evaluate the feasibility of several options for improving water quality and instream flows.

Lewis and Clark Rural Water System, SD.—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for this continuing construction project. The Committee is disappointed that the administration has chosen not to request funding for this project, despite that it is in peak construction. The Committee urges the administration to budget for this project more responsibly in the future.

Mid-Dakota Rural Water System, SD.—The Committee has included $15,000,000 for this continuing construction project.

Mni Wiconi Project, SD.—The Committee has provided $20,217,000 for this continuing construction project. This funding level should in no way be considered any diminution of interest or support for the project, but instead reflects the very limited resources of the Committee.

El Paso Water Reclaim and Reuse Project, TX.—The Committee has included $371,000 for this continued project.

Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources, TX.—The Committee has included $6,000,000 for the Bureau to begin the implementation of cost sharing agreements.

Columbia Basin Project, WA.—Of the funds provided, $250,000 is for the final design of Phase 2 of the Icicle Creek Restoration project.

Yakima River Basin Water Storage Study, WA.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the continued feasibility study, which was not in the administration's budget request.

Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project: Title I.—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 Mexican Water Treaty. This loss of water has become particularly acute due to the drought in the Col-

orado River Basin, and the loss of more than 100,000 acre feet per year depletes all seven Basin States of badly needed water.

Title I of the Salinity Control Act of 1974 to implement the agreement with Mexico, known as Minute 242, identified construction of the Yuma Desalting Plant as the solution preferred by the United States, Mexico, and the seven Colorado River Basin States.

The Bureau of Reclamation is urged to expedite its modifications to the existing Yuma Desalting Plant to accomplish state of the art operation and accelerate the permitting and environmental compliance process for the operation of the Plant and report the status to the Committee within 180 days of enactment of this Act.

Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program.—The Committee has included an additional $750,000 for the Uncompahgre, CO selenium project, and an additional $250,000 for the completion of the Stewart Lake/Middle Green River, UT selenium project.

Drought Emergency Assistance Program.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for drought assistance to the Navajo Nation, NM; and $1,000,000 for the completion of the emergency wells in Santa Fe, NM and within the funds appropriated for drought emergency assistance, the Committee urges the agency to provide full and fair consideration of the request for drought assistance from the State of Hawaii. The Committee understands the impacts of the significant drought which has lasted several years in the West, and has provided additional funds for drought assistance in an effort to mitigate some effects of the drought.

General Planning Studies.—The Committee has included an additional $100,000 for the continuation of the Arch Hurley Water Conservation Study, NM.

Western Water Initiative.—The dire drought the West is currently experiencing, combined with an unprecedented number of water users and endangered species and related requirements, make water use efficiencies more critical than ever. The Committee has provided $7,400,000 for this new initiative proposed by the administration. The Committee regrets that it could not fully fund this effort and the reduction does not reflect the Committee's strong support for this effort but instead its budget constraints. The initiative is an effort to enhance efficiency and performance in water and power delivery. Ultimately, the Committee believes that the initiative, if successfully carried out, will result in enhanced efficiency in the operation of Reclamation programs and projects. Of the funds provided $1,400,000 is for the Desert Research Institute to address water quality and environmental issues in ways that will bring industry and regulators to mutually acceptable answers.

The Committee believes that the water resource and efficiency issues, combined with the drought and endangered species listings, make the Rio Grande River in New Mexico the embodiment of the Western Water Initiative. Therefore, the Committee has included $2,000,000 to provide for efficiency and water improvements related to the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy district, including a system evaluation, siphons, flow measurement gages, gates and the automation of diversions.

Power Program Services.—The Committee has included an additional $250,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to evaluate a pilot

project to optimize the production of hydropower from the Colorado River Storage Project.

Science and Technology, Desalination Research and Development Program.—The Committee has included an additional $6,600,000 for desalination efforts for research and development of new, advanced technologies to create new additional water supplies using desalination and related technologies. The Commissioner is directed to assess the potential use of advanced water treatment technologies as a resource to create new net water supplies and to evaluate project benefits, economic values and environmental effects. Further, the Commissioner should identify resource needs that can be met through these technologies and inter-party transfers, and to identify obstacles to be overcome (physical, financial, institutional, and regulatory). In using the funds provided, the Bureau shall pay particular attention to research and development of shallow well pretreatment, brine disposal and recycling, micro-filtration and ultra-filtration, and water conditioning. Further, the Committee continues to urge the Bureau of Reclamation to place a higher priority on desalination activities in future budgets given the importance of sustainable water supplies to the West and to other regions of the country.

Of the funds provided, $4,000,000 is for the continuation of the project in Tularosa, NM. The Committee notes that, with regard to the Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Center, section 7 of the Water Desalination Act of 1996 does not apply to the project because it is a joint Federal effort. In addition, $2,600,000 is provided to further desalination research and development activities of the Bureau.

Title XVI, Water Reclamation and Reuse.—The Committee has included $500,000 in additional funds for the Alamogordo, NM desalination study.

The Committee has also included $1,000,000 in additional funds for the WateReuse Foundation. The funds shall be available to support the Foundation's research priorities.

The Committee recommends $200,000 for the Bureau to work with local authorities in Hawaii to investigate and identify opportunities for reclamation and reuse of municipal, industrial, domestic, and agricultural wastewater, and naturally occurring impaired ground and surface waters and to design and construct demonstration and permanent facilities to reclaim and reuse such waters.

Water Management and Conservation Program.—Within the funds provided, the Committee has provided $500,000 to continue urban water conservation programs within the service area of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and $200,000 for the Bureau to initiate a cost shared, industrial recirculation water efficiency study to determine the benefits and liabilities related to recirculating water use by industries in Southern California to conserve water.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2003	$48,586,000
Budget estimate, 2004	39,600,000
Committee recommendation	39,600,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $39,600,000, the same as the budget request for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund.

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

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2003	.....
Budget estimate, 2004	$15,000,000
Committee recommendation	.....

This account funds activities that are consistent with the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, a collaborative effort involving 18 State and Federal Agencies and representatives of California's urban, agricultural, and environmental communities. The goals of the program are to improve fish and wildlife habitat, water supply reliability, and water quality in the San Francisco Bay-San Joaquin River Delta, the principle hub of California's water distribution system.

The CALFED Program was established in May 1995, for the purpose of developing a comprehensive, long-term solution to the complex and inter-related problems in the San Francisco Bay-Delta area of California. The program's focus is on the health of the ecosystem and improving water management. In addition, this program addresses the issues of uncertain water supplies, aging levees, and threatened water quality.

Absent authorizing legislation, the Committee has recommended no funding under the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration Project. In order to support the efforts of the State of California to provide a safe, clean water supply and improve the environment, the Committee has provided funds for previously authorized studies under the Central Valley Project. These studies will support and further the goals of the overall CALFED Program until such time as the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration Project is reauthorized.

The Committee has provided an additional $7,500,000 over the budget request for the Central Valley Project. Additional funds to support the goals of CALFED are provided as follows:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL WATER ACCOUNT

Miscellaneous Project Programs.—$1,000,000 to acquire water and ground water storage.

PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Delta Division Oversight.—$500,000 to continue coordination, administration, planning, performance tracking and science activities in coordination with CALFED Program Implementation Plan.

STORAGE

Delta Division.—$1,000,000 for Reclamation to continue participating in planning and study activities associated with enlarging Los Vaqueros reservoir.

Friant Division.—$750,000 to continue storage investigations in the Upper San Joaquin Watershed.

Sacramento River Division.—$500,000 to continue planning and study activities for Sites reservoir.

Shasta Division.—$750,000 to continue evaluating the potential impacts of the proposed Shasta raise.

CONVEYANCE

Miscellaneous Project Programs.—$1,000,000 for the continuation of feasibility levels studies and technical assistance to the State of California; $1,000,000 for the Bureau for the administration of storage, conveyance, water use efficiency, ecosystem restoration, science and water transfer; $1,000,000 for the environmental water account.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2003	$54,513,000
Budget estimate, 2004	56,525,000
Committee recommendation	56,525,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is $56,525,000. This is the same as the budget request.

The policy and administrative expenses program provides for the executive direction and management of all reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, DC, Denver, CO, and 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.

Endangered Species Requirements.—The Committee is aware that the Bureau of Reclamation is facing increasing costs for endangered species requirements which currently are not tracked nor reflected in the Bureau's budget documents. The Committee believes that these costs are dramatically increasing each year as the listing of species grows, however the Bureau's budget submission, in most instances, does not necessarily reflect these costs. Since there is no specific account or activity related to the general ESA efforts the Bureau carries out, these increasing costs erode the base funding of the budget, something which needs to be addressed. Therefore, the Committee requests that the Bureau of Reclamation, within 9 months of enactment of this Act, is to provide the Committee with a report which contains a cost accounting of the ESA expenditures the Bureau bears as it carries out its mission. The Committee is interested in both costs that are carried in the Water and Related Resources account as well as the OM&R account.

Contracting Out.—The Committee continues to be committed to increasing the contracting out of the Bureau's functions which are reasonably done in the private sector, particularly planning, engineering and design work. However, the Committee also believes that some Federal capability is necessary and needs to be maintained. The Committee is pleased that the Bureau made the 10 percent target for fiscal year 2003, and looks forward to working with the Commissioner to further the administration's initiative in this area with regards to the Bureau.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Section 201. The Committee has included a continuing provision regarding the Indian Self Determination Act and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Section 202 of the bill includes language regarding the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson Reservoir in California.

Section 203 of the bill includes language that States requirements for purchase or lease of water from the Middle Rio Grande or Carlsbad Projects, New Mexico.

Section 204 of the bill includes language concerning Drought Emergency Assistance.

Section 205. The Committee has included a new general provision regarding ESA requirements on the Rio Grande River, NM.

Section 206. The Committee has included a new general provision which reforms the ESA Collaborative Workgroup.

Section 207. The Committee has included a new general provision regarding the cost-sharing on the Tularosa Desalination Facility, NM.

Section 208. The Committee has included a continuing provision regarding CALFED studies.

Section 209. The Committee has included a new provision regarding the Western Water Initiative.

Section 210. The Committee has included a new provision regarding a study authority for Hawaii.

Section 211. The Committee has included a new provision regarding the CUP account.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Title III provides for the Department of Energy's programs relating to energy supply, environmental management, science, national security and other related programs, including the power marketing administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

REPROGRAMMINGS

The Committee requires the Department to promptly and fully inform the Committee when a change in program execution or funding is required during the fiscal year. 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, including contemplated site budgets as presented to and approved or modified by Congress in an appropriations act or the accompanying statement of managers or report. For construction projects, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project identified in the justifications to another or a significant change in the scope of an approved project.

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

ENERGY SUPPLY

Appropriations, 2003	$696,858,000
Budget estimate, 2004	861,805,000
Committee recommendation	920,357,000

The purposes of the programs funded under Energy Supply are to develop new energy technologies and improve existing energy technologies through basic and applied research and targeted programs in technology development. This account provides funds for both operating expenses and capital equipment for the advancement of the various energy technologies. The Energy Supply account includes the following major programs: renewable energy resources; nuclear energy; electricity transmission and distribution;

environment, safety and health; energy support activities; and energy supply infrastructure.

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2003	$419,492,000
Budget estimate, 2004	444,207,000
Committee recommendation	358,476,000

The Committee recommendation provides $358,476,000 for renewable energy resources, a decrease of $61,016,000 from the current year level.

This program undertakes research and development of renewable energy and related technologies to meet the growing need for clean and affordable energy. Program activities range from basic research in universities and national laboratories to cost-shared applied research, development, and field validation in partnership with the private sector.

The recommendation for Renewable Energy Resources reflects the Committee's strong belief that only a balanced portfolio of production and distribution technologies and strategies will fulfill our Nation's long-term needs and goals for both energy and the environment.

Renewable Energy Technologies

Biomass/Biofuels—Energy Systems.—The Committee recommendation includes $75,005,000 for biomass/biofuels energy systems, an increase of $5,255,000 over the request.

The Department has indicated a desire to end direct support to the Regional Biomass Energy Program [RBEP]. The Committee believes that the RBEP has been a successful partnership with the five distinct regions it has served. The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 and directs the Department to work with regional governors' organizations to make RBEP even more successful. The Committee recommendation also includes $3,500,000 for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, a successful consortium of 34 universities and 33 agribusinesses and trade associations. The recommendation includes $20,000,000, the amount of the request, for the Bioconversion Production Integration Program.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommends $26,300,000 for geothermal technology development, an increase of $800,000 over the request, including continued funding (at current year levels) for GeoPowering the West.

Hydrogen Research.—The Committee recommendation strongly supports and endorses the administration's broad new investments in hydrogen technology through the FreedomCAR and Hydrogen Fuel Initiative and recognizes hydrogen to be a highly promising and cost effective energy carrier. As such, the Committee recommendation includes $87,982,000 for hydrogen research, the amount of the request and $48,522,000 above the current year level.

Industrial consumption of hydrogen, especially by the petrochemical and fertilizer communities is large and growing. The rate of petro-chemical hydrogen consumption necessary for gasoline-powered vehicles will accelerate as global reserves of sweet crude oil diminish. The dominant resource for hydrogen production today

is natural gas whose reformation into hydrogen and carbon dioxide contributes significantly to atmospheric greenhouse gases. Moreover, natural gas reserves are insufficient to service simultaneously domestic heating and electricity requirements, industrial hydrogen consumption, and future demands by hydrogen powered vehicles and other fuel cell applications that would accompany the future "Hydrogen Economy." Thus, the Committee recommendation seeks to focus the resources of the initiative on developing the most economical means of producing hydrogen from renewable sources and nuclear power.

The administration proposes to eliminate the funding of fuel cell activities within the Energy & Water Development appropriation. The Committee rejects that portion of the budget request and expects appropriate fuel cell activities to continue within this appropriation.

The Committee understands that the funding provided in fiscal year 2004 will support several competitive solicitations for research, development, and demonstration proposals on production, delivery, storage, and infrastructure validation technologies. The Committee directs that at least $5,000,000 should be used to support a competitive solicitation for solid oxide fuel cell research under a cost-shared grant program to look at the application of solid oxide electrochemical technology for co-production of hydrogen and electricity and also for storage of electricity through closed and open system regenerative fuel cells.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for hydropower, a reduction of $2,489,000 from the request. The amount includes $400,000 to assess low head and low power resources.

Solar Energy.—The Committee recommendation for solar energy programs is $89,693,000, an increase of $10,000,000 above the budget request.

The Committee recommendation includes $2,500,000 for the Southeast and Southwest photovoltaic experiment stations. The Department should continue to fully support the success of the public/private Million Solar Roofs initiative. Based on new information before the Committee that calls into question earlier concerns raised by the National Research Council regarding the potential of concentrating solar power technologies, the Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 from within available funds for concentrating solar power. If the Department needs more than $5,000,000 in fiscal year 2004 to regain lost momentum in the CSP program, the Committee urges the Department to seek a reprogramming.

Zero Energy Buildings.—The Committee recommendation includes no funding for zero energy building technologies and supports the full transfer and incorporation of these activities into the building technologies program funded under the jurisdiction of Interior and Related Agencies appropriations.

Wind.—The Committee recommendation includes $41,600,000 for wind, the same as the request. The Committee expects the Department to utilize funds to accelerate development and deployment of low wind speed turbines. The Wind Powering America initiative is to be continued at last year's funding level. The Committee con-

tinues to recognize the need for a set-aside for small wind programs.

The Committee is aware that the potential for expanding wind generated energy to new locations is significant, but further development in the Dakotas and the Upper Midwest is stymied by transmission constraints. The Committee is committed to developing the potential of wind energy in the United States and especially on tribal lands. The Committee directs the Department to work with the transmission industry to conduct a comprehensive analysis of upper Midwest wind energy locations and transmission requirements and to report to the Committee on Appropriation by May 31, 2004.

Intergovernmental Activities.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $9,500,000, a reduction of $3,000,000 from the budget request. The intergovernmental activities total includes $5,000,000 for the tribal energy program to help Native Americans develop renewable energy resources on their lands and helps tribal leaders develop energy plans. Within the funds provided to the tribal energy program, the Committee includes $1,000,000 for the Council of Renewable Energy Resource Tribes [CERT] to provide technical expertise and training of Native Americans in renewable energy resources development and electric generation facilities management. The intergovernmental total includes $4,500,000 for the International Renewable Energy program to promote the use of renewable energy resources in international markets. From within the funds provided, the Committee recommendation includes $750,000 for the Renewable Energy Policy Project [REPP] to conduct a survey of all commercially viable renewable energy technologies to determine the job and skill requirements relating to the manufacturing, installation, and operation and maintenance for each technology.

The Committee is aware that in October 2002 the Department, on behalf of an interagency working group of nine Federal agencies, released a 5-year strategic plan to implement the Clean Energy Technology Exports [CETE] Initiative. The Committee notes that the CETE strategic plan outlines a program to increase U.S. clean energy technology exports to international markets through increased coordination among Federal agency programs as well as to enhance program coordination with non-governmental, private sector, and other international partners. The Committee is disappointed by the apparent lack of progress. Recognizing that opportunities to open and expand international markets and export U.S. clean energy technologies are very important to helping achieve national and international energy security, economic, trade, environmental, and climate change objectives, the Committee directs the interagency working group, through the Department of Energy and other Federal agency partners, to provide the Appropriations Committee with a report, no later than January 15, 2004, on the status of the implementation of the strategic plan and specific actions that each of the participating agencies have taken in fiscal year 2003 and will take in fiscal year 2004 to engage non-governmental, private sector, and other international partners.

Renewable Support and Implementation

Departmental Energy Management Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,800,000, an increase of $310,000 over the current year level. The Department should continue to fund, through internal competition, the most cost effective opportunities to improve energy efficiency in the Department's facilities, employing renewable or other technologies as appropriate.

Renewable Energy Production Incentive.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000, the amount the Department requested under the electricity reliability sub-program. The Committee instead funds the requested amount under renewable support and implementation.

Renewable Program Support.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 to continue the efforts of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory [NREL] to develop renewable energy resources uniquely suited to the Southwestern United States through its virtual site office in Nevada.

National Climate Change Technology Initiative

The Department's budget request proposes to create and fund this new initiative to support competitive solicitations to promote applied research that has, as its primary goal, the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions or the sequestration of greenhouse gases. The Committee strongly supports the goals of this initiative and has recommended funding for the development of these technologies within the existing renewable energy and nuclear energy programs. The Committee recommendation does not include separate funding for the national climate change technology initiative.

Facilities and Infrastructure

National Renewable Energy Laboratory.—The Committee recommendation includes $7,700,000 for facilities and infrastructure, an increase of $3,500,000 over the current year level. The recommendation includes $4,200,000 for operation and maintenance of facilities and $3,500,000 for construction of Project 04–E–001, Science and Technology Facility, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, Colorado.

Oak Ridge National Laboratory.—The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 for engineering and design of the energy reliability and efficiency laboratory.

Program Direction

The Committee recommendation includes $13,146,000, a decrease of $2,750,000 from the current year level, and primarily reflects the transfer of those resources to the new Office of Electricity and Energy Assurance.

ELECTRICITY AND ENERGY ASSURANCE

Appropriations, 2003	$0
Budget estimate, 2004	0
Committee recommendation	100,425,000

The Committee directs the creation of a new Office for Electricity and Energy Assurance, reporting directly to the Under Secretary

for Energy, Science and Environment. The Committee's recommendation is consistent with the principles espoused in the President's National Energy Policy report issued in May, 2001, and section 926 of S. 1005, the Energy Policy Act of 2003. The office shall lead a national effort to modernize and expand our Nation's electricity delivery system to ensure economic and national security. The office should be primarily responsible for the full spectrum of transmission, distribution, demand response, storage, transmission siting and permitting, and other technologies that affect supply and demand in the delivery of electricity. In carrying out this effort, the office shall coordinate and develop a comprehensive, multi-year strategy to improve the Nation's electricity transmission and distribution; ensure that the recommendations of the Secretary's National Transmission Grid Study are implemented; carry out the research, development, and demonstration functions; grant authorizations for electricity import and export; perform other electricity transmission and distribution-related functions assigned by the Secretary; and develop programs for workforce training in power and transmission engineering. The office shall also assume the responsibilities of the energy security and assurance program.

Activities previously funded under the electric energy systems and storage program within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and the energy security and assurance program shall be consolidated and funded under this new office.

The Committee recommendation includes $100,425,000 for these activities, including $7,587,000 for program direction. The Committee recommendation includes a total of $20,000,000 in additional funds for the Department's energy assurance mission. Of the additional funds included, $16,000,000 shall be available for the National Energy Technology Laboratory [NETL] to support the Department in accordance with its National Agenda for Energy Assurance activities, and $4,000,000 shall be available to support construction, renovation, furnishing, and demolition of NETL facilities in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and Morgantown, West Virginia, as authorized in Public Law 107–63.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2003	$259,990,000
Budget estimate, 2004	390,601,000
Committee recommendation	437,422,000

The Committee recommendation provides $437,422,000 for nuclear energy, an increase of $44,821,000 above the request.

Radiological Facilities Management.—The Committee recommendation includes $66,650,000, an amount that is $4,000,000 above the request for radiological facilities management. The Department is directed to use the additional resources for upgrades of radiological facilities at Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support.—The Committee recommends $22,000,000 for university reactor fuel assistance and support, an increase of $3,500,000 over the request. University nuclear engineering programs and university research reactors represent a fundamental and key capability in supporting our national

policy goals in health care, materials science and energy technology.

The Committee strongly supports both the University Reactor Fuel Assistance and Support program's efforts to provide fellowships, scholarships, and grants to students enrolled in science and engineering programs at U.S. universities, as well as efforts to provide fuel assistance and reactor upgrade funding for university-owned research reactors.

The Committee notes the progress of the Department in carrying out congressional direction to establish and support regional university reactor consortia. Although progress is visible, the Committee remains concerned about the ability of the Nation to respond to the growing demand for trained experts in nuclear science and technology in the face of financial and other challenges affecting engineering programs and research reactor facilities at American universities. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of $3,500,000 over the request to fund additional consortia and strongly encourages the Department to request sufficient funding in future years to fund all meritorious proposals, including appropriate proposals to support health physics university programs.

The Committee commends the State of South Carolina for recently creating one of the first new graduate nuclear engineering programs in the last 20 years. The Committee strongly encourages the Department to support the University of South Carolina's new nuclear engineering graduate program, using Departmental resources to further leverage the investments recently made by the State of South Carolina. The Committee is also aware that the University of Nevada-Las Vegas is contemplating the addition of a graduate nuclear engineering program to their curriculum. The Committee hopes and expects that the Department will be supportive of this worthy effort.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy research and development includes a total of $151,746,000, an increase of $24,721,000 over the budget request.

Nuclear Energy Research Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Nuclear Energy Technologies.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $55,721,000, an increase of $7,721,000 over the budget request.

The recommendation includes $24,973,000 for nuclear power 2010, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the request, and the Department is directed to focus the resources on the demonstration of the regulatory licensing processes of 10 CFR Part 52 for early site permits, design certifications, and combined construction and operating licenses. The Committee recommendation does not includes direct support of gas reactor fuel technologies within nuclear power 2010, and instead funds such activities under the generation IV nuclear systems initiative.

The recommendation includes $29,720,000 for the generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative, an increase of $20,000,000 over the request, and the Department is directed to use the additional

resources to begin the research, development and design phase of an advanced reactor hydrogen co-generation project at Idaho National Laboratory.

The Committee remains interested in the potential use and application of small modular reactors that would be inherently safe, be relatively cost effective, contain intrinsic design features which would deter sabotage or diversion, require infrequent refuelings, and be primarily factory constructed and deliverable to remote sites. The Department shall continue to support the international effort to develop this technology.

The recommendation does not include the requested funding for the national climate change technology initiative.

Nuclear Hydrogen Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000, an increase of $4,000,000 over the request. The additional funding is provided to support research and development necessary to support-high-temperature electrolysis and sulfur-iodine thermochemical technologies necessary to the advanced reactor hydrogen co-generation project at Idaho National Laboratory. Additionally, the recommendation includes $2,000,000 to continue the development, in partnership with industry and national laboratories, of an efficient high temperature heat exchanger at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas. These funds shall be provided to the UNLV Research Foundation.

Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes $78,025,000, an increase of $15,000,000 over the budget request. The initiative should continue to focus on development of fuel cycle technologies that minimize the toxicity of final waste products resulting from spent fuel while recovering energy remaining in spent fuel; maximizing the utility of the Yucca Mountain repository, consistent with statutory limits on its contents, or any future repository; and minimizing proliferation concerns and environmental impacts of the fuel cycle. The initiative shall assist the Secretary with development of alternative technology options that may influence the Secretary's 2007 statutorily required recommendation for the need to develop a second repository.

The Committee notes that the January 2003 Report to Congress on this project focused primarily on use or modification of existing reprocessing technologies. The Committee directs that the Department shall also explore new and alternative approaches to provide high confidence that the options finally chosen are the best for further development. The Department shall also contract for studies to determine the probable extent of global uranium reserves and global uranium demand. Based on these studies, and on a range of assumptions about the available capacity of monitored retrievable storage and repositories in the country, the project shall identify time scales on which elements of an advanced fuel cycle must be operational in order to impact national requirements for management of spent fuel. This study should include information to guide Congress in establishing the date by which an advanced recycle facility must be available for performing research on scalable, proliferation resistant, waste efficient, recycle technologies as well as other key facilities supporting future spent fuel management strategies. Based on these studies, the Secretary is directed to report to Congress by March 2005 with quantitative goals for the program

including evaluation of future spent fuel inventories, and detailed analysis of the various options to achieve these goals.

To provide confidence in the technology options proposed, the project will use Department of Energy national laboratory and University expertise to perform research and development of advanced technologies for spent fuel treatment and transmutation of plutonium, higher actinides and long-lived fission products. Advanced nuclear material recycle and safeguard technologies, proliferation-resistant nuclear fuels, and transmutation systems shall be investigated. Both reactor-based and a combination of reactor and accelerator-based transmutation approaches may be included as part of the research and systems analysis.

The project shall use international and university collaborations to provide cost effective use of research funding. Within the funds made available for this initiative, $1,500,000 is provided for the Idaho Accelerator Center, $4,500,000 for the University of Nevada Las Vegas, and $3,000,000 for directed research aimed at enhancing university-based collaborations focused on the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative with U.S. universities. All university research shall be closely coordinated with the technical projects conducted by principal investigators within the national laboratories.

IDAHO FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation includes $78,160,000, an increase of $12,600,000 over the request. The recommendation includes an additional $6,000,000 for the addition of a high-temperature gas loop in the Advanced Test Reactor, and an additional $6,600,000 for deferred landlord activities including the development of a remote treatment facility to treat remote-handled transuranic waste, remediation of an industrial waste pond, and to address other critical infrastructure issues.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation includes $60,207,000 for program direction, the amount of the request.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

Appropriations, 2003	$22,553,000
Budget estimate, 2004	30,000,000
Committee recommendation	22,437,000

The Committee recommendation includes $22,437,000 for non-defense environment, safety, and health which includes $15,641,000 for program direction.

ENERGY SUPPLY INFRASTRUCTURE

Appropriations, 2003	$0
Budget estimate, 2004	0
Committee recommendation	17,600,000

The Committee recommendation provides $17,600,000 for energy supply infrastructure.

The Energy Supply Infrastructure program provides assistance, technical support, and project funding to specific energy projects. The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the Upper

Lynn Canal power supply project, $5,000,000 for the Swan Lake-Lake Tyee segment of the Southeastern Alaska Intertie System, $1,000,000 for the Tazimina hydroelectric project, $2,000,000 for the Juneau/Green's Creek/Hoonah intertie project, $100,000 for the Hope distribution line relocation, $500,000 to support the planning and permitting of the Petersburg/Kake intertie project, and $2,000,000 for the Lake Louise/Glenallen facility.

The Committee recommendation also includes $5,000,000 for the National Center on Energy Management and Building Technologies and directs that this initiative shall be subject to the cost-sharing requirements of a research project rather than a demonstration project.

NON-DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION

Appropriations, 2003	$0
Budget estimate, 2004	170,875,000
Committee recommendation	171,875,000

The Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion program is responsible for managing and addressing the environmental legacy resulting from nuclear energy and civilian energy research programs. The programs and activities are funded within the following subprograms.

2006 ACCELERATED COMPLETIONS

The Committee recommendation includes $48,677,000, the same as the request. This program provides funding for completing cleanup and closing down facilities with an accelerated cleanup plan closure date of 2006 or earlier (such as Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory). In addition, this program provides funding for environmental management sites where overall site cleanup will not be complete by 2006 but cleanup projects within a site (for example, spent fuel removal and TRU waste shipped off-site) will be complete by 2006.

2012 ACCELERATED COMPLETIONS

The Committee recommendation includes $119,750,000, the same as the request. This program provides funding for completing cleanup and closing down facilities with an Accelerated Cleanup Plan closure date of 2007 through 2012 (such as, Brookhaven National Laboratory and West Valley Demonstration Project). In addition, this program provides funding for environmental management sites where overall site cleanup will not be complete by 2012 but cleanup projects within a site (for example, spent fuel removal and TRU waste shipped off-site) will be complete by 2012.

The Committee understands that the Department recently issued a Final Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact related to remediation of the Energy Technology and Engineering Center [ETEC]. The Committee is concerned that under the Department's plans, the ETEC site will not be remediated to CERCLA standards. The Committee understands that the Department intends to remediate 5,500 cubic meters of soil around one installation, leaving in place an additional 400,000 cubic meters of contaminated soil. This may represent an unacceptable deviation

from the Department's commitment in a 1995 Department of Energy-EPA Joint Policy. Under that agreement, the Department committed to fund an EPA radiological survey of the ETEC site and to remediate the site to CERCLA standards. The Committee urges the Department to fulfill those commitments and reassess whether the decision meets the joint policy and CERCLA standards.

2035 ACCELERATED COMPLETIONS

The Committee recommendation includes $6,448,000, an increase of $4,000,000 over the request. This program provides funding for completing cleanup and closing down facilities that are expected to be completed beyond 2012 but by 2035. The Committee recommendation includes a total of $6,000,000 for the Department to continue activities related to accelerated remediation of the former Atlas Mill Site in Moab, Utah. In evaluating alternatives for site remediation, the Department shall give full consideration to removal or relocation given the sites on the Colorado River.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $3,000,000 in prior year balances.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriations, 2003	$0
Budget estimate, 2004	418,124,000
Committee recommendation	396,124,000

The Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund supports projects to maintain, decontaminate, decommission and otherwise remediate the gaseous diffusion plants at Portsmouth, Ohio; Paducah, Kentucky; and Oak Ridge, Tennessee. In addition, the Uranium/Thorium Licensee Reimbursement program activities are funded within this appropriation.

Decontamination and Decommissioning.—The Committee recommendation includes $370,124,000, an increase of $3,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $167,359,000 for activities at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and $80,894,000 for Portsmouth, Ohio, the amounts of the budget request. The Committee recommendation provides a total of $121,871,000 for activities related to the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, including $2,000,000 for continued support of the Kentucky Consortium for Energy and Environment.

The Committee is dismayed by the failure of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the Department to reach an agreement on accelerated cleanup at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. Recognizing that environmental contamination poses an unacceptable risk to the health and well being of the citizens of western Kentucky, this Committee has generously provided ample resources for cleanup at Paducah for several consecutive years. However, the inability of State and Federal regulators to work cooperatively in the best interests of the citizens of Kentucky in reaching an agreement places the continued availability of such funds in jeopardy. It should be

noted that Kentucky is the only State that has not yet signed a letter of intent to enter into an accelerated cleanup agreement with the Department. The Committee eagerly awaits the completion of a report from the General Accounting Office examining the slow pace of cleanup at the Paducah facility. The Committee expects GAO's report to show the absence of an agreement and continued intransigence of all parties have unnecessarily delayed the cleanup of environmental hazards at Paducah.

Uranium/Thorium Reimbursement.—The Committee recommendation includes $26,000,000, a reduction of $25,000,000 from the budget request, but an increase of $10,000,000 over the current year level and $25,000,000 over the fiscal year 2002 level.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Appropriations, 2003	$0
Budget estimate, 2004	292,121,000
Committee recommendation	302,121,000

The Non-Defense Environmental Services program supports non-defense related activities that indirectly support the primary environmental management mission of accelerated risk reduction and closure. The programs and activities are funded within the following subprograms.

COMMUNITY AND REGULATORY SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $1,034,000, the same as the request. This program funds activities that are indirectly related to on-the-ground cleanup results but are integral to the Office of Environmental Management's ability to conduct cleanup at specific sites (for example, Agreements in Principles with State regulators and tribal nations and Site Specific Advisory Boards).

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP PROJECTS

The Committee recommendation includes $43,842,000, the same as the request. This program provides funds to support the transfer of additional contaminated excess facilities to the environmental management program from other Departmental programs for surveillance and maintenance and eventual decontamination and decommissioning (for example, the Fast Flux Test Facility beginning in 2004). These transfers constitute new work for the Office of Environmental Management.

NON-CLOSURE ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommendation includes $257,245,000, the same as the request. This program provides funds for activities that indirectly support the Department's accelerated cleanup and closure mission such as gaseous diffusion plant uranium programs. These activities, while not in direct support of cleanup, provide valuable services to other Departmental priorities and missions.

Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Project, Paducah, Kentucky and Portsmouth, Ohio.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $100,000,000 including $96,800,000 for the construction line item (02–U–101) and $3,200,000 in operating funding. The Department shall use these funds only for the project

scope as described in the budget justifications and none of the funds provided may be used to cover administrative costs at other Departmental sites. The additional $10,000,000 shall be used for construction at the Paducah, Kentucky facility. The additional funding shall have no effect on the amounts available for the Portsmouth, Ohio facility.

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2003	$3,261,328,000
Budget estimate, 2004	3,310,935,000
Committee recommendation	3,360,435,000

The Science account funds investment in basic research critical to the success of the Department's missions in national security, energy security and economic security. Programs funded under this account perform a leadership role in advancing the frontiers of knowledge in the physical sciences and areas of biological, environmental and computational sciences. The programs are also responsible for providing world-class research facilities for the Nation's broader scientific enterprise. The Science account includes the following major programs: high energy physics, nuclear physics, biological and environmental research, basic energy sciences, advanced scientific computing research, science laboratories infrastructure, and fusion energy sciences.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Investment in the physical sciences and engineering plays a critical role in enabling U.S. technological innovation and global economic leadership. It is essential to the development and utilization of our energy resources, as well as innovations in the areas of defense, the environment, communications and information technologies, health care and much more. Over the past 50 years, half of U.S. economic growth has come from prior investment in science and technological innovation. Life expectancy has grown from 55 years in 1900 to nearly 80 years today.

The Department of Energy is the leading source of Federal investment for R&D facilities and fundamental research in the physical sciences. Yet investment in the Department's R&D has declined in constant dollars from $11,200,000,000 in 1980 to $7,700,000,000 in 2001. As a percentage of GDP, total Federal investment in the physical sciences and engineering has been cut roughly in half since 1970.

Shrinking investment in the physical sciences and engineering poses serious risks to DOE's ability to perform its mission. It also threatens the Nation's science and technology enterprise. DOE faces a shortage of nearly 40 percent in its technical workforce over the next 5 years. To meet its needs, DOE must compete with industry for a shrinking pool of skilled workers, many of whose leaders also report serious shortages of scientists and engineers.

American educational institutions are failing to attract sufficient numbers of U.S. students, especially women and minorities, into undergraduate and graduate programs in the physical sciences and engineering. For these skills the United States is now more heavily

dependent on foreign nations than ever before. The H1–B visa has become a main element of U.S. technology policy.

As fewer foreign students choose to pursue their education in the United States, and too few U.S. students enter these fields, our vulnerability grows. The National Science Foundation reports that between 1996 and 1999, the number of Ph.D.s in science and engineering awarded to foreign students declined by 15 percent. Only 5 percent of U.S. students now earn bachelors degrees in natural science or engineering. Since 1986, the total number of bachelors degrees in engineering is down 15 percent. Between 1994 and 2000, the number of Ph.D.s awarded in physics in the United States declined by 22 percent.

These trends must be reversed. Many DOE user facilities do not operate at their designed capacity. As a result, opportunities and momentum are lost as researchers and students encounter barriers to the pursuit of their studies, including promising research opportunities at the boundaries of the life sciences, physical sciences, engineering, and computer sciences. Future U.S. global leadership and technological leadership will rely upon today's investment in research in all of the science and engineering disciplines.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2003	$722,264,000
Budget estimate, 2004	737,978,000
Committee recommendation	737,978,000

The Committee recommendation includes $737,978,000 for high energy physics, an increase of $15,714,000 over the current year level.

The high energy physics program focuses on gaining insights into the fundamental constituents of matter, the fundamental forces in nature, and the transformations between matter and energy at the most elementary level. The program encompasses both experimental and theoretical particle physics research and related advanced accelerator and detector technology R&D. The primary mode of experimental research involves the study of collisions of energetic particles using large particle accelerators or colliding beam facilities.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2003	$381,872,000
Budget estimate, 2004	389,430,000
Committee recommendation	389,430,000

The Committee recommends $389,430,000 for nuclear physics, an increase of $7,558,000 over the current year level.

The nuclear physics program supports and provides experimental equipment to qualified scientists and research groups conducting experiments at nuclear physics accelerator facilities. These facilities provide new insights and advance our knowledge of the nature of matter and energy and develop the scientific knowledge, technologies and trained manpower needed to underpin the Department's nuclear missions. The Committee supports the Continuous Electron Bean Accelerator Facility at the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility and encourages the Jefferson Lab to increase operational time and thereby reduce the significant backlog

of peer reviewed and approved scientific experiments and begin work toward the 12 GeV upgrade. Therefore, the Committee urges the Department to grant approval and include adequate funds in its fiscal year 2005 request to continue this process.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2003	$506,685,000
Budget estimate, 2004	499,535,000
Committee recommendation	534,035,000

The Committee recommendation includes $534,035,000 for biological and environmental research, an increase of $34,500,000 over the current year level.

The biological and environmental research program develops the knowledge base necessary to identify, understand, and anticipate the long-term health and environmental consequences of energy use and development. The program utilizes the Department's unique scientific and technological capabilities to solve major scientific problems in the environment, medicine, and biology. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $3,000,000 for the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Washington and $7,776,000 for the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $17,496,000 for low dose radiation research.

Genomes to Life.—The Committee recommendation continues its strong support of the "genomes to life" activities aimed at understanding the composition and function of biochemical networks that carry out essential processes of living organisms. This activity is funded at $69,039,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the request.

Energy-Water Supply Technologies.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $15,500,000 to support a research and demonstration program to study energy-related issues associated with water resources and issues associated with sustainable water supplies for energy production. The recommendation includes $6,000,000 to continue the arsenic removal research in conjunction with the American Water Works Association Research Foundation as begun in fiscal year 2003; $4,000,000 in support of desalination research consistent with the Desalination and Water Purification Technology Roadmap in partnership with the Bureau of Reclamation; and $1,500,000 to support the public/private ZeroNet Energy-Water Initiative. The Committee recommendation also includes $4,000,000 to fund a demonstration of a stand-alone stirling engine that will run on any fuel. The engine shall be a portable, closed-cycle, reciprocating, and regenerative heat engine used in conjunction with an electrical generator to convert heat, external to the engine, into electricity and usable thermal power. This engine should be combined with an advanced vapor compression distillation system for making drinking water from virtually any water source. The water system shall remove all contaminants, including volatile compounds. The goal of the combined stirling and water system is to provide safe water and power in remote rural areas. The value and efficiency of the combined system will come from using the emission free engine's waste heat to help power the

water purifier. The demonstration of this technology should take place on Native American reservations.

Molecular Medicine.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $6,000,000 for programs that bring together PET imaging, systems biology and nanotechnology to develop new molecular imaging probes. These probes should provide a biological diagnosis of disease that is informative of the molecular basis of disease and specific for guiding the development of new molecular therapies. The programs must bring together chemists, physicists, biologists and imaging scientists to produce new technologies and science in the stated area. The particular disease orientation is in cancers such as breast, prostrate, colorectal, melanoma and others and degenerative neurological disorders such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's diseases.

The Committee is concerned about consequence mitigation activities and public health impacts associated with the threat of any radiological event and strongly encourages the Department to develop therapeutic radiological countermeasures to protect against exposure to the effects of ionizing radiation. The Committee is aware of the potential of inositol signaling molecules as a therapy for exposure to ionizing radiation and encourages the Department to support research of this emerging technology. The Committee recommends the Science and Technology Division of the Department of Energy fund medical therapy research arid other treatment options to protect the public health against radiation exposure.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 2003	$1,023,305,000
Budget estimate, 2004	1,008,575,000
Committee recommendation	1,008,575,000

The Committee recommendation includes $1,008,575,000, the same as the budget request.

The basic energy sciences [BES] program funds basic research in the physical, biological and engineering sciences that support the Department's nuclear and non-nuclear technology programs. The BES program is responsible for operating large national user research facilities, including synchrotron light and neutron sources, a combustion research facility, as well as smaller user facilities such as materials preparation and electron microscopy centers. The BES program supports a substantial basic research budget for materials sciences, chemical sciences, energy biosciences, engineering and geosciences.

Research

The Committee recommendation includes $788,625,000, the amount of the request, for materials sciences, engineering research, chemical sciences, geosciences, and energy biosciences.

Construction

Spallation Neutron Source.—The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $124,600,000 to continue construction at Oak Ridge National Laboratory for the Spallation Neutron Source [SNS] to meet the Nation's neutron scattering needs.

Nanoscale Science Research Centers.—The Committee recommendation supports the high priority given to nanoscale research and has included the budget request totaling $87,850,000 for the nanoscale science research centers at Brookhaven National Laboratory, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and the joint effort between Sandia National Laboratories and Los Alamos National Laboratory.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation provides $183,490,000 for advanced scientific computing research, an increase of $10,000,000 over the current year level.

The Advanced Scientific Computing Research [ASCR] program supports advanced computational research—applied mathematics, computer science, and networking—to enable the analysis, simulation and prediction of complex physical phenomena. The program also supports the operation of large supercomputer user facilities.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommends $48,590,000, an increase of $5,000,000 for Oak Ridge National Laboratory infrastructure. The program supports infrastructure activities at the five national labs under the direction of the Office of Science.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 2003	$248,375,000
Budget estimate, 2004	257,310,000
Committee recommendation	257,310,000

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is $257,310,000, an amount that is equal to the budget request.

The fusion energy sciences program supports research emphasizing the underlying basic research in plasma and fusion sciences, with the long-term goal of harnessing fusion as a viable energy source.

International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor.—The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $1,990,000 to allow the Department to enter multilateral international negotiations aimed at building the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor [ITER], a burning plasma physics experiment many view as an essential next step toward eventually developing fusion as a commercially viable energy source. Reasonably conservative estimates suggest that the United States' participation in ITER will require approximately $1,500,000,000 over the next 10 years in direct contributions to the construction of ITER and in supporting science. The Department's request of less than $2,000,000 in direct support of the ITER project for fiscal year 2004 certainly leads the Committee to question the Department's commitment to supporting ITER without prejudice or damage to alternative fusion technologies, much less other Departmental science programs.

The Department's proposed fiscal year 2004 budget proposes to cut severely long-term activities in fusion technology and advanced design that will have significant impact on the ultimate attractiveness of fusion power. The Committee recommends that,

within available funds, the Department should make adjustments to redress the imbalance resulting from these cuts.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation provides $51,887,000 for safeguards and security, an increase of $3,760,000 over the request.

The safeguards and security line identifies the funding necessary for the physical protection, protective forces, physical security, protective systems, information security, cyber security, personnel security, materials control and accountability and program management activities for national laboratories and facilities of the Office of Science.

SCIENCE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation provides $6,470,000 for science workforce development, an increase of $1,045,000 from the current year level.

The science workforce development program provides limited funding to train young scientists, engineers, and technicians to meet the demand for a well trained scientific and technical workforce, including the teachers that educate the workforce. The Committee encourages the Department of Energy to provide funds and technical expertise for high school students to participate in the 2004 For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology [FIRST] Robotics competition. FIRST has proven to be a valuable program to introduce and mentor students in math and science.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation provides $147,053,000 for science program direction, an increase of $11,554,000 from the current year level.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriations, 2003	$144,058,000
Budget estimate, 2004	161,000,000
Committee recommendation	140,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes $425,000,000 for nuclear waste disposal. Of that amount, $140,000,000 is derived from the nuclear waste fund, and $285,000,000 shall be available from the "Defense nuclear waste disposal" account.

The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for the State of Nevada and $8,000,000 for affected units of local government in accordance with the statutory restrictions contained in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. These funds are direct payments, not grants or cooperative agreements, and are available until expended. The failure of the Department to request any funding for state or county oversight programs in fiscal year 2004 indicates a disturbing lack of support for congressionally-mandated programs to identify impacts, to make comments and recommendations to the Secretary, and to provide information about the repository to local residents, particularly concerning policy developments at the national level. The Committee strongly urges the Department to include funding for states and affected units of local government in the fiscal year 2005

budget request. During fiscal year 2003, audits of affected unit of local government funds provided to Nye and Lincoln Counties in Nevada resulted in nearly $2,000,000 in disallowed costs. These costs were disallowed despite the advance approval of the county work plans by the Office of Civilian Radioactive Nuclear Waste. However, the disallowed costs should be borne by the the affected units of local government [AULGs]. The balance of funds appropriated for the AULGs should be made available for appropriate and allowable programs and activities of the AULGs and should not be utilized by the Department for any other purpose. The Committee expects the Department and the AULGs to do a substantially better job of complying with congressional direction concerning appropriate uses for these funds. The Department and the AULGs should work cooperatively to set funding guidelines to prevent a repeat of these problems.

The Committee recommendation includes funding for the following research and oversight activities: $2,500,000 for the University of Nevada-Reno to conduct nuclear waste repository research in the areas of materials evaluation, fundamental studies on degradation mechanisms, alternate materials and design, and computational and analytical modeling; $1,500,000 for the Research Foundation at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas to conduct safety and risk analyses, simulation and modeling, systems planning, and operations and management to support radioactive and hazardous materials transportation; $1,000,000 for the Research Foundation at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas to assess earthquake hazards and seismic risk in Southern Nevada; $2,500,000 for the Desert Research Institute's Yucca Mountain Environmental Monitoring Program; $2,500,000 for the University of Nevada-Reno to expand the earthquake engineering and simulation facility. These funds are available until expended. In fiscal year 2003, the Office of Civilian Radioactive Nuclear Waste appeared to some to be dilatory in releasing funding required by Congress to the State of Nevada, the affected units of local government, and other grant recipients. The Committee directs the Department to deliver a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, by no later than October 31, 2003, detailing how and when all fiscal year 2004 grants will be distributed.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 2003	$205,280,000
Budget estimate, 2004	326,306,000
Committee recommendation	309,564,000

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2003	−$120,000,000
Budget estimate, 2004	−146,668,000
Committee recommendation	−146,668,000

The Department recommends $309,564,000 for departmental administration, a net appropriation of $162,896,000. This amount represents a decrease of $16,742,000 from the budget request and

is detailed further in the table at the end of the portion of the report regarding Title III.

The Departmental Administration account funds policy development and analysis activities, institutional and public liaison functions, and other program support requirements necessary to ensure effective operation and management. The account also covers salaries and expenses for the Office of the Secretary; Board of Contract Appeals; Chief Information Officer; Congressional and intergovernmental affairs; Economic impact and diversity; General Counsel; Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation; Policy and International Affairs; and Public Affairs.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $5,000,000 for the Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation for increased oversight and reporting on new Office of Environmental Management acceleration contracts.

The National Research Council [NRC] observed progress in improving DOE project management procedures over the past 3 years, but noted that it is still too soon to observe any measurable affect on project performance. The NRC found that it will require several more years to determine if changes in DOE project management culture have increased its ability to undertake projects that support its missions and whether DOE project managers have the ability plan and execute them successfully. Accordingly, the Committee directs DOE to contract with the NRC to provide continued oversight until sustained improvement in project performance can be documented and measured.

INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2003	$37,426,000
Budget estimate, 2004	39,462,000
Committee recommendation	39,462,000

The Committee has provided $39,462,000 for the Office of the Inspector General, the same as the budget request.

The Office of the Inspector General provides agency-wide audit, inspection, and investigative functions to identify and correct management and administrative deficiencies which create conditions for existing or potential instances of fraud, waste, and mismanagement.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy are provided for in two categories—the National Nuclear Security Administration and Environmental and Other Defense Activities. Appropriation accounts under the National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA] are Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and the Office of the Administrator. Environmental and Other Defense Activities include appropriation accounts for Defense Site Acceleration Completion, Defense Environmental Services, Other Defense Activities, and Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA], a separately organized and semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy, came into existence on March 1, 2000. The missions of the NNSA are: (1) to enhance United States national security through the military application of nuclear energy; (2) to maintain and enhance the safety, reliability, and performance of the United States nuclear weapons stockpile, including the ability to design, produce, and test, in order to meet national security requirements; (3) to provide the United States Navy with safe, militarily effective nuclear propulsion plants and to ensure the safe and reliable operation of those plants; (4) to promote international nuclear safety and nonproliferation; (5) to reduce global danger from weapons of mass destruction; and (6) to support United States leadership in science and technology. The programs and activities of the NNSA are funded through the following appropriation accounts: Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and Office of the Administrator.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2003	$5,914,409,000
Budget estimate, 2004	6,378,000,000
Committee recommendation	6,473,814,000

The Weapons Activities account provides for the maintenance and refurbishment of nuclear weapons in order to sustain confidence in their safety, reliability, and performance; the expansion of scientific, engineering, and manufacturing capabilities to enable certification of the enduring nuclear weapons stockpile; and the manufacture of nuclear weapon components under a comprehensive test ban. The Weapons Activities account also provides for maintaining the capability to return to the design and production of new weapons and to underground nuclear testing if so directed by the President. The major elements of the program include the following: directed stockpile work, campaigns, readiness in technical base and facilities, facilities and infrastructure, secure transportation asset, and safeguards and security.

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

not been authorized by Congress. Congressional notification within 15 days of the use of this reprogramming authority is required. Transfers during the fiscal year which would result in increases or decreases in excess of $5,000,000 or which would be subject to the limitations outlined above require prior notification and approval from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

The Committee recommendation includes $1,367,786,000 for directed stockpile work, an increase of $3,000,000 over the request.

The directed stockpile work program encompasses all activities that directly support specific weapons in the stockpile. These activities include maintenance and day-to-day care; planned refurbishment; reliability assessments; weapon dismantlement and disposal; and research, development, and certification technology efforts to meet future stockpile requirements.The NNSA Administrator shall insure that all of the assessments provided to him have utilized the judgements of independent, expert, and cognizant reviewers who are not normally involved in the stewardship of the assessed nuclear warheads or their associated delivery systems.

Stockpile Research and Development.—The Committee recommends $433,150,000, the same as the budget request. Stockpile R&D provides for assessment, certification, surveillance and maintenance research and development for systems comprising our enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. The recommendation also includes $21,000,000, the amount of the request for advanced concept initiative activities.

Stockpile Maintenance.—The Committee recommends $415,746,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the request, to provide for stockpile maintenance and production and exchange of limited life components in the enduring stockpile, as well as major refurbishment activities to extend the stockpile life of the W87, W76, W80, and B61 weapons systems. The additional resources are intended to support activities at the Y-12 Plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

Stockpile Evaluation.—The Committee recommends $202,886,000, the amount of the request, to support new material laboratory tests, new material flight tests, stockpile laboratory tests, stockpile flight tests, quality evaluations, special testing, and surveillance of weapons systems to support assessment of the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile, all of which contributes to the Annual Certification to the President.

Dismantlement/Disposal.—The Committee recommends $37,722,000, the amount of the request. The program includes all activities associated with weapon retirement and disassembly.

Production Support.—The Committee recommends $271,113,000, a reduction of $7,000,000 from the request to adjust for a lower-than-expected program growth.

CAMPAIGNS

The Committee recommendation includes $2,370,655,000 for campaigns, a reduction of $24,800,000 from the budget request.

The campaigns program focuses on scientific, technical and engineering efforts to develop and maintain critical capabilities and

tools needed to support stockpile refurbishment and continued assessment and certification of the stockpile for the long term in the absence of underground nuclear testing. The major elements of the campaigns program are: science campaigns, engineering campaigns, inertial confinement fusion and high yield, advanced simulation and computing, pit manufacturing and certification, and readiness campaigns.

Science Campaigns

Primary Certification.—The Committee recommends $64,849,000, a reduction of $1,000,000 to adjust for a lower-than-expected program growth.

Dynamic Materials Properties.—The Committee recommends $87,251,000 an increase of $5,000,000 from the request. The Committee commends the administration for its investment in the future through university grants, partnerships and cooperative agreements. Using $5,000,000 of the available funds, the Administration is directed to make full use of existing and developing capabilities for materials properties studies, including the subcritical experiments at the U1a facility, Joint Actinide Shock Physics Experimental Research facility and the Atlas facility at the Nevada Test Site. The Committee understands that this materials work is essential to predicting the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons in the absence of nuclear weapons testing.

Advanced Radiography.—The Committee recommends $65,985,000, the same as the request. The recommendation includes $24,844,000 for advanced radiography requirements and technology development.

Secondary Certification and Nuclear Systems Margins.—The Committee recommends $54,463,000, a reduction of $1,000,000 to adjust for a lower-than-expected program growth, for radiation source development, radiation, case dynamics studies radiation transport and the effects of aging, and refurbishment on secondary performance.

Engineering Campaigns

Enhanced Surety.—The Committee recommends $36,974,000, a reduction of $1,000,000 to adjust for a lower-than-expected program growth, to develop and demonstrate advanced initiation concepts and enhanced use denial concepts, and to enhance efforts to establish high precision, micro-system technologies for enhanced surety of future weapon systems.

Weapons Systems Engineering Certification.—The Committee recommends $27,238,000, a reduction of $1,000,000 to adjust for a lower-than-expected program growth, to accelerate the acquisition of experimental data necessary to validate new models and simulation tools being developed in the Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign.

Nuclear Survivability.—The Committee recommends $22,977,000, a reduction of $1,000,000 to adjust for a lower-than-expected program growth, to develop and validate tools to simulate nuclear environments for survivability assessments and certification; restore the capability to provide nuclear-hardened microelectronics and microsystem components for the enduring stockpile;

and accelerate the qualification and certification of the neutron generator and the arming, fusing and firing system for the refurbished W76.

Enhanced Surveillance.—The Committee recommendation includes $92,781,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 from the request to adjust for a lower-than-expected program growth.

Advanced Design and Production Technologies.—The Committee recommendation includes $77,917,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 from the request to adjust for a lower-than-expected program growth.

Project 01–D–108 Microsystem and Engineering Science Applications [MESA], SNL, Albuquerque, NM.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $43,200,000 to accelerate the construction schedule consistent with projected stockpile needs.

Inertial Confinement Fusion and High Yield

The Committee recommends $432,769,000, a decrease of $34,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $150,000,000 for National Ignition Facility construction, Project 96–D–111, and $282,769,000 for the ICF ignition and high yield program.

National Ignition Facility.—The Committee recommendation includes $150,000,000 for construction and $96,300,000 for the NIF demonstration program, consistent with the revised NIF project baseline. All construction and support activities related to the NIF should be funded from either the NIF construction line or the NIF demonstration program. The Committee is concerned about the dramatic growth in other NIF-related activities funded elsewhere in the inertial confinement fusion campaign and specifically rejects that portion of the budget request. As such, the budget request for experimental support technologies is reduced by $44,000,000, and the balance of that sub-program is directed towards the support of other high energy density physics laboratories and facilities.

Inertial Fusion Technology.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to initiate assessments and initial development and testing of Z-Pinch inertial fusion energy.

Petawatt Lasers.—The Committee also includes an additional $5,000,000 for university grants and other support. Within this amount, $2,500,000 is provided for continued development of an ultra short pulse petawatt laser at the University of Texas; and $2,500,000 is provided to continue short-pulse laser development and research at the University of Nevada, Reno.

The Committee understands that high intensity laser physics enables major new areas of science and engineering endeavor in the United States and that advances in this field will enable important progress in critical aspects of basic science, fusion energy, and national security. A robust, coordinated program in high intensity lasers will affordably maintain U.S. leadership in this critically important area. Accordingly, the Committee directs that Department to pursue a joint high intensity laser program with the National Science Foundation. The Committee further directs the NNSA and the Department's Office of Science to develop, in collaboration with the NSF, a report that identifies the benefits and disadvantages of multi-agency coordinated research in high intensity laser science

and delineates how a joint program in this area will be structured. This report should be delivered to the Committee no later than April 15, 2004.

Advanced Simulation and Computing

The Committee recommendation includes $725,626,000, an amount that is $25,000,000 below the budget request.

Currently the National Academies Computer Science and Telecommunications Board and the JASONs are completing separate reports due to the Committee on August 1, 2003 as directed in the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003, Public Law 108–7. The recommendation of the Committee to reduce the program by $25,000,000 still leaves the program with just under a $60,000,000 increase over the adjusted current year level, excluding construction. The recommended reduction is without prejudice and the Committee expects to revisit the appropriate level of funding at conference with the benefit of the National Academies' and JASONs' reports.

Pit Manufacturing and Certification

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $320,228,000 for the pit manufacturing and certification campaign, the same as the budget request. This amount includes $235,365,000 to support the manufacturing and certification of a W88 pit consistent with the project baseline. The Committee directs the NNSA to revise as appropriate the pit production and certification plan and submit the report to the relevant congressional committees by March 31, 2003, and annually thereafter.

Modern Pit Facility.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $22,810,000, the same as the budget request. The recommendation includes $7,000,000 to continue conceptual design of the modern pit facility and $15,810,000 to support a site selection decision for the modern pit facility in fiscal year 2004.

Readiness Campaigns

Stockpile Readiness Campaign.—The Committee recommends $55,158,000 for the stockpile readiness campaign the amount of the request. This program, initiated in fiscal year 2001, enables the Y–12 National Security Complex to replace or restore production capability and to modernize aging facilities. At present, all of the critical manufacturing capabilities required for weapons refurbishments at Y–12 do not exist.

High Explosives Manufacturing and Weapons Assembly/Disassembly Readiness.—The Committee recommends $27,649,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 to adjust for lower-than-expected program growth, to establish production-scale high explosives manufacturing and qualification; to deploy and validate technologies and facilities for production re-qualification; and, to demonstrate and validate Enterprise Integration and Collaborative Manufacturing.

Non-Nuclear Readiness.—The Committee recommends $34,397,000, a reduction of $3,000,000 to adjust for lower-than-expected program growth, to deploy commercial products and processes for components supporting the B61, W80, and W76 stockpile life extension programs; to modify existing tritium loading and

cleaning facilities to support stockpile life extension programs; and, to support neutron target loading and detonator production.

Tritium Readiness.—The Committee recommendation includes $134,893,000 for the tritium readiness campaign, the same as the request.

Cooperative Agreements.—The Committee recognizes that cooperative agreements with universities are important resources for developing essential technical data for stockpile stewardship. Additionally, such long-term relationships with universities allow considerable opportunity for promoting advanced studies and recruiting the future workforce in technical areas that are critical to the continuing stewardship enterprise. The Committee remains supportive of this activity and directs the administration to honor existing cooperative agreements as this new office implements its responsibilities. The Committee is aware of the successful partnerships between the NNSA and the University of Nevada-Las Vegas and the University of Nevada-Reno that have been fostered through a series of cooperative agreements. The Department is encouraged to renew these agreements at higher levels as appropriate.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

The Committee recommendation includes $1,731,585,000, an increase of $118,114,000 from the budget request.

The readiness in technical base and facilities [RTBF] program provides the underlying physical infrastructure and operational readiness for the directed stockpile work and campaign programs. RTBF activities include ensuring that facilities are operational, safe, secure, and in compliance with regulatory requirements, and that a defined level of readiness is sustained at facilities funded by the Office of Defense Programs.

Operations of Facilities.—The Committee recommends $1,091,773,000, an increase of $117,000,000, to maintain warm standby readiness for all RTBF facilities with some allowance for inflation. Within available funds, an additional $10,000,000 is provided to support the operation of facilities at the Nevada Test Site, including the Device Assembly Facility, the Joint Actinide Shock Physics Experimental Research facility, operations associated with the Atlas relocation project, U1a operations, general plant projects and other NTS support facilities.

For continued facility upgrades, refurbishments, operations and maintenance costs associated with and for the National Center for Combating Terrorism, an additional $25,000,000 is provided. The Committee directs that not less than $5,000,000 of the funds for the NCCT be provided jointly to the Institute for Security Studies at UNLV and the comparable program at the University of Nevada-Reno.

The Committee recommendation also includes an additional $10,000,000 for facility operations at Pantex, an additional $10,000,000 for operation of facilities at Y–12, an additional $20,000,000 for the Kansas City Plant to address pension liability issues, an additional $15,000,000 for the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and an additional $20,000,000 for the Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Committee recommendation includes

an additional $8,000,000 for modification of the Z-Beamlet laser to the Z Machine at Sandia National Laboratories.

Technology Transfer and Industrial Partnerships.—The Committee recognizes that partnerships with industry may enable the weapons complex to accomplish its mission more efficiently. Such partnership can provide access to new technologies, processes, and expertise that improve NNSA's mission capabilities. One of the most successful technology transfer and commercialization efforts in the Department of Energy has occurred with the not-for-profit Technology Ventures Corporation around Sandia National Laboratories, resulting in over 30 start-up ventures and thousands of jobs created. The Committee has included an additional $3,000,000 and directs the NNSA to continue to support this highly successful public/private partnership at the NNSA laboratories and the Nevada Test Site. The Committee recommendation also includes $1,000,000 for the NNSA to utilize the capabilities of its laboratories for a joint effort with the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission on sensor technologies and applications.

Program Readiness.—The Committee recommends $131,093,000, the same as the budget request, to enhance readiness and maintain materials processing and component manufacturing readiness.

Special Projects.—The Committee recommendation includes $60,025,000 for special projects. Within available funds, $6,900,000 is provided for the New Mexico Education Enrichment Foundation; $500,000 for the design, fabrication, and installation of exhibits at the Atomic Testing History Institute; $2,500,000 for stockpile stewardship research at the Nevada terrawatt facility at the University of Nevada-Reno; and $6,900,000 for the Sandia National Laboratories. The Los Alamos County Schools Program is funded at the level of the President's request.

The Committee is aware of concerns expressed by the City of Oak Ridge and Anderson and Roane counties in the State of Tennessee regarding the level of financial assistance provided by the Department of Energy. As a Manhattan Project atomic energy community, the Department has a special relationship with Oak Ridge. Although the area receives modest support from the Department as part of the Payment in Lieu of Tax program, economic development has been severely limited by extensive Federal ownership of lands, aging infrastructure, and disproportionately high local tax rates. Unfortunately, Oak Ridge has not achieved the level of self-sufficiency envisioned by the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955. The Committee urges the Department to work with city and county officials to develop a plan to help the Oak Ridge community achieve financial self-sufficiency.

Material Recycle and Recovery.—The Committee recommends $76,189,000, the amount of the budget request.

Nuclear Weapons Incident Response.—The Committee recommends $89,694,000, the amount of the request, to enhance the state of response readiness at various locations.

Construction Projects.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $274,940,000, for construction projects under Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities.

The following list details changes in appropriations for construction projects under Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities:

Project 04–D–103 Project Engineering and Design [PED], Various Locations.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,564,000, an increase of $1,564,000. The additional amount is to support the replacement of Fire Station No. 1, Nevada Test Site, Nevada. The base request also includes $800,000 to support the replacement of Fire Station No. 2, Nevada Test Site, Nevada. The Department is directed to provide a study of the potential benefits in terms of both time and cost of utilizing a design-build process for the replacement of these fire stations. Neither station meets current fire regulations which has practical and potential impacts on the state of test readiness. This report shall be provided to the House and Senate Committee by August 31, 2003.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation includes $265,123,000, the same as the budget request.

The facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program is a multi-year but limited term effort to restore the physical infrastructure of the weapons complex and eliminate the maintenance backlog. The program provides funds to accomplish deferred maintenance and utilities replacement while improving facility management practices to preclude further deterioration.

The FIRP program was designed to be a program of limited duration to accomplish these purposes. The Committee notes its concern that the regular maintenance budgets within the RTBF account remain under funded and are thus still contributing to the deferred maintenance backlog—3 years after the FIRP program was created, and during a period when weapons complex funding increased from an annual rate of approximately $5,000,000,000 to approximately $6,700,000,000. The Committee directs the NNSA to request a budget that allows all sites within the complex to adequately fund maintenance activities at appropriate levels to achieve an orderly reduction of the infrastructure deferred maintenance backlog down to the private industry standard for comparable facilities. The NNSA shall establish procedures to ensure the site managers and laboratory managers are appropriately funding maintenance.

SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $162,400,000, a reduction of $20,000,000 from the budget request. The fiscal year 2003 supplemental included an additional $20,000,000 for the secure transportation asset and the Committee directs the use of these carryover balances for fiscal year 2004.

The secure transportation asset program provides for the safe, secure movement of nuclear weapons, special nuclear material, and weapon components between military locations and nuclear complex facilities within the United States.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation includes $585,750,000, the same as the budget request.

The safeguards and security line identifies the funding necessary for all safeguard and security requirements (except for personnel

security investigations) at NNSA landlord sites, specifically the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, Kansas City Plant, Pantex Plant, Y–12 Plant, and the Savannah River Site Tritium Facilities.

The Committee encourages the Administration to support a joint Air Force/NNSA research and development program in physical security systems and technologies at the Sandia National Laboratory.

The Committee remains concerned about the unintended effects of the misguided effort to fund security as a separate line item, rather than as an element of overhead. This situation results in the relative inability of line management to control the resources required to execute the security mission and interferes with the risk-management decisions necessary to effective management by the laboratory directors and plant or site managers. Ironically, the separate funding of security, introduced 3 years ago as a measure to improve security, restricts the ability of managers to move monies into security activities when needed. Therefore, the Committee directs the NNSA to eliminate the separate line-item treatment of the security budget in its fiscal year 2005 budget request in a manner consistent with the recommendation of the April 2002 Report of the Commission on Science and Security ("Hamre Commission"). Furthermore, the Administrator of the NNSA shall have the ability to authorize the augmentation of the Safeguards and Security account upon the request of a laboratory director, plant manager, or site manager in order to address urgent security needs or provide enhanced protection for special weapons projects. The augmentation of funds shall be permissible with 15 days advance notification to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and shall not require the approval of a formal reprogramming action by the Congress. Funds for security augmentation shall be derived from other NNSA accounts or from indirect funds of the laboratory, plant or site.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriations, 2003	$1,020,860,000
Budget estimate, 2004	1,340,195,000
Committee recommendation	1,340,195,000

The Committee recommendation includes $1,340,195,000 for defense nuclear nonproliferation, the same as the budget request.

The Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account funds programs and activities to (1) prevent the spread of materials, technology, and expertise relating to weapons of mass destruction; (2) detect the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction worldwide; (3) provide for international nuclear safety, and (4) eliminate inventories of surplus fissile materials usable for nuclear weapons. These highly important initiatives address the danger that hostile nations or terrorist groups may acquire weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material, dual-use production technology or weapons of mass destruction expertise. The major elements of the program include the following: nonproliferation and verification research and development, nonproliferation and international security, and nonproliferation programs with Russia.

The fiscal year 2003 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act provided $1,020,860,000 for nuclear nonproliferation activities. Since that time, Congress has appropriated an additional $148,000,000 for defense nuclear nonproliferation in supplemental appropriations bills. Unfortunately, a substantial portion of the total appropriated funding for fiscal year 2003 remains unspent and unobligated.

These programs are of critical interest to this Committee and to Congress as a whole. However, success is still coming much too slowly. Security upgrades have still not begun on more than 100 tons of Russia's plutonium and HEU. In the year since United States and Russian officials proclaimed the removal of HEU from 24 research institutes around the world a high priority, none has been removed. Many of Russia's nuclear warhead storage sites have yet to receive interim security upgrades and few if any have received permanent upgrades. And this is added to a complete lack of credible information on the location and status of Russia's substantial stockpile of tactical nuclear weapons. There is no question that the Russian bureaucracy is slow and problematical, but such should not be used as an excuse for the difficulty of the task, but as the reason these issues deserve greater levels of coordination and attention at the highest levels of the U.S. government.

Furthermore, the Committee is concerned that the rate of expenditure for nonproliferation programs lags substantially behind that of the rest of the National Nuclear Security Administration. Carry-over rates of 40 percent are not uncommon. Although the Committee recognizes the difficulty in implementing nonproliferation activities in Russia, the Committee strongly urges the Department to improve on this level of performance. However, the Committee does not expect the Department to carry out these programs with any less rigorous oversight in ensuring efficient and cost-effective implementation. The securing and safeguarding of fissile nuclear material abroad is a critical component of our Nation's terrorism prevention effort.

NONPROLIFERATION VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation includes $234,873,000, an increase of $31,000,000 from the request.

The nonproliferation and verification research and development program conducts applied research, development, testing, and evaluation leading to prototype demonstrations and detection systems that are critical to the United States response to current and projected threats posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and diversion of special nuclear material. The program works directly with agencies responsible for monitoring proliferation and combating terrorism.

The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 to complete funding for the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology PASSCAL Instrument Center. The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 in emergency response funding for the Remote Sensing Laboratory to recover eroding emergency response infrastructure, repair and replace aging equipment, and begin upgrading capabilities to current technology. From within the funds provided to RSL, the Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000

for the University of Nevada-Reno for the development of state-of-the-art chemical, biological, and nuclear detection sensors. The Committee also encourages the Office of Nuclear Nonproliferation to assess the capabilities of the Fire Training Academy in Elko, Nevada, to determine if it has utility to the Department as a place to conduct nuclear exposure training activities. The Department should report back to the House and Senate Committees by December 31, 2003.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $20,000,000 in support of the nuclear and radiological national security program. The NNSA is directed to provide for the sustained development of advanced technologies needed to counter nuclear terrorism threats and should focus on improving capabilities through research and development in threat assessment and prediction, basic nuclear understanding, sensors and detection systems, consequence mitigation, forensics and attribution and render-safe technologies. From within the funds provided for ground-based nuclear explosion monitoring, the Committee recommendation includes $2,500,000 in support of the 3-year research effort by the Caucasus Seismic Information Network.

NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The Committee recommendation includes $121,734,000, an increase of $20,000,000 from the request.

The nonproliferation and international security program supports activities to: control the export of items and technology useful for weapons of mass destruction [WMD]; implement international safeguards in conjunction with the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA]; monitor and implement treaties and agreements; develop and implement policy in support of international security efforts aimed at securing high-risk nuclear material; develop and implement transparency measures to assure international nonproliferation and arms control commitments; and explore and implement innovative approaches to improve regional security.

The Committee recommendation includes $8,270,000 for continuing the efforts for disposition of spent nuclear fuel in Kazakhstan.

The Committee commends the NNSA for engaging the wider U.S. scientific community in contributions to the treaty monitoring program. The Committee will not continue direction that the NNSA compete a specific portion of the treaty monitoring program, but strongly encourages the laboratories to continue to incorporate more industry and academic involvement and to establish metrics that will allow the Committee to track progress in this effort.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $20,000,000 to reinvigorate initiatives focused on removing nuclear weapons-usable materials from vulnerable sites around the world. These activities are essential to prevent terrorist groups or states hostile to the United States from acquiring destructive nuclear capabilities. The Administrator, working with the Secretary, must utilize the NNSA's strength in the inter-agency process to become the lead agency for all such governmental activities world-wide.

NONPROLIFERATION PROGRAMS WITH RUSSIA

The Committee recommendation includes $1,030,505,000, a decrease of $4,083,000 from the request.

International Materials Protection, Control, and Cooperation.—The Committee recommendation includes $226,000,000, the same as the request. This program will continue to improve the security for nuclear material and weapons in Russia by installing basic rapid upgrades and through comprehensive security improvements.

The increased funding from fiscal year 2003 supplemental appropriations and the fiscal year 2004 recommendation will allow for additional material consolidation and control work. The Committee continues to believe that these activities are critical elements of the United States nonproliferation efforts.

Regarding the second line of defense activities within the MP,C&C program, the Committee urges the NNSA to continue its efforts in the use of integrated monitoring methodology for special nuclear monitoring detection at airports, ports, and border crossing in the former Soviet Union and newly independent States and to continue to accelerate the Megaports initiative funded with $84,000,000 in the fiscal year 2003 supplemental.

The Committee directs that $5,000,000 of the total amounts available to the NNSA to address the threats of radiological dispersion devices be made available to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for bilateral and international efforts to strengthen regulatory controls over radioactive sources that are at the greatest risk of being used in RDDs.

Accelerated Materials Disposition.—The Committee recommendation recommends $30,000,000, the amount of the budget request to accelerate the purchase of Russian HEU in amounts beyond the 1993 United States-Russia HEU Purchase Agreement. These additional amounts would be used to: establish a reserve inventory of low enriched uranium for use as fuel in the United States; accelerate development of low enriched research reactor fuel designs, and increase the amount of Russian HEU down-blended under the material consolidation and conversion program.

Russian Transition Initiatives.—The Committee recommendation includes $50,000,000 to support the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention [IPP] and the Nuclear Cities Initiative [NCI] programs to reduce the risk of adverse migration of former Soviet nuclear and other WMD expertise, and to work with the Russians in downsizing their nuclear weapons complex. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $10,000,000 over the budget request for IPP.

HEU Transparency Implementation.—The Committee recommendation includes $18,000,000 to support continued work with Russia to provide confidence to the United States that the Russian highly enriched uranium [HEU] being converted is from its military stockpile, consistent with the 1993 United States-Russia HEU Purchase Agreement.

International Nuclear Safety.—With the completion of the Soviet-designed reactor safety program in fiscal year 2003, the Committee recommendation does not continue a separately funded international nuclear safety program. The Committee strongly rec-

ommends the remaining programs in research reactor safety and shutdown in the former Soviet Union, Kazakhstan BN–350 reactor shutdown, nuclear power plant protection, nuclear safety cooperation with China and other international organizations, and international emergency management and cooperation shall be consolidated and continued within the nonproliferation and international security program.

Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $50,000,000 for this program to assist the Russian Federation in ceasing its production of weapons-grade plutonium production by providing replacement power production capacity.

Fissile Materials Disposition.—The Committee recommendation includes $656,505,000, the same as the budget request. This program conducts activities in both the United States and Russia to dispose of fissile materials that would pose a threat to the United States if acquired by hostile nations or terrorist groups.

Excess weapons grade plutonium in Russia is a clear and present danger to the security of the United States because of the possibility that it will fall into the hands of non-Russian entities or provide Russia with the ability to rebuild its nuclear arsenal at a rate the United States may be unable to equal. For that reason, the Committee considers the Department's material disposition program of comparable importance to weapons activities; both are integral components of our national effort to reduce any threat posed to the United States and to deter the threat that remains.

The Committee recommendation includes $193,805,000 for U.S. surplus materials disposition, the same as the budget request.

Construction.—

Project 99–D–141 Pit Disassembly & Conversion Facility.—The Committee recommends $13,600,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 99–D–143 Mixed Oxide [MOX] Fuel Fabrication Facility.—The Committee recommends $402,000,000, the same as the budget request.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $46,917,000 in prior year balances.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2003	$702,196,000
Budget estimate, 2004	768,400,000
Committee recommendation	768,400,000

The Committee recommendation includes $768,400,000, the same as the budget request.

The Naval Reactors account funds the design, development, and testing necessary to provide the Navy with safe, militarily effective nuclear propulsion plants in keeping with the Nation's nuclear-powered fleet defense requirements. During 2003, the program expects to exceed 126 million miles safely steamed by the nuclear fleet, and will continue to support and improve operating reactors and plant components, and carry out test activities and

verification. Additionally, Naval Reactors will continue to develop nuclear reactor plant components and systems for the Navy's new attack submarine and next-generation aircraft carriers, and continue to maintain the highest standards of environmental stewardship by responsibly inactivating shut down prototype reactor plants.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 2003	$325,102,000
Budget estimate, 2004	347,980,000
Committee recommendation	337,980,000

The Committee recommendation includes $337,980,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request.

The Office of the Administrator account provides corporate planning and oversight for programs funded by the Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Naval Reactors appropriations including the National Nuclear Security Administration field offices. This account provides the Federal salaries and other expenses of the Administrator's direct staff, headquarters employees, and employees at the field service center and site offices. Program Direction for Naval Reactors remains within that program's account, and program direction for the Secure Transportation Asset remains in Weapons Activities.

The National Nuclear Security Administration Act and subsequent Appropriations Acts have included requirements or direction to develop and implement a planning, programming, and budgeting system. The Committee directs the Department to retain the Institute for Defense Analysis to conduct an independent assessment of the NNSA's PPBS process and structure, including its comparability to that of the Department of Defense. The review should also determine whether the NNSA's PPBS is capable of being used as the central decision making process for resource allocation decisions and the extent to which it has been incorporated by NNSA M&O contractors.

In December 2003, the National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA] implemented a major reorganization. The new organizational structure eliminated a layer of management and set the NNSA to achieve an overall 20 percent reduction in Federal personnel, with Headquarters committing to take a 30 percent cut. The Administrator said the reorganization follows the principles of the President's Management Agenda, which strives to improve Government through performance and results. As a result of this organizational change, the NNSA field operation was affected the most. An NNSA Service Center was established in Albuquerque, New Mexico, consolidating numerous functions from the previous field operations offices. This consolidation of functions was done to streamline business functions and involves the movement of personnel from the previous Nevada and Oakland Operations Offices. The movement of personnel is scheduled to be complete by the end of fiscal year 2004. The Committee directs the Administrator to forward to the House and Senate Committees, no later than October 31, 2003, a position-by-position listing of the exact Headquarters jobs to be eliminated in order to achieve the agreed-to 30 percent Federal personnel reduction.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The 2004 budget proposes to restructure Environmental Management programs. Activities funded under the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management account, the Defense Facilities Closure Projects account, and the Defense Environmental Management Privatization account in 2003 and prior years are transferred to the Defense Site Acceleration Completion account and the Defense Environmental Services accounts.

The Department is pursuing alternative accelerated cleanup and risk-reduction strategies that are intended to significantly reduce life-cycle cost and schedules for cleanup of the former nuclear weapons production complex. When the Department reaches agreement with regulatory officials on these strategies, establishes a new funding profile and estimates the cost savings for the alternate cleanup strategy, these activities will be funded within the appropriate Defense or Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion accounts.

The Department's defense environmental management program is responsible for identifying and reducing health and safety risks, and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out defense nuclear energy or weapons research and production activities which resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination. The Environmental Management program goals are to eliminate and manage the urgent risk in the system; emphasize health and safety for workers and the public; establish a system that increases managerial and financial control; and establish a stronger partnership between DOE and its stakeholders.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT CONTRACT PERFORMANCE AND OVERSIGHT

The Committee notes with concern the recent notification by the Department that the Hanford Waste Treatment Plant, Richland, Washington, construction project baseline would increase from $4,350,000,000 to $5,781,000,000, an increase of over $1,400,000,000. The relative lack of outrage over a baseline change of that magnitude speaks volumes about what the Congress and public have come to expect from the Department's clean-up program. The tank waste treatment project has a long and sordid history that indicates both the magnitude of the task before the Department, as well as the Department's historic combination of overly optimistic cost estimates coupled with consistent project mismanagement. The Committee notes its concern in the demonstrated pattern of Departmental officials announcing reform of some aspect of the clean-up program, only to depart and be replaced by a new set of officials coming before the Committee to describe dramatic cost overruns on the project baselines promised by their predecessors, and claiming no responsibility for the assumptions underlying those previous commitments.

The Department is now into the second year of entering into new acceleration and reform agreements consistent with the policy conclusions of the Secretary's 2001 top-to-bottom review of the environmental clean-up program. The effort is commendable in its success in focusing the Department and its stakeholders on the impor-

tance of completing clean-up activities decades earlier than planned. The acceleration agreements entered into at the various clean-up sites have allowed the Department to book huge paper out-year savings and acceleration of completion dates. For example, the Department is claiming savings of $12,000,000,000 and 20 years at the Savannah River Site, South Carolina; $30,000,000,000 and 35 years at Hanford, Washington; $2,000,000,000 and 6 years at Oak Ridge, Tennessee; and $19,000,000,000 and 35 years at Idaho. In many cases the savings are based on assumed changes in law, yet-to-be reformed regulatory environments, contractor savings, and other highly optimistic assumptions. The Department has had its successes, most notably Rocky Flats, Colorado, and should be commended. But even with such highlights, the weight of the historical record leaves the Committee to question who will be around in the future (other than the taxpayers) when these estimated cost savings will inevitably be revised.

Thus, the Committee recommendation includes an additional $5,000,000 for the Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation to increase its oversight of the Department's new acceleration and reform clean-up agreements. The Department is directed to report back to the Committee by March 15, 2004, on a proposal to utilize the additional funds to establish a formal process by which the Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation shall certify to the Committees that new acceleration and reform agreements based on the site performance management plans are comprehensive in their cost estimates and contain adequate contingency. Among the items that should be considered are, for example, whether the contract cost estimate is dependent on any change of existing law or regulation, whether contract success is dependent on the development of certain technology; whether the contract estimate contains reserves for normal or foreseeable project evolution; or other items that would allow both the Department and the Congress to improve oversight and confidence in the cost savings promised in the acceleration and reform agreements.

DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION

Appropriations, 2003	$0
Budget estimate, 2004	5,814,635,000
Committee recommendation	5,770,695,000

The Defense Site Acceleration Completion account funds programs responsible for managing and addressing the environmental legacy resulting from nuclear weapons related activities. The account's activities are funded within the following subprograms.

2006 ACCELERATED COMPLETIONS

The Committee recommendation includes $1,245,171,000, the same as the budget request. This program includes all geographic sites with an accelerated cleanup plan closure date of 2006 or earlier (such as Rocky Flats, Fernald and Mound). In addition, this account provides funding for Environmental Management [EM] sites where overall site cleanup will not be complete by 2006 but cleanup projects within a site will be complete by 2006.

The Committee strongly urges the Department to establish and implement a plan, or use existing plans, in which the waste material in the Fernald silos will be packaged, transported, and disposed at a commercial, NRC-licensed or Agreement State-licensed facility. The Fernald silos' waste is waste from processing ore for its source material content and disposal of this waste as if it were "11e.(2) by-product material" is critical to meeting the congressional expectation of a safe, timely and cost-effective closure of the Fernald facility by 2006.

2012 ACCELERATED COMPLETIONS

The Committee recommendation includes $2,221,714,000, a reduction of $6,600,000 from the request. This program includes all geographic sites with an accelerated cleanup plan closure date of 2007 through 2012 (such as Pantex and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory—Site 300). In addition, this account provides funding for EM sites where overall site cleanup will not be complete by 2012 but cleanup projects within a site will be complete by 2012.

The Committee recommendation reflects the transfer of $6,600,000 from the Office of Environmental Management to the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology at Idaho National Laboratory for support of deferred landlord activities.

2035 ACCELERATED COMPLETIONS

The Committee recommendation includes $1,899,384,000, an increase of $6,500,000 above the request. This program provides funding for site closures and site specific cleanup and closure projects that are expected to be completed after 2012 but by 2035.

The Department is expected to continue making PILT payments to counties that have the Hanford reservation within their boundaries and at last year's level. Within available funds for activities on the Hanford reservation, the Committee also directs the Department to fund the following: The Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program at levels consistent with fiscal year 2003 levels. The Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 for the worker training programs at the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response Training and Education Center [HAMMER] and $1,000,000 to support communications infrastructure, oversight, and management activities for HAMMER. In fiscal year 2003 the Committee directed that this program was to be transferred to the Department of Homeland Security and is disappointed that this has not yet occurred. The Committee recognizes the critical importance of HAMMER to Washington State and the Nation and expects the Department to make every effort to transfer this program to the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2004 and beyond. Finally, the Committee provides $1,000,000 to the State of Oregon to cover costs of its clean-up effort, including emergency drills, planning activities, technical review of Departmental waste management and clean-up plans, participation in the Hanford Advisory Board meetings and other meetings at Hanford.

The Department is directed to pay its title V air permitting fees at the Idaho National Laboratory consistent with prior year levels.

The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $1,356,000 for activities at Amchitka Island, Alaska.

The Committee also encourages the Office of Environmental Management to assess the capabilities of the Fire Training Academy in Elko, Nevada, to determine if it has utility to the Department as a place to conduct environmental management training activities. The Department should report back to the House and Senate Committees by December 31, 2003.

The conferees are aware that the resolution of the Pit 9 dispute at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory has been in process for over 5 years at the cost of tens of millions of dollars in legal expenses with no appreciable progress. In the Statement of the Managers accompanying the fiscal year 2003 Omnibus Appropriations Act, the Department of Energy was directed to participate in mediation and failing that to go to binding arbitration to end this dispute and proceed with clean up activities. The conferees note with disappointment that the Department has made little or no progress toward that end. The Pit 9 litigation should be brought to an end as expeditiously as possible.

Carlsbad Field Office.—The recommendation includes an additional $3,500,000 which shall be made available to the Carlsbad community for educational support, infrastructure improvements, and related initiatives to address the impacts of accelerated operations.

The Committee understand that the Carlsbad Field Office has established a joint task force with the City of Carlsbad to evaluate the needs, functions, and requirements of a record center in Carlsbad. In order to provide more timely information in a useable format to citizens, researchers, stakeholders, and regulators, the Committee provides an additional $2,000,000 directs the Department to consolidate at Carlsbad, all record archives relevant to the operations of WIPP and the TRU waste in the repository.

The Committee directs the Department to utilize up to $5,000,000 from within funds available to the Office of Environmental Management to support the important work of the National Border Technology Partnership Program to reduce waste streams that threaten public health and safety in collaboration with the United States-Mexico Border Health Commission.

Waste Analysis Requirements for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.—The Committee recognizes that the WIPP facility is central to the cleanup of the nuclear weapons complex and that waste should be emplaced as quickly and safely as possible—for reasons of reducing clean-up costs, public safety, and with the growing threat of radiological terrorism, for national security. Current law and regulation regarding the sampling and analysis of waste destined for WIPP produces substantial health and safety risks to workers with little if any corresponding public benefit. Both the New Mexico Environmental Evaluation Group, an independent WIPP oversight group, and the National Academy of Sciences have strongly suggested that waste destined for disposal at WIPP should not undergo hazardous waste sampling and analysis. To this end, the Committee believes that eliminating dangerous and excessive waste confirmation requirements that offer little if any benefit to the health and safety of the public will serve the national interests

inherent in the safe and expeditious cleanup of the nuclear weapons complex. For these reasons, the Committee has included language in section 310 that requires that waste characterization be limited to determining that the waste is not ignitable, corrosive, or reactive. This confirmation will be performed using radiography or visual examination of a representative subpopulation of the waste. The language further directs the Secretary of Energy to seek a modification to the WIPP Hazardous Waste Facility Permit to implement the provisions of this bill by December 31, 2003. The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for regulatory and technical assistance to the State of New Mexico to amend the existing WIPP Hazardous Waste Permit to comply with the provisions of the bill.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation includes $299,977,000, the same as the request. The safeguards and security line identifies the funding necessary for all safeguard and security requirements for sites at which Office of Environmental Management has responsibility. This includes activities related to site-specific safeguards and security plans; facilities master security plans, cyber security plans, and personnel security programs at EM sites.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT

The Committee recommendation includes $85,080,000, an increase of $21,160,000 over the budget request. This program focuses on high priority technical needs at near-term closure sites and projects. In addition, the technology program will focus on identifying technical vulnerabilities and alternative solutions in support of the Department's accelerated cleanup strategies.

Within available funds, the Committee provides $6,000,000 for the Western Environmental Technology Office; $6,000,000 for the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory; and $4,350,000 for the University Research Programs in Robotics.

The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for the subsurface science research institute under development with Idaho National Laboratory and the Inland Northwest Research Alliance [INRA] institutions.

The Department is directed to renew its cooperative agreements with the University of Nevada-Las Vegas through its Research Foundation, and the University of Nevada-Reno.

The Department shall continue its support of the Tribal Colleges Initiative grant, involving Crownpoint Institute of Technology, Diné College, Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute, to develop high-quality environmental programs at tribal colleges.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $4,000,000 for continued support of the international agreement and collaboration with AEA Technology to address alternative cost effective technologies for cleaning up legacy waste.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation for Defense Site Acceleration Completion includes a funding adjustment of $65,000,000 for use of

prior year balances and anticipated schedule slippage, a reduction of $15,924,000 from the current year level.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Appropriations, 2003	$0
Budget estimate, 2004	995,179,000
Committee recommendation	987,679,000

The Defense Environmental Services account funds defense related activities that indirectly support the primary environmental management mission of accelerated risk reduction and closure. The programs and activities are funded within the following subprograms.

COMMUNITY AND REGULATORY SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $63,837,000, an increase of $2,500,000 over the request. This program funds activities that are indirectly related to on-the-ground cleanup results and are integral to the Department's ability to conduct cleanup at sites (for example, Agreements in Principle with State regulators and tribal nations, and Site Specific Advisory Boards).

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $2,500,000 for the Waste Management Education and Research Consortium consistent with the terms of its cooperative agreement with the Department. From within available funds, $500,000 shall be used to support the Energy and Environmental Hispanic Community Participation project of the Self Reliance Foundation needed to increase Hispanic community understanding of and participation in environmental management initiatives of the Department.

The Committee encourages the Department of Energy to continue to work collaboratively with the Western States to reach consensus on mutually agreeable routes for the transportation of transuranic nuclear waste to the Waste Isolation Plant in New Mexico. The Committee believes that the success of the WIPP Program Implementation Guide agreed to by the Department and the Western Governor's Association can be attributed to the cooperative relationship between the States and DOE. The Committee urges DOE to continue to work in a cooperative fashion with the States toward consensus and concurrence on proposed shipping routes.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING [D&D] FUND

The Committee recommendation includes $452,000,000, the same as the budget request. This program funds the Federal Government contribution to the Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund, as required by the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

NON-CLOSURE ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommendation includes $189,698,000, the same as the budget request. This program funds ongoing activities that indirectly support the Environmental Management accelerated cleanup and closure mission. These activities provide valuable support to other Departmental priorities and missions.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation includes $282,144,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request. This program provides the funding necessary for oversight and management functions for the EM program, including Federal salaries and benefits, travel, and other costs.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2003	$511,659,000
Budget estimate, 2004	522,678,000
Committee recommendation	492,209,000

The Other Defense Activities account provides funding for the following Departmental offices and functions: security; intelligence; counterintelligence; independent oversight and performance assurance; defense-related environment, safety and health support; worker and community transition, legacy management; and hearings and appeals.

SECURITY

The Committee recommendation includes $211,757,000, the same as the budget request.

The security program consists of the following elements: nuclear safeguards and security, security investigations, and program direction. These programs provide policy for the protection of the Department's nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, classified information, and facilities. They ensure a Department-wide capability to continue essential functions across a wide range of potential emergencies, allowing DOE to uphold its national security responsibilities and provide security clearances for Federal and contractor personnel.

INTELLIGENCE

The Committee recommendation includes $39,823,000 for intelligence activities, the same as the budget request.

The intelligence program is focused on providing the Department, other U.S. Government policy makers, and the Intelligence Community with foreign intelligence technical analyses and technology applications relevant to the Department's core missions and unique capabilities.

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

The Committee recommendation includes $45,955,000, the same as the budget request.

The counterintelligence program is responsible for the development and implementation of an effective program throughout the Department to identify, neutralize and deter foreign government or industrial intelligence, and international terrorist activities at or involving departmental programs, personnel, facilities, technologies, classified information and unclassified sensitive information.

The Department has proposed consolidating the counterintelligence activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration

into one office within the Department of Energy. While the Department's concerns about the duplication of effort and inefficiency are valid, the Committee is not prepared to accept the notion that the Department, rather than the NNSA, is the appropriate home for the consolidated counterintelligence program. The most critical counterintelligence programs are currently found in the NNSA, not the Department. In the view of the Committee, a preferable solution may be to move the Department's counterintelligence programs into the NNSA.

INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Committee recommendation includes $22,575,000 for independent oversight and performance assurance, the amount of the budget request.

The Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance program provides independent evaluation and oversight of safeguards, security, environment, safety, health emergency management, cyber security and other critical functions for the Department.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $105,761,000, a decrease of $1,925,000 from the budget request. The recommendation includes $17,410,000 for program direction, a reduction of $3,000,000 from the budget request.

The defense-related environment, safety and health program is a corporate resource that provides Departmental leadership and management to protect the workers, public, and environment in the areas of oversight, health studies, radiation effects research, employee compensation support, and program direction.

The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to continue the DOE worker records digitization project through the Research Foundation at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas. The Committee continues to be concerned that the Department has failed to recognize the importance of automating records management processes and continues to encumber extraordinary costs by employing labor intensive procedures in support of these requirements. Though the Committee recommended a Department-wide standardization of processes to ensure data preservation and access, the Committee is not aware of a comprehensive coordinated effort being undertaken within the Department. The Committee is also aware that even within the Environment Safety & Health organization, parallel activities were undertaken to digitize worker records while another part of the organization sought the digitization of similar worker records to support the Employee Compensation Initiative. To the extent that there is a desire to digitize records in support of the ECI, the Committee strongly encourages the Department to utilize the existing program at UNLV.

The Committee recommends $3,075,000, an increase of $2,075,000 above the request, for medical monitoring at the gaseous diffusion plants at Paducah, Kentucky, Portsmouth, Ohio, and Oak Ridge, Tennessee. This will fully fund, as required by law, the worker screening program for both current and former workers. The Committee strongly supports and requires the continued use of helical low-dose CAT scanning for early lung cancer detection in

workers with elevated risks of lung cancer. Such tests may detect lung cancers at an early stage even when they are not visible with conventional x-rays. The program in place at the gaseous diffusion plants is successfully identifying early lung cancers at a stage when they are treatable and can be expected to dramatically increase survival rates.

The Committee supports and is pleased with the Department's efforts to expand the Voluntary Protection Program [VPP] and other voluntary cooperative programs. The Department's work in expanding participation in the program and promoting prompt review and processing of applications is particularly noteworthy. In fiscal year 2004, the Committee expects DOE to continue to place priority on the DOE–VPP as it is an important part of the Department's ability to ensure worker safety and health.

The Committee urges the Department to consider, as appropriate, requiring its contractor at the Nevada Test Site to assume responsibility for self-insuring for worker compensation for all diagnosed occupationally induced hearing loss claims for those employed at the Nevada Test Site prior to 1994, to notify former employees and the State of Nevada, and to reimburse the DOE contractor for the related costs.

Energy Employees Compensation Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes $16,000,000, the amount of the request, for the Energy Employees Compensation Initiative. Title 36 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2001 (Public Law 106–398) established the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation program to provide benefits to DOE contractor workers made ill as a result of exposures from nuclear weapons production. The Department is responsible for establishing procedures to assist workers in filing compensation claims.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation includes $57,525,000, an increase of $10,000,000 from the budget request.

The Department proposes the creation of a new Office of Legacy Management in fiscal year 2004. The purpose of the office would be to conduct stewardship activities at sites where active environmental remediation as a result of weapons production has been completed. These activities include records management, groundwater monitoring and the administration of post closure contractor liabilities. The Committee endorses the creation of such an office and also recommends that the new Office of Legacy Management incorporate the mission and budget of the Office of Worker and Community Transition. Beginning in fiscal year 2004, those activities carried out pursuant to section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1993 to provide options to assist workers affected by workforce restructuring, assistance to communities, and disposition of excess assets shall be carried out by the new Office of Legacy Management.

The Committee directs the Department to complete without further delay the remaining record of decision for the Weldon Spring Site Remedial Action Project and provide such funding as it necessary for remaining site clean-up activities.

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $25,000,000 for National Security Programs Administrative support. This fund pays for departmental services that are provided in support of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

The Committee recommendation includes $3,797,000 for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, the same as the budget request.

The Office of Hearings and Appeals conducts all of the Department's adjudicative process and provides various administrative remedies as may be required.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2003	$312,952,000
Budget estimate, 2004	430,000,000
Committee recommendation	285,000,000

The Committee recommends $285,000,000 for defense nuclear waste disposal, a decrease of $65,000,000 from the budget request.

This account provides the Federal Government's fiscal year 2004 contribution to the nuclear waste repository program to support nuclear waste repository activities attributed to atomic energy defense activities.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

All Power Marketing Administrations except Bonneville are funded annually with appropriations, and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury. Bonneville operations are self-financed under authority of Public Law 93–454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, which authorizes Bonneville to use its revenues to finance operating costs, maintenance and capital construction, and sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The Bonneville Power Administration [BPA] is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000 square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent states in the Columbia River basin. BPA markets hydroelectric power from 21 multipurpose water resource projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and 10 projects of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, plus some energy from non-Federal generating projects in the region. These generating resources and BPA's transmission system are operated as an integrated power system with operating and financial

results combined and reported as the Federal Columbia River Power System [FCRPS]. BPA is the largest power wholesaler in the Northwest and provides about 45 percent of the region's electric energy supply and about three-fourths of the region's electric power transmission capacity.

BPA finances its operations on the basis of the self-financing authority provided by Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974 (Transmission Act) (Public Law 93–454) and the borrowing authority provided by the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (Pacific Northwest Power Act) (Public Law 96–501) for energy conservation, renewable energy resources and capital fish facilities. Authority to borrow is available to the BPA on a permanent, indefinite basis.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2003	$4,505,000
Budget estimate, 2004	5,100,000
Committee recommendation	5,100,000

The Southeastern Power Administration markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers projects in 11 Southeastern States. There are 23 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092 megawatts. Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through transmission arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

The Committee recommendation includes $34,400,000 for purchase power and wheeling activities, an increase of $19,937,000 over the current year level.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2003	$27,200,000
Budget estimate, 2004	28,600,000
Committee recommendation	28,600,000

The Southwestern Power Administration is the marketing agent for the power generated at Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana with a total installed capacity of 2,158 megawatts. It operates and maintains some 1,380 miles of transmission lines, 24 generating projects, and 24 substations, and sells its power at wholesale primarily to publicly and cooperatively owned electric distribution utilities.

The Committee recommendation includes $2,800,000 for purchase power and wheeling activities, an increase of $1,288,000 over the current year level.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2003	$167,760,000
Budget estimate, 2004	171,000,000
Committee recommendation	177,950,000

The Western Area Power Administration is responsible for marketing electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission which operate hydropower generating plants in 15 Central and Western States encompassing a 1.3-million-square-mile geographic area. Western is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of almost 17,000 miles of high-voltage transmission lines with more than 260 substations.

Utah Mitigation and Conservation Fund.—This fund is dedicated primarily for environmental mitigation expenditures covering fish and wildlife, and recreation resources impacted by the Central Utah Project and the Colorado River Storage Project in the State of Utah. For fiscal year 2004, the President's Budget proposes to transfer the authorities and future contributions for the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account from the Secretary of Energy, Western Area Power Administration, to the Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. The Committee recommendation does not include this change in law. Of the total resources available to the Western Power Administration, $6,200,000 shall be transferred to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission. The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 on a non-reimbursable basis for a transmission study on the placement of 500 MW of wind energy in North Dakota and South Dakota.

The Committee recommendation includes $186,100,000 for purchase power and wheeling activities, an increase of $29,976,000 over the current year level.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

The Committee recommendation is $2,640,000, the same as the budget request.

Creation of the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund was directed by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994–95. This legislation also directed that the fund be administered by the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission to defray operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams in Texas.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2003	$192,000,000
Budget estimate, 2004	199,400,000
Committee recommendation	199,400,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2003	−$192,000,000
Budget estimate, 2004	−199,400,000
Committee recommendation	−199,400,000

The Committee recommendation includes $199,400,000, the amount of the budget request, for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC]. Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) regulates key interstate aspects of the electric power, natural gas, oil pipeline, and hydropower industries. Regulated entities pay fees and charges sufficient to recover the Government's full costs of operations.

The Federal Power Act [FPA] requires the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to collect from non-Federal hydropower project licensees reasonable annual charges to recompense the United States for a project's use, occupancy, and enjoyment of Federal lands, but in setting such charges, to seek to avoid increasing the price of power to the consumer. Since 1987, the Commission has used an established U.S. Forest Service [USFS] and Bureau of Land Management [BLM] assessment system. The method satisfies the legislative mandate to collect reasonable fees without increasing the cost of power to the consumer and provides significant administrative savings.

Recently, the General Accounting Office [GAO] conducted an analysis of the Commission's charges for use of Federal lands (GAO–03–383), and although not determining what would be a reasonable fee pursuant to the FPA, attempted to determine the net benefits of a select few hydropower projects as a substitute for fair market value. It should be noted here that the provisions of section 10(e) of the FPA do not call for the Commission to collect either fair market value or net benefits. Nevertheless, GAO concluded that the Commission is only collecting 2 percent of the fair market value. As the GAO Report itself acknowledges, the analysis of such a limited sample of projects cannot reliably be extrapolated to the unstudied projects; to obtain valid results, all projects would have to be analyzed. The cost of undertaking such analyses would be prohibitive, which was a major reason the Commission has never adopted a project-specific valuation methodology. The GAO's project-specific methodology would in most cases, result in drastic increases in charges to licensees that ultimately would be passed on to the consumers and would require extensive data collection and analysis thereby increasing the Commission's administrative costs, which would increase costs to almost all licensees, not only those which occupy Federal lands. Also, there would be a high probability that the assessed charges would be challenged resulting in further increases in administrative costs. Considering all of these factors, the GAO net benefits methodology appears to be inconsistent with the previously stated requirements of the FPA.

Therefore, the Commission's continued use of locally determined values for fixing annual charges is appropriate, administratively efficient, and consistent with the requirements of setting reasonable

charges that seek to avoid increasing the costs of power to the consumer, as required by section 10(e) of the FPA.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

(RESCISSION)

The Committee recommendation includes the rescission of $15,329,000 from Defense Environmental Management Privatization. The balances shall be derived as follow: $13,329,000 from the Paducah Disposal Facility Privatization (OR–574) and $2,000,000 from the Portsmouth Disposal Facility Privatization (OR–674).

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee's detailed funding recommendation for programs in Title III, Department of Energy, are contained in the following table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ENERGY SUPPLY		
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES		
Renewable energy technologies:		
Biomass/biofuels energy systems	69,750	75,005
Geothermal technology development	25,500	26,300
Hydrogen research	87,982	87,982
Hydropower	7,489	5,000
Solar energy	79,693	89,693
Zero energy building	4,000	.....
Wind energy systems	41,600	41,600
Intergovernmental activities	12,500	9,500
Electricity reliability	76,866	.....
Total, Renewable energy technologies	405,380	335,080
Electric energy systems and storage	.....	.....
Renewable support and implementation:		
Departmental energy management	2,300	1,800
International renewable energy program	.....	.....
Renewable energy production incentive program	.....	4,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	.....	.....
Renewable program support	.....	4,000
Total, Renewable support and implementation	2,300	9,800
National climate change technology initiative	15,000	.....
Facilities and infrastructure:		
National renewable energy laboratory	4,200	4,200
Construction:		
02–E–001 Project engineering and design, NREL Golden, CO	.....	.....
04–E–001 Science and technology facility	.....	3,500
Total, National renewable energy laboratory	4,200	7,700
Oak Ridge National Laboratory:		
Construction: 04–E–TBD Plant engineering and design (PED), energy reliability and efficiency laboratory	750	750
Total, Facilities and infrastructure	4,950	8,450

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Program direction	16,577	13,146
Subtotal, Renewable Energy Resources	444,207	366,476
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....
Reduction for nuclear hydrogen initiative	.....	−8,000
TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES	444,207	358,476
ELECTRICITY ENERGY AND ASSURANCE		
Office of Electricity and Energy Assurance	.....	45,000
High temperature superconducting R&D	.....	47,838
Program direction	.....	7,587
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY AND ENERGY ASSURANCE	.....	100,425
NUCLEAR ENERGY		
Radiological facilities management:		
Space and defense infrastructure	36,230	40,230
Medical isotopes infrastructure	26,425	26,425
Isotope support and production	.....	.....
Construction: 599–E–201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	.....	.....
Subtotal, Isotope support and production	.....	.....
Offsetting collections	.....	.....
Subtotal, Medical isotopes infrastructure	26,425	26,425
Total, Radiological facilities management	62,655	66,655
University reactor fuel assistance and support	18,500	22,000
Research and development:		
Nuclear energy plant optimization	.....	.....
Nuclear energy research initiative	12,000	12,000
Nuclear energy technologies	48,000	55,721
Nuclear hydrogen initiative	4,000	8,000
Advanced fuel cycle initiative	63,025	78,025
Total, Research and development	127,025	153,746
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	.....	.....
Idaho facilities management:		
Radiological facilities	.....	.....
ANL-West operations	31,615	44,215
Subtotal	31,615	44,215
INEEL infrastructure	31,605	31,605
Test reactor area landlord	.....	.....
Construction:		
99–E–201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	.....	.....
99–E–200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Lab, ID	1,840	1,840
95–E–201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Lab, ID	500	500
Subtotal, Construction	2,340	2,340
Subtotal, INEEL infrastructure	33,945	33,945
Total, Idaho facilities management	65,560	78,160

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	56,654	56,654
Nuclear facilities management:		
EBR–II shutdown		
Disposition of spent fuel and legacy materials		
Disposition technology activities		
Total, Nuclear facilities management		
Advanced fuel cycle initiative		
Program direction	60,207	60,207
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy	390,601	437,422
Use of prior year balances		
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	390,601	437,422
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH		
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)	10,000	6,796
Program direction	20,000	15,641
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	30,000	22,437
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES		
Technical information management program		
Program direction		
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES		
ENERGY SUPPLY INFRASTRUCTURE		
Energy Supply Infrastructure		17,600
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY INFRASTRUCTURE		17,600
Subtotal, Energy supply	864,808	936,360
General reduction		−13,000
Less security charge from reimbursable work	−3,003	−3,003
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	861,805	920,357
NON-DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION		
Accelerated completions, 2006	48,677	48,677
Accelerated completions, 2012	119,750	119,750
Accelerated completions, 2035	2,448	6,448
Subtotal	170,875	174,875
Use of prior year balances		−3,000
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION	170,875	171,875
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT		
Site closure		
Site/project completion		
Post 2006 completion		
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)		
Long-term stewardship		
Excess facilities		

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Subtotal, Non-Defense Environmental Management	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	.....	.....
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECOMTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND		
Decontamination and decommissioning	367,124	370,124
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	51,000	26,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT D&D FUND	418,124	396,124
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES		
Community and regulatory support	1,034	1,034
Environmental cleanup projects	43,842	43,842
Non-closure environmental activities	160,445	160,445
Construction: 02–U–101 Depleted uranium hexafluoride conversion project, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH	86,800	96,800
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES	292,121	302,121
URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION		
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund:		
Decontamination and decommissioning	.....	.....
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	.....	.....
Total, Uranium enrichment D&D fund	.....	.....
Other Uranium Activities:		
Maintenance and pre-existing liabilities	.....	.....
02–U–101 Depleted uranium hexafluoride conversion project, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH	.....	.....
96–U–201 DUF6 cylinder storage yard, Paducah, KY	.....	.....
Total, Other uranium activities	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....
TOTAL, URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION	.....	.....
SCIENCE		
High energy physics	.....	.....
Research & Technology	.....	.....
Facility operations	.....	.....
Proton accelerator-based physics	399,494	399,494
Electron accelerator-based physics	159,486	159,486
Non-accelerator physics	43,000	43,000
Theoretical physics	42,256	42,256
Advanced technology R&D	81,242	81,242
Subtotal	725,478	725,478
Construction: 98–G–304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	12,500	12,500
Total, High energy physics	737,978	737,978
Nuclear physics	389,430	389,430
Biological and environmental research	499,535	534,035
Construction: 01–E–300 Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics, ORNL	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Total, Biological and environmental research	499,535	534,035
Basic energy sciences:		
Research:		
Materials sciences and engineering research	567,711	567,711
Chemical sciences, geosciences and energy biosciences	220,914	220,914
Engineering and geosciences	.....	.....
Energy biosciences	.....	.....
Subtotal, Research	788,625	788,625
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	7,500	7,500
03–R–312 Center for nanophase materials sciences, ORNL	20,000	20,000
03–R–313 Center for Integrated Nenotechnology	.....	.....
02–SC–002 Project engineering and design (VL)	3,000	3,000
99–E–334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	124,600	124,600
Subtotal, Construction	219,950	219,950
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,008,575	1,008,575
Advanced scientific computing research	173,490	183,490
Energy research analyses	.....	.....
Science laboratories infrastructure:		
Infrastructure support	1,520	1,520
Oak Ridge landlord	5,079	10,079
Excess facilities disposal	5,055	5,055
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	.....	.....
MEL–001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	29,936	29,936
02–SC–001 Multiprogram energy laboratories, project engineering design, various locations	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	31,936	31,936
Total, Science laboratories infrastructure	43,590	48,590
Fusion energy sciences	257,310	257,310
Safeguards and security	48,127	51,887
Science workforce development	6,470	6,470
Science program direction:		
Field offices	83,802	80,102
Headquarters	58,217	58,217
Science education	.....	.....
Technical information management program	7,774	7,714
Energy research analyses	1,020	1,020
Total, Science program direction	150,813	147,053
Subtotal, Science	3,315,318	3,364,818
General reduction/use of prior year balances	.....	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−4,383	−4,383
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	.....	.....
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,310,935	3,360,435

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL		
Repository program	85,830	64,830
Program direction	75,170	75,170
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	161,000	140,000
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION		
Administrative operations:		
Salaries and expenses:		
Office of the Secretary	4,624	4,624
Board of Contract Appeals	653	653
Chief information officer	42,214	35,214
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,724	4,724
Economic impact and diversity	4,701	4,701
General counsel	22,879	22,879
International affairs	.....	.....
Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation	104,210	109,210
Policy office	.....	.....
Policy and international affairs	17,777	14,777
Public affairs	4,465	4,465
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	206,247	201,247
Program support:		
Minority economic impact	1,400	1,192
Policy analysis and system studies	1,000	397
Energy security and assurance	2,000	2,000
Environmental policy studies	1,500	569
Engineering and construction management reviews	.....	.....
Cybersecurity and secure communications	26,432	26,432
Corporate management information program	37,632	27,632
Subtotal, Program support	69,964	58,222
Total, Administrative operations	276,211	259,469
Cost of work for others	75,095	75,095
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	351,306	334,564
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	.....	.....
Funding from other defense activities	−25,000	−25,000
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	326,306	309,564
Miscellaneous revenues	−146,668	−146,668
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	179,638	162,896
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL		
Office of Inspector General	39,462	39,462
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	39,462	39,462
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION		
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES		
Directed stockpile work:		
Stockpile research and development	433,150	433,150
Stockpile maintenance	405,746	415,746

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Stockpile evaluation	202,885	202,885
Dismantlement/disposal	37,722	37,722
Production support	278,113	271,113
Field engineering, training and manuals	7,170	7,170
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,364,786	1,367,786
Campaigns:		
Science campaigns:		
Primary certification	65,849	64,849
Dynamic materials properties	82,251	87,251
Advanced radiography	65,985	65,985
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins	55,463	54,463
Subtotal, Science campaigns	269,548	272,548
Engineering campaigns:		
Enhanced surety	37,974	36,974
Weapons system engineering certification	28,238	27,238
Nuclear survivability	23,977	22,977
Enhanced surveillance	94,781	92,781
Advanced design and production technologies	79,917	77,917
Engineering campaigns construction activities	4,500	4,500
Construction: 01–D–108 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM	61,800	105,000
Subtotal, Engineering campaigns & construction	66,300	109,500
Subtotal, Engineering campaigns	331,187	367,387
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield	316,769	282,769
Construction: 96–D–111 National ignition facility, LLNL	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	466,769	432,769
Advanced simulation and computing	713,326	688,326
Construction:		
01–D–101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	12,300	12,300
00–D–103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	25,000	25,000
00–D–105 Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	.....	.....
00–D–107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	37,300	37,300
Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing	750,626	725,626
Pit manufacturing and certification	320,228	320,228
Readiness campaigns:		
Stockpile readiness	55,158	55,158
High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness	29,649	27,649
Non-nuclear readiness	37,397	34,397
Materials readiness	.....	.....
Tritium readiness	59,893	59,893
Construction: 98–D–125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	75,000	75,000
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	134,893	134,893
Subtotal, Readiness campaigns	257,097	252,097
Total, Campaigns	2,395,455	2,370,655

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Readiness in technical base and facilities:		
Operations of facilities	972,773	1,091,773
Program readiness	131,093	131,093
Special projects	42,975	60,025
Material recycle and recovery	76,189	76,189
Containers	16,006	16,006
Storage	11,365	11,365
Nuclear weapons incident response	89,694	89,694
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,340,095	1,476,145
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	20,000
04–D–103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	2,000	3,564
04–D–104 National security sciences building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	50,000	50,000
04–D–125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	20,500	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 SURF, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	.....	.....
03–D–102 LANL Administration Building (LANL)	.....	.....
03–D–103 Project engineering and design various locations	10,570	10,570
03–D–121 Gas transfer capacity expansion, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO	15,300	15,300
03–D–122 Purification facility, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	.....	.....
03–D–123 Special nuclear materials requalification, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	7,628	7,628
02–D–103 Project engineering and design, various locations	10,950	10,950
02–D–105 Engineering technology complex upgrade, LLNL, CA	9,776	9,776
02–D–107 Electrical power systems safety communications and bus upgrades, NV	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	.....	.....
01–D–108 Microsystems and engineering sciences applications complex (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM	.....	.....
01–D–124 HEU materials facility, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	45,000	45,000
01–D–126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	2,838	2,838
01–D–800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL, CA	.....	.....
99–D–103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	.....	.....
99–D–104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction—Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	3,500	3,500
99–D–106 Model validation & system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	.....	.....
99–D–108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	.....	.....
99–D–125 Replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	.....	.....
99–D–127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	12,475	12,475
99–D–128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	.....	.....
98–D–123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	.....	.....
98–D–124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y–12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	.....	.....
97–D–123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
96–D–102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations	1,552	1,552
Subtotal, Construction	273,376	274,940
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,613,471	1,751,085
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	261,404	261,404
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	265,123	265,123
Secure transportation asset:		
Operations and equipment	123,605	123,605
Program direction	58,795	58,795
Use of prior year balances	.....	−20,000
Total, Secure transportation asset	182,400	162,400
Safeguards and security	582,067	582,067
Construction: 99–D–132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	3,683	3,683
Total, Safeguards and security	585,750	585,750
Subtotal, Weapons activities	6,406,985	6,502,799
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....
General reduction	.....	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−28,985	−28,985
Subtotal, Weapons activities	6,378,000	6,473,814
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	.....	.....
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–206)	.....	.....
Rescission (Public Law 107–206)	.....	.....
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	.....	.....
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	6,378,000	6,473,814
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION		
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	203,873	234,873
Construction: 00–D–192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	.....	.....
Total, Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	203,873	234,873
Nonproliferation and international security	101,734	121,734
Nonproliferation programs with Russia:		
International materials protection, control, and cooperation	226,000	226,000
Accelerated highly enriched uranium (HEU) disposition	.....	.....
Russian transition initiative	40,000	50,000
HEU transparency implementation	18,000	18,000
International nuclear safety	14,083	.....
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	50,000	50,000
Accelerated materials disposition	30,000	30,000
Fissile materials disposition:		
U.S. surplus materials disposition	193,805	193,805
Russian surplus materials disposition	47,100	47,100
Construction:		
01–D–407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
99–D–141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility Savannah River, SC ..	13,600	13,600
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	402,000	402,000
Subtotal, Construction	415,600	415,600
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	656,505	656,505
Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia	1,034,588	1,030,505
Program direction	.....	.....
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,340,195	1,387,112
Use of prior year balances	.....	−46,917
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	.....	.....
Regular appropriations (Public Law 107–206)	.....	.....
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	.....	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,340,195	1,340,195
NAVAL REACTORS		
Naval reactors development	724,600	724,600
Construction:		
03–D–201 Cleanroom technology facility, Bettis atomic power lab, West Mifflin, PA	300	300
01–D–200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY	.....	.....
90–N–102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID ..	18,300	18,300
Subtotal, Construction	18,600	18,600
Total, Naval reactors development	743,200	743,200
Program direction	25,200	25,200
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	768,400	768,400
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR		
Office of the Administrator	347,980	337,980
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	.....	.....
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	347,980	337,980
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	8,834,575	8,920,389
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.		
Site/project completion:		
Operation and maintenance	.....	.....
Construction:		
03–D–414, Preliminary project engineering and design (PE&D), Aiken, SC	.....	.....
02–D–402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, INEEL, Idaho Falls, ID	.....	.....
02–D–420 Plutonium packaging and stabilization, Savannah River	.....	.....
01–D–414 Preliminary project, engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	.....	.....
99–D–402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	.....	.....
99–D–404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID	.....	.....
98–D–453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	.....	.....
96–D–471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
86–D–103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility (LLNL), Livermore, CA		
Subtotal, Construction		
Total, Site/project completion		
Post 2006 completion:		
Operation and maintenance		
Construction: 93–D–187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC		
Office of River Protection:		
Operation and maintenance		
Construction:		
03–D–403 Immobilized high-level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA		
01–D–416 Hanford waste treatment plant, Richland, WA		
97–D–402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA		
94–D–407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA		
Subtotal, Construction		
Subtotal, Office of River Protection		
Total, Post 2006 completion		
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution		
Science and technology		
Excess facilities		
Multi-site activities		
Safeguards and security		
Program direction		
Subtotal, Defense environmental management		
Use of prior year balances		
General reduction		
Less security charge for reimbursable work		
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)		
Rescission (Public Law 107–206)		
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)		
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT		
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS		
Site closure		
Safeguards and security		
TOTAL, DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS		
DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION		
Accelerated completions, 2006	1,245,171	1,245,171
Accelerated completions, 2012	1,512,554	1,505,954
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

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Total, Accelerated completions, 2012	2,228,314	2,221,714
Accelerated completions, 2035	1,892,884	1,899,384
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 engineering and design (PED), various locations	51,500	51,500
Subtotal, Construction	85,713	85,713
Total, Accelerated completions, 2035	1,978,597	1,985,097
Safeguards and security	299,977	299,977
Technology development and deployment	63,920	85,080
Subtotal, Defense site acceleration completion	5,815,979	5,837,039
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−1,344	−1,344
Use of prior year balances	.....	−65,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION	5,814,635	5,770,695
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION		
Privatization initiatives, various locations	.....	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION	.....	.....
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES		
Community and regulatory support	61,337	63,837
Federal contribution to the uranium enrichment	452,000	452,000
Non-closure environmental activities	189,698	189,698
Program direction	292,144	282,144
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES	995,179	987,679
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	6,809,814	6,758,374
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
Other national security programs:		
Energy security and assurance:		
Energy security	.....	.....
Program direction	4,272	.....
Subtotal, Energy security and assurance	4,272	.....
Office of Security:		
Nuclear safeguards and security	104,713	104,713
Security investigations	54,554	54,554
Corporate management information program	.....	.....
Cyber security and secure communications	.....	.....
Program direction	52,490	52,490
Subtotal, Office of Security	211,757	211,757
Intelligence	39,823	39,823
Counterintelligence	45,955	45,955
Independent oversight and performance assurance	22,575	22,575
Advanced accelerator applications	.....	.....
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	87,276	88,351
Program direction—EH	20,410	17,410
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	107,686	105,761

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Worker and community transition	12,321	.....
Program direction—WT	2,679	.....
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	15,000	.....
Office of Legacy Management	47,525	45,216
Program Direction	.....	12,309
Subtotal, Office of Legacy Management	47,525	57,525
National Security programs administrative support	25,000	25,000
Office of hearings and appeals	3,797	3,797
Subtotal, Other defense activities	523,390	512,193
Use of prior year balances	.....	−15,000
Less security charge for reimbursable work	−712	−712
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–117)	.....	.....
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 107–206)	.....	.....
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	.....	.....
Less transfer of Energy Security and Assurance	.....	−4,272
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	522,678	492,209
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL		
Defense nuclear waste disposal	430,000	285,000
CERRO GRANDE FIRE ACTIVITIES		
Cerro Grande fire activities (rescission)	−75,000	.....
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	16,522,067	16,455,972
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS		
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance:		
Purchase power and wheeling	15,000	34,400
Program direction	5,100	5,100
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	20,100	39,500
Offsetting collections	.....	−19,400
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)	−15,000	−15,000
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	5,100	5,100
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance:		
Operating expenses	4,663	4,663
Purchase power and wheeling	288	2,800
Program direction	19,205	19,205
Construction	4,732	4,732
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	28,888	31,400
Offsetting collections	.....	−2,512
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)	−288	−288
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	28,600	28,600

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance:		
Construction and rehabilitation	12,200	12,950
System operation and maintenance	36,204	36,204
Purchase power and wheeling	20,000	186,100
Program direction	126,588	126,588
Utah mitigation and conservation	.....	6,200
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	194,992	368,042
Offsetting collections	.....	−166,100
Offsetting collections (Public Law 98–381)	−3,992	−3,992
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)	−20,000	−20,000
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	171,000	177,950
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND		
Operation and maintenance	2,640	2,640
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	207,340	214,290
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION		
Federal energy regulatory commission	199,400	199,400
FERC revenues	−199,400	−199,400
Subtotal, Federal energy regulatory commission	.....	.....
Defense Environmental Management Privatization (rescission)	.....	−15,329
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	22,163,367	22,148,203

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The following list of general provisions are recommended by the Committee. The recommendation includes several provisions which have been included in previous Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts and new provisions as follows:

Language under section 301 prohibits the use of funds to award, amend or modify a contract in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulations unless on a case-by-case basis, a waiver is granted by the Secretary of Energy. Similar language was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2003.

Language is included under section 302 which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to develop or implement a workforce restructuring plan or enhanced severance payments and other benefits for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 484. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2003.

Language is included under section 303 which prohibits the use of funds for severance payments under the worker and community transition program. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2003.

Language is included under section 304 which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to initiate requests for proposals or expression of interest for new programs which have not yet been presented to Congress in the annual budget submission, and which have not yet been approved and funded by Congress. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2003.

Language is included under section 305 which permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2003.

Language is included under section 306 that prohibits the use of funds by the Bonneville Power Administration to enter into energy efficiency contracts outside its service area.

Language is included under section 307 which provides that the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration may authorize 2 percent of the amount allocated to a nuclear weapons production plant for the production plant to engage in research, development, and demonstration activities with respect to the Engineering and manufacturing capabilities of the plant in order to maintain and enhance such capabilities at the plant. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2003.

Language is included in section 308 specifically authorizing intelligence activities pending enactment of the fiscal year 2004 Intelligence Authorization Act.

Language is included under section 309 which provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to dispose of transuranic waste in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant which contains concentrations of plutonium in excess of 20 percent by weight for the aggregate of any material category on the date of enactment of this Act, or generated after such date. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2003.

Language is included in section 310 that requires that waste characterization at WIPP be limited to determining that the waste is not ignitable, corrosive, or reactive. This confirmation will be performed using radiography or visual examination of a representative subpopulation of the waste. The language directs the Department of Energy to seek a modification to the WIPP Hazardous Waste Facility Permit to implement the provisions of this bill by December 31, 2003.

Language is included in section 311 that allows the Department to dispose of certain waste at Fernald, Ohio as "byproduct material" as defined by section 11e.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act.

Language is included in section 312 that requires the Secretary to collect fees for Army Corps of Engineers hydropower operation and maintenance funding under certain conditions.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2003	$70,827,000
Budget estimate, 2004	33,145,000
Committee recommendation	71,145,000

The Committee recommendation for the Appalachian Regional Commission totals $71,145,000, $38,000,000 more than the request.

The Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is composed of the Governors of the 13 Appalachian States and a Federal cochairman who is appointed by the President.

Consistent with the administration's budget request, the Committee recommendation does not include funding for ARC highways. Funding for ARC development highways is provided through the Highway Trust Fund in fiscal years 1999 through 2004 consistent with provision contained in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act.

The Committee recognizes the importance of trade and investment opportunities to the Appalachian region, and is encouraged by the findings of a preliminary trade report determining that Appalachian firms might find significant trade and investment opportunities, particularly in the energy, high technology, and transportation sectors, in the Republic of Turkey and the surrounding region. In this regard, the Committee supports the Appalachian-Turkish Trade Project [ATTP], a project to promote opportunities to expand trade, encourage business interests, stimulate foreign studies, and to build a lasting and mutually meaningful relationship between the Appalachian States and the Republic of Turkey, as well as the neighboring regions, such as Greece. The Committee commends the ARC for its leadership role in helping to implement the mission of the ATTP. The Committee expects the ARC to continue to be a prominent ATTP sponsor.

The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to construct a multi-purpose facility for Noxubee County, Mississippi. The Committee typically does not choose to direct funding to specific projects within the jurisdiction of the Appalachian Regional Commission. However, the Committee notes the severe economic conditions in this poor rural area require immediate action, and believes it appropriate to exercise the Congressional prerogative in this case.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2003	$18,876,000
Budget estimate, 2004	19,559,000
Committee recommendation	19,559,000

An appropriation of $19,559,000, the amount of the request, is recommended for fiscal year 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 also responsible for investigating any event or practice at a defense nuclear facility which has or may adversely affect public health and safety. 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.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2003	$7,948,000
Budget estimate, 2004	2,000,000
Committee recommendation	7,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,000,000 for the Delta Regional Authority.

The Delta Regional Authority [DRA], authorized by Public Law 106–554, was established to assist an eight-state, 236-county region of demonstrated distress in obtaining transportation and basic public infrastructure, skills training, and opportunities for economic development essential to strong local economies.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2003	$47,688,000
Budget estimate, 2004	9,500,000
Committee recommendation	48,500,000

The Committee recommendation includes $48,500,000 for the Denali Commission.

The Denali Commission is a regional economic development agency established in 1998 for the intended purpose of delivering basic utilities, including affordable power, and other essential infrastructure to the nation's most geographically isolated communities. The Committee is encouraged by the progress of the Denali Commission in assisting distressed communities throughout Alaska, and urges continued work among local and State agencies, nonprofit organizations and other participants in meeting the most pressing infrastructure needs.

The Committee recommendation includes funding for the Eyak power plant remediation project, relocation and modernization of the Nome power plant, the Tok/Chistochina transmission line, the Fire Island power line extension, and the CVEA co-generation project.

Of the amounts provided to the Denali Commission, $5,000,000 is for community showers and washeteria in villages with homes with no running water; $5,000,000 is for multi-purpose community facilities including the Bering Straits Region; $10,000,000 is for teacher housing in remote villages such as Savoogna, Allakaket, Hughes, Huslia, Minto, Nulato, and Ruby where there is limited housing available for teachers which, in some instances, forces

teachers to live in their schools; $10,000,000 is for facilities serving Native elders and senior citizens to enable them to remain in their home village; and $5,000,000 is for (1) the Rural Communications service to provide broadcast facilities in communities with no television or radio station or no more than one television or radio station and (2) the Public Broadcasting Digital Distribution Network to link rural broadcasting facilities together to improve economies of scale, share programming, and reduce operating costs.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2003	$577,806,000
Budget estimate, 2004	618,800,000
Committee recommendation	618,800,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2003	−$520,087,000
Budget estimate, 2004	−538,844,000
Committee recommendation	−538,844,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2003	$57,719,000
Budget estimate, 2004	79,956,000
Committee recommendation	79,956,000

The Committee recommendation includes $79,956,000, the same amount as the request, for the Commission.

Nuclear energy received a strong endorsement in the National Energy Policy of May 2001 and serious industry interest has emerged in building a new generation of nuclear power plants in the United States to meet the Nation's electricity demands. Three nuclear utilities have announced intentions to submit early site permit applications to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC]. Others are also expected to submit early site permit applications over the next few years. Industry has proposed a new risk-informed regulatory framework to license the next generation of plants. The framework would build on the successful structure of the revised reactor oversight process and be reactor design neutral. NRC should evaluate the merits of this approach and establish the new framework through rulemaking.

The Committee recommendation for the NRC is $618,800,000. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $538,844,000 resulting in a net appropriation of $79,956,000.

Fee Recovery.—Pursuant to the agreement reached in fiscal year 2001, the NRC is required to recover 92 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the Nuclear Waste Fund, by assessing license and annual fees.

Reports.—The Committee directs the Commission to continue to provide monthly reports on the status of its licensing and other regulatory activities. In addition, continued congressional oversight is necessary to ensure the NRC streamlines its business processes

to improve regulatory efficiency while reducing unnecessary burden on licensees.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2003	$6,797,000
Budget estimate, 2004	7,300,000
Committee recommendation	7,300,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2003	−$6,392,000
Budget estimate, 2004	−6,716,000
Committee recommendation	−6,716,000

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $584,000 for fiscal year 2004.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2003	$3,179,000
Budget estimate, 2004	3,177,000
Committee recommendation	3,177,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,177,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The following list of general provisions are recommended by the Committee. The recommendation includes several provisions which have been included in previous Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts:

Language is included under section 501 which provides that none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of Title 18, United States Code. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60.

Language is included under section 502 which requires that American-made equipment and goods be purchased to the greatest extent practicable. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60.

Language is included under section 503 making a technical correction to the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The recommended appropriations in title III, Department of Energy, generally are subject to annual authorization. However, the Congress has not enacted an annual Department of Energy authorization bill for several years, with the exception of the programs funded within the atomic energy defense activities which are authorized in annual defense authorization acts. The authorization for the atomic energy defense activities, contained in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2004, is currently in conference with the House.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(C), RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on July 17, 2003, the Committee ordered reported en bloc: S. 1427, an original bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004; S. 1424, an original bill making appropriations for Energy and Water Development for the fiscal

year ending September 30, 2004; and S. 1426, an original bill making appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004; each subject to amendment and each subject to the budget allocations, by a recorded vote of 29–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Stevens	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Burns	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Campbell	
Mr. Craig	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. DeWine	
Mr. Brownback	
Mr. Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Hollings	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Johnson	
Ms. Landrieu	

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee."

In compliance with this rule, changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italic; and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

With respect to this bill, it is the opinion of the Committee that it is necessary to dispense with these requirements in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93–344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation [1]	Amount of bill	Committee allocation [1]	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the Budget Resolution for 2004: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Discretionary	27,313	27,313	27,359	[1] 27,310
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2004	.....	.....	.....	[2] 18,112
2005	.....	.....	.....	7,815
2006	.....	.....	.....	1,342
2007	.....	.....	.....	36
2008 and future years	.....	.....	.....	17
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2004	NA	119	NA	23

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2003 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2003 Pappropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
General investigations	134,141	100,000	131,700	−2,441	+31,700
Construction, general	1,744,598	1,350,000	1,538,000	−206,598	+188,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	342,334	280,000	329,000	−13,334	+49,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,927,556	1,939,000	1,949,000	+21,444	+10,000
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	39,000	.....	.....	−39,000	.....
Regulatory program	138,096	144,000	139,000	+904	−5,000
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	160,000	+5,857	−11,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	4,638,827	4,194,000	4,426,700	−212,127	+232,700
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	23,489	42,463	42,463	+18,974	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	11,186	.....	.....	−11,186	.....
Subtotal	34,675	42,463	42,463	+7,788	.....
Program oversight and administration	1,317	1,728	1,728	+411	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	35,992	44,191	44,191	+8,199	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2003 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2003 Pappropriation	Budget estimate
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	808,203	771,217	853,517	+45,314	+82,300
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	25,000			−25,000	
Loan program		200	200	+200	
(Limitation on direct loans)					
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	945,317	+9,015	+67,300
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	972,294	922,208	989,508	+17,214	+67,300
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	696,858	861,805	920,357	+223,499	+58,552
Non-defense site acceleration completion		170,875	171,875	+171,875	+1,000
Non-defense environmental management	213,624			−213,624	
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund		418,124	396,124	+396,124	−22,000
Non-defense environmental services		292,121	302,121	+302,121	+10,000
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation	453,409			−453,409	
Science	3,261,328	3,310,935	3,360,435	+99,107	+49,500
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	11,000			−11,000	
Nuclear Waste Disposal	144,058	161,000	140,000	−4,058	−21,000
Departmental administration	205,280	326,306	309,564	+104,284	−16,742
Miscellaneous revenues	−120,000	−146,668	−146,668	−26,668	
Net appropriation	85,280	179,638	162,896	+77,616	−16,742

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	6,473,814	+559,405	+95,814
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	67,000	.....	.....	−67,000	.....
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,020,860	1,340,195	1,340,195	+319,335	.....
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	148,000	.....	.....	−148,000	.....
Naval reactors	702,196	768,400	768,400	+66,204	.....
Office of the Administrator	325,102	347,980	337,980	+12,878	−10,000
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	8,177,567	8,834,575	8,920,389	+742,822	+85,814
Environmental and Other Defense Activities:					
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	5,428,806	.....	.....	−5,428,806	.....
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	6,000	.....	.....	−6,000	.....
Defense facilities closure projects	1,130,915	.....	.....	−1,130,915	.....
Defense site acceleration completion	.....	5,814,635	5,770,695	+5,770,695	−43,940
Defense environmental management privatization	157,369	.....	.....	−157,369	.....
Defense environmental services	.....	995,179	987,679	+987,679	−7,500
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	6,723,090	6,809,814	6,758,374	+35,284	−51,440
Other defense activities	511,659	522,678	492,209	−19,450	−30,469
Supplemental appropriations (Public Law 108–11)	4,000	.....	.....	−4,000	.....
Defense nuclear waste disposal	312,952	430,000	285,000	−27,952	−145,000
Cerro Grande fire activities (rescission)	.....	−75,000	.....	.....	+75,000
Subtotal, Environmental and Other Defenses Activities	7,551,701	7,687,492	7,535,583	−16,118	−151,909
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	15,729,268	16,522,067	16,455,972	+726,704	−66,095
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	177,950	+10,190	+6,950
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,716	2,640	2,640	−76	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	202,181	207,340	214,290	+12,109	+6,950

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2003 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2003 Pappropriation	Budget estimate
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	192,000	199,400	199,400	+7,400	.....
Revenues applied	−192,000	−199,400	−199,400	−7,400	.....
Subtotal, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Defense Environmental Management Privatization (rescission)	.....	.....	−15,329	−15,329	−15,329
Total, title III, Department of Energy	20,834,432	22,163,367	22,148,203	+1,313,771	−15,164
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	70,827	33,145	71,145	+318	+38,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,876	19,559	19,559	+683	.....
Delta Regional Authority	7,948	2,000	7,000	−948	+5,000
Denali Commission	47,688	9,500	48,500	+812	+39,000
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	.....
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,179	3,177	3,177	−2	.....

Total, title IV, Independent agencies	206,642	147,921	229,921	+23,279	+82,000
Grand total:.					
New budget (obligational) authority	26,652,195	27,427,496	27,794,332	+1,142,137	+366,836
Appropriations	(26,652,195)	(27,507,021)	(27,814,186)	(+1,161,991)	(+307,165)
Rescissions	.....	(−79,525)	(−19,854)	(−19,854)	(+59,671)

○