Calendar No. 157

112TH CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
112–75

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012

SEPTEMBER 7, 2011.—Ordered to be printed

Mrs. FEINSTEIN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2354]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

New obligational authority

Total of bill as reported to the Senate	$32,765,568,000
Amount of 2011 appropriations	31,789,895,000
Amount of 2012 budget estimate	36,575,809,000
House allowance	30,224,061,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2011 appropriations	+975,673,000
2012 budget estimate	−3,810,241,000
House allowance	+2,541,507,000

68–134 PDF

CONTENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2012 beginning October 1, 2011, and ending September 30, 2012, 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, 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 2012 budget estimates for the bill total $36,539,809,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $31,625,000,000. This is $4,889,809,000 below the budget estimates and $57,000,000 below the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

The Committee recommendation also includes $1,044,568,000 in additional funding for disaster relief.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water held three sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2012 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

The recommendations for fiscal year 2012 therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of 29 to 1 the Committee on September 7, 2011, 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 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is made up of approximately 35,000 civilian and 650 military members that perform both military and Civil Works functions. The military and civilian engineers, scientists and other specialists work hand in hand as leaders in engineering and environmental matters. The diverse workforce of biologists, engineers, geologists, hydrologists, natural resource managers, and other professionals meets the demands of changing times and requirements as a vital part of America's Army.

The Corps' mission is to provide quality, responsive engineering services to the Nation including:

—Planning, designing, building, and operating water resources and other Civil Works projects (Navigation, Flood Control, Environmental Protection, Disaster Response, et cetera);

—Designing and managing the construction of military facilities for the Army and Air Force (Military Construction); and

—Providing design and construction management support for other Defense and Federal agencies (Interagency and International Services).

The Energy and Water bill only funds the Civil Works missions of the Corps of Engineers. Approximately 23,000 civilians and about 290 military officers are responsible for this nationwide mission.

While the Corps Civil Works programs impact all 50 States and virtually every citizen of our Nation, they are a relatively minor part of the Federal budget. Funding for the Corps comprised a little over 0.13 percent of the total Federal budget for fiscal year 2011.

OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The fiscal year 2012 budget request for the Corps of Engineers is composed of $4,609,000,000 in new budget authority including a proposed $22,000,000 rescission. This is a decrease of $308,000,000 from the fiscal year 2011 request. The budget request is $284,213,000 less than the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount. The budget request assumes a $22,000,000 rescission that was included as a part of the fiscal year 2011 enacted bill. The administration has not proposed a budget amendment to close this $22,000,000 gap. Therefore the Committee will refer to the Corps' budget request as $4,631,000,000 throughout this report.

The tradition of this bill has been that virtually all funding for the Corps of Engineers is designated to specific studies/projects. The administration's budget request for fiscal year 2012 continues this tradition. The four major study/project accounts (General Investigations, Construction, General, Mississippi River and Tributaries, and Operation and Maintenance) comprise $4,108,000,000 of the administration's overall budget request of $4,631,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers. Only $309,198,000 of the budget request in these four accounts is considered as programmatic funding. That is about 7.5 percent of the funding proposed in these accounts. The remainder of the $3,798,802,000 proposed in the four major accounts is divided among 876 individual line item studies or projects proposed by the administration. As the Corps of Engineers has no inherent programmatic authorities under which the organization was created, all of these individual studies and projects are intended to be specifically authorized by Congress and specifically funded through appropriations acts.

This Committee continues to believe that Members of Congress are best positioned to know the unique needs of their individual States and congressional districts. In past years, Congress, exercising their prerogatives under the Constitution would have added projects and studies to the administration's request to ensure that the Nation's water resource needs were met. As the four major study/project accounts in the Corps are comprised of individual line items of studies or projects, the Committee usually added line items for studies or projects that were not included in the administration's budget request or, alternatively, increased funding to items requested by the administration to accelerate the project delivery process on those items.

The line items that were added by Congress in previous years were authorized and vetted in a public process in the same manner as those line items that the administration included in their request. The difference between the items added by Congress and those included by the administration is that the administration applied a number of supplemental criterion for budgeting a study or project that the authorizations for these studies or projects does not require. Establishment of budget criteria was, and continues to be, an administrative prerogative. It should be understood that this criteria is established not necessarily to meet the Nation's water resource needs, but rather to help the administration decide which needs they choose to include in their budget request. History has shown that this criteria is extremely flexible depending on what an administration wants to fund in a given year. This Committee does not believe that this budget criteria, established by the administration without input from the public or Congress, has any more validity than the criteria that the Congress has used in the past to decide which projects to fund.

Due to the vagaries of the administration's budget criteria, the Congress has provided the consistency in funding for items within the Corps of Engineers budget. Corps of Engineers projects generally have two definitive points where Congress can decide the Federal commitment to a water resources development project. The first point is when an item is being studied. By providing the initial study funding, the Congress is making a tacit commitment that

it intends to see the study process through to completion. By the same token when a project is authorized for construction and receives its initial construction funding, that is a commitment that the Congress intends to see the project through to completion. That is why so few "new" studies and projects have been funded in recent years. Congress has acknowledged the tight fiscal environment by not creating tremendous outyear obligations for the Corps with new work.

The administration used to adhere to these two definitive starting points as well in their budget process, but that has changed in recent years. There are numerous examples of projects or studies that are included in the budget request in a given year or for several years in a row and then suddenly, due to changed budgeting criteria, they are not included.

Nearly all studies and projects are cost shared. That means a local sponsor has contractually agreed to provide a proportionate non-Federal share to match the Federal funds appropriated. When these projects are not provided either through the budget or an appropriations act, the work is deferred until funding is appropriated. This inconsistent funding, increases project costs, defers the projects benefits to the national economy and plays havoc with the non-Federal entities' financing plans for a projects and studies. Traditionally, Congress has provided the consistency for studies and projects undertaken by the Corps of Engineers through congressionally directed spending by maintaining the commitments to local sponsors and insuring consistent levels of funding for the projects or studies that were initiated or funded in appropriation acts.

A few examples will illustrate this point of this inconsistent budgeting.

Congress added initial construction funding for St. Louis flood protection in fiscal year 2008. This project was not proposed by the administration because it did not meet their budgetary criteria. Yet the administration included this project in their fiscal year 2009 and fiscal year 2010 budget and completed the project because their criteria for those years allowed it to be budgeted. Had Congress not initiated this project, it is unclear when it might have made it into the administration's budget request.

Initial funding for the Ozark-Jeta Taylor and Whitney Lake Powerhouse rehabilitations were added by Congress in fiscal year 2004. In fiscal year 2005, they were included in the administration budget request. In fiscal year 2006, neither was included in the budget request. In fiscal year 2007, neither was included in the administration budget request, but Whitney Lake was funded in the fiscal year 2007 work plan when the administration decided how the fiscal year 2007 continuing resolution funding would be administered. In fiscal year 2008, Ozark was included in the budget but Whitney was excluded. In fiscal year 2009, Ozark was in the budget request and Whitney was out. In fiscal year 2010–2012, both were excluded from the budget request. The Corps informed the Committee that the termination costs for the Ozark contract would exceed $20,000,000 in fiscal year 2011. Yet, the administration managed to include funding under the continuing resolution for fiscal year 2011 to avoid this termination even though this was not an item

that was budgeted for. In the cases of both Whitney and Ozark, Congress consistently provided needed funding through Appropriation Acts since they were initiated.

A final example is the Chicago Sanitary Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier. This project was initiated by Congress in fiscal year 2003. In fiscal year 2004 it was included in the budget request and funded by Congress at more than the administration requested. In fiscal year 2005, it was not included in the budget request but was funded by Congress. In fiscal year 2006 it was not in the budget request and no funding was provided. However, it has been requested and funded in every year from fiscal year 2007–2012. This is the main barrier designed to keep Asian carp out of the Great Lakes. How could a project as important as this be treated so inconsistently in the administration's budget request?

In fiscal year 2011 Congress was not able to provide the usual level of funding oversight and consistency because of the decision by Congress to forgo congressionally directed spending. Instead the administration was required to submit a work plan detailing how they would spend the funding provided by Congress. The administration primarily funded their budget requests with the funding included in the various accounts. With the additional funding that Congress included, the administration chose to fund a number of the line items that were funded in the fiscal year 2010 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act but not in the fiscal year 2011 budget request. However, many items funded in fiscal year 2010 were suspended.

The General Investigations Program is proposed at $104,000,000 for fiscal year 2012. This is a decrease of $22,746,000 from the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount. This account funds the preauthorization studies necessary to determine the Federal interests in a water resource problem or need.

The Construction, General account is proposed at $1,480,000,000 for fiscal year 2012. The 85 line items proposed for the construction, general account can be broken down as follows:

—Dam safety activities $436,700,000 (29.5 percent);
—Environmental compliance activities comprise $202,800,000 (13.7 percent);
—Flood control and storm damage reduction activities comprise $243,500,000 (16.5 percent);
—Coastal or deep draft navigation activities comprise $110,900,000 (7.5 percent);
—Inland and shallow draft navigation activities comprise $157,400,000 (10.6 percent);
—Ecosystem or environmental restoration activities comprise $272,600,000 (18.4 percent); and
—An additional $56,100,000 is proposed for national programs (3.8 percent).

This is a decrease of $133,822,000 from the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount. This account funds post authorization studies and physical construction of authorized projects.

The Mississippi River and Tributaries account is proposed at $152,000,000 and includes two rescissions totaling $58,000,000 that are no longer available. The actual amount requested when disregarding these rescissions is $210,000,000. This account funds

studies, construction and operation and maintenance activities along the Mississippi River and designated tributaries from Cape Giradeau, Missouri to the Gulf of Mexico.

The Operation and Maintenance account is proposed at $2,314,000,000. This is a decrease of $51,759,000 from the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount. This account funds post authorization studies of operating projects, maintenance of Federal facilities and Federal operation of facilities where authorized by law.

The Regulatory Program is proposed at $196,000,000 for fiscal year 2012. This is an increase of $6,380,000 over the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount to this program that provides the funding for the Corps nationwide regulatory roles primarily under section 404 of the Clean Water Act and section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899.

The Committee is disappointed that funding for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] proposed at $109,000,000 was cut by $20,740,000 from the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount of $129,740,000. This program was transferred to the Corps from the Department of Energy, because the Committee was concerned with management and cost issues of the program within the Energy Department. This is a program that is being well-managed by the Corps and should have stable, adequate budget resources to continue these radiological clean-up activities. This decrease in funding will further stretch out the clean-up of these sites.

The Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account is proposed at $27,000,000 for fiscal year 2012. These funds are proposed for readiness and preparedness activities for the Corps of Engineers.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) is proposed as a separate account for $6,000,000. This is $1,010,000 more than provided in fiscal year 2011. The Committee continues to believe that the Assistant Secretary's office should be funded in the Defense appropriations bill. However, until such time as this account can be reintegrated into that bill, the Committee agrees that the office should be funded as a separate account. The Assistant Secretary's duties encompass much more than the Civil Works functions of the Corps of Engineers and the budget needs of the office should be addressed separately.

The General Expenses [GE] account is proposed at $185,000,000 for fiscal year 2012. This is approximately the same as the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount. With inflation, this is a cut to the management and oversight functions of the headquarters of the Corps. The Committee notes that the Corps operates one of the most efficient headquarters staffs in the National Capital region. Only about 3.5 percent of their staffing is at headquarters as opposed to 10 percent or more for comparable agencies in the National Capital region.

THE NATION'S WATERWAY SYSTEM

The Nation's waterway system constructed, operated, and maintained by the Corps is an incredibly versatile and interconnected system providing vital linkages to other modes of transportation as well as providing benefits to the national economy of more than $7,000,000,000 through transportation savings over other available

modes of transportation. This system has been developed over the past 200 years and is starting to show its age. Whether it is lock chambers that are long past their design life or lock chambers that need to be enlarged to handle increased traffic or harbor and channel projects that need to be deepened or enlarged to handle contemporary vessel sizes, a major recapitalization of this infrastructure is needed, particularly if the Nation is to meet the President's goal of doubling exports in the next 5 years. Unfortunately only about 18 percent of the administration's proposed construction budget is dedicated to navigation projects. Despite whatever other efforts may be underway to meet this goal, the budget request for the Corps for improvements and maintenance of the waterway system falls woefully short. It is hard for this Committee to understand how exports can be doubled without improvements and adequate maintenance to the projects that provide for the transit and the exit points for these commodities.

INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND

The Committee is deeply trouble by the lack of progress on finding a solution to the funding shortfalls in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. This fund provides one-half the costs of construction and rehabilitation of locks and dams on the Inland Waterways System. The system moves nearly 600 million tons of cargo annually. To move that amount of cargo on the Nation's highways would require an additional 24 million trucks or 5.456 million rail cars. Moving these same commodities by rail or truck would cost billions more in fuel costs as well as generating millions of tons of pollution. The Inland Waterways System includes 238 lock chambers—138 of which have been in operation for more than 50 years. Modernization of this system is critical if the Nation expects to continue to benefit from this highly fuel efficient and low pollution transportation link.

The previous administration notified this Committee when they submitted the fiscal year 2008 budget (February 2007) that there was a looming problem with the amount of revenues available in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and that a legislative proposal would be forthcoming to address the situation. That legislative proposal was not presented to Congress until April 2008. In the fiscal year 2009 budget (February 2008) the previous administration proposed a lockage user fee to replace the current fuel tax as a mechanism to enhance revenues in the trust fund. This lockage fee was roundly criticized as being developed without any input from navigation users and was rejected by Congress. Unfortunately the administration assumed these revenues as a part of their fiscal year 2009 budget request which overstated the amount of funding available for cost sharing with these projects. Budgeted items could not be funded without these assumed revenues leading to curtailment of the work planned for fiscal year 2009. For fiscal year 2010–2012, the current administration did not make that assumption. Rather they aligned their budget request to account for expected revenues to be generated by the trust fund in the given budget year. This severely curtailed the funding available for modernization of the system. However, the budget request has still discussed the lockage fee proposal as a way to enhance revenues in the trust fund.

In fiscal year 2010 this Committee recommended that waterway users, the Corps and the appropriate authorizing committees should work together to find a solution to this funding issue. A working group consisting of a combination of Corps of Engineers navigation, economics and engineering experts and Inland Waterways User Board members from industry, worked diligently for over a year to develop a 20-year capital investment strategy for the Inland Waterways System. The proposal they developed not only enhanced revenues in the trust fund, but also provided a schedule to prioritize the work over a 20-year period. The plan was submitted to the Congress and the administration last year.

In December 2010, the administration provided their views on the capital investment strategy. While the administration noted the efforts of the working group, it found fault with virtually every facet of the strategy. While the Committee recognizes that implementation of some of the proposals in the overall strategy would have been problematic, the Committee believes that the strategy could have been further modified to develop a plan that was acceptable to all parties. Unfortunately, the overall tone of the administration response was dismissive of the working group's efforts. This is especially disappointing since a number of members of the working group were employees of the administration. The administration's response to the strategy further decided to bring in extraneous issues to the Trust Fund discussion concerning operation and maintenance costs. Those issues may need to be addressed, but not in the scope of determining an investment strategy to recapitalize the Inland Waterways System.

We are now in the fifth budget cycle, since this problem was identified with no solutions on the horizon. The Committee remains committed to cost shared solutions to modernizing the Nation's Inland Waterways System. The Committee recognizes that this system, constructed over the last 100 years, is critical to our national economy. However, the current financing model for the Inland Waterways System is barely providing for minimal improvements to the current system, much less the modernization required if the system is to remain a low cost mode of transportation. The Committee urges all of the parties involved (including the administration) to reassemble and commit to finding a solution that can be proposed as a part of the fiscal year 2013 budget submission.

The Inland Waterways System is far too important to allow it to continue to languish with inadequate funding and crumbling infrastructure. The Committee is willing to wait for a while longer to see if all of the appropriate parties are willing to fulfill their responsibilities to resolve this issue. If not, this Committee will be forced to act in some manner to address the serious funding shortfalls in modernizing this system.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDING FOR INLAND WATERWAYS

The administration segregates the Inland Waterways System into at least two parts for budgeting purposes. Those that are designated as "low use" are given considerably lower budget priority for maintenance dollars than the remainder of the system. But is the administration really saving money by segregating the projects in this manner? The "low use" waterways move more than 50 mil-

lion tons annually. That obviously pales in comparison to the roughly 550 million tons moved on the "high use" waterways. However, these 50 million tons of cargo would still have to be moved somehow, if they are not moved by water transportation. The only other candidates are truck and rail. It would require 2 million trucks or 455,000 rail cars to move the same amount of cargo that can be moved on 33,500 barges. The shipping costs to the national economy to move the same commodities to the same destinations would likely increase by at least $500,000,000 by rail or $1,500,000,000 by truck. The costs cited do not even begin to include the costs to the economy of the increased pollution, the likely increase in transportation fatalities or other costs that are incurred. If maintenance of all "low use" projects were fully funded, the Corps budget would be increased by less than $200,000,000. Therefore the Committee has to ask, where are the savings?

The Committee urges the administration to reconsider this shortsighted budgetary decision in future budget submissions.

HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND

The administration has discussed a proposal as a part of the fiscal year 2012 budget request to expand the authorized uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund [HMTF] so that its receipts are available to finance the Federal share of efforts carried out by several agencies in support of commercial navigation through the Nation's ports. No legislative proposal to provide for this expansion has been forthcoming from the administration. The administration asserts that work that other Federal agencies perform at our Nation's ports would be more appropriately charged to the HMTF rather than the general treasury. However current law limits funds in the HMTF to be used only for maintenance of waterways and harbors.

Available revenue from the 0.125 percent tax on the value of imports at designated harbors amounts to roughly $1,500,000,000 annually. These revenues can be utilized for maintenance on more than 1,500 ports, harbors and waterways. Current expenditures for maintenance of commercial waterways and ports average about one-half of the revenue generated. This imbalance has led to a surplus in the HMTF of roughly $6,000,000,000. However, the Committee is concerned that if the administration's proposal was implemented, the current surplus in the HMTF would be rapidly exhausted. The funds deposited in the HMTF are available through appropriations provided by this Committee. As such, these appropriations are subject to the same budget authority cap that all other appropriated funds in this bill are subject to. To appropriate more funds for maintenance of these projects would require the Committee to cut funding elsewhere within the bill in order to stay within the budget authority cap. With all of the competing demands on funding from this Committee, it is impossible to find sufficient funds to fully expend revenues that are generated by the HMT.

There are at least two potential solutions to providing more funding for these projects. One would be for the authorizing committees to modify the HMTF so that it is not subject to appropriation by this Committee. In other words, the revenues would flow directly

to the projects through whatever mechanism was legislated. The second potential solution would be for the administration to increase the amount of funding from the HMTF included in their budget request. This could, if the increase did not result in a corresponding decrease elsewhere in the bill, lead to a higher allocation cap for the bill allowing the Committee to dedicate more budget authority to these items. Absent either of these solutions, the Committee has provided some additional funding for maintenance of projects subject to the HMT. However, the Committee recognizes that these additional funds are insufficient to dredge all eligible projects to their authorized widths and depths.

DAM SAFETY

The Committee notes that dam safety related activities in fiscal year 2012 comprise more than $436,000,000 or 29.5 percent of the administration's $1,480,000,000 CG request. That is a significant part of the construction budget and has been consistent for the last several years while overall construction funding has declined. The Committee is concerned that with the downward trends in administration budgets that there will be no room in the budget for anything but safety improvements at Corps facilities.

The Committee does not dispute the need for these dam safety improvements. When most of these projects were built, they were located in very rural or remote areas with low population density. In the intervening years, populations have exploded around these projects placing many more people at risk. Failure of these structures could potentially wipe out entire communities that have grown-up in the valleys below these projects.

The Committee is concerned that sometimes the desire to keep the public informed about dam safety risks outstrips the available engineering data. A prime case of this is a project that reportedly needed immediate fixes of approximately $50,000,000 and the public was told that the ultimate fix was estimated at more than $500,000,000. This created tremendous public angst as to how and when this project would be repaired. However, when all of the engineering data was available, it was determined that the ultimate fix was less than $50,000,000. The Corps is to be commended for a solution that was so cost effective versus earlier estimates. However, a lot of angst could have been averted if the Corps had been more circumspect in when and how the information was shared.

LEVEE SAFETY

Hurricane Katrina was for the Corps was what the Teton Dam failure was for the Bureau of Reclamation—the first time a major structure designed and constructed by the agencies had failed and cost lives. Reclamation became a pioneer in dam safety over the intervening 30 years since the Teton Dam failure and continue to upgrade their structures across the west. The Corps seems to be on a similar albeit accelerated track since Hurricane Katrina.

One positive outcome from the tragedy of Hurricane Katrina was that the public became more aware of the levees that protect their communities. This new awareness resulted in an examination of the conditions of these projects. Concurrent with this new awareness was the Federal Emergency Management Agency map mod-

ernization program for flood insurance rate maps. With this remapping came the issue of certification of existing levees and the need to determine how safe these levees are. All of these factors have combined to cause a great deal of uncertainty.

While the Committee would like to believe that engineered structures will never fail, the reality is that all engineered structures have the potential for failure if the right set of circumstances happen at the right time. The Corps' own analysis of the levee failures in New Orleans indicate that the failure mode that occurred was not unknown to the Corps. However, the Corps's designers did not account for that failure mode, because it was not thought that type of failure could occur at that location.

Risk is inherent in any man-made structure and the Corps is charged with balancing that risk with the costs of the risk reduction measures. The cost for risk-free protection is more than the Nation has been willing to consider for any project. There are always trade-offs. This is especially true with flood control structures. There is always a larger flood, or an unknown or unaccounted for failure mode that can cause the structure to fail. The Committee looks to the Corps to build structures to protect people based on the risks that they may face and to communicate the residual risk that people protected by these structure still face. It should be understood that while the structures mitigate risk, they do not eliminate it.

The Committee fully supports the Corps efforts on levee safety. However, the Committee is concerned that the costs to repair levees may be overwhelming to local interests. The Committee is not suggesting that the Corps should back away from its safety culture, only that there should be checks and balances to ensure that recommendations are not blindly made in the name of safety without determining if the recommendations actually provide cost effective safety improvements. The Committee encourages the Corps when working with communities on levee issues to be cognizant of the costs for proposed fixes and the community's ability to fund the repairs.

The Committee is concerned about what it believes is an overly broad reading of the definition of levees provided in section 9002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007. While the definition includes "structures along canals that constrain water flows and are subject to more frequent water loadings but that do not constitute a barrier across a watercourse" the Committee does not believe that the intent was that the Corps should be setting the standards for irrigation canals or canals that convey water for power projects. Water in these canals can be shut off in relatively short period of time as opposed to a canal failure in a flood situation. Also, the Federal agencies responsible for these canals have active safety programs in-place and Corps efforts would be duplicative. The Committee encourages the Committee on Levee Safety to provide categorical exclusions for these canal systems.

THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOOD OF 2011

This year, the greatest flood in the history of the Mississippi River proved that the Mississippi River and Tributaries System could withstand and manage epic flows, and the most critical as-

pect of the 2011 event was what did not happen because the system performed as designed.

Runoff from a snowpack three times greater than normal combined with rainfall 10 times greater than average spread out over a 200,000-square-mile area within the Mississippi River's watershed and produced the Great Flood of 2011.

Even though there was water in historic proportions, significant economic losses and plenty of pain and disruption for many people, the real story was the non-event: a massive, even unprecedented, discharge that was passed from north of Cairo, Illinois, to the Gulf of Mexico without major catastrophe.

This was a non-story due solely to the foresight of the Federal Government acting in close partnership with State and local officials after what some have called the worst natural disaster to strike the United States—the 1927 flood.

The 1927 disaster which claimed 500 lives, left 600,000 people homeless and created a pathway of destruction 80 miles wide and 1,000 miles long, flooding more than 26,000 square miles, or 16.6 million acres of land.

After this massive flood, it was apparent to thoughtful observers that the previous "levees only" approach to containing the Mississippi River was ill-conceived. Under the leadership of the Chief of Engineers, Major General Edgar Jadwin, a plan was developed and submitted for approaching flood control on the Mississippi River and its tributaries which is unprecedented in its scope and foresight. Here are a few significant excerpts from Jadwin's report:

"The plan heretofore pursued has been the construction of levees high enough and strong enough to confine all of the flood waters within the river channels. The levees that have been constructed are not sufficiently high for such floods as are now predicted. The cost of raising and strengthening them sufficiently to carry extreme floods would greatly exceed the cost of the plan proposed. Furthermore, the extent of the disaster which follows a crevasse increases greatly as the flood is forced to higher stages by confinement wholly within the levee system. The loss of life and property in the recent great flood in the alluvial valley followed the breaking of the levees which reclaimed the land for the use of man. This reclamation had been pushed so far that insufficient room was left in the river for the passage of the unprecedented volume of flood water. The levees must be strengthened but a halt must be called on further material increase in their heights and the consequent threat to the inhabitants of the areas they are built to protect.

"Man must not try to restrict the Mississippi River too much in extreme floods. The river will break any plan which does this. It must have the room it needs, and to accord with its nature must have the extra room laterally.

"The plan recommended provides the requisite space for the passage of floods, and levees of adequate strength to withstand them, so that should a flood recur of the magnitude of the flood just experienced, the maximum of record, it would be passed out to the gulf without danger to life in the alluvial valley, and without damage to property except in the floodways allotted for its passage."

As faulty as the "levees only" plan was for flood protection in the Lower Mississippi River Valley, it was recognized that the levees had contributed to making the lower valley an inhabitable area, a major contributor to the Nation's economic security and providing one of the world's great producers of food and fiber.

The Jadwin plan had four major components working together in a complementary fashion:

—Levees;

—Floodways;

—Channel improvements to increase the river's carrying capacity at a given stage; and

—Backwater improvements, including use of backwater areas to store water until it can be safely released.

Levees had to be set back to reduce bottlenecks and where that was not practical floodways were created—reconnecting the river to its natural floodplains in today's parlance. The Corps developed a comprehensive, systems approach for managing floods on the river. A systems approach was necessary because many features and components had to work together in a coordinated fashion for the overall plan to function. This was decades before comprehensive watershed planning was proposed for other rivers and streams. Long before the Dutch developed their ideas for "room for the river" or other advocates proposed letting "rivers run free", the Chief of Engineers was recommending space for rivers in 1927 while as a practical matter including levees and other features too.

The Jadwin plan was adopted into law in the 1928 Flood Control Act and the major components of the resulting project, the Mississippi River and Tributaries [MR&T] project, remain largely unchanged today.

The epic floodwaters experienced in the valley this year surpassed even the Great Flood of 1927 in many locations. The Corps of Engineers' response required using every flood control resource within the Mississippi River watershed, the third largest in the world, to shave height from historic crest levels during the flood's most dangerous hours.

Reservoirs and lakes along the Ohio, Missouri, and upper Mississippi Rivers were filled to capacity and exceeded many historic levels to help keep the water from overtopping the Mississippi River and Tributaries System's flood control structures.

Still, the reservoirs were not enough to stem the steadily rising river. Fortunately other safety valves had been built into the system. Floodways in Missouri and Louisiana were operated to lower peak stages at various points in the river to ensure that levees were not overtopped. While operating these floodways led to loss of property and livelihood, the damages were minimized as these areas were designed to flood, rather than having levees overtopped and flooding in an uncontrolled manner.

The floodways served their design purposes. Over a 3-day period, activation of the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway reduced the forecasted crest near Hickman, Kentucky, by 3.8 feet and prevented the river from overtopping Federal levees protecting cities and towns in Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, and Tennessee. The operation of both the Morganza and Bonnet Carré Floodways resulted in a 2.5-foot lowering of the river's forecasted crest at New Orleans

and Baton Rouge, protecting a 200-mile-long corridor of people and the Nation's commerce. History was made with the opening of the Morganza spillway because it represented the first time three floodways had been operated simultaneously.

During this flood, the Corps worked closely with the U.S. Coast Guard to ensure navigation safety as well as the integrity of flood control structures. Even though navigation was constrained at times, the channel improvements along the river were a critical part of the flood control system during this historic event. Without river bend cutoffs, dikes, and revetments, the high water would have overwhelmed levees and floodwalls and the communities they protect. From Cairo to Baton Rouge, flood stage records were broken; however, where channel improvements were made—at Memphis, Helena, and Arkansas City—river crests stayed well below prior record levels.

As waters from the upper Mississippi and Ohio Rivers gathered below the confluence at Cairo, Illinois, on May 3, the river grew to monstrous proportions with flows of more than 2.3 million cubic feet per second, equal to 25 times the amount of water flowing over Niagara Falls. During the peak of the flood at Memphis, the Mississippi River was more than 8 miles wide. Between May 3 and May 19, the river inundated 6.8 million acres of farmland in unprotected areas between Cape Girardeau, Missouri, and the Head of Passes in Louisiana. These were areas which were designed to flood as a part of the Mississippi River and Tributaries project. Approximately 10,000 people were evacuated due to backwater flooding.

Despite giving up some ground to allow the river to flex its power, the flood control system operated as designed and protected almost 10 million acres, thousands of homes, more than 4 million people and $200,000,000,000 of infrastructure from inundation. By operating the MR&T system as it was designed, including the floodways, the value of this investment to our Nation can be counted by what we haven't lost: lives, critical infrastructure for the energy industry and more than $70,000,000,000 in damages to homes and businesses.

This was despite flows near or above those experienced during the 1927 and 1937 floods. All the MR&T's flood control features (floodways/spillways, backwater levees, channel improvements, levees/floodwalls, gates, pumps, reservoirs and relief wells) worked in concert to pass historic flows while accommodating the natural tendencies of the mighty Mississippi River.

To date, over the 80 years since passage of the 1928 Flood Control Act, the Nation has spent $13,000,000,000 toward the planning, construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and, to date, the Nation has received a 27-to-1 return on that investment, including $350,000,000,000 in flood damages prevented. Such astounding figures place the MR&T project among the most successful and cost-effective public works projects in the history of the United States.

THE MISSOURI RIVER FLOOD AND OTHER FLOOD EVENTS OF 2011

The Mississippi River was not the only natural disaster that the Nation faced in 2011. Floods on the Red River of the North in

North Dakota and Minnesota, on the West Coast, in the Ohio Valley and on the Missouri River also caused major damages across the Nation. However, the scope of the Missouri River flood was second only to the Mississippi River flood of 2011 and the duration of the flooding along the Missouri River may be longer.

Runoff into the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City, Iowa, during the month of June was the highest single runoff month since the Corps began keeping detailed records in 1898. The previous record monthly runoff was 13.2 million acre feet [MAF] in April of 1952. June 2011 runoff into the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City was 13.8 MAF, enough water to fill the Memorial Stadium in Lincoln, Nebraska, more than 9,700 times, or once every 1.5 minutes during the entire month.

The May 2011 runoff into the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City was 10.5 MAF, the third highest single month of runoff since 1898. The May and June combined runoff totaled 24.3 MAF, just short of the normal total annual runoff of 24.8 MAF. Runoff for the calendar year is projected to reach 57.7 MAF, approximately 230 percent of normal. The previous record of 49 MAF was reached in 1997.

At the beginning of the runoff season, the Corps had evacuated all of the floodwaters from last year and the reservoirs were prepared to capture the expected 2011 runoff of 16.3 million acre feet. However, during May, the eastern half of Montana received between 300 and 400 percent of normal rainfall, more than a year's worth of rain in some locations during a 2-week span. Portions of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming received more than 200 percent of normal rainfall.

Heavy rain continued into June with significant areas of Montana and South Dakota receiving more than 200 percent of normal rainfall. Mountain snowpack, which typically peaks around April 15, continued to accumulate until early May. To date, more than 90 percent of that snowpack has melted and run off into the system.

There are six lakes that comprise the main stem Missouri River System. The base of the annual flood control and multiple use pool storage is 56.8 MAF. As a system, the Missouri River reservoirs can store a total of 73.1 MAF of water. On March 1, the system storage level was 57.6 MAF, 0.8 MAF above the base of the annual flood control and multiple use pool. The additional water in the system was from early plains snowmelt runoff in February.

The dams along the river allow the Corps to hold back floodwaters in various communities. With the upper basin reservoirs (Fort Peck, Garrison, and Oahe) providing nearly 85 percent of the flood control storage capacity, they store floodwaters until conditions downstream permit release.

Fort Randall also contains a significant amount of flood control storage and serves a major role in reducing flood damages on the lower river. The remaining two reservoirs (Big Bend and Gavins Point), have very little flood control storage available and as a result function more as a pipeline regulating the releases from the upstream reservoirs.

The system is protecting the public from unregulated flows. Unregulated flows—which occur when flood waters flow uncontrolled

in a spillway—would result in significantly more damage. In 2010 alone, the system prevented $2,300,000,000 in flood damages and reduced peak river stages by 4 to 6 feet in various areas. Without the dams, some communities would otherwise have experienced flooding and damages similar to what the river historically yielded in the late 1940s and early 1950s.

To deal with the onslaught of water, the Corps stepped up reservoir releases leading to record amounts of water downstream. Reservoir releases on the Missouri changed several times in the span of a few weeks, due to changing daily forecasts and increasing precipitation in Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. The Corps released as much as 160,000 cubic feet per second from five of the six main stem dams, which resulted in much higher levels on the river downstream, on an earlier timeline than originally forecast. The releases from the reservoirs set new records and in most cases were more than double the previous records.

Flooding started in late May and has been working its way through the Missouri River since that time. It is anticipated that flood stages and high water will extend well into the late summer and early fall of this year.

Damages to Corps of Engineers, owned, operated or inspected infrastructure, both known and anticipated, due to all of these natural disasters is anticipated to exceed $3,000,000,000.

PLANNING PROGRAM

The Committee is pleased that the Corps has taken an in depth review of its planning program and is trying to make it more responsive to the local sponsors and congress. One of the Committee's major concerns was the inconsistent nature across the Corps concerning planning efforts. The Corps seems to have interpreted this as a desire to shorten the planning process. While that is a laudable goal, the Committee recognizes that some timeframes within the planning process are statutory and cannot be shortened and some studies require a more in-depth look. Items such as determining the future without project conditions and determining the array of alternatives that should be considered require careful evaluation. The Committee is more concerned with the inconsistency of the planning process across the Corps. Some districts seem rigid and overly bureaucratic in their approach to planning. Others are creative and accommodating to a fault. In large measure it depends on the culture of the Corps district and division. The Corps needs to continue to work on this. While a one-size-fits-all approach will not work due to the great variations in problems and needs throughout the country, more consistency as to how these problems and needs are evaluated should be the goal. The importance of these study reports cannot be overstated. They are the basis from which all of the Corps' work is derived and Congress depends heavily on these planning reports to inform the decisionmaking process for authorizing and funding these infrastructure investments. The Committee will continue to monitor the progress of improving the consistency of the planning process.

CONTINUING CONTRACTS AND REPROGRAMMING

The Committee expects the Chief of Engineers to execute the Civil Works program generally in accordance with congressional direction. This includes moving individual projects forward in accordance with the funds annually appropriated. However, the Committee realizes that many factors outside the Corps' control may dictate the progress of any given project or study.

The Committee is retaining the reprogramming legislation provided in the fiscal year 2010 Energy and Water Development Act.

NEW STARTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

Due to continued declining budgets for the foreseeable future, the Committee has concluded that it would not be prudent to include any of the new starts proposed in the administration's fiscal year 2012 budget request because of the outyear requirements that would be incurred. This also includes the new starts that the administration proposed in fiscal year 2011 and included in their fiscal year 2012 budget as continuing projects.

FLOOD CONTROL CREDITS

The Committee is concerned about the Secretary's recent policy change concerning credits—particularly for flood control projects utilizing section 104 of Public Law 99–662. The Secretary, in a letter dated May 5, 2011, stated that her office will no longer consider applications for section 104 credit eligibility. The letter goes on to state that section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970, as amended by section 2003 of WRDA 2007, provides a more contemporary and comprehensive general authority for affording credit for non-Federal in-kind contributions that covers all water resources development projects. The Committee does not dispute that the Secretary has the right to set policy based on laws passed by Congress. However, the Committee believes that in this case, the law may not be as clear as perhaps it should have been. The Committee is concerned that under this revised crediting policy local projects that could reduce flood damages or improve flood protection might not be constructed in a timely matter by local interests because they are waiting on the Federal project to get to a stage such that credits can be considered under this new policy. Of particular concern are cases where local communities are trying to restore flood control projects to provide 100-year level of protection in order to avoid mandatory flood insurance requirements. The Committee does not believe it is the Secretary's intent via this policy change to cause delays in constructing needed local flood control measures that would be integral to a Federal project. Therefore, the Committee urges the Secretary to consider requests for flood control credits on a case-by-case basis to ensure that legitimate credits that could be afforded under section 104 would still be eligible for inclusion in an eventual Federal project.

LAKE TAHOE CROSS-CUT BUDGET

The Committee is aware that considerable funding is being expended by various Federal agencies to improve the water quality of Lake Tahoe. However, the Committee cannot tell whether the

various agencies are coordinating their efforts and putting these resources to their best uses. Therefore the Committee directs the Corps to prepare a cross-cut budget that displays the amounts of funding and the types of work being expended for the improvement of Lake Tahoe. The initial cross-cut budget for fiscal year 2012 should be prepared and submitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 120 days of enactment of this act. Subsequent cross-cut budgets should be prepared and submitted concurrently with the annual budget submission by the Corps.

SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE

Savings and slippage [S&S] is a budgetary term that recognizes that nothing ever goes completely as planned. As Corps budgets are initiated some 22 months before they are presented to Congress a myriad of changes occur between this initial budget submission and when funds are actually appropriated. Projects speed up and slow down for a number of reasons. Hazardous wastes or a cultural resources site is discovered in the project right-of-way; a local sponsor may not have his cost share in-place; additional alternatives may need to be examined in a study; studies or even projects are terminated. All of these things lead to uncertainties which impact Corps' budgets.

When viewed in the historical context of annual Corps spending rates, reasonable percentages of S&S make sense as a way to accommodate additional projects needs, even if funding is insufficient and has been utilized by the Committee for the four major accounts. The Committee directs that the S&S amount in each subaccount initially be applied uniformly across all projects within the subaccounts. Upon applying the S&S amounts, normal reprogramming procedures should be undertaken to account for schedule slippages, accelerations, or other unforeseen conditions.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING

Congressionally directed spending has become synonymous with earmarks in recent debates, even for agencies such as the Corps of Engineers where the majority of the budget request is based on individual line item studies and projects. Due to this ongoing debate, the Committee has voluntarily refused all congressionally directed spending requests for fiscal year 2012. That means that the administration has total discretion as to how the funding that this Committee appropriates will be spent as it relates to individual studies and projects. The Committee has retained the traditional tables for each of the four major accounts delineating the 876 line items requested by the President in the budget request. Due to inadequacies in the administration's budget request, the Committee has also inserted some additional line item funding under the nationwide heading for specific categories of studies or projects that the Committee feels are underrepresented in the administration's budget request. The Corps has discretion within the guidelines provided in each account as to which line items this additional funding will be applied to. The Committee has not included any congressionally directed spending as defined in section 5(a) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2011	$126,746,000
Budget estimate, 2012	104,000,000
House allowance	104,000,000
Committee recommendation	125,000,000

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 planning program is the entry point for Federal involvement in solutions to the Nation's water resource problems and needs. Unfortunately, the General Investigations [GI] account amount proposed in the budget is generally the same as what has been proposed in previous budgets. Nationwide studies and programs consume almost one-half of the administration's GI request. This budget asserts that the Nation should concentrate scarce resources on completing studies but not carrying forward ongoing studies.

The Committee has provided for a robust and balanced planning program for fiscal year 2012. However, no new starts are included in this recommendation.

The first column represents the reconnaissance phase of the planning process. These studies determine if there is a Federal interest in a water resource problem or need and if there is a cost sharing sponsor willing to move forward with the study. The next column represents the feasibility phase of the study. These detailed cost-shared studies determine the selected alternative to be recommended to the Congress for construction. The third column represents the preconstruction engineering and design phase. These detailed cost-shared designs are prepared while the project recommended to Congress is awaiting authorization for construction.

The Committee believes that by segregating the table in this manner, more attention will be focused on the various study phases, and a more balanced planning program will be developed by the administration. As the last two columns are generally cost shared, they demonstrate the commitment by cost-sharing sponsors to be a part of the Federal planning process. By the same token, it also shows the level of commitment of the Federal Government to these cost-sharing sponsors.

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			House allowance			Committee recommendation		
	RECON	FEAS	PED	RECON	FEAS	PED	RECON	FEAS	PED
ALASKA									
MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED, AK		100			100			100	
YAKUTAT HARBOR, AK		100			100			100	
CALIFORNIA									
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA		900			900			900	
COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA			500			500			500
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA		80			80			80	
MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA		210			210			210	
SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY, CA		300			300			300	
SAC-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA ISLANDS AND LEVEES, CA		1,015			1,015			1,015	
SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA		500			500			500	
SOLANA BEACH, CA		133			133			133	
SUTTER COUNTY, CA		339			339			339	
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA		177			177			177	
YUBA RIVER FISH PASSAGE, CA	100								
FLORIDA									
LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL		293			293			293	
MILE POINT, FL		50			50			50	
GEORGIA									
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA			600						
TYBEE ISLAND, GA		200			200			200	
HAWAII									
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI		400			400			400	
ILLINOIS									
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)		500			500			500	
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL		400			400			400	
INTERBASIN CONTROL OF GREAT LAKES—MISSISSIPPI RIVER AQ		3,000			3,000			3,000	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate			House allowance			Committee recommendation		
	RECON	FEAS	PED	RECON	FEAS	PED	RECON	FEAS	PED
INDIANA									
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	300
KANSAS									
TOPEKA, KS	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	100
LOUISIANA									
BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA	.....	.....	2,000	.....	.....	2,000	.....	.....	2,000
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	.....	1,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, LA	.....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	.....	10,845	5,400	.....	10,845	5,400	.....	10,845	5,400
MARYLAND									
CHESAPEAKE BAY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD, PA, AND VA	250	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
EASTERN SHORE, MID CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND, MD	.....	.....	169	.....	.....	169	.....	.....	169
MASSACHUSETTS									
PILGRIM LAKE, TRURO AND PROVINCETOWN, MA	.....	113	.....	.....	113	.....	.....	113	.....
MINNESOTA									
MINNESOTA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, MN AND SD (MINNESOTA RI	.....	350	.....	.....	350	.....	.....	350	.....
KANSAS CITYS, MO AND KS	.....	330	.....	.....	330	.....	.....	330	.....
MISSOURI RIVER DEGRADATION, MO	.....	600	.....	.....	600	.....	.....	600	.....
MONTANA									
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....
NEW HAMPSHIRE									
MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH AND MA	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....
NEW JERSEY									
DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE, NJ	.....	290	.....	.....	290	.....	.....	290	.....

HUDSON-RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	100
HUDSON-RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....
NEW MEXICO									
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO, AND TX	.....	300	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	300	.....
NEW YORK									
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, NY AND NJ	.....	400	.....	.....	400	.....	.....	400	.....
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	.....	.....	170	.....	.....	170	.....	.....	170
WESTCHESTER COUNTY STREAMS, BYRAM RIVER BASIN, NY AND CT	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....
NORTH CAROLINA									
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	.....	400	.....	.....	400	.....	.....	400	.....
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	.....	.....	450	.....	.....	450	.....	.....	450
SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	300
NORTH DAKOTA									
FARGO, ND—MOORHEAD, MN	.....	.....	12,000	.....	.....	12,000	.....	.....	12,000
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, ND, MN, SD, AND MANITOBA, CANADA	.....	433	.....	.....	433	.....	.....	433	.....
OREGON									
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA	.....	300	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	300	.....
WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR	.....	250	.....	.....	250	.....	.....	250	.....
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	.....	213	.....	.....	213	.....	.....	213	.....
PENNSYLVANIA									
SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN, WISSAHICKON CREEK BASIN, PA	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....
UPPER OHIO NAVIGATION STUDY, PA	.....	1,363	.....	.....	1,363	.....	.....	1,363	.....
PUERTO RICO									
CANO MARTIN PEÑA, PR	.....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
SOUTH CAROLINA									
EDISTO ISLAND, SC	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....
TEXAS									
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX	.....	726	.....	.....	726	.....	.....	726	.....
DALLAS FLOODWAY, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	.....	700	.....	.....	700	.....	.....	700	.....
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER REALIGNMENTS, TX	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	.....	400	.....	.....	400	.....	.....	400	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate			House allowance			Committee recommendation		
	RECON	FEAS	PED	RECON	FEAS	PED	RECON	FEAS	PED
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	.....	425	.....	.....	425	.....	.....	425	.....
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	.....	650	.....	.....	650	.....	.....	650	.....
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....
VIRGINIA									
CHOWAN RIVER, VA	124	.....	.....	124	.....	.....	124	.....	.....
JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (SECTION 216)	.....	365	.....	.....	365	.....	.....	365	.....
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	300
UPPER RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, VA	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....
WASHINGTON									
MOUNT ST. HELENS, WA	.....	225	.....	.....	225	.....	.....	225	.....
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	.....	400	.....	.....	400	.....	.....	400	.....
SUBTOTAL, ITEMS UNDER STATES	474	31,675	22,389	124	31,475	21,789	124	31,475	21,789
NATIONAL PROGRAMS									
ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATIONS	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,650	.....	.....	.....	.....
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:									
REMOTE COASTAL OR SMALL WATERSHEDS	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,000	.....
SHORE PROTECTION	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,000	.....
SMALL, REMOTE OR SUBSISTENCE NAVIGATION	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,500	.....
FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	11,000	.....
ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION OR ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,500	.....
INLAND NAVIGATION	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,000	.....
COASTAL AND DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,500	.....
MULTI-PURPOSE	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,000	.....
COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES:									
ACCESS TO WATER DATA	.....	350	.....	.....	350	.....	.....	350	.....
COMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS:									
CALFED	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM	.....	75	.....	.....	75	.....	.....	75	.....

COORDINATION WITH OTHER WATER RESOURCE AGENCIES	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....
GULF OF MEXICO	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....
INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	.....	600	.....	.....	600	.....	.....	600	.....
INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	.....	955	.....	.....	955	.....	.....	955	.....
INVENTORY OF DAMS	.....	400	.....	.....	400	.....	.....	400	.....
LAKE TAHOE	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....	.....	100	.....
PACIFIC NW FOREST CASE	.....	10	.....	.....	10	.....	.....	10	.....
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS	.....	1,550	.....	.....	1,550	.....	.....	1,550	.....
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	.....	5,000	.....	.....	5,000	.....	.....	5,000	.....
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA:									
AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUPPORT TRI-CADD	.....	350	.....	.....	350	.....	.....	350	.....
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	.....	1,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	.....	75	.....	.....	75	.....	.....	75	.....
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	.....	220	.....	.....	220	.....	.....	220	.....
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	.....	9,000	.....	.....	9,000	.....	.....	9,000	.....
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	.....	250	.....	.....	250	.....	.....	250	.....
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	200	.....
PRECIPITATION STUDIES	.....	225	.....	.....	225	.....	.....	225	.....
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	.....	75	.....	.....	75	.....	.....	75	.....
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	.....	50	.....	.....	50	.....	.....	50	.....
STREAM GAGING	.....	600	.....	.....	600	.....	.....	600	.....
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	.....	350	.....	.....	350	.....	.....	350	.....
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	.....	17,252	.....	.....	17,252	.....	.....	17,252	.....
OTHER—MISCELLANOUS:									
INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW	.....	500	.....	.....	500	.....	.....	500	.....
NATIONAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	.....	3,000	.....	.....	3,000	.....	.....	3,000	.....
NATIONAL SHORELINE	.....	175	.....	.....	175	.....	.....	175	.....
PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM	.....	3,100	.....	.....	3,100	.....	.....	3,100	.....
TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	.....	1,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....
WATER RESOURCES PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES	.....	500	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
WATER RESOURCES PRIORITIES STUDY	.....	2,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL, NATIONAL PROGRAMS	.....	49,462	.....	.....	50,612	.....	.....	83,462	.....
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	−11,850	.....
TOTAL	474	81,137	22,389	124	82,087	21,789	124	103,087	21,789
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		104,000			104,000			125,000	

Englebright and Daguerre Point Dams (Yuba River), California.—No funding is included for this new item proposed in the fiscal year 2012 budget.

Savannah Harbor Expansion, Georgia.—The Committee has not funded this item in the GI account as recommended by the administration. The Committee has transferred the budget request to the Construction, General account where the Committee has funded it every year since fiscal year 2009.

Louisiana Coastal Comprehensive Study, Louisiana.—No funding is included for this new item proposed in the fiscal year 2012 budget.

Chesapeake Bay Comprehensive Plan, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, Delaware, and District of Columbia.—No funding is included for this new item proposed in the fiscal year 2012 budget.

Cano Martin Peña, Puerto Rico.—No funding is included for this new item proposed in the fiscal year 2012 budget.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funds above the budget request to continue ongoing studies. The Committee recommends that these funds be used to accelerate high priority flood control, storm damage reduction, navigation, and environmental restoration studies. The Committee recommends that priority in allocating these funds should be towards completing on-going studies or for accelerating studies which will enhance the Nation's economic development, job growth and international competitiveness or for areas that have suffered recent natural disasters.

The administration has complete discretion over how these funds are to be used. The intent of these funds is for ongoing work that either did not make it into the administration request or were inadequately budgeted for. While this additional funding is shown in the feasibility column, the Corps should utilize these funds in whichever phase of work that the funding should be applied to. Within 30 days of enactment, the Corps shall provide the House and Senate Appropriations Committees a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed and in which phase the work is being accomplished.

Water Resources Principles and Guideline.—No funding is included for this new item first proposed in the fiscal year 2011 budget and treated as a continuing item in the fiscal year 2012 budget request.

Water Resources Priorities Study.—No funding is included for this new item first proposed in the fiscal year 2009 budget. This item has never been funded but was treated as a continuing item in the fiscal year 2012 budget request.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2011	$1,613,822,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,480,000,000
House allowance	1,565,191,000
Committee recommendation	1,610,000,000

This appropriation includes funds for construction, major rehabilitation and related activities for water resources development projects having navigation, flood and storm damage reduction,

water supply, hydroelectric, environmental restoration, and other attendant benefits to the Nation. The construction and major rehabilitation for designated projects for inland and costal waterways will derive one-half of the funding from the Inland Waterways 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 administration request for the Construction, General account is $1,480,000,000, a decrease of $133,822,000 from the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount. By the Committee's estimate, less than 60 percent of the needed funding is available in this account. Construction levels will slip due to constrained funding and benefits to the national economy will be deferred. The Committee is concerned that this lack of investment will inevitably lead to another Katrina-style disaster somewhere in the Nation, whether it is a catastrophic failure on the Inland Waterways System or overwhelmed incomplete or damaged flood control or shore protection infrastructure. The aftermath of Hurricane Katrina should have taught us, if nothing else, that more robust investment before the fact would have led to considerably smaller payouts after the disaster. Yet, based on the budget requests in the intervening 6 years, it is obvious that no lesson has been learned.

The Committee recommendation includes $1,610,000,000 in new budget authority for this account. The Committee recognizes that this is considerably less than the needs in the program, but is the best that can be accomplished in this constrained fiscal environment.

The Committee deleted the new construction starts requested by the administration as sufficient funding does not exist in the current budget nor is there reasonable assurance that sufficient funds will be available in the future to accommodate these new items as well as ongoing work.

Continuing Authorities Program [CAP].—The Continuing Authorities Program (projects which do not require specific authorizing legislation) 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 (section 208), aquatic ecosystem restoration (section 206), beneficial uses of dredged material (section 204), and project modifications for improvement of the environment (section 1135). The Committee rejects the administration proposal to transfer funds from other sections of the CAP to only fund sections 205, 206 and 1135 for fiscal year 2012. The Corps has told the Committee on numerous occasions that there is a considerable backlog of ongoing work in all sections of the CAP program. For that reason the Committee is surprised that the administration would propose to carry over funding to fiscal year 2012 for this ill considered proposal when the funding proposed for carryover was previously provided to address this backlog. The Committee believes these funds should be expended for the CAP sections for which they were appropriated and should be executed as quickly as possible. The Committee continues to believe that the various sections of the CAP program provide a useful tool for the Corps to undertake small localized

projects without being encumbered by the lengthy study and authorization phases typical of most Corps projects.

Even though there was no budget request for funding in the CAP program for fiscal year 2012, the Committee has included a total of $30,000,000 spread over the nine CAP sections for work in fiscal year 2012. The Committee believes that it was an imprudent and shortsighted decision by the administration to not propose any funding for this program. The Committee urges the administration to execute the program laid out by the Committee and include funding for this program in future budgets in the same manner as in the past.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
CALIFORNIA			
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA	25,548	23,149	25,548
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), CA	21,000	19,028	21,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM RAISE), CA	1,000	906	1,000
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	8,250	7,475	8,250
HAMILTON CITY, CA	8,000	.....	.....
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	9,500	8,607	9,500
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	350	317	350
SACRAMENTO DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	3,500	3,171	3,500
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	10,000	9,061	10,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	20,500	18,575	20,500
SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	2,078	1,882	2,078
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	5,000	4,530	5,000
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	18,000	18,000	18,000
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	2,000	1,812	2,000
FLORIDA			
BREVARD COUNTY, CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	350	317	350
DADE COUNTY, FL	15,202	13,774	15,202
DUVAL COUNTY, FL	100	90	100
FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL	350	317	350
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	85,000	85,000	85,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	7,000	6,342	7,000
MANATEE COUNTY, FL	100	90	100
NASSAU COUNTY, FL	700	634	700
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	162,724	130,000	162,724
ST. JOHN'S COUNTY, FL	350	317	350
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	3,000	2,718	3,000
GEORGIA			
LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA	45	40	45
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	3,200	2,899	3,200
SAVANNAH HARBOR DISPOSAL AREAS, GA AND SC	5,040	4,566	5,040
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	.....	543	600
ILLINOIS			
ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICTS, IL AND MO	500	453	500
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	2,250	2,038	2,250
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	13,500	21,805	24,065
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	1,000	906	1,000
EAST ST. LOUIS, IL	1,350	1,223	1,350
LOCK AND DAM 27, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (MAJOR REHAB)	100	90	100
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	12,000	10,873	12,000
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL AND KY	150,000	135,915	150,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO, AND	18,150	16,445	18,150
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, DEFICIENCY CORRECTION AND RECONSTRUCTION	830	752	830
INDIANA			
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	9,000	7,100	9,000
IOWA			
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO,	72,888	72,888	72,888
KANSAS			
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	4,000	3,624	4,000
KENTUCKY			
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	132,000	132,000	132,000
LOUISIANA			
LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	5,500	4,983	5,500
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	10,620		
MARYLAND			
ASSATEAGUE, MD	1,000	906	1,000
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD AND VA	5,000	4,530	5,000
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	12,000	10,873	12,000
MASSACHUSETTS			
MUDDY RIVER, MA	4,000	3,624	4,000
MINNESOTA			
CROOKSTON, MN	1,250	1,132	1,250
MISSOURI			
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	3,000	2,718	3,000
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	32,900	32,900	32,900
KANSAS CITYS, MO AND KS	500	453	500
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS	7,320	6,632	7,320
MONARCH—CHESTERFIELD, MO	1,351	1,224	1,351
ST. LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	100	90	100
NEW JERSEY			
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	500	453	500
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	7,650	6,931	7,650
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY (PORT MONMOUTH), NJ	3,000	2,718	3,000
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	6,000	5,436	6,000
NEW MEXICO			
RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	10,000	9,061	10,000
NEW YORK			
ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT, NY	100	90	100
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	1,350	1,223	1,350
LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	300	271	300
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ	65,014	58,909	65,014
OHIO			
DOVER DAM, MUSKINGUM RIVER, OH (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	5,000	5,000	5,000
OKLAHOMA			
CANTON LAKE, OK	11,100	11,100	11,100
OREGON			
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR AND WA	2,000	1,812	2,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA	4,200	3,805	4,200
PENNSYLVANIA			
EMSWORTH LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, PA	3,000	3,000	3,000
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3, AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	1,000	1,000	1,000
PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	1,500	1,359	1,500
PUERTO RICO			
PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	45,000	40,774	45,000
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	7,000	6,342	7,000
TENNESSEE			
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	78,700	78,700	78,700
TEXAS			
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	3,000	2,718	3,000
HOUSTON—GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	600	543	600
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN (WHARTON/ONION), TX	5,000	.....	.....
VIRGINIA			
LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, VA, W	5,000	4,530	5,000
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	27,400	24,827	27,400
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	1,075	974	1,075
WASHINGTON			
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR, AND ID	128,405	128,405	128,405
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	2,060	1,866	2,060
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA,	1,500	1,500	1,500
MOUNT SAINT HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	6,500	5,889	6,500
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	1,000	906	1,000
WEST VIRGINIA			
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	70,000	70,000	70,000
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS	1,423,950	1,320,479	1,411,495
NATIONAL PROGRAMS			
ADDITIONAL FLOOD AND COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION	.....	124,600	.....
ADDITIONAL NAVIGATION	.....	118,400	.....
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:			
SHORE PROTECTION	.....	.....	40,000
FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION	.....	.....	50,000
NAVIGATION	.....	.....	22,000
MISCELLANEOUS	.....	.....	7,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR COMPLIANCE PROJECTS	.....	.....	15,000
ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCURE PROJECTS	.....	.....	40,000
HYDROPOWER PROJECTS	.....	.....	15,000
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	.....	.....	4,000
CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC:			
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	.....	.....	5,000
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTIONS 20	.....	.....	3,000
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION)	.....	.....	2,000
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	.....	.....	5,000
NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)	.....	.....	2,500
NAVIGATION PROGRAM (SECTION 107)	.....	.....	3,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT	.....	.....	5,000
SHORE PROTECTION (SECTION 103)	.....	.....	4,000
SNAGGING AND CLEARING (SECTION 208)	.....	.....	500
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	37,155	37,155	37,155
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	15,000	13,591	15,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE	70	63	70
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE	825	747	825
ESTUARY RESTORATION PROGRAM (PUBLIC LAW 106–457)	2,000	.....	2,000
PERIODIC REVIEW OF BCRS	1,000	906	1,000
SUBTOTAL, NATIONAL PROGRAMS	56,050	295,462	279,050
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	−80,545
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL	1,480,000	1,615,941	1,610,000

Hamilton City, California.—No funding is included for this new item proposed in the fiscal year 2012 budget.

Napa River, Salt Marsh Restoration, California.—This project was a new start construction project proposed by the administration as a part of the fiscal year 2010 budget. Congress agreed with this new start proposal and provided $100,000 for this project in the fiscal year 2010 conference report. A total of $17,250,000 was included in the work plan developed by the administration as directed in the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution. An additional $9,500,000, the administration's fiscal year 2012 request, is included in this report.

However, it has come to the Committee's attention that the administration has directed the Corps to only budget for the parts of the authorization that the administration supports and that no funds can be budgeted for parts of the project that the administration does not support. The Committee believes that if the administration did not support portions of the project as authorized, the project should have never been a part of the administration budget request, much less one of the administration proposals as a new start. The Committee believes that if the administration puts forth a project as a new start in their budget request, it should have the administration's unqualified support and by definition, should have risen to the top of all other potential new starts available for the administration to choose from. If the authorization was flawed, in the administration's view, then how could the project have risen to the top of the list? This is a clear case of the administration trying to budget for what they wish had been authorized, rather than what was actually authorized.

The Committee's position is that the administration (by budgeting) and Congress (by appropriating funds) has committed to the project as authorized in section 101(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 regardless of what the administration may have wanted. The project partnership agreement executed between the Government and the non-Federal sponsor delineates the project as authorized, not the project that the administration would like to have been authorized. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps to utilize any unspent funds that have been previously provided for this project as well as those included in the administration's fiscal year 2012 budget request, provided in this bill, for all of the authorized project features as appropriate to the current stage of con-

struction. Further, the Committee directs that future budget submissions should not selectively budget for parts of this project, but should include all authorized project features as appropriate for the work planned for that budget request.

Savannah Harbor Expansion, Georgia.—The administration budget request for this item that was proposed in the GI account has been moved to this account where it has been funded for the last 3 fiscal years.

Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier, Illinois.—After release of the fiscal year 2012 budget justifications, the Corps informed the Committee that the funding proposed in the O&M account for this project was actually needed in this account. The Committee has accommodated this change and provided no funding in the O&M account.

Raritan and Sandy Hook Bay, Port Monmouth, New Jersey.—The Committee recommendation includes the budget request for this project as proposed by the administration even though the administration labeled this project as a "previously unfunded item" in their budget request. The Committee does not consider this as a new start as it was provided funding in the fiscal year 2010 Energy and Water Act. The Committee's view is that since the Congress enacted the fiscal year 2010 bill and the President signed the bill into law, that this project has been initiated.

Louisiana Coastal Area Ecosystem Restoration, Louisiana.—No funding is included for this new item first proposed in the fiscal year 2011 budget and treated by the administration as a continuing project in fiscal year 2012.

Onion Creek, Lower Colorado River, Texas.—No funding is included for this new item first proposed in the fiscal year 2011 budget and treated by the administration as a continuing project for fiscal year 2012.

Norfolk Harbor, Craney Island, Virginia.—This project, much like the one mentioned previously, was a new start construction project proposed by the administration as a part of the fiscal year 2010 budget. Congress agreed with this new start proposal and provided $100,000 for this project in the fiscal year 2010 conference report. $1,000,000 was included in the work plan developed by the administration as directed in the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution. An additional $27,400,000, the administration's fiscal year 2012 request, is included in this report.

However, it has come to the Committee's attention that the administration has directed the Corps to only budget for the parts of the authorization that the administration supports and that no funds can be budgeted for parts of the project that the administration does not support. The Committee believes that if the administration did not support portions of the project as authorized, the project should have never been a part of the administration, budget request, much less one of the administration proposals as a new start. The Committee believes that if the administration puts forth a project as a new start in their budget request, it should have the administration's unqualified support and by definition, should have risen to the top of all other potential new starts available for the administration to choose from. If the authorization was flawed, in the administration's view, then how could the project have risen to

the top of the list? This is a clear case of the administration trying to budget for what they wish had been authorized, rather than what was actually authorized.

The Committee's position is that the administration (by budgeting) and Congress (by appropriating funds) has committed to the project as authorized in section 101(45) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 regardless of what the administration may have wanted. The project partnership agreement executed between the Government and the non-Federal sponsor delineates the project as authorized, not the project that the administration would like to have been authorized. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps to utilize any unspent funds that have been previously provided for this project as well as those included in the administration's fiscal year 2012 budget request, provided in this bill, for all of the authorized project features as appropriate to the current stage of construction. Further, the Committee directs that future budget submissions should not selectively budget for parts of this project, but should include all authorized project features as appropriate for the work planned for that budget request.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funds above the budget request to continue ongoing projects and activities. The Committee recommends that these funds be used for flood control, storm damage reduction, navigation, environmental restoration, environmental infrastructure, and miscellaneous projects. The Committee recommends that priority in allocating these funds should be towards completing on-going projects, accelerating projects which will enhance the Nation's economic development, job growth and international competitiveness or those where the local sponsor has the funding in-place for their share of the construction contemplated with the funds available.

The administration has complete discretion over how these funds are to be used. The intent of these funds is for ongoing work that either did not make it into the administration request or were inadequately budgeted. Within 30 days of enactment, the Corps shall provide the House and Senate Appropriations Committees a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed and in which phase the work is being accomplished.

Continuing Authorities Program.—For each Continuing Authorities Program [CAP] section, available funds shall be allocated utilizing this sequence of steps until the funds are exhausted:

—capability-level funds for ongoing projects that have executed cost-sharing agreements for the applicable phase;

—capability-level funds for projects that are ready for execution of new cost-sharing agreements for the applicable phase and for which Corps headquarters authorizes execution of the agreements;

—funds, as permitted by Corps policies, for other projects previously funded for the applicable phase but not ready for execution of new cost-sharing agreements; and

—funds as permitted by Corps policies, for projects not previously funded for the applicable phase.

Funds shall be allocated by headquarters to the appropriate Field Operating Agency [FOA] for projects requested by that FOA.

If the FOA finds that the study/project for which funds were requested cannot go forward, the funds are to be returned to Corps headquarters to be reallocated based on the nationwide priority listing. In no case should the FOA retain these funds for use on a different project than the one for which the funds were requested without the explicit approval of the Corps' headquarters.

Within the step at which available funds are exhausted for each CAP section, funds shall be allocated to the projects in that section that rank high according to the following factors: high overall performance based on outputs; high percent fiscally complete; and high unobligated carry-in. Section 14 funds shall be allocated to the projects that address the most significant risks and adverse consequences, irrespective of phase or previous funding history.

The Corps shall continue the ongoing process for suspending and terminating inactive projects. Suspended projects shall not be reactivated or funded unless the sponsor reaffirms in writing its support for the project and establishes its willingness and capability to execute its project responsibilities.

In order to provide a mix of studies, design and construction within each CAP section, the Corps is directed to divide the funding generally 80/20 between the Design and Implementation and the Feasibility phases within each authority. The Chief of Engineers shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations within 30 days of enactment of this act detailing how funds will be distributed to the individual items in the various CAP sections for the fiscal year. The Chief shall also provide an annual report at the end of each fiscal year detailing the progress made on the backlog of projects. The report should include the completions and terminations as well as progress of ongoing work.

The Corps may initiate new continuing authorities projects in all sections as funding allows. New projects may be initiated after an assessment is made that such projects can be funded over time based on historical averages of the appropriation for that section and after prior approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

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

Appropriations, 2011	$241,906,000
Budget estimate, 2012	152,000,000
House allowance	210,000,000
Committee recommendation	250,000,000

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:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, STORM WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, TN	100	100	100
SUBTOTAL, INVESTIGATIONS	100	100	100
CONSTRUCTION			
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, AND TN	45,570	45,570	45,570
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, AND TN	24,180	24,180	24,180
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	1,900	1,900	1,900
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	6,300	6,300	6,300
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	77,950	77,950	77,950
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, AND TN	61,230	61,230	61,230
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	122	122	122
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	189	189	189
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	223	223	223
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	150	150	150
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, AND TN	7,951	7,951	7,951
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO	4,174	4,174	4,174
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR AND LA	1,884	1,884	1,884
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	896	896	896
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	110	110	110
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	60	60	60
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	1,468	1,468	1,468
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	8,918	8,918	8,918
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	42	42	42
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	48	48	48
BONNET CARRE, LA	2,145	2,145	2,145
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	697	697	697
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	377	377	377
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	438	438	438
OLD RIVER, LA	6,954	6,954	6,954
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	2,473	2,473	2,473
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	18	18	18
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	109	109	109
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	32	32	32
YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	4,606	4,606	4,606
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	185	185	185
YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS	4,386	4,386	4,386
YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS	807	807	807
YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS	4,511	4,511	4,511
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	1,019	1,019	1,019
YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS	5,687	5,687	5,687
YAZOO BASIN, WILL M. WHITTINGTON AUXILARY CHANNEL, MS	378	378	378
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	517	517	517
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS	731	731	731
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	125	125	125
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	4,167	4,167	4,167
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	60	60	60
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	1,394	1,394	1,394
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	130,248	130,248	130,248
REMAINING ITEMS			
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	500	500	500
MAPPING	1,202	1,202	1,202
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK			
DREDGING	.....	.....	5,000
FLOOD CONTROL	.....	.....	25,000
MISCELLANEOUS	.....	.....	20,000

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	1,702	1,702	51,702
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE			−10,000
TOTAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	210,000	210,000	250,000

Post-2011 Flood Studies.—The Committee recognizes that the Mississippi River and Tributaries project performed as designed during the 2011 flood, but also recognizes that the project has not yet been completed. The flooding that did occur within the project area could have been mitigated by remaining features yet to be constructed. The Committee directs the Secretary to provide a report to the Committee within 90 days of enactment of this act that describes the construction features that remain and the costs of those features, a report on the prior studies that proposed to make improvements to the system, and to evaluate, within existing authorities, the issue of backwater flooding that occurred in this year's flood and what can be done in the future to mitigate this issue.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funds above the budget request to continue ongoing studies projects or maintenance. The Committee recommends that these funds be used for flood control, navigation, water supply, ground water protection, waterfowl management, bank stabilization and environmental restoration work. The Committee recommends that priority in allocating these funds should be towards completing on-going work or for accelerating work which will enhance the region and Nation's economic development, job growth and international competitiveness or for areas that have suffered recent natural disasters.

The administration has complete discretion over how these funds are to be used. The intent of these funds is for ongoing work primarily along the Mississippi River tributaries that either did not make it into the administration request or were inadequately budgeted. While this additional funding is shown under remaining items, the Corps should utilize these funds in whichever phase of work that the funding is applied to. Within 30 days of enactment, the Corps shall provide the House and Senate Appropriations Committees a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed and in which phase the work is being accomplished.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2011	$2,365,759,000
Budget estimate, 2012	2,314,000,000
House allowance	2,368,925,000
Committee recommendation	2,360,000,000

This appropriation funds operation, maintenance, and related activities at the water resources projects that the Corps operates and maintains. Work to be accomplished consists of dredging, repair, and operation of structures and other facilities, as authorized in

the various river and harbor, flood control, and water resources development acts. Related activities include aquatic plant control, monitoring of completed projects where appropriate, removal of sunken vessels, and the collection of domestic waterborne commerce statistics.

Maintenance of our aging water infrastructure inventory gets more expensive every year, however, it is consistently underfunded. If this trend continues, the Corps will not be able to maintain expected levels of service at all of its projects. The Committee has maintained its tradition of supporting what the budget request terms as "low use harbors and waterways". The Committee recognizes the importance of these facilities and will continue to provide funding for them. The Committee is concerned about the general downward trend in the administration's O&M request. Since fiscal year 2010, the administration's budget proposal has decreased by $190,000,000 for operation and maintenance. The Committee understands that the O&M budget fluctuates from year to year due to periodic maintenance dredging requirements, however, the general trend should be for this budget to increase. Nearly 75 percent of the O&M budget consists of labor and dredging costs in most years. Labor costs rarely decrease for the Corps as it takes roughly the same amount of manpower to operate Corps projects on a yearly basis. That means that when the budget request is reduced as it is for fiscal year 2012, the only areas available to reduce are dredging and real maintenance items.

This is the wrong trend for this program. The Corps is to be commended for managing to keep as much of their infrastructure operable as they have with the O&M budgets that have been put forward and enacted. The Committee urges the administration to commit to a more realistic budget for O&M in future fiscal years.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA			
ALABAMA-COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	250	245	250
ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL	13,120	12,857	13,120
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	21,429	21,000	21,429
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,335	5,228	5,335
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	30	29	30
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	23,360	22,892	23,360
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	100	98	100
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	1,847	1,810	1,847
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL AND MS	23,141	22,678	23,141
WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA	7,744	7,589	7,744
ALASKA			
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	14,000	13,720	14,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	2,948	2,889	2,948
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	987	967	987
HOMER HARBOR, AK	453	443	453
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	194	190	194
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	420	411	420
NOME HARBOR, AK	1,066	1,044	1,066

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	500	490	500
ARIZONA			
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,758	1,722	1,758
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	87	85	87
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,307	1,280	1,307
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	48	47	48
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	288	282	288
ARKANSAS			
BEAVER LAKE, AR	5,784	5,668	5,784
BLAKELY MT. DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	7,241	7,096	7,241
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,854	1,816	1,854
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	6,050	5,929	6,050
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	7,914	7,755	7,914
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	5,712	5,597	5,712
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,687	1,653	1,687
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,421	1,392	1,421
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,345	1,318	1,345
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	5,654	5,540	5,654
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	100	98	100
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	397	389	397
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	26,610	26,077	26,610
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,558	2,506	2,558
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	4,342	4,255	4,342
NIMROD LAKE, AR	2,182	2,138	2,182
NORFORK LAKE, AR	9,091	8,909	9,091
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	7,451	7,301	7,451
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	6,064	5,942	6,064
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	8	7	8
CALIFORNIA			
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	2,337	2,290	2,337
BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	2,032	1,991	2,032
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	525	514	525
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,647	3,574	3,647
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	5,624	5,511	5,624
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	470	460	470
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	2,272	2,226	2,272
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	2,800	2,744	2,800
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	3,854	3,776	3,854
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,721	1,686	1,721
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	5,083	4,981	5,083
MARINA DEL REY, CA	3,170	3,106	3,170
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	399	391	399
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	332	325	332
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,590	1,558	1,590
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,456	2,406	2,456
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,897	1,859	1,897
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	8,755	8,579	8,755
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,520	1,489	1,520
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	3,291	3,225	3,291
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,710	1,675	1,710
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	8,146	7,983	8,146
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,299	1,273	1,299
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	125	122	125
SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	3,800	3,724	3,800
SAN FRANCISCO BAY DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	986	966	986
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	1,979	1,939	1,979
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,548	2,497	2,548
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	3,746	3,671	3,746

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	3,470	3,400	3,470
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,530	3,459	3,530
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	2,040	1,999	2,040
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,648	1,615	1,648
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	2,564	2,512	2,564
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	2,770	2,714	2,770
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	2,346	2,299	2,346
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,805	2,748	2,805
YUBA RIVER, CA	97	95	97
COLORADO			
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	569	557	569
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,269	1,243	1,269
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	1,162	1,138	1,162
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	260	254	260
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,629	2,576	2,629
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	740	725	740
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,701	1,666	1,701
CONNECTICUT			
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	582	570	582
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	641	628	641
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	376	368	376
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	1,022	1,001	1,022
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	368	360	368
LONG ISLAND SOUND DMMP, CT	1,000	980	1,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	672	658	672
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	437	428	437
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	850	833	850
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	463	453	463
THOMASTON DAM, CT	839	822	839
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	686	672	686
DELAWARE			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DE	15	14	15
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY	18,648	18,275	18,648
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	105	102	105
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,250	3,185	3,250
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	154	150	154
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL)	875	857	875
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	40	39	40
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	25	24	25
FLORIDA			
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	5,150	5,047	5,150
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	15,063	14,761	15,063
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	1,350	1,323	1,350
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	6,500	6,370	6,500
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL, AND GA	8,159	7,995	8,159
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,008	1,967	2,008
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,850	2,793	2,850
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	2,015	1,974	2,015
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	2,000	1,960	2,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	1,575	1,543	1,575
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,750	3,675	3,750
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	32	31	32
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	5,276	5,170	5,276
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	6,287	6,161	6,287

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
GEORGIA			
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	6,335	6,208	6,335
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL AND	638	625	638
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,000	2,940	3,000
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	8,346	8,179	8,346
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	7,722	7,567	7,722
HARTWELL LAKE, GA AND SC	10,549	10,338	10,549
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, GA	85	83	85
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	141	138	141
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA AND SC	9,786	9,590	9,786
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA	149	146	149
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA, AND SC	7,305	7,158	7,305
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	17,452	17,102	17,452
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	85	83	85
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL	7,857	7,699	7,857
HAWAII			
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	266	260	266
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	984	964	984
NAWILIWILI HARBOR, HI	250	245	250
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	931	912	931
IDAHO			
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,404	1,375	1,404
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,695	2,641	2,695
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	312	305	312
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	2,918	2,859	2,918
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	514	503	514
ILLINOIS			
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL AND IN	3,983	3,903	3,983
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	5,340	5,233	5,340
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,158	2,114	2,158
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	523	512	523
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	10,565	.....	.....
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	432	423	432
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL AND IN	31,937	31,298	31,937
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL AND IN	2,181	2,137	2,181
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	1,945	1,906	1,945
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,539	1,508	1,539
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	725	710	725
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	6,865	6,727	6,865
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS	49,748	48,753	49,748
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS	23,582	23,110	23,582
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	111	108	111
REND LAKE, IL	5,436	5,327	5,436
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	689	675	689
INDIANA			
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	1,155	1,131	1,155
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	176	172	176
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	1,087	1,065	1,087
CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE, IN	1,178	1,154	1,178
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	6,675	6,541	6,675
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	645	632	645
J. EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	2,270	2,224	2,270
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,231	1,206	1,231
MONROE LAKE, IN	1,252	1,226	1,252
PATOKA LAKE, IN	1,118	1,095	1,118
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	185	181	185
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	1,073	1,051	1,073

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	129	126	129
IOWA			
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	4,298	4,212	4,298
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	552	540	552
MISSOURI RIVER-SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA, KS, MO, AND	6,199	6,075	6,199
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,184	2,140	2,184
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	4,639	4,546	4,639
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	5,275	5,169	5,275
KANSAS			
CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,140	2,097	2,140
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	2,237	2,192	2,237
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	1,086	1,064	1,086
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	871	853	871
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,308	1,281	1,308
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	849	832	849
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	339	332	339
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,453	1,423	1,453
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,619	1,586	1,619
MARION LAKE, KS	1,800	1,764	1,800
MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,068	2,026	2,068
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,073	2,031	2,073
PEARSON-SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	1,323	1,296	1,323
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,358	2,310	2,358
POMONA LAKE, KS	2,371	2,323	2,371
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	150	147	150
TORONTO LAKE, KS	699	685	699
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,239	2,194	2,239
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,607	1,574	1,607
KENTUCKY			
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN	10,091	9,889	10,091
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,362	2,314	2,362
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,655	1,621	1,655
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,615	1,582	1,615
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,765	1,729	1,765
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	990	970	990
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,792	1,756	1,792
FALLS OF THE OHIO NATIONAL WILDLIFE, KY AND IN	21	20	21
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,969	1,929	1,969
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,515	1,484	1,515
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	2,280	2,234	2,280
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,222	2,177	2,222
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	865	847	865
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	10	9	10
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,589	1,557	1,589
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	1,224	1,199	1,224
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	240	235	240
NOLIN LAKE, KY	2,487	2,437	2,487
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, AND OH	33,561	32,889	33,561
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA, AND WV	5,582	5,470	5,582
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,195	1,171	1,195
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	7	6	7
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,514	2,463	2,514
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,205	1,180	1,205
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	7,559	7,407	7,559
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,135	1,112	1,135
LOUISIANA			
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, LA	7,152	7,008	7,152

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	2,057	2,015	2,057
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	1,191	1,167	1,191
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	24	23	24
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	15	14	15
BAYOU TECHE, LA	132	129	132
CADDO LAKE, LA	220	215	220
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	15,474	15,164	15,474
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,695	1,661	1,695
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	30,575	29,963	30,575
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	885	867	885
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	814	797	814
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	7,717	7,562	7,717
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,250	1,225	1,250
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,272	1,246	1,272
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	68,000	66,640	68,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	60	58	60
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	200	196	200
WALLACE LAKE, LA	239	234	239
MAINE			
DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME	1,050	1,029	1,050
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	117	114	117
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	800	784	800
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	20	19	20
MARYLAND			
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	13,879	13,601	13,879
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)	400	392	400
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	150	147	150
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	171	167	171
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV	1,955	1,915	1,955
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	500	490	500
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	64	62	64
SUSQUEHANNA-HAVRE DE GRACE, MD	180	176	180
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	1,500	1,470	1,500
MASSACHUSETTS			
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	687	673	687
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	839	822	839
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	609	596	609
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	17,457	17,107	17,457
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	300	294	300
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	278	272	278
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	558	546	558
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	580	568	580
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	437	428	437
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	692	678	692
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	643	630	643
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	446	437	446
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	1,100	1,078	1,100
TULLY LAKE, MA	781	765	781
WEST HILL DAM, MA	686	672	686
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	633	620	633
MICHIGAN			
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI	722	707	722
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	325	318	325
DETROIT RIVER, MI	5,817	5,700	5,817
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	743	728	743
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	10	9	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	200	196	200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	12	11	12
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	700	686	700
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	600	588	600
ROUGE RIVER, MI	960	940	960
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	550	539	550
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	20	19	20
ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI	643	630	643
ST. MARYS RIVER, MI	26,031	25,510	26,031
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,576	2,524	2,576
MINNESOTA			
BIGSTONE LAKE-WHETSTONE RIVER, MN AND SD	236	231	236
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN AND WI	7,581	7,429	7,581
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	377	369	377
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	611	598	611
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	270	264	270
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS	44,993	44,093	44,993
ORWELL LAKE, MN	409	400	409
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	86	84	86
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	163	159	163
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,357	3,289	3,357
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	452	442	452
MISSISSIPPI			
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	25	24	25
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	258	252	258
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	1,801	1,764	1,801
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	70	68	70
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	40	39	40
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,605	1,572	1,605
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	5,655	5,541	5,655
PEARL RIVER, MS AND LA	133	130	133
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	82	80	82
MISSOURI			
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	6,330	6,203	6,330
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	3,288	3,222	3,288
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	7,801	7,644	7,801
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	2,255	2,209	2,255
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	907	888	907
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	1,018	997	1,018
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS	25,571	25,059	25,571
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,415	2,366	2,415
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	14	13	14
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	400	392	400
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,257	1,231	1,257
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,895	3,817	3,895
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO AND AR	7,082	6,940	7,082
UNION LAKE, MO	7	6	7
MONTANA			
FORT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	15,366	15,058	15,366
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	200	196	200
LIBBY DAM, MT	1,736	1,701	1,736
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	147	144	147
NEBRASKA			
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE AND SD	7,434	7,285	7,434
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	2,722	2,667	2,722
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	345	338	345
MISSOURI RIVER-KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	137	134	137

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
PAPILLION CREEK, NE	835	818	835
SALT CREEKS AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	1,267	1,241	1,267
NEVADA			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	185	181	185
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV AND CA	954	934	954
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	304	297	304
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	644	631	644
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	775	759	775
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	769	753	769
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,489	1,459	1,489
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	91	89	91
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	653	639	653
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH	500	490	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	250	245	250
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	735	720	735
NEW JERSEY			
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	350	343	350
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	360	352	360
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	15	14	15
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA, AND DE	21,410	20,981	21,410
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	238	233	238
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	300	294	300
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	60	58	60
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	570	558	570
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	1,575	1,543	1,575
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	65	63	65
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	60	58	60
NEW MEXICO			
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	3,738	3,663	3,738
COCHITI LAKE, NM	3,240	3,175	3,240
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	3,317	3,250	3,317
GALISTEO DAM, NM	938	919	938
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	843	826	843
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	1,155	1,131	1,155
RIO GRANDE ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM, NM	2,425	2,376	2,425
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,814	1,777	1,814
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	548	537	548
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	1,053	1,031	1,053
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM	1,312	1,285	1,312
NEW YORK			
ALMOND LAKE, NY	696	682	696
ARKPORT DAM, NY	354	346	354
BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	60	58	60
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,324	1,297	1,324
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	950	931	950
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	60	58	60
EAST RIVER, NY	130	127	130
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	823	806	823
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	60	58	60
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	60	58	60
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINTENANCE)	2,150	2,107	2,150
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O & C)	1,700	1,666	1,700
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	959	939	959
JAMAICA BAY, NY	3,360	3,292	3,360
LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	5	4	5

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY	2,861	2,803	2,861
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	40	39	40
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	6,558	6,426	6,558
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY AND NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	9,200	9,016	9,200
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSIT	1,100	1,078	1,100
NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	60	58	60
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,990	1,950	1,990
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	5	4	5
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	900	882	900
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	642	629	642
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	822	805	822
NORTH CAROLINA			
B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,833	1,796	1,833
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	806	789	806
FALLS LAKE, NC	2,014	1,973	2,014
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	261	255	261
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	1,000	980	1,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	5,900	5,782	5,900
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	700	686	700
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	50	49	50
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	250	245	250
W. KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	3,449	3,380	3,449
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	12,445	12,196	12,445
NORTH DAKOTA			
BOWMAN HALEY, ND	151	147	151
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	10,519	10,308	10,519
HOMME LAKE, ND	208	203	208
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	262	256	262
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,249	1,224	1,249
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	702	687	702
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	137	134	137
SOURIS RIVER, ND	351	343	351
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	28	27	28
OHIO			
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	1,462	1,432	1,462
BERLIN LAKE, OH	2,613	2,560	2,613
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,599	1,567	1,599
CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM, OH	1,274	1,248	1,274
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	9,665	9,471	9,665
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	1,275	1,249	1,275
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	2,363	2,315	2,363
DILLON LAKE, OH	1,354	1,326	1,354
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	1,000	980	1,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	610	597	610
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,056	1,034	1,056
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	29	28	29
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	1,356	1,328	1,356
MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL, OH	1,993	1,953	1,993
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,454	1,424	1,454
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	12,381	12,133	12,381
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	444	435	444
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	1,740	1,705	1,740
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	305	298	305
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	35	34	35
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	270	264	270
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	5,982	5,862	5,982
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	655	641	655
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	838	821	838

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	1,069	1,047	1,069
OKLAHOMA			
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	591	579	591
BIRCH LAKE, OK	987	967	987
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	2,058	2,016	2,058
CANTON LAKE, OK	3,902	3,823	3,902
COPAN LAKE, OK	1,420	1,391	1,420
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	6,049	5,928	6,049
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	4,992	4,892	4,992
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	1,089	1,067	1,089
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	711	696	711
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	634	621	634
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,549	1,518	1,549
HULAH LAKE, OK	772	756	772
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	201	196	201
KAW LAKE, OK	2,149	2,106	2,149
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	7,071	6,929	7,071
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	6,827	6,690	6,827
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	4,369	4,281	4,369
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	32	31	32
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	128	125	128
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,254	1,228	1,254
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OK	5,399	5,291	5,399
SARDIS LAKE, OK	1,002	981	1,002
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	1,000	980	1,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,767	1,731	1,767
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	4,055	3,973	4,055
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,537	1,506	1,537
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	4,913	4,814	4,913
WISTER LAKE, OK	1,231	1,206	1,231
OREGON			
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	931	912	931
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	561	549	561
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	6,640	6,507	6,640
CHETCO RIVER, OR	561	549	561
COLUMBIA AND LOWER WILLAMETTE RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER,	24,378	23,890	24,378
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA	12,857	12,599	12,857
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR	693	679	693
COOS BAY, OR	4,793	4,697	4,793
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	298	292	298
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	1,299	1,273	1,299
COUGAR LAKE, OR	1,682	1,648	1,682
DETROIT LAKE, OR	830	813	830
DORENA LAKE, OR	1,100	1,078	1,100
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	60	58	60
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	1,130	1,107	1,130
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	1,771	1,735	1,771
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,658	1,624	1,658
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	702	687	702
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, OR	20	19	20
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	575	563	575
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	4,394	4,306	4,394
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,835	1,798	1,835
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,487	3,417	3,487
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	5,309	5,202	5,309
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	200	196	200
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	574	562	574
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	95	93	95
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	551	539	551

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	7,400	7,252	7,400
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	104	101	104
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	459	449	459
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	685	671	685
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,962	1,922	1,962
PENNSYLVANIA			
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	4,000	3,920	4,000
ALVIN R. BUSH DAM, PA	816	799	816
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	384	376	384
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,473	1,443	1,473
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,891	2,833	2,891
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,356	1,328	1,356
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	2,446	2,397	2,446
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	2,086	2,044	2,086
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	893	875	893
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	1,095	1,073	1,095
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,660	1,626	1,660
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	898	880	898
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	1,216	1,191	1,216
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	400	392	400
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	1,101	1,078	1,101
JOHNSTOWN, PA	80	78	80
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,565	1,533	1,565
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,611	1,578	1,611
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	2,005	1,964	2,005
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	17,018	16,677	17,018
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH, AND WV	23,140	22,677	23,140
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH, AND WV	626	613	626
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	120	117	120
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	623	610	623
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	63	61	63
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	4,507	4,416	4,507
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	46	45	46
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	250	245	250
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,426	2,377	2,426
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	514	503	514
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	112	109	112
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,752	2,696	2,752
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	2,421	2,372	2,421
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	390	382	390
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	1,431	1,402	1,431
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	883	865	883
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD	2,210	2,165	2,210
PUERTO RICO			
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	2,700	2,646	2,700
RHODE ISLAND			
FOX POINT BARRIER, NARRANGANSETT BAY, RI	558	546	558
GREAT SALT POND, BLOCK ISLAND, RI	250	245	250
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	90	88	90
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	450	441	450
WOONSOCKET, RI	420	411	420
SOUTH CAROLINA			
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	13,841	13,564	13,841
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	5,408	5,299	5,408
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	65	63	65
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	875	857	875

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	8,285	8,119	8,285
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	296	290	296
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	222	217	222
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,818	8,641	8,818
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	189	185	189
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD AND MN	554	542	554
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD AND ND	10,318	10,111	10,318
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	84	82	84
TENNESSEE			
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	6,020	5,899	6,020
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,346	6,219	6,346
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	3,098	3,036	3,098
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	6,358	6,230	6,358
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	5,925	5,806	5,925
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	34	33	34
J. PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,380	4,292	4,380
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	8,106	7,943	8,106
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	8	7	8
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	21,845	21,408	21,845
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	109	106	109
TEXAS			
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	1,081	1,059	1,081
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI	1,593	1,561	1,593
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,861	1,823	1,861
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,776	3,700	3,776
BELTON LAKE, TX	3,516	3,445	3,516
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,464	2,414	2,464
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	3,878	3,800	3,878
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	3,670	3,596	3,670
CANYON LAKE, TX	3,580	3,508	3,580
CEDAR BAYOU, TX	350	343	350
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,912	5,793	5,912
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	6,939	6,800	6,939
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	44	43	44
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	3,464	3,394	3,464
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	4,796	4,700	4,796
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	3,738	3,663	3,738
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	3,519	3,448	3,519
GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	500	490	500
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,305	2,258	2,305
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,981	2,921	2,981
GREENS BAYOU, TX	800	784	800
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	24,277	23,791	24,277
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,635	1,602	1,635
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	18,188	17,824	18,188
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	1,343	1,316	1,343
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,586	1,554	1,586
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	1,956	1,916	1,956
LAKE KEMP, TX	183	179	183
LAVON LAKE, TX	3,062	3,000	3,062
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,199	3,135	3,199
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,307	4,220	4,307
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	2,867	2,809	2,867
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	2,447	2,398	2,447
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,802	1,765	1,802
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,211	1,186	1,211
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	3,526	3,455	3,526
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	100	98	100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	1,922	1,883	1,922
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	14,182	13,898	14,182
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	5,045	4,944	5,045
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	242	237	242
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	3,246	3,181	3,246
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	2,087	2,045	2,087
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,667	4,573	4,667
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	100	98	100
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	2,935	2,876	2,935
WACO LAKE, TX	3,035	2,974	3,035
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,990	1,950	1,990
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	5,397	5,289	5,397
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	3,847	3,770	3,847
UTAH			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	31	30	31
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	642	629	642
VERMONT			
BALL MOUNTAIN, VT	889	871	889
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	79	77	79
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	748	733	748
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	941	922	941
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	879	861	879
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	1,993	1,953	1,993
VIRGINIA			
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA	1,742	1,707	1,742
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA	1,156	1,132	1,156
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	600	588	600
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,253	2,207	2,253
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HARBOR, VA (DRIF	1,048	1,027	1,048
HAMPTON ROADS, VA (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	75	73	75
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	461	451	461
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	4,363	4,275	4,363
JOHN H. KERR LAKE, VA AND NC	10,629	10,416	10,629
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	2,341	2,294	2,341
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	11,050	10,829	11,050
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	486	476	486
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	4,694	4,600	4,694
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	902	883	902
WASHINGTON			
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	708	693	708
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	2,445	2,396	2,445
GRAYS HARBOR, WA	8,500	8,330	8,500
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	3,050	2,989	3,050
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,734	3,659	3,734
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WA	70	68	70
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	730	715	730
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	10,553	10,341	10,553
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,062	2,020	2,062
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,823	2,766	2,823
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,172	2,128	2,172
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	3,021	2,960	3,021
MOUNT ST. HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	313	306	313
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	3,549	3,478	3,549
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	516	505	516
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	995	975	995
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	453	443	453
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	4,240	4,155	4,240

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	271	265	271
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	55	53	55
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	145	142	145
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA AND OR	3,236	3,171	3,236
WEST VIRGINIA			
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,366	1,338	1,366
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	2,039	1,998	2,039
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,695	2,641	2,695
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	2,116	2,073	2,116
ELKINS, WV	60	58	60
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	528	517	528
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	12,401	12,152	12,401
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY, AND OH	34,232	33,547	34,232
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY, AND OH	2,805	2,748	2,805
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	2,407	2,358	2,407
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,064	1,042	1,064
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,692	2,638	2,692
SUTTON LAKE, WV	2,587	2,535	2,587
TYGART LAKE, WV	1,406	1,377	1,406
WISCONSIN			
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	741	726	741
FOX RIVER, WI	2,889	2,831	2,889
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	3,406	3,337	3,406
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	69	67	69
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	288	282	288
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	19	18	19
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	524	513	524
WYOMING			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	55	53	55
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,014	993	1,014
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	111	108	111
SUBTOTAL, ITEMS LISTED UNDER STATES	2,112,016	2,059,118	2,101,451
NATIONAL PROGRAMS			
ADDITIONAL FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION	.....	10,400	.....
ADDITIONAL NAVIGATION	.....	123,313	.....
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:			
SMALL, REMOTE OR SUBSISTENCE HARBOR MAINTENANCE	.....	.....	30,000
INLAND NAVIGATION CHANNEL MAINTENANCE	.....	.....	15,000
COMMERCIAL HARBOR MAINTENANCE	.....	.....	55,000
MISCELLANEOUS MAINTENANCE	.....	.....	34,000
MULTI-PURPOSE PROJECT O&M	.....	.....	9,000
INTERAGENCY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TASK FORCE/HURRICANE	6,000	2,450	6,000
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	690	676	690
ASSET MANAGEMENT/FACILITIES AND EQUIP MAINT (FEM)	4,750	4,655	4,750
BUDGET/MANAGEMENT SUPPORT FOR O&M BUSINESS PROGRAMS:			
STEWARDSHIP SUPPORT PROGRAM	750	735	750
PERFORMANCE-BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	4,000	3,920	4,000
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,650	1,617	1,650
OPTIMIZATION TOOLS FOR NAVIGATION	392	384	392
COASTAL AND OCEAN DATA SYSTEM	3,000	3,920	5,000
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,700	2,646	2,700
RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE AT CORPS PROJECTS	5,000	4,900	5,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	4,500	4,410	4,500
DREDGE MCFARLAND READY RESERVE	12,000	11,760	.....
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	12,000	11,760	.....
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,150	1,127	1,150
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH [DOER]	6,300	6,174	6,300

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM [DOTS]	2,820	2,763	2,820
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	270	264	270
FACILITY PROTECTION [CISP]	6,500	6,370	6,500
FERC HYDROPOWER COORDINATION	3,000	2,940	3,000
FISH & WILDLIFE OPERATING FISH HATCHERY REIMBURSEMENT	3,800	3,724	3,800
GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODEL	1,080	1,058	1,080
GLOBAL CHANGE SUSTAINABILITY	10,000	.....	.....
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	3,420	3,351	3,420
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED FEDERAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	26,780	26,244	26,780
MONITORING OF COMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS	3,920	3,841	3,920
NATIONAL (LEVEE) FLOOD INVENTORY	21,000	20,580	21,000
NATIONAL (MULTIPLE PROJECT) NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	4,230	4,145	4,230
NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING PROGRAM	6,300	6,174	8,300
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM (PORTFOLIO RISK ASSESSMENT	15,000	14,700	15,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM [NEPP]	6,750	6,615	6,750
NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR REALLOCATIONS	571	559	571
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT	300	294	300
PROTECT, CLEAR, AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS	50	49	50
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	490	500
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,771	4,675	4,771
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	825	808	825
RECREATIONONESTOP [R1S] NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVATION	65	63	65
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,800	1,764	4,100
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHAB	300	294	300
SHORELINE USE PERMIT STUDY	250	245	250
SUSTAINABILITY AND ENERGY (NEW)	12,300	.....	.....
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT [WOTS]	500	490	500
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	201,984	307,347	304,984
REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	−46,435
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	2,314,000	2,366,465	2,360,000

Dam Re-operation Studies.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is encouraged to initiate and complete, on the most expedited basis practicable, a study to determine the feasibility and estimated water supply benefit of updating the operations and maintenance manuals for the dams in the State of California within the jurisdiction of the Sacramento and San Francisco office of the Corps of Engineers.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funds above the budget request to continue ongoing projects and activities. The Committee is concerned that the administration criteria for navigation maintenance, does not allow small, remote, or subsistence harbors to properly compete for scarce navigation maintenance funds. The Committee urges the Corps to revise the criteria used for determining which navigation maintenance projects are funded to account for the economic impact that these projects provide to local and regional economies. The Committee recommends that priority in allocating these funds should be towards completing ongoing work maintaining harbors and shipping channels, particularly where there is a U.S. Coast Guard presence, or that will enhance national, regional, or local economic development, and promote job growth and inter-

national competitiveness or for critical backlog maintenance activities.

The administration has complete discretion over how these funds are to be used. The intent of these funds is for ongoing work that either did not make it into the administration request or were inadequately budgeted. Within 30 days of enactment, the Corps shall provide the House and Senate Appropriations Committees a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed and in which phase the work is being accomplished.

Coastal Ocean Data System.—The administration proposed a line item called Coastal Data Information Program under the Operation and Maintenance account in the Press Book that accompanied the administration's fiscal year 2011 budget request as a "previously unfunded item" commonly referred to as a new start. When the fiscal year 2011 budget justification sheets were delivered to the Committee, this line item was renamed Coastal Ocean Data System. The fiscal year 2012 budget request treated this as a continuing item for 2012 as Coastal Ocean Data System under the Operations and Maintenance account because the fiscal year 2011 appropriations process was not completed when the budget was released. Once the continuing resolution for fiscal year 2011 was enacted and the Corps prepared their work plan, the Corps included funding for this newly named item in the Investigations account under the traditional line item Coastal Field Data Collection.

The Committee has reviewed the budget justifications for fiscal year 2011 and fiscal year 2012 and does not agree that this item should be designated as a new start. While the line item description is new, the work proposed appears to be similar, if not the same work as to what has traditionally been funded for this item regardless of the name. Therefore the Committee has included funding for this as a continuing item. Additional funding has been recommended for the maintenance of wave observations and expansion of the national wave monitoring network. The Committee notes the importance of accurate directional wave measurements to the success of coastal projects.

Dredge Wheeler and McFarland Ready Reserve.—The Committee notes that $24,000,000 has been requested to keep these two dredges in ready reserve status in accordance with legislation provided in the Water Resources Development Acts of 1996 and 2007. These funds are intended to allow the dredges to be staffed and ready for periodic testing and utilization, if needed, based on very specific criteria.

In this tight fiscal environment, the Committee does not believe that it is justifiable for $24,000,000 to be provided to the Corps for these vessels to sit at the dock. The fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water conferees commissioned a GAO study of the benefits and impacts of the minimum dredge fleet. That report, published in March 2003, stated that "Restrictions on the use of the Corps' hopper dredge fleet, which began in fiscal year 1993, have imposed costs on the Corps' dredging program, but have thus far not resulted in proven benefits. Most of the costs of the Corps' hopper dredges are incurred regardless of how frequently the dredges are used. For example, the Corps' placement of the *Wheeler* in ready reserve—55 annual workdays plus emergencies—reduced the ves-

sel's productivity by 56 percent but reduced costs by only 20 percent." The Corps has yet to provide any documentation showing the benefits of the ready reserve of these dredges.

In light of this report and the current economic climate, the Committee believes that it is prudent to fully utilize the capabilities of these dredges. The Committee recommends that rather than using the proposed $24,000,000 for keeping these vessels in a ready reserve status that these funds be used for actual dredging of navigation harbors and channels. Consequently, the Committee has included legislative language directing full utilization of these dredges.

Global Change Sustainability.—No funding is included for this new item first proposed in the fiscal year 2011 budget. As it has not received any funding it is considered a new start and is ineligible for funding in fiscal year 2012.

Sustainability and Energy.—No funding is included for this new item proposed in the fiscal year 2012 budget.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2011	$189,620,000
Budget estimate, 2012	196,000,000
House allowance	196,000,000
Committee recommendation	193,000,000

An appropriation of $193,000,000 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 33 U.S.C. section 401, the Clean Water Act of 1977 Public Law 95–217, and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 Public Law 92–532.

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

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2011	$129,740,000
Budget estimate, 2012	109,000,000
House allowance	109,000,000
Committee recommendation	109,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $109,000,000 to continue activities related to the FUSRAP in fiscal year 2005.

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.

The Corps is directed to prioritize sites that are nearing completion.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 2011	.....
Budget estimate, 2012	$27,000,000
House allowance	27,000,000
Committee recommendation	27,000,000

The Committee has recommended $27,000,000 for the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account. 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.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2011	$184,630,000
Budget estimate, 2012	185,000,000
House allowance	177,640,000
Committee recommendation	185,000,000

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 $185,000,000.

Executive Direction and Management.—The Office of the Chief of Engineers and 8 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, and develops planning techniques for the management and development of the Nation's water resources.

Within the funds provided, the Institute for Water Resources is directed to submit to the Senate Appropriations Committee within 180 days of enactment of this act, a vision on how the Nation should address the critical need for port and inland waterway modernization to accommodate the post-Panamax vessels that currently

transit the Suez Canal and will soon take advantage of the Panama Canal Expansion. Factors for consideration within the vision include the costs associated with deepening and widening deep-draft harbors; the ability of the waterways and ports to enhance the Nation's export initiatives benefitting the agricultural and manufacturing sectors; the current and projected population trends that distinguish regional ports and ports which are immediately adjacent to large population centers; and the environmental impacts resulting from the modernization of inland waterways and deep-draft ports.

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

Office of Congressional Affairs.—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 Corps is reminded that 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.

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

Appropriations, 2011	$4,990,000
Budget estimate, 2012	6,000,000
House allowance	5,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,000,000

The Committee has recommended $5,000,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) [OASA(CW)]. As has been previously stated, the Committee believes that this office should be funded through the Defense appropriations bill and directs the administration to budget for this office under the Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance—Army account in future budget submissions. It is the Committee's opinion that the traditional role of the ASA(CW) is to provide the Chief of Engineers advice about policy matters and generally be the political spokesperson for the administration's policies; however, the Chief of Engineers is responsible for carrying out the program. This is underscored by the administration's budget documents that state that the OASA(CW) provides policy direction and oversight for the civil works program and the Headquarters of the Corps provides executive direction and management of the civil works program.

The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works advises the Secretary of the Army on a variety of matters, including the Civil Works program of the Corps of Engineers. The Assistant Secretary is a member of the Army Secretariat with responsibilities, such as

participating in continuity of Government exercises that extend well beyond Civil Works.

The Army's accounting system does not track OMA funding of overhead or Army-wide support offices on the basis of which office receives support, nor would it be efficient or effective to do so for a 20-person office. Instead, expenses such as legal support, personnel services, finance and accounting services, the executive motor pool, travel on military aircraft, and other support services are centrally funded and managed on a department-wide basis. Transferring the funding for the expenses of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works to a separate account has greatly complicated the Army's accounting for such indirect and overhead expenses with no commensurate benefit to justify the change. The Committee does not agree that these costs should be funded in this bill and therefore has only provided funding for salaries and expenses as in previous years.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Section 101. The bill includes language concerning reprogramming guidelines.

Section 102. The bill includes language prohibiting implementation of competitive sourcing or HPO.

Section 103. The bill includes language concerning continuing contracts and the Inland Waterway Trust Fund.

Section 104. The bill includes language concerning report notifications.

Section 105. The bill includes a provision providing the Corps of Engineers authorization for emergency measures to exclude Asian carp from the Great Lakes. It should be noted that when considering this language for inclusion in this bill that the Committee did not consider hydrologic separation of the Great Lakes Basin from the Mississippi River Basin to be an emergency measure. The Committee believes that the issue of hydrologic separation should be fully studied by the Corps of Engineers and vetted by the appropriate congressional authorizing committees and specifically enacted into law rather than have implementation be attempted through this limited provision.

Section 106. The bill includes language concerning funding transfers.

Section 107. The bill includes language authorizing employees to serve on an International Commission.

Section 108. The bill includes language concerning the utilization of the Revolving Fund for the acquisition of a building.

Section 109. The bill includes language concerning the transfer of funds to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Section 110. The bill includes language concerning Federal dredges.

Section 111. The bill includes language concerning Federal dredges.

Section 112. The bill includes language concerning Federal dredges.

Section 113. The bill includes language concerning a real property interest.

Section 114. The bill includes language concerning the deauthorization of a portion of a project.

Section 115. The bill includes language concerning the utilization of the revolving fund for construction of facilities.

Section 116. The bill includes language concerning disposition of acquired lands.

Section 117. The bill includes language concerning dredge material disposal sites.

Section 118. The bill includes language deauthorizing a portion of a project.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2011	$31,940,000
Budget estimate, 2012	32,991,000
House allowance	28,704,000
Committee recommendation	28,991,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2012 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act totals $28,991,000. An appropriation of $25,441,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction; $2,000,000 for fish, wildlife, and recreation, mitigation and conservation. The Committee recommendation provides $1,550,000 for program administration and oversight.

Legislative language is included which allows up to $1,500,000 of the funds provided to be used for administrative costs.

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

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Reclamation was established in 1902 with the primary mission of harnessing the western rivers that led to homesteading and the economic development in the west. Today, Reclamation has evolved into a contemporary water management agency. In addition to the traditional missions of bringing water and power to the west, Reclamation has developed and continues to develop, programs, initiatives, and activities that will help the Western States, Native American tribes, and others meet new water needs and balance the multitude of competing uses of water in the West.

While Reclamation only has projects in the 17 Western States, their programs impact the entire Nation. Reclamation is the largest wholesaler of water in the country operating 348 reservoirs with a total storage capacity of 245 million acre-feet. Reclamation projects

deliver 10 trillion gallons of water to more than 31 million people each year, and provide 1 out of 5 Western farmers (140,000) with irrigation water for 10 million acres of farmland that produce 60 percent of the Nation's vegetables and 25 percent of its fruits and nuts. Reclamation manages, with partners, 289 recreation sites that have 90 million visits annually.

OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The fiscal year 2012 budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation is composed of $1,018,389,000 in new budget authority. The budget request is $44,196,000 less than the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount.

Unfortunately this budget proposal is woefully inadequate in funding the infrastructure needs. The Committee is particularly disappointed to see that rural water projects are greatly underfunded in this budget. In many cases the budget proposals for these projects are less than the inflation rate for the project. In other words, at this level of investment, these projects will never be completed because project costs are increasing faster than the amount recommended by the administration.

The largest account in Reclamation's budget is the Water and Related Resources account. The administration budget proposal includes $805,187,000 for this account. This is a decrease of $106,486,000, from the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount.

The Central Valley Project Restoration Fund is proposed at $53,068,000 for fiscal year 2012. This is an increase of $3,154,000 over the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount. This account is primarily funded from revenues collected from water and power customers. Levels of funding in this account are based on a 3-year rolling average of revenues collected.

The California Bay-Delta Restoration account is proposed at $39,651,000 for fiscal year 2012. This is approximately the same as the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount.

The Policy and Administration account is requested at $60,000,000, $1,078,000 less than the fiscal year 2011 enacted amount.

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2011	$911,673,000
Budget estimate, 2012	805,187,000
House allowance	822,300,000
Committee recommendation	885,670,000

An appropriation of $885,670,000 is recommended by the Committee for 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.

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.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING

The budget for the Bureau of Reclamation consists of individual line items of projects. As presented by the President, the budget contains 204 specific line-item requests for directed spending by the administration. An additional 42 line-item requests for funding by the administration is for nationwide line items. All of these line items were specific requests by the administration to be funded in fiscal year 2012. They did not request these funds programmatically, they requested them for a specific project in a specific location for a specific purpose.

Congressionally directed spending has become synonymous with earmarks in recent debates, even for agencies such as the Bureau of Reclamation where the majority of the budget request is based on individual line item studies and projects. Due to this ongoing debate, the Committee has voluntarily refused all congressionally directed spending requests for fiscal year 2012. That means that the administration has total discretion as to how the funding that this Committee appropriates will be spent as it relates to individual studies and projects. The Committee has retained the traditional table for the Water and Related Resources Account delineating the line items requested by the President in the budget request. Due to inadequacies in the administration's budget request, the Committee has also inserted some additional line item funding under the Regional Programs heading for specific categories of studies or projects that the Committee feels are underrepresented in the administration's budget request. Reclamation has discretion within the guidelines provided as to which line items this additional funding will be applied to. The Committee has not included any congressionally directed spending as defined in section 5(a) of rule XLIV of the standing rules of the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
ARIZONA						
AK CHIN INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	.....	12,706	.....	12,489	.....	12,706
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT—CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT	6,589	436	6,476	428	6,589	436
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	2,049	.....	2,014	.....	2,049	.....
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	326	.....	320	.....	326	.....
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJE	200	.....	196	.....	200	.....
SALT RIVER PROJECT	646	230	635	226	646	230
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	335	.....	329	.....	335	.....
SIERRA VISTA SUBWATERSHED FEASIBILITY STUDY	463	.....	455	.....	463	.....
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	702	.....	690	.....	702	.....
WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION	.....	.....	4,865	.....	.....	.....
YUMA-AREA PROJECTS	1,576	19,378	1,549	19,048	1,576	19,378
CALIFORNIA						
CACHUMA PROJECT	622	625	611	614	622	625
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJECT	1,452	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECTS:						
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, FOLSOM DAM UNIT/MORMON IS	1,474	7,746	1,448	7,614	1,474	7,746
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	33	2,668	32	2,622	33	2,668
DELTA DIVISION	7,304	5,377	7,179	5,285	7,304	5,377
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,358	2,754	1,334	2,707	1,358	2,754
FRIANT DIVISION	1,738	3,246	1,708	3,190	1,738	3,246
SAN JOAQUIN RESTORATION	.....	.....	.....	.....	9,000	.....
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	11,367	846	11,173	831	11,367	846
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINTENANCE	.....	17,911	.....	17,606	.....	17,911
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	35,344	1,578	34,743	1,551	35,344	1,578
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	638	29	627	28	638	29
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	356	.....	349	.....	356	.....
SHASTA DIVISION	378	7,766	371	7,633	378	7,766
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	10,786	4,201	10,602	4,129	10,786	4,201
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	917	8,002	901	7,865	917	8,002
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	15,426	5,388	15,163	5,296	15,426	5,388

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	500	.....	491	.....	500	.....
LONG BEACH DESALINATION PROJECT	500	.....	491	.....	500	.....
ORLAND PROJECT	.....	709	.....	696	.....	709
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	294	.....	289	.....	294	.....
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	2,485	.....	2,442	.....	2,485	.....
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	247	.....	242	.....	247	.....
SOLANO PROJECT	1,323	2,382	1,300	2,341	1,323	2,382
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	268	.....	263	.....	268	.....
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT	344	41	338	40	344	41
COLORADO						
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PARTIC	11,504	1,249	11,308	1,227	11,504	1,249
COLLBRAN PROJECT	217	1,461	213	1,436	217	1,461
COLORADO—BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	275	10,859	270	10,674	275	10,859
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	344	.....	338	.....	344	.....
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	99	166	97	163	99	166
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	108	8,871	106	8,720	108	8,871
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT—ARKANSAS VALLEY CONDUIT	2,958	.....	2,907	.....	2,958	.....
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	209	1,351	205	1,328	209	1,351
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	.....	4,652	.....	4,572	.....	4,652
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	95	.....	93	.....	95	.....
MANCOS PROJECT	67	120	65	117	67	120
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	100	2,633	98	2,588	100	2,633
PINE RIVER PROJECT	152	240	149	235	152	240
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT	356	4,479	349	4,402	356	4,479
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	754	197	741	193	754	197
UPPER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	256	.....	251	.....	256	.....
IDAHO						
BOISE-AREA PROJECTS	3,004	3,240	2,952	3,184	3,004	3,240
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	17,830	.....	17,526	.....	17,830	.....
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	59	.....	57	.....	59	.....

LEWISTON ORCHARDS PROJECT	1,086	30	1,067	29	1,086	30
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	2,361	12,093	2,320	11,887	2,361	12,093
KANSAS						
WICHITA PROJECT	6	464	5	456	6	464
WICHITA PROJECT (EQUUS BEDS DIVISION)	49	.....	48	.....	49	.....
MONTANA						
CROW TRIBE WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	.....	.....	8,194	.....	.....	.....
FORT PECK RESERVATION/DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	493	.....	484	.....	493	.....
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	.....	345	.....	339	.....	345
HUNTLEY PROJECT	31	53	30	52	31	53
LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT	534	15	524	14	534	15
MILK RIVER PROJECT	327	1,421	321	1,396	327	1,421
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	50	.....	49	.....	50	.....
ROCKY BOYS/NORTH CENTRAL MT RURAL WATER SYSTEM	493	.....	484	.....	493	.....
SUN RIVER PROJECT	52	275	51	270	52	275
NEBRASKA						
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	13	110	12	108	13	110
NEVADA						
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT (HUMBOLT, NEWLANDS, AND WASHOE	4,209	3,022	4,137	2,970	4,209	3,022
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	105	.....	103	.....	105	.....
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	493	.....	484	.....	493	.....
NEW MEXICO						
AAMODT LITIGATION SETTLEMENT ACT	.....	.....	9,240	.....	.....	.....
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,391	1,613	2,350	1,585	2,391	1,613
EASTERN NEW MEXICO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	47	.....	46	.....	47	.....
JICARILLA APACHE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	496	.....	487	.....	496	.....
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	11,838	11,734	11,636	11,534	11,838	11,734
NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	230	.....	226	.....	230	.....
NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY	.....	.....	24,375	.....	.....	.....
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	1,010	4,027	992	3,958	1,010	4,027
RIO GRANDE PUEBLOS PROJECT	250	.....	245	.....	250	.....
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	181	.....	177	.....	181	.....
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	192	.....	188	.....	192	.....
TAOS PUEBLO INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	.....	.....	3,932	.....	.....	.....
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	40	32	39	31	40	32

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	78	.....	76	.....	78	.....
NORTH DAKOTA						
P–SMBP—GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT (NON-RURAL WATER)	10,524	5,814	10,345	5,715	10,524	5,814
OKLAHOMA						
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	66	170	64	167	66	170
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	37	724	36	711	37	724
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	25	547	24	537	25	547
NORMAN PROJECT	37	537	36	527	37	537
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	67	1,397	65	1,373	67	1,397
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	56	604	55	593	56	604
OREGON						
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	473	487	464	478	473	487
DESCHUTES PROJECT	264	192	259	188	264	192
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	594	216	583	212	594	216
KLAMATH PROJECT	16,726	1,883	16,441	1,850	16,726	1,883
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	59	.....	57	.....	59	.....
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	354	325	347	319	354	325
TUALATIN PROJECT	90	204	88	200	90	204
UMATILLA PROJECT	446	2,461	438	2,419	446	2,461
SOUTH DAKOTA						
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	493	.....	484	.....	493	.....
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	.....	15	.....	14	.....	15
MNI WICONI PROJECT	16,270	10,058	15,993	9,887	16,270	10,058
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT	.....	93	.....	91	.....	93
TEXAS						
BALMORHEA PROJECT	43	14	42	13	43	14
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	52	85	51	83	52	85

LOWER RIO GRANDE WATER CONSERVATION PROJECT	49	.....	48	.....	49	.....
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	17	601	16	590	17	601
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	28	638	27	627	28	638
UTAH						
HYRUM PROJECT	166	136	163	133	166	136
MOON LAKE PROJECT	10	61	9	59	10	61
NEWTON PROJECT	53	106	52	104	53	106
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	181	.....	177	.....	181	.....
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	214	215	210	211	214	215
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	1,163	393	1,143	386	1,163	393
SANPETE PROJECT	.....	10	.....	9	.....	10
SCOFIELD PROJECT	301	49	295	48	301	49
SOUTHERN NEVADA/UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	74	.....	72	.....	74	.....
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	206	.....	202	.....	206	.....
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	354	34	347	33	354	34
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	920	752	904	739	920	752
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	65	62	63	60	65	62
WASHINGTON						
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	3,278	4,446	3,222	4,370	3,278	4,446
WASHINGTON AREA PROJECTS	388	46	381	45	388	46
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	59	.....	57	.....	59	.....
YAKIMA PROJECT	824	5,608	809	5,512	824	5,608
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	8,940	.....	8,788	.....	8,940	.....
WYOMING						
KENDRICK PROJECT	117	4,231	115	4,159	117	4,231
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	255	1,964	250	1,930	255	1,964
SHOSHONE PROJECT	75	883	73	867	75	883
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	20	.....	19	.....	20	.....
SUBTOTAL, ITEMS UNDER STATES	237,915	224,832	282,987	220,966	245,463	224,832
REGIONAL PROGRAMS						
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:						
RURAL WATER	.....	.....	.....	.....	21,000	.....
FISH PASSAGE AND FISH SCREENS	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,000	.....
WATER CONSERVATION AND DELIVERY STUDIES AND PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES	.....	.....	.....	.....	8,000	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND COMPLIANCE	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,000	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
ADDITIONAL MAINTENANCE NEEDS	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,500
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT—TITLE	.....	11,519	.....	11,323	.....	11,519
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT—TITLE	6,939	.....	6,821	.....	6,939	.....
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT [CRSP], SECTION 5	3,551	4,469	3,490	4,393	3,551	4,469
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT [CRSP], SECTION 8	4,039	217	3,970	213	4,039	217
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	729	.....	716	.....	729	.....
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:						
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,600	.....	1,600	.....	1,600
INITIATE SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION	.....	63,587	.....	63,587	.....	63,587
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	.....	18,520	.....	18,520	.....	18,520
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	.....	1,300	.....	1,277	.....	1,300
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM	19,954	.....	19,614	.....	19,954	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,610	.....	1,582	.....	1,610	.....
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	.....	9,167	.....	9,011	.....	9,167
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	.....	1,400	.....	1,376	.....	1,400
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES	2,294	.....	2,255	.....	2,294	.....
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENTS:						
TAOS	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,000	.....
AAMODT	.....	.....	.....	.....	9,400	.....
NAVAJO-GALLUP	.....	.....	.....	.....	23,754	.....
WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,950	.....
CROW	.....	.....	.....	.....	8,336	.....
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	8,945	.....	8,792	.....	8,945	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	25,980	.....	25,538	.....	25,980	.....
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	.....	875	.....	860	.....	875
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	6,951	.....	6,832	.....	6,951	.....
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	2,060	.....	2,024	.....	2,060	.....
OPERATION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	874	1,222	859	1,201	874	1,222
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM (OTHER PICK SLOAN)	3,137	40,449	3,083	39,761	3,137	40,449
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	1,735	307	1,705	301	1,735	307
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	711	155	698	152	711	155
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	2,258	.....	2,219	.....	2,258	.....

RECREATION AND FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	2,181	.....	2,143	.....	2,181	.....
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:						
DESALINATION AND WATER PURIFICATION PROGRAM	986	1,100	.....	.....	986	1,100
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,108	.....	9,936	.....	10,108	.....
RURAL WATER PROGRAM, TITLE I	2,000	.....	1,966	.....	2,000	.....
SITE SECURITY ACTIVITIES	.....	25,942	.....	25,500	.....	25,942
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECHNICAL SUPPORT	95	.....	93	.....	95	.....
WATERSMART PROGRAM:						
WATERSMART GRANTS (CHALLENGE GRANT IN 2010)	18,500	.....	10,798	.....	18,500	.....
COOPERATIVE WATERSHED MANAGEMENT	250	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
WATER CONSERVATION FIELD SERVICES PROGRAM	5,108	.....	4,000	.....	5,108	.....
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE PROJECTS	23,616	.....	16,138	.....	23,616	.....
BASIN STUDIES	6,000	.....	4,000	.....	6,000	.....
SUBTOTAL, REGIONAL PROGRAMS	160,611	181,829	139,272	179,075	249,051	184,329
UNDERFINANCING	.....	.....	.....	.....	−12,005	−6,000
TOTAL	398,526	406,661	422,259	400,041	482,509	403,161
TOTAL, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION	805,187		822,300		885,670	

Buried Metallic Water Pipe.—The Committee is aware of concerns regarding implementation and review of Reclamation's Technical Memorandum [TM] 8140–CC–2004–1 ("Corrosion Considerations for Buried Metallic Water Pipe"). The Committee's primary concern is that this TM may be applying different materials to different standards of reliability and potentially increasing project costs unnecessarily. The Committee understands that Reclamation contracted with the National Academy of Sciences in 2009 for an independent review of the TM. While the National Academy generally supported the TM, the Committee notes that the National Academy also recommended in their report ("Review of the Bureau of Reclamation's Corrosion Prevention Standards for Ductile Iron Pipe" (2009)) that Reclamation assemble data on pipeline reliability for all types of pipe specified in Table 2 of TM 8140–CC–2004–1 along with the specified corrosion protection applied in the various soil types. Reclamation has yet to carry out this recommendation which has contributed to continued concerns and challenges to the TM. Therefore, the Committee directs Reclamation to use the TM as only one of the possible criterion for determinations on whether to deny funding or approve of a project or to disqualify any type of pipe from use in highly corrosive soils until it has assembled data on pipeline reliability as recommended by the National Academy and conducted an analysis of the performance of these types of pipe installed in the same or similar conditions. This analysis shall apply consistent standards of reliability and cost effectiveness over the life cycle of the project.

Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project, California.—No funding has been provided for this project as Reclamation apportioned sufficient funding to complete the authorized Federal share of the project.

Indian Water Rights Settlements Account.—The Committee has chosen not to include a separate account for this work. The Committee recognizes that these are legal settlements with the affected tribes, however, believe it is prudent to keep these items within the Water and Related Resources Account. Beyond the actual water rights settlement funding, many of these settlements included construction components very similar to rural water projects funded elsewhere in this account. The Committee understands that due to the way the settlements were structured, that some of the discretionary funding may not be obligated in fiscal year 2012 and will be carried over into later years. The Committee urges Reclamation to minimize this practice to the extent practicable and within the confines of these settlements. To maintain the visibility of these projects, the Committee has included the five projects under the Regional Programs heading with a subheading called Indian Water Rights Settlements.

San Joaquin Restoration Account.—The Committee has chosen not to include a separate account for this item. Rather it is being funded as a sub element under the Friant Division of the Central Valley Project. The Committee believes that this is prudent to keep these funds within the Water and Related Resources account maximizing the flexibility of the funding.

Additional Funding for Water and Related Resources Work.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funds above the

budget request for Water and Related Resources studies, projects and activities. The Committee recommends that priority in allocating these funds should be to complete ongoing work, improve water supply reliability, improve water deliveries, tribal and non-tribal water settlement studies, ecosystem restoration, enhance national, regional, or local economic development, promote job growth or for critical backlog maintenance activities.

The administration has complete discretion over how these funds are to be used. The intent of these funds is for work that either did not make it into the administration request or were inadequately budgeted. Within 30 days of enactment, Reclamation shall provide the House and Senate Appropriations Committees a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed and in which phase the work is being accomplished.

WaterSmart Program, Title XVI Water Reclamation/Reuse Projects.—The Committee is concerned that constrained budgets will severely impact the research and development vital to improvements in water recycling and desalination technologies' development and applications. The Committee believes that only through enhanced Federal and non-Federal research partnerships can this situation be bridged. Therefore, the Bureau of Reclamation should consider how competitively procured cost-shared research on water reuse and desalination can be incorporated into this program. This would potentially allow qualified organizations with extensive experience in conducting research on water reuse and desalination to leverage the Bureau's funding with other cost sharing partners.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2011	$49,914,000
Budget estimate, 2012	53,068,000
House allowance	53,068,000
Committee recommendation	53,068,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $53,068,000 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.

The Central Valley Project Improvement Act, enacted into law in October 1992, established 34 activities to restore and enhance fish and wildlife habitats in California's Central Valley and Trinity Basins. The act set up a Restoration Fund for the deposit of contributions from CVP water and power users to pay for those activities, along with contributions from the State of California, Federal appropriations, and other contributors. Unfortunately a number of

sources envisioned to contribute to this fund never materialized or funding is no longer available from those sources.

Power users, in particular, are paying a much greater share than anyone anticipated. This has resulted in high CVP power costs, and unpredictable fee assessments on power agencies. The power users fees are unpredictable, since in low water years the water users pay very little and the power users make up the difference. The Restoration Fund collection in the early years of the act was the equivalent of adding $1 per megawatt hour to the cost of CVP power, but this has now increased to an average cost of approximately $11 per megawatt hour over the last 4 years.

Since the fund was established in 1992 more than $1,400,000,000 has been spent for restoration activities, but there has been little accountability on how effectively it has been used. There is very little assurance that the goals of the Restoration Fund will be met in the near future, such that the fees could be reduced under the statute. Therefore, the Committee urges the Commissioner to work with power users to determine a more predictable payment stream for power users and to develop measures to provide more accountability and transparency to the restoration process. Reclamation should provide a report to the Senate Appropriations Committee within 180 days of enactment of this act on actions they are taking in this regard. Further, a report covering the previous fiscal year activities should be incorporated into the budget justifications submitted with the President's budget request starting in fiscal year 2013.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2011	$39,920,000
Budget estimate, 2012	39,651,000
House allowance	35,928,000
Committee recommendation	39,651,000

The Committee recommendation includes an appropriation of $39,651,000 for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

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.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2011	$61,078,000
Budget estimate, 2012	60,000,000
House allowance	60,000,000
Committee recommendation	60,000,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is $60,000,000.

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, Colorado, 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.

INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENTS

Appropriations, 2011	
Budget estimate, 2012	$51,483,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $0 for the Indian Water Rights Settlements Account.

This account was proposed as a part of the administration request to cover expenses associated with four Indian water rights settlements contained in the Claims Resolution Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–291), title X of the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11), and the White Mountain Apache Tribe Rural Water System Loan Authorization Act (Public Law 110–390). Rather than create a new account as the budget request suggested, the Committee has chosen to provide this funding request under the Regional Programs section of the Water and Related Resources Account as similar work and funding has been previously provided in that account.

SAN JOAQUIN RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2011	
Budget estimate, 2012	$9,000,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $0 for the San Joaquin Restoration Fund Account.

This account was proposed to implement the provisions described in the Stipulation of Settlement for the *National Resources Defense Council et al.* v. *Rodgers* lawsuit. Rather than provide discretionary funding in this account as the budget request suggested, the Committee has chosen to provide this funding request under the Central Valley Project, Friant Division of the Water and Related Resources Account as similar work and funding has been previously provided in that account.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Section 201. The bill includes language regarding Bureau of Reclamation Reprogramming.

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

Section 203. The bill includes language concerning a project cost ceiling increase.

Section 204. The bill includes language concerning the desalination act.

Section 206. The bill includes language concerning the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

Section 207. The bill includes language concerning groundwater banking.

Section 208. In 2009, the Bureau of Reclamation approved a total of 168 individual transfers among water contractors within the CVP. These transfers represented 435,286 acre feet of Federal contract water, most of which were accomplished with accelerated water transfer programs using programmatic environmental documentation. Reclamation's accelerated transfer programs apply only to water transfers among CVP contractors within specifically defined geographic regions. This provision is not intended to affect existing accelerated water transfer programs that are carried out in compliance with all applicable Federal and State law. Instead, the provision is intended to strengthen Reclamation's ability to facilitate appropriate water transfers between CVP contractors south of the Delta by applying key elements of the existing accelerated programs more broadly within the CVP.

The provision subsumes within it the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act and the Settlement, so that any proposed transfer under section (a) that would interfere with the Settlement Act, the Settlement or implementation of that Settlement would violate the new condition language in section (a) and would not be approved by the Secretary.

The Committee understands that if transfers of water may take up capacity in the San Joaquin River channel it is the intent of the Committee that no transfers under this authority shall be approved if they would occupy capacity needed for interim flows or restoration flows under the Settlement. The intention is to preserve the Settlement, not to expand or diminish it and this provision does not modify or amend the rights and obligations of the parties to the Settlement. It also does not modify, amend or supersede the separate water transfer authorities in section 10010(e) of the Settlement Act.

Section 209. This provision concerns the Friant prepayment for the San Joaquin River Settlement currently authorized for disbursement starting in 2019. The provision advances disbursement of these prepaid funds to 2014 and limits expenditure of these authorized mandatory funds to $40,000,000 per year. The provision changes no other provisions of the San Joaquin River Settlement.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The Committee recommends $25,548,976,000 for the Department of Energy. Within these funds, $11,050,000,000 is for the National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA]. The Committee's highest priority is accelerating breakthroughs in clean energy technologies to reduce the Nation's dependence on foreign oil and developing carbon-free sources of energy that will change the way the United States produces and consumes energy. Increases to ARPA–E should accelerate the commercialization of these technologies and a shift of funding in the Office of Science toward goal-oriented research will focus limited investments. The Committee also provides credit subsidies for renewable loan guarantees to encourage the early commercial production and use of new or significantly improved energy efficient technologies. Moreover, the Committee recommends an increase of $528,000,000 above fiscal year 2011 enacted levels for NNSA to address critical national security missions. The increase would allow NNSA to stay on track to meet its goal of securing all vulnerable nuclear materials in 4 years to protect the United States against nuclear terrorism, continue modernizing the nuclear weapons complex consistent with the Nuclear Posture Review and New START Treaty, and develop a new reactor core for the OHIO-class submarine.

EXASCALE INITIATIVE

The Committee supports the Department's initiative to develop exascale computing—1,000 times more powerful than today's most powerful computer. The Committee recommends $126,000,000 to support this initiative, which includes $90,000,000 for the Office of Science and $36,000,000 for the National Nuclear Security Administration. The Committee encourages the Office of Science and the National Nuclear Security Administration to continue collaborating on the development of exascale computing to take advantage of each other's expertise and avoid duplication of effort. The Committee understands that the path to exascale computing will be extremely challenging and will require significant research and development breakthroughs. For example, an exaflop system made entirely out of today's technology would probably cost $100,000,000,000, require $1,000,000,000 a year to operate, need its own dedicated power plant to power the computing system, and be very unreliable. Despite these challenges, the Department has set an ambitious goal of 2018 to deploy the first exascale system. The Committee directs the Department's Undersecretary for Science and the National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA] Administrator to submit within 120 days of enactment of this act, a joint, integrated strategy and program plan with estimated budg-

et needs through 2018 on how the Office of Science's Advanced Scientific Computing Research and NNSA's Advanced Simulation and Computing programs will share responsibilities and coordinate research and development activities to reach exascale computing required for national security, energy, environmental, and other science missions and to retain the United States' global leadership and competitiveness in advanced computing.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

In November 2010, the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology recommended that the Secretary of Energy extend procedures used successfully in ARPA–E to all DOE energy programs. For example, ARPA–E uses a rigorous peer review process to select the most deserving projects and from conception to the award of the contract it only takes 6 to 8 months, much faster than other DOE energy programs. The Committee directs the Secretary of Energy within 120 days of enactment of this act to submit a report on how the Department will implement the Council of Advisors' recommendation to extend ARPA–E processes and procedures to all DOE energy programs.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The Department of Energy is directed to operate in a manner fully consistent with the following reprogramming guidelines. A reprogramming request must be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations for consideration before any implementation of a reorganization proposal which includes moving previous appropriations between appropriation accounts. The Department is directed to inform the Committees promptly and fully when a change in program execution and funding is required during the fiscal year. To assist the Department in this effort, the following guidance is provided for programs and activities funded in the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. The Department is directed to follow this guidance for all programs and activities unless specific reprogramming guidance is provided for a program or activity.

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

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 PROGRAMS

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $1,825,641,000
Budget estimate, 2012	3,200,053,000
House allowance	1,304,636,000
Committee recommendation	1,795,641,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $30,000,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommendation is $1,795,641,000 for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

The Committee notes that the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 authorized the Department to issue efficiency standards for a list of products, and to date televisions are the only item for which DOE has failed to issue a standard. The Committee also notes that recent studies demonstrate that set top boxes consume $3,000,000,000 in electricity per year in the United States, and 66 percent of that power is when the television is not on. The Committee directs the Secretary to initiate rulemaking processes to establish effective efficiency standards for electronic devices, including both televisions and set-top boxes, within 12 months.

Hydrogen Technology.—The Committee recommends $98,000,000 for hydrogen technology. The Committee recognizes the progress and achievements of the Fuel Cell Technologies program. The program has met or exceeded all benchmarks, and has made significant progress in decreasing costs and increasing efficiency and durability of fuel cell and hydrogen energy systems. Further, the Committee believes fuel cell and hydrogen energy systems for stationary, transportation and other motive, mobile and portable power applications have the potential to enable clean and efficient use of our domestic energy resources. The Committee affirms its support for stable and continued funding for these programs now and in the future. Within the available funds, the Committee recommends funding is provided for Technology Validation focused on passenger vehicle and hydrogen infrastructure applications, hydrogen fuels R&D, and for Market Transformation in early markets.

Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D.—The Committee recommends $180,000,000 for biomass and biorefinery systems R&D. Within the available funds a total of $30,000,000 is for algae biofuels.

Solar Energy.—The Committee recommends $290,000,000 for solar energy. The Committee encourages the Department of Energy to designate and fund, in fiscal year 2012, a center for solar energy innovation to be located in close proximity to high-quality solar resources and focused on promoting the integration of solar technologies and products into utility, building and commercial systems, and to improve their reliability, affordability and rapid deployment across the Southwest region and the United States. The Department of Energy shall continue to award funding for its Solar Demonstration Zone Project in recognition of the work needed to test, evaluate and develop innovative solar energy projects and the link such a zone could provide between DOE's advanced technology development and utility-scale commercialization efforts.

The Committee encourages the Department, in partnership with universities, to support the research and development of organic

photovoltaic cells for the advancement of developing alternative energy technologies.

Wind Energy.—The recommendation is $80,000,000 for wind energy. The Committee supports the Department's efforts to develop advanced offshore wind energy technologies, including freshwater, deepwater, shallow water, and transitional depth installations.

Geothermal Technology.—The recommendation for geothermal technology is $34,000,000. The funds made available by this section shall be disbursed to the full spectrum of geothermal technologies as authorized by the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140) and the Department of Energy shall continue its support of comprehensive programs that support academic and professional development initiatives. The Committee directs the Department to make not less than $5,000,000 available to continue development and deployment of low-temperature geothermal systems.

Water Power Energy R&D.—The Committee recommends $34,000,000 for water power. All funding provided is for marine and hydrokinetic technology research, development, and deployment. Within available funds, the Committee directs the Department to provide not less than $10,000,000 to build necessary infrastructure at marine and hydrokinetic industry testing sites designated by the Department as National Marine Renewable Energy Centers. Additionally, the Committee encourages the Department to provide not less than $15,000,000 in funding for competitive demonstrations of marine and hydrokinetic technologies and requests the Department consider reducing and/or waiving cost share requirements for small businesses.

Vehicle Technologies.—The Committee recommends $319,157,000 for vehicle technologies. The Energy Policy Act [EPAct] of 1992 requires that State, Federal and certain private fleets convert an increasing percentage of their vehicle fleets to alternative fuel vehicles [AFVs]. However, the EPAct 1992 provision does not contemplate the emergence of new alternative fuel vehicle technologies, so the definition of AFV does not include key electric drive technologies, such as hybrid electric and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. To remedy this, ensuring that the EPAct 1992 fleet requirements reflected evolving technology options and provided covered fleets critical options in meeting their obligations under the law, the Energy Independence and Security Act [EISA] of 2007 amended the law. EISA expands the AFV definition to include electric drive vehicles (including hybrid and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles), infrastructure and other emerging technologies. To implement this change, DOE was directed to issue guidance no later than January 31, 2009. To date, no guidance has been issued, which constrains the covered fleets' ability to integrate electric drive vehicles into their fleets. The Committee directs DOE to move forward with due diligence and to provide a status report on the effort and a timeline for issuance.

Funds provided to Vehicle Technology Deployment are to be used to expand the program's activities in promoting the adoption and use of petroleum reduction technologies and practices by working with Clean Cities coalitions and their stakeholders on alternative

fuel and electric drive advanced technology vehicles and related fueling/charging infrastructure.

Medium- and heavy-duty trucks consume roughly one-fifth of transportation fuels in the United States, and increasing the efficiency of these vehicles can lower the costs of land-based freight and the industries that depend on it, while greatly reducing the Nation's dependence on imported oil. The SuperTruck program focuses on truck efficiency in a partnership between DOE and commercial vehicle and equipment manufacturers to conduct research and develop the next generation of more efficient engines and vehicles. At a time of overall constraints on resources for worthy initiatives, the Committee appreciates the Department continuing to set as a priority this high value public-partnership to develop advanced vehicle technologies that will improve the efficiency of medium- and heavy-duty commercial vehicles.

Within available funds, $4,000,000 is provided for lightweight materials modeling and design for vehicle optimization. The Committee also recommends up to $5,000,000 from within available funds to commission a study from the National Academies to comprehensively examine market barriers that impede the commercial deployment of electric vehicles and supporting infrastructure. The study should incorporate input from stakeholders, including State utility commissions, electric utilities, automobile manufacturers, and local and Federal governmental entities with relevant missions. The study should include recommendations on the Federal role (including specific roles for different Federal agencies) in resolving the market barriers the study identifies.

Further, within available funds up to $10,000,000 is made available to fund section 131 of the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act [EISA] to promote zero emission cargo transport in areas of severe nonattainment and severe traffic congestion. Eligible recipients must provide 1-to-1 matching funds.

Building Technologies.—The Committee recommends $210,500,000 for building technologies. Within these funds, the Committee directs $12,000,000 to manufacturing improvements for general illumination LED lighting products that meet the efficiency requirements of section 321 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

The Committee urges the Department create a strategic plan to promote the use of geothermal heat pumps in both residential and commercial buildings; develop innovative technologies to enhance the use of geothermal heat pumps; and collect and disseminate information regarding the benefit of geothermal heat pumps. The Department is directed to report to the Committee within 6 months of enactment of this act on the progress of this effort.

Industrial Technologies.—The Committee recommends $96,000,000 for industrial technologies.

Federal Energy Management Program.—The Committee recommends $30,000,000 for the Federal Energy Management Program [FEMP].

Facilities and Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends $26,407,000 for facilities and infrastructure consistent with the budget request.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $165,000,000 for program direction.

Strategic Programs.—The Committee recommends $50,000,000 for strategic programs.

Weatherization Assistance Program.—The Committee provides $174,300,000. Of that amount, $3,000,000 is for training and technical assistance.

Intergovernmental Activities.—The Committee provides $50,000,000 for State Energy Programs and $10,000,000 for Tribal Energy Activities.

Use of Prior-Year Balances.—The Department is directed to use $26,364,000 of prior-year balances as proposed in the budget request.

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $144,710,000
Budget estimate, 2012	237,717,000
House allowance	139,496,000
Committee recommendation	141,010,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $3,700,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommends $141,010,000 for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability. No funding is provided for the proposed new hub. The recommendation includes $27,000,000 for Clean Energy Transmission and Reliability with $17,000,000 of this going toward integration and $10,000,000 toward advanced modeling. The recommendation includes $24,000,000 for Smart Grid Research and Development with $4,000,000 of this for power electronics.

The Committee recognizes the opportunities presented by the application and integration of smart grid technologies across all sectors of the economy, but particularly in the growing number of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles coming to market. The Department of Energy should ensure that the efforts within the Office of Electricity Delivery and Reliability and at the Vehicle Technologies Program are coordinated and focused on developing and deploying electric vehicle technologies that can help expedite grid-integration of clean and renewable power generation sources and those energy resources can be used effectively to meet peak daytime electricity demand.

Within the funds appropriated to the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability the Committee encourages it to accelerate its efforts to provide grants for regional transmission planning and technical assistance to entities that support or implement additional deployment of new renewable electricity generation in the Western and Eastern interconnections.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $732,124,000
Budget Estimate, 2012	754,028,000
House allowance	733,633,000
Committee recommendation	583,834,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $6,300,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommends $583,834,000 for Nuclear Energy.

The events at the Fukushima-Daiichi facilities in Japan have resulted in a reexamination of our Nation's policies regarding the safety of commercial reactors and the storage of spent nuclear fuel. These efforts have been supported by appropriations in this bill, and the Committee provides funding for continuation and expansion of these activities.

While the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has found that spent nuclear fuel can be stored safely for at least 60 years in wet or dry cask storage beyond the licensed life of the reactor, the Committee has significant questions on this matter and is extremely concerned that the United States continues to accumulate spent fuel from nuclear reactors without a comprehensive plan to collect the fuel or dispose of it safely, and as a result faces a $15,400,000,000 liability by 2020. The Committee approved funding in prior years for the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future [BRC], which was charged with examining our Nation's policies for managing the back end of the nuclear fuel cycle and recommending a new plan. The BRC issued a draft report in July 2011 with recommendations, which is expected to be finalized in January 2012. The Committee directs prior existing funding, contingent on the renewal of its charter, to the BRC to develop a comprehensive revision to Federal statutes based on its recommendations, to submit to Congress for its consideration.

The Committee directs the Department to develop and prepare to implement a strategy for the management of spent nuclear fuel and other nuclear waste within 3 months of publication of the final report of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future. The strategy shall reduce long-term Federal liability associated with the Department's failure to pick up spent fuel from commercial nuclear reactors, and it should propose to store waste in a safe and responsible manner. The Committee notes that a sound Federal strategy will likely require one or more consolidated storage facilities with adequate capacity to be sited, licensed, and constructed in multiple regions, independent of the schedule for opening a repository. The Committee directs that the Department's strategy include a plan to develop consolidated regional storage facilities in cooperation with host communities, as necessary, and propose any amendments to Federal statute necessary to implement the strategy.

Although successfully disposing of spent nuclear fuel permanently is a long-term effort and will require statutory changes, the Committee supports taking near- and mid-term steps that can begin without new legislation and which provide value regardless of the ultimate policy the United States adopts. The Committee therefore includes funding for several of these steps in the Nuclear Energy Research and Development account, including the assessment of dry casks to establish a scientific basis for licensing; continued work on advanced fuel cycle options; research to assess disposal in different geological media; and the development of enhanced fuels and materials that are more resistant to damage in reactors or spent fuel pools.

The Committee has provided more than $500,000,000 in prior years toward the Next Generation Nuclear Plant [NGNP] program. Although the program has experienced some successes, particularly

in the advanced research and development of TRISO fuel, the Committee is frustrated with the lack of progress and failure to resolve the upfront cost-share issue to allocate the risk between industry and the Federal Government. Although the Committee has provided sufficient time for these issues to be resolved, the program has stalled. Recognizing funding constraints, the Committee cannot support continuing the program in its current form. The Committee provides no funding to continue the existing NGNP program, but rather allows the Department to continue high-value, priority research and development activities for high-temperature reactors, in cooperation with industry, that were included in the NGNP program.

NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends $291,667,000 for Nuclear Energy Research and Development.

Use of Prior Existing Balances.—If the Secretary renews the charter of the Blue Ribbon Commission, the Department is directed to use $2,500,000 of prior existing balances appropriated to the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management to develop a comprehensive revision to Federal statutes based on its recommendations. The recommendation should be provided to Congress not later than March 30, 2012 for consideration.

Nuclear Energy Enabling Technologies.—The Committee recommends $68,880,000 for Nuclear Energy Enabling Technologies, including $24,300,000 for the Energy Innovation Hub for Modeling and Simulation, $14,580,000 for the National Science User Facility at Idaho National Laboratory, and $30,000,000 for Crosscutting research. The Committee does not recommend any funding for Transformative research. The Committee recommends that the Department focus the Energy Innovation Hub on the aspects of its mission that improve nuclear powerplant safety.

Light Water Reactor Small Modular Reactor Licensing Technical Support.—The Committee provides no funding for Light Water Reactor Small Modular Reactor Licensing Technical Support.

Reactor Concepts Research, Development, and Demonstration.—The Committee provides $31,870,000 for Reactor Concepts Research, Development and Demonstration. Of this funding, $21,870,000 is for Advanced Reactor Concepts activities. The Committee does not include funding for the Next Generation Nuclear Plant Demonstration project. The Department may, within available funding, continue high-value, priority research and development activities for high-temperature reactor concepts, in cooperation with industry, that were conducted as part of the NGNP program. The remaining funds, $10,000,000, are for research and development of the current fleet of operating reactors to determine how long they can safely operate.

Fuel Cycle Research and Development.—The Committee recommends $187,917,000 for Fuel Cycle Research and Development. Within available funds, the Committee provides $10,000,000 for the Department to expand the existing modeling and simulation capabilities at the national laboratories to assess issues related to the aging and safety of storing spent nuclear fuel in fuel pools and dry storage casks. The Committee includes $60,000,000 for Used Nu-

clear Fuel Disposition, and directs the Department to focus research and development activities on the following priorities:

—$10,000,000 for development and licensing of standardized transportation, aging, and disposition canisters and casks;

—$3,000,000 for development of models for potential partnerships to manage spent nuclear fuel and high level waste; and

—$7,000,000 for characterization of potential geologic repository media.

The Committee provides funding for evaluation of standardized transportation, aging and disposition cask and canister design, cost, and safety characteristics, in order to enable the Department to determine those that should be used if the Federal Government begins transporting fuel from reactor sites, as it is legally obligated to do, and consolidating fuel. The Committee notes that the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future has, in its draft report, recommended the creation of consolidated interim storage facilities, for which the Federal Government will need casks and canisters to transport and store spent fuel.

The Committee also requests that the Department revisit the recommendations of the 2006 National Academies report titled "Going the Distance: the Safe Transport of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste in the United States," as recommended by the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future in its draft report. The Committee shares the view of the Blue Ribbon Commission that "NAS recommendations that have not yet been implemented, for whatever reason, should be revisited and addressed as appropriate." The Department is directed to report to the Committee within 90 days of enactment of this act on its plan to revisit these recommendations.

The Committee further recommends $59,000,000 for the Advanced Fuels program. With the increased funding the Department is directed to give priority to developing enhanced fuels and cladding for light water reactors to improve safety in the event of accidents in the reactor or spent fuel pools. While the Committee acknowledges the value of engineering upgrades and regulatory enhancements to ensure the safety of the Nation's current fleet of nuclear reactors following the disaster at Japan's Fukushima Daiichi nuclear powerplant, it is becoming increasingly clear that failure of the nuclear fuel upon loss of coolant was the ultimate cause of the destruction of the Japanese reactors and the extensive environmental damage. The Committee continues to support the Department's advanced fuels activities, in particular the ongoing coated particle fuel (deep burn) effort, and urges that special technical emphasis and funding priority be given to activities aimed at the development and near-term qualification of meltdown-resistant, accident-tolerant nuclear fuels that would enhance the safety of present and future generations of Light Water Reactors. Last, the Department is directed to report to the Committee, within 90 days of enactment of this act, on its plan for development of meltdown-resistent fuels leading to reactor testing and utilization by 2020.

International Nuclear Energy Cooperation.—The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for International Nuclear Energy Cooperation.

RADIOLOGICAL FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

Space and Defense Infrastructure.—The Committee provides $69,888,000 for Space and Defense Infrastructure, including $15,000,000 for nuclear infrastructure at Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The Committee encourages the Department, within available funds, to provide the base infrastructure funding such that all strategic nuclear materials and engineering facilities are maintained in full compliance with Department of Energy operational and safety orders and directives for nuclear infrastructure and to ensure these facilities are capable of serving Department mission needs in nuclear research and development.

Plutonium-238 Production Restart Project.—The Committee provides no funding for the Plutonium-238 Production Restart project.

IDAHO FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The Committee provides $136,000,000 for Idaho Facilities Management.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $584,529,000
Budget estimate, 2012	452,975,000
House allowance	476,993,000
Committee recommendation	[2] 445,471,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $140,000,000 under Public Law 112–10.
[2] Does not include proposed rescission of $187,000,000.

The Committee recommends $445,471,000 for Fossil Energy Research and Development, including the use of $23,007,000 of prior-year balances as proposed in the request. This is $7,504,000 less than the budget request which reflects a reduction in program direction to fiscal year 2011 levels. The Committee also rescinds $187,000,000 in prior year funds.

CCS and Power Systems.—The Committee recommends $291,358,000 for CCS and Power Systems, the same as the request. The Committee recognizes and encourages the Department of Energy to provide funding for regional carbon sequestration partnerships, including those that are seeking to identify geologic formations, using seismic reflection technology, suitable for carbon sequestration. Using computer modeling, investigations should assess the storage potential of underground reservoirs, the potential volume of carbon dioxide that can be stored, the effect of storing carbon dioxide in the reservoir, and the length of time carbon dioxide may be stored. Studies should also address how injecting carbon dioxide in underground reservoirs could increase the amount of natural gas that can be recovered from coalbed methane wells near the reservoirs.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $151,729,000 for program direction, which will remain available until September 30, 2014.

Other Programs.—The Committee recommends $16,794,000 for Plant and Capital Equipment; $7,897,000 for Fossil Energy Environmental Restoration; and $700,000 for Special Recruitment Pro-

grams. Within available funds, the Committee directs the Department to continue the Risk Based Data Management System. The Committee directs the Department to continue funding methane hydrates research within the Office of Fossil Energy.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $22,954,000
Budget estimate, 2012	14,909,000
House allowance	14,909,000
Committee recommendation	14,909,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $2,100,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommends $14,909,000 for Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves, the same as the budget request. The Committee requests the Department provide a report on the Department's obligations related to the reserves and a time-line for exiting from responsibility for the reserves.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $209,441,000
Budget estimate, 2012	192,704,000
House allowance	192,704,000
Committee recommendation	192,704,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $86,300,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommends $192,704,000 for the operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The recommendation does not include the budget's proposed rescission of $71,000,000 as that was already included in the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution.

The Committee notes that the Department has continued to ignore the statutory directive in Public Law 111–8 to submit a report to Congress regarding the effects of expanding the Reserve on the domestic petroleum market by April 27, 2009. The Department has not yet submitted the report, and continues to fail to meet other congressionally mandated deadlines without explanation or cause. Although now nearly 2½ years delayed, the information requested in the report continues to be pertinent to policy decisions, and the Secretary is directed to submit the report as expeditiously as possible to the Committee.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2011	.....
Budget estimate, 2012	−$250,000,000
House allowance	−500,000,000
Committee recommendation	−500,000,000

The fiscal year 2012 budget request proposes a non-emergency sale of oil valued at $500,000,000. The sale of oil will free up space in the reserve in order to conduct necessary maintenance.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2011	$10,978,000
Budget estimate, 2012	[1] 10,119,000
House allowance	[1] 10,119,000
Committee recommendation	[1] 10,119,000

[1] Does not include proposed rescission of $100,000,000.

The Committee recommends $10,119,000 for the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve as requested. The Reserve was sold in early 2011 to transition to low-sulfur heating oil. The budget request proposes, and the Committee supports, the cancellation of any excess revenues from the sale which is scored as a saving of $100,000,000.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $95,409,000
Budget estimate, 2012	123,957,000
House allowance	105,000,000
Committee recommendation	105,000,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $86,300,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommends $105,000,000 for the Energy Information Administration. The Committee notes that the Energy Information Administration has announced that it will not release the 2007 Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey [CBECS] due to data and sample flaws resulting from the survey method employed. The 2003 CBECS remains the most current survey of commercial building efficiency used as the baseline for The Energy Star program at U.S. EPA, the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design [LEED] program, and Green Globes. In light of the age of the 2003 survey and the failure of the 2007 study, the Committee recommends that the Energy Information Administration complete a new Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey during fiscal year 2012.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $224,350,000
Budget estimate, 2012	219,121,000
House allowance	254,121,000
Committee recommendation	219,121,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $900,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee's recommendation for Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup is $219,121,000, the same as the budget request.

Reprogramming Control Levels.—In fiscal year 2012, the Environmental Management program may transfer funding between operating expense funded projects within the controls listed below using guidance contained in the Department's budget execution manual (DOE M 135.1–1A, chapter IV). All capital construction line item projects remain separate controls from the operating projects. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be formally notified in advance of all reprogrammings, except internal reprogrammings, and the Department is to take no financial action in anticipation of congressional response. The Com-

mittee recommends the following reprogramming control points for fiscal year 2012:

—Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning;

—Gaseous Diffusion Plants;

—Small Sites; and

—West Valley Demonstration Project.

Internal Reprogramming Authority.—Headquarters Environmental Management may transfer up to $2,000,000, one time, between accounts listed above to reduce health and safety risks, gain cost savings, or complete projects, as long as a program or project is not increased or decreased by more than $2,000,000 in total during the fiscal year.

The reprogramming authority—either formal or internal—may not be used to initiate new programs or to change funding levels for programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the act or report. The Committee on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be notified within 30 days after the use of the internal reprogramming authority.

Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning.—The Committee recommends $2,703,000.

Gaseous Diffusion Plants.—The Committee recommends $100,588,000.

Small Sites.—The Committee recommends $57,430,000. The Committee is aware of the lack of remediation activity at various DOE-sponsored facilities and small sites characterized as under the responsibility of DOE, such as national laboratories and small experimental nuclear research reactors. The Committee directs the Department to submit detailed action plans within 3 months of enactment of this act for remediating these sites and sponsored facilities.

West Valley Demonstration Project.—The Committee recommends $58,400,000.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $506,984,000
Budget estimate, 2012	504,169,000
House allowance	449,000,000
Committee recommendation	429,000,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $9,900,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee's recommendation is $429,000,000 to sustain cleanup activities at uranium enrichment facilities. Of the funds provided, $77,780,000 is recommended to the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, $162,747,000 is recommended for the East Tennessee Technology Park, and $188,473,000 is recommended for the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant. With these funds and any transfers of uranium from the Department's inventory, the Department is encouraged to maintain its current accelerated cleanup schedule at the Portsmouth site to the degree possible, consistent with the Committee's direction below. The Department is also directed to consider all Federal sites in allocating services for cleanup resulting from any uranium transfers.

Although the Committee recognizes the use of uranium transfers to accelerate cleanup at Federal sites, the Committee expresses continued concern with the Department's lack of oversight and transparency of this program. The Government Accountability Office [GAO] has twice found DOE's administration of the program in violation of Federal law. According to GAO, the Department has violated the miscellaneous receipts statute, which requires Government agencies to deposit money received from any source into the Treasury. The Committee directs the Secretary to ensure the Department's uranium transfer program is in compliance with Federal law.

The Committee is also frustrated by the Department's refusal to submit the program to congressional oversight. The Department continues to ignore the Committee's requests to be notified of basic information about the program, such as the dates and amounts of uranium prior to the consummation of a transfer. Although the Department had previously requested to be allowed to voluntarily notify the Committee of information regarding the program, it has failed to do so, and the Committee accordingly includes language to codify notification requirements and expects the Department to adhere strictly to them. Because the Department is dealing with such significant sums of taxpayer dollars in an off-budget manner, it should expect Congress to scrutinize this program.

The Committee also expresses concern about the Department's market impact analyses required under the USEC Privatization Act prior to any sale or transfer of uranium. The scope of the previous market impact analysis included the calendar years of 2011, 2012, and 2013. The price of uranium continues to be volatile, and attempting to make predictions months in advance—let alone 3 years—is extremely speculative and may not justify a determination that certain transfers would not adversely affect the uranium industry. The Committee includes language to allow the Department to cover only 2 years in the future for each market impact analysis.

Finally, the Committee includes a requirement for the Department to conduct an economic feasibility study on the re-enrichment of depleted uranium tailings that are located at Federal sites. Although there are currently 60,000 cylinders of depleted uranium located at Federal sites, the Department has no updated plan or timeline for either re-enriching high-assay tails or disposing of them. The Department is directed to consider the economic feasibility of re-enriching these materials, taking into account factors including safety, cost, national security, the costs of storage and disposal, and the enrichment capacity at domestic sites. The Department is directed to prepare and submit this economic feasibility study to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations prior to December 31, 2011.

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $4,857,665,000
Budget estimate, 2012	5,416,114,000
House allowance	4,800,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,842,665,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $15,000,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommends $4,842,665,000. The Committee believes this level of funding will maintain U.S. leadership in science and technology during a time of significant funding constraints. Investments in basic research will lead to new and improved energy technologies and the construction and operation of new, large-scale scientific facilities will be vitally important for many areas of science as well as private industry, such as pharmaceutical and aerospace companies. Funding for advanced computing will also position the United States to maintain international leadership in scientific computing and simulation over the next decade.

Office of Science Priorities.—The Committee commends the Office of Science for identifying three clear priorities for basic scientific research:

—the discovery and design of new materials for the generation, storage, and use of energy,

—better understanding of microorganisms and plants for improved biofuels production, and

—the development and deployment of more powerful computing capabilities to take advantage of modeling and simulation to advance energy technologies and maintain U.S. economic competitiveness.

Office of Science Advisory Committee.—The Committee encourages the Office of Science to continue prioritizing within its broad scientific portfolio to help accelerate the discovery of new energy technologies for a clean energy future, especially during a time of fiscal constraints. The Committee also encourages the Office of Science to establish an advisory committee that would help the Secretary of Energy and the Director of the Office of Science prioritize among the different areas of basic research. An independent advisory committee for the Office of Science could provide valuable advice at a time of declining budgets on research priorities, determining the proper balance among the different disciplines, and what areas of basic research would best maintain U.S. scientific leadership and a technical workforce.

Project Management.—While scientific exploration without use-inspired goals is important to advancing science, innovation, and American intellectual property, Department of Energy funded research is ultimately centered on energy-focused goals. Within that context, most Office of Science research should have concrete goals, and most research should have measurable performance. The Department is therefore directed to create a performance ranking of all ongoing multi-year research projects across Basic Energy Sciences, Fusion Energy, High Energy Physics, Nuclear Energy, Biological and Environmental Research, and Advanced Supercomputing Research, including those at universities, national laboratories, Energy Frontier Research Centers, Energy Innovation Hubs and other recipients, by comparing current performance with original project goals.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommends $1,693,860,000 for Basic Energy Sciences. Of these funds, $151,400,000 is provided for construction activities as requested in the budget. The remaining $1,542,460,000 is for research. Within the research funds provided, up to

$100,000,000 shall be used to support the 46 Energy Frontier Research Centers. The Committee encourages the Department to continue interim science and management reviews during these centers' 5-year award period to maintain proper oversight and ensure that the centers continue to pursue fundamental research needed to accelerate breakthroughs in clean energy technologies.

The Committee recommends $24,300,000 for the Fuels from Sunlight energy innovation hub and $20,000,000 for a new Hub for Batteries and Energy Storage. The Committee also recommends $10,000,000 for predictive modeling of internal combustion engines. In 2007, the engine company Cummins achieved a milestone in engine design by bringing a diesel engine to market solely with computer modeling. The diesel engine is being used in more than 200,000 Dodge Ram pickup trucks. The only testing was after-the-fact to confirm performance, which significantly reduced development time and cost. Building on this success, developing more advanced computer models for engines holds the promise of increasing the efficiency of current engines in the short to medium term by 50 percent for automobiles and 30 percent for trucks, which would reduce carbon emissions and the country's dependence on foreign oil. This research would also demonstrate the feasibility of using renewable fuels, such as biofuels, in internal combustion engines.

The Committee also recommends $37,000,000 for major items of equipment, including $11,500,000 for new instruments and $5,500,000 for a power upgrade at the Spallation Neutron Source at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, $8,000,000 for design and engineering work to enhance the capabilities of the Linac Coherent Light Source at SLAC, and $12,000,000 for equipment for the new National Synchrotron Light Source facility at Brookhaven. The Committee recommends no funding for upgrades to the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory or to build a new electron microscope. The Committee is concerned about outyear liabilities for major construction projects and upgrades to facilities at a time of flat or declining budgets. Upgrades to the Advanced Photon Source and the Linac Coherent Light Source both have estimated costs of over $300,000,000. The Office of Science should consider phasing these projects to reflect the highest priority or demonstrate how it can build both concurrently without significant impacts to basic research.

The Committee recommends $20,000,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research [EPSCoR] to support science and technology programs in States that have historically received relatively less Federal research funding.

The Committee directs the Office of Basic Energy Sciences [BES] to implement the recommendations in the April 2010 Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee report on ways to strengthen the link between basic research and industry. One of the report's main conclusions was that more direct feedback, communication, and collaboration between industrial and BES scientists was needed to better identify scientific roadblocks to emerging clean energy technologies, address the scientific challenges, and transfer the results to industry for commercialization. BES-supported scientists need to be better informed of the detailed scientific issues facing industry

and industry more aware of BES capabilities and how to utilize them.

The Committee understands that catalysis is the key enabling technology for transportation fuel production today and further advances in catalysis are required to develop advanced fuels from domestic sources that use the country's existing energy infrastructure and are the lowest cost path to reducing oil imports. The Committee encourages the Office of Science to continue catalysis research. The Committee also encourages the Office of Science in partnership with universities to support research and development of novel device materials for alternative energy applications.

The Committee encourages the Department of Energy in partnership with universities to support research and development of advanced nanostructure polymer-particle composite materials for improved ultra-capacitor devices. The Committee also encourages the Department to continue funding to support research and development needs of graduate and post-graduate science programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommends $621,823,000 for Biological and Environmental Research. The Committee recommends $295,079,000 for climate and environmental sciences. The Committee recognizes the unique contributions of this program in advancing climate research. DOE has stationary and mobile facilities around the world that collect data on climate change and the world's best high-performance computers to develop sophisticated climate models to help decisionmakers understand the impact of climate change. Despite advances in climate models, there is still uncertainty in predicting how climate change may impact future energy use, land use, food production, and water resources and affect regional stability. The Committee supports DOE's efforts in improving the reliability and accuracy of climate models by resolving two major areas of uncertainty—the effect of clouds and aerosols on climate. The Committee encourages DOE to continue using data obtained from satellite sensors operated by other Federal agencies in addition to ground based data to produce the most accurate and reliable information for climate modeling.

The Committee also supports research related to producing biomass-based biofuels to reduce the country's dependence on fossil-based transportation fuels. The Committee understands that making efficient use of organic materials to make biofuels continues to be a major challenge. The Committee agrees that a top priority should be developing biomass feedstocks than can produce the most biomass at the least cost and take into account environmental factors, such as water consumption, competition with food production, and insect resistance. The Committee believes that synthetic biology, which involves designing new biological parts, devices and systems for specific purposes, will accelerate major breakthroughs not only in biofuels, but also in other important energy and environmental missions of the Department. The Committee directs the Secretary of Energy, not later than 9 months after enactment of this act, in consultation with other relevant Federal agencies, the academic community, research based nonprofit entities, and the

private sector, to submit a comprehensive synthetic biology plan for federally supported research and development activities that will support the energy and environmental missions of the Department and enable a competitive synthetic biology industry in the United States. The plan shall assess the need to create a database for synthetic biology information, the need and process for developing standards for biological parts, components, and systems, and funding requirements for implementing the plan.

Within the funds provided, $20,000,000 shall be used for radiobiology to help determine health risks from exposures to low levels of ionizing radiation to properly protect radiation workers and the general public. The Fukushima Daiichi disaster in Japan is an opportunity to learn about the impacts of the disaster on human health and apply lessons learned to make more informed decisions on protection if a similar accident occurs in the future, including dose trip points for evacuation and shelter-in-place orders. Within the funds provided, $12,000,000 is to continue nuclear medicine research with human application. The Committee notes that DOE-funded nuclear medicine research has led to numerous achievements in patient care, such as cutting-edge nuclear medicine imaging and therapy procedures, including PET scans, that are crucial for identifying the presence of cancer in the body and cardiac stress tests to analyze heart function.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee recommends $441,619,000 for Advanced Scientific Computing Research. The Committee recommends $90,000,000 for the exascale initiative to spur U.S. innovation and increase the country's ability to address critical national challenges. The Committee understands that exascale computing will help maintain U.S. industrial competitiveness. In particular, high-tech industries such as transportation, aerospace, nuclear energy, and petroleum will increasingly rely on high-performance computing, especially when traditional experiments would be impossible, dangerous, or inordinately costly to perform.

The Committee understands that the Department will have the lead Government role in computing research and development. The Department's role in developing more advanced computing platforms is even more important with the elimination of the DARPA High Performance Computing program. For this reason, the Committee supports the budget request for the Leadership Computing Facilities, which will enable Oak Ridge and Argonne National Laboratories to move forward with upgrades to their Cray XT5 and IBM Glue Gene/P systems, respectively. These upgrades will ensure that they remain on track to be the most powerful supercomputers in the world and represent an important step in the Department's research effort to develop the first exascale system.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The Committee recommends $780,200,000 for High Energy Physics. With the shutdown of the Tevatron at Fermilab at the end of fiscal year 2011 and the successful operation of the most powerful energy particle collider in the world, the Large Hadron Collider in Switzerland, U.S. dominance of the energy frontier has come to an

end. However, the Committee understands that the United States has an opportunity to lead in the intensity frontier. Specifically, the United States has unique capabilities that should be exploited to develop a world-leading program of neutrino science to understand the role neutrinos play in the evolution of the universe and design new particle beams and highly sensitive detectors to advance this area of science. The Committee directs the Office of Science to submit a report not later than 180 days of enactment that lays out

—the expected benefits of intensity frontier science,

—a strategy for maintaining the U.S. lead, and

—the funding needs over the next 10 years, including construction activities, of implementing the proposed strategy.

The Committee provides no construction funds for the Long Baseline Neutrino Experiment. The Committee is concerned that this project is not mature enough for construction because a location for this experiment in an underground laboratory has not yet been selected and the decision of the National Science Foundation to discontinue construction funding for the Deep Underground Science and Engineering Laboratory in South Dakota has created uncertainty about the future of the project. In addition, the Office of Science has not yet selected a technology, which affects where the experiment can be located and total cost.

The Committee also recommends $15,000,000 as requested—$10,000,000 from the High Energy Physics program and $5,000,000 from the Nuclear Physics program—to support minimal, sustaining operations at the Homestake Mine in South Dakota. The Committee is aware of the National Science Foundation's decision. However, the Committee encourages the Office of Science to examine cost-effective options for using the mine to stage critical experiments related to neutrino and dark matter research.

The Committee understands that powerful new accelerator technologies created for basic science and developed by industry will produce particle accelerators with the potential to address key economic and societal issues confronting our Nation. However, the Committee is concerned with the divide that exists in translating breakthroughs in accelerator science and technology into applications that benefit the marketplace and American competitiveness. The Committee directs the Department to submit a 10-year strategic plan by June 1, 2012 for accelerator technology research and development to advance accelerator applications in energy and the environment, medicine, industry, national security, and discovery science. The strategic plan should be based on the results of the Department's 2010 workshop study, Accelerators for America's Future, that identified the opportunities and research challenges for next-generation accelerators and how to improve coordination between basic and applied accelerator research. The strategic plan should also identify the potential need for demonstration and development facilities to help bridge the gap between development and deployment.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee recommends $550,114,000 for Nuclear Physics. The Committee recommends $55,000,000 in construction funds for the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility, which the Nu-

clear Physics Advisory Committee concluded was the highest priority for the Nation's nuclear physics program. The Committee also recommends $24,000,000 for the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommends $335,463,000 for Fusion Energy Sciences. The Department is directed to submit a 10-year plan, not later than 12 months after enactment of this act, on the Department's proposed research and development activities in magnetic fusion under four realistic budget scenarios. The report shall (1) identify specific areas of fusion energy research and enabling technology development in which the United States can and should establish or solidify a lead in the global fusion energy development effort and (2) identify priorities for facility construction and facility decommissioning under each of the four budget scenarios. The Department is encouraged to use a similar approach adopted by the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel that developed a 10-year strategic plan for the Department's high energy physics program.

Of the $24,741,000 requested for the High Energy Density Laboratory Plasma program, $12,000,000 shall be spent on heavy-ion fusion, laser-driven fusion, and magneto-inertial fusion to be evenly distributed among these three areas of science. A recent Department of Energy report on scientific grand challenges for fusion energy sciences identified these three areas of research as critical toward advancing inertial fusion energy. In particular, the Committee does not understand why the Department would redirect funding for magnetized high-energy-density plasma research after the panel report found that this approach has the potential to significantly reduce power requirements compared to conventional inertial confinement fusion and could permit fusion development without building multi-billion dollar facilities.

The Committee is concerned about the impact ITER will have on the domestic fusion energy budget. Based on DOE budget estimates, DOE will be requesting between $300,000,000 to $400,000,000 a year from fiscal years 2014 through 2016 to help build ITER. If current trends of declining or flat budgets continue, almost all of the fusion energy sciences budget will be consumed by ITER. The Committee encourages DOE to find a solution to this problem without compromising the scientific and technical expertise residing at U.S. universities, labs, and industrial partners.

The Committee encourages the Office Fusion Energy Sciences Program to closely collaborate with the Office of Basic Energy Sciences, the Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research, the Office of Nuclear Energy, and the National Nuclear Security Administration to address mutual needs for technology development in magnetic fusion, inertial fusion, and next-generation fission reactor concepts. One focus area of these collaborations should be on identifying, characterizing, and developing new materials that can endure the intense neutron and heat fluxes expected in these reactor environments. The Committee expects the Department to consider these nuclear technology needs as it develops its prioritization plan.

The Committee also encourages the fusion energy program take continue taking advantage of high performance computing to address scientific and technical challenges on the path to fusion energy. The Committee supports the Fusion Simulation Program to provide experimentally validated predictive simulation capabilities that are critical for ITER and other current and planned toroidal fusion devices. Given current and future budget constraints, the Committee views this initiative as critical to maintain U.S. world leadership in fusion energy in a cost-effective manner.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee provides $136,800,000 to support infrastructure activities. Within these funds, $25,000,000 shall be used to accelerate excess facility clean up at the national laboratories, which may include remediation of seismically deficient buildings and areas in need of modernization.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee provides $82,000,000 for Safeguards and Security activities.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee provides $180,786,000 for the Office of Science Program Direction. No funds shall be used to hire new site office personnel, except for field staff at the Integrated Support Centers in Chicago and Oak Ridge.

SCIENCE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

The Committee provides $20,000,000. Of these funds, up to $7,500,000 shall be available for the graduate fellowship program. The Committee encourages the Office of Science to monitor the impact of this program and demonstrate whether students continue to pursue careers in scientific and technical fields. The Committee commends the Office of Science for terminating student and teacher education programs that did not have clear program goals and were not effective in encouraging students to pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, and math. Limited resources will be better targeted to programs that are most effective in developing a skilled scientific and technical workforce to address energy, environmental, and national security challenges. As the Office of Science evaluates the impact of workforce development activities and makes changes to the program, the Committee urges the Office of Science to look at other uses for these funds, including the Distinguished Scientist program authorized in the America COMPETES bill.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2011	[1]
Budget estimate, 2012	.....
House allowance	$25,000,000
Committee recommendation	.....

[1] Does not include rescission of $2,800,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommends no funding for the nuclear waste disposal program.

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY

Appropriations, 2011	$179,640,000
Budget estimate, 2012	550,011,000
House allowance	179,640,000
Committee Recommendation	250,000,000

The Committee recommends $250,000,000 for the Advanced Research Projects Agency–Energy [ARPA–E]. ARPA–E is responsible for funding high-risk research and development projects to meet long-term energy challenges. The Committee understands that ARPA–E is currently funding 121 projects. Given the high-risk nature of the research, the Committee understands that not all of them will be successful. However, if just a fraction of ARPA–E funded projects are successful in reaching the marketplace, the United States would benefit greatly by creating new industries and jobs, making energy technologies substantially more efficient and profitable, and accelerating the timeframe for achieving energy and security goals. The Committee is encouraged that private investors have provided $220,000,000 in additional funding to several projects to help accelerate development of new, promising technologies. For example, a $750,000 ARPA–E award to develop a compressed air energy storage system to help integrate renewable energy, such as wind, into the grid, attracted $12,000,000 in follow-on private funding. ARPA–E funding allowed a company to build an improved version of their technology that showed that their technology worked and has the potential to store electricity anywhere on the grid, which subsequently attracted private investment.

INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $239,490,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,098,000,000
House allowance	198,000,000
Committee recommendation	238,000,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $181,830,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee reiterates its support for the $8,000,000,000 in loan guarantee authority authorized in Public Law 110–161 for Advanced Fossil Energy Projects. The Committee recognizes the importance of carbon dioxide pipelines to advanced fossil energy projects such as advanced coal gasification and industrial gasification activities incorporating carbon capture and sequestration or other beneficial uses of carbon and the Department of Energy is authorized to consider associated costs of connected carbon pipelines as eligible under section 1703.

OFFSETTING RECEIPTS

Appropriations, 2011	−$58,000,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−38,000,000
House allowance	−38,000,000
Committee recommendation	−38,000,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $181,490,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,060,000,000
House allowance	160,000,000
Committee recommendation	200,000,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $181,830,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommends $200,000,000 for the cost of renewable loan guarantees.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2011	$9,978,000
Budget estimate, 2012	6,000,000
House allowance	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	6,000,000

The Committee recommends $6,000,000 for the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program.

BETTER BUILDINGS PILOT LOAN GUARANTEE INITIATIVE

Appropriations, 2011	.....
Budget estimate, 2012	$105,000,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

The Committee recommends no funding for the Better Buildings Pilot Loan Guarantee Initiative.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $250,139,000
Budget estimate, 2012	240,623,000
House allowance	63,374,000
Committee recommendation	237,623,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $81,900,000 under Public Law 112–10.

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2011	−$119,501,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−111,883,000
House allowance	−111,883,000
Committee recommendation	−111,883,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $130,638,000
Budget estimate, 2012	128,740,000
House allowance	−48,509,000
Committee recommendation	125,740,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $81,900,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommends $237,623,000 for Department Administration.

An Independent Review of DOE Oversight of National Laboratories.—DOE accomplishes most of its activities through a network of Government-owned, contractor-operated laboratories and facilities across the United States. In providing an appropriate level of oversight of these contractor-operated facilities, DOE must carefully balance the need to protect the Government's interests while not overly burdening contractors or depriving them of the ability to operate most effectively and efficiently. The Committee notes that the National Laboratory Directors Council has expressed concerns about overly burdensome oversight and operational requirements.

The Committee directs the Secretary of Energy to contract with National Academy of Public Administration [NAPA] for a study that assesses its processes for reviewing contractor performance, including performance metrics currently being used by DOE for that purpose, as well as assesses the validity and applicability of the findings and recommendations of the recent Laboratory Directors' report. The Committee has included $1,000,000 within the funds available to carry out this activity. NAPA shall submit a report to the Committee with findings in the above areas and recommendations for improvement no later than 9 months after DOE has contracted with NAPA pursuant to this directive.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2011	$42,764,000
Budget estimate, 2012	41,774,000
House amount	41,774,000
Committee recommendation	41,774,000

The Committee recommends $41,774,000 for the Office of the Inspector General.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $6,946,398,000
Budget estimate, 2012	[2] 7,629,716,000
House allowance	[2] 7,131,993,000
Committee recommendation	7,190,000,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $50,000,000 under Public Law 112–10.
[2] Does not include proposed rescission of $40,332,000.

The Committee recommends $7,190,000,000 for National Nuclear Security Administration's [NNSA] Weapons Activities. The Committee recognizes the important contributions that advanced computing and experimental facilities have made in the last few years to the success of the stockpile stewardship program and to increase confidence in the safety, security, and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile. After investing billions of dollars over more than a decade, critical capabilities are in place to respond to nuclear weapons issues without underground nuclear weapons testing. Petascale computing capabilities allow weapons scientists and engineers to conduct weapons simulations with reasonable efficiency and resolution. In the past year, the Dual-Axis Radiographic Hydrodynamic Test facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory successfully completed four experiments that resolved a long open significant finding investigation, improved the basis for the assessment of several stockpile systems, and provided data to better understand multipoint safety options for possible use in future life ex-

tension programs. The past year also marked the execution of the Barolo series of subcritical experiments at the U1a underground facility at the Nevada National Security Site. These experiments provided data on the behavior of plutonium driven by high explosives, which is critical to understanding primary implosions. The National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory also successfully completed its first set of weapon-relevant physics experiments to help validate computer models that resolved one of the most critical areas of uncertainty in assessing nuclear weapons performance.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

The Committee recommends $1,804,882,000 for directed stockpile work.

Life Extension Programs.—The Committee recommends $437,039,000 for the Life Extension Program.

B61 Life Extension Program.—The Committee is concerned about NNSA's plans to incorporate new safety and security features in the life extension version of the B61. The B61 life extension program will be the most ambitious and extensive refurbishment of a weapon system to date. For example, the B61 has three times as many major components that must be replaced as the W76. Further complicating matters is the ambitious timeframe for replacing these components before they reach the end of their life and affect weapon reliability. In a May 2011 study, the Government Accountability Office identified significant challenges in building the first refurbished weapon by 2017, including manufacturing critical materials and components, meeting production requirements, ensuring the quality of finished products, and coordinating the production of bomb components between NNSA and the Air Force. Adding to this ambitious scope of work, NNSA plans to incorporate untried technologies and design features to improve the safety and security of the nuclear stockpile. The Committee supports enhanced surety of weapon systems to avoid accidents and unauthorized use, but it should not come at the expense of long-term weapon reliability. New safety and security features should be incorporated in weapon systems when feasible, but the primary goal of a life extension program should be to increase confidence in warhead performance without underground nuclear testing.

For these reasons, the Committee recommends $180,000,000 for the B61 life extension program, a reduction of $43,562,000. The Committee directs that:

—the JASON group of scientific advisers submit a classified and unclassified assessment by February 1, 2012 to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees that determines whether proposed intrinsic nuclear warhead safety and security features for the B61 bomb will affect the long-term safety, security, reliability, and operation of the weapon, whether these surety features are justified when measured against the plausible range of deployment scenarios and threats likely to confront the future B61 stockpile, and the benefits outweigh the costs of installing such features; and

—the Administrator of NNSA and the laboratory directors from Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandia certify to the House and

Senate Appropriations Committees that the benefits of installing intrinsic safety and security features outweigh the costs and there are no less costly and effective alternatives to surety that can be accomplished without introducing intrinsic surety features in the B61 by March 1, 2012.

In addition, when NNSA completes its Phase 6.2/6.2A study for the B61 life extension program, the Committee directs NNSA to submit to the Committee both a classified and unclassified report 90 days after the completion of the study with:

—a description of the safety and security features NNSA would add to a refurbished B61 and

—a cost and benefit analysis of installing the proposed features in the warhead.

The cost and benefit analysis should include:

—the costs of science, technology, and engineering to install new safety and security features;

—the costs of assessing the impact the new features may have on the performance of the nuclear explosive package at the national laboratories;

—the extent to which the proposed safety and security features address specific safety and security concerns; and

—why current safety and security features would not be sufficient.

Stockpile Systems.—The Committee recommends $472,109,000. Of these funds, at least $175,000,000 shall be used for surveillance activities. The Committee commends NNSA for sustaining increased funding for surveillance activities in the fiscal year 2012 request. The Committee encourages NNSA to continue developing and using non-destructive evaluation technologies to economically obtain greater quantities of assessment data while reducing warhead or component destruction. The Committee also recommends $26,000,000, a decrease of $25,087,000 below the request, for the planned W78 life extension program because of delays in completing the Phase 6.1 study.

Weapons Dismantlement.—The Committee recommends $56,770,000 as requested.

Stockpile Services.—The Committee recommends $838,964,000. Within these funds, at least $64,000,000 shall be used to support surveillance activities. The Committee understands that NNSA completed building the last W88 war reserve pits in fiscal year 2011 and is preparing to transition to build the W87 pit. However, the Committee is concerned about NNSA's ability to maintain a pit manufacturing capability during the transition. The Committee directs NNSA to provide a report to the Committee 90 days after enactment that:

—describes how NNSA will maintain a pit manufacturing capability without manufacturing pits;

—assesses the costs of maintaining a pit manufacturing capability without pit production; and

—evaluates the costs of developing pit manufacturing capabilities for future requirements.

CAMPAIGNS

The Committee recommends $1,716,407,000 for NNSA Campaigns.

Science Campaign.—The Committee recommends $347,055,000. Within these funds, at least $44,000,000 shall be used for plutonium and other physics experiments at Sandia's Z facility. The Committee commends Sandia National Laboratory for successfully and safely performing two plutonium experiments at the refurbished Z facility. The Committee understands that these experiments yielded fundamentally new and surprising data about the behavior of plutonium at high pressure and this new data has been one of the most valuable contributions to the stockpile stewardship program. The Committee continues to strongly support the weapons physics activities at Sandia's Z facility that are critical to sustaining a safe, secure, and effective nuclear stockpile.

No funding shall be used to design, prepare, or execute a scaled experiment. The Committee is concerned that a scaled experiment, which is a type of subcritical experiment that uses plutonium pit-like designs, may not be needed for annual assessments of the current stockpile and a new program for scaled experiments may interfere with achieving the Nuclear Posture Review's goals and schedule. In addition, the Committee is concerned that NNSA does not have the diagnostic equipment at the Nevada National Security Site to collect the necessary data for scaled experiments. Hundreds of millions of dollars and several years may be needed to install new radiographic capabilities to conduct scientifically meaningful scaled experiments. These costs are not included in budget projects for future years and the Committee is concerned that adding this additional requirement will come at the expense of higher priorities. The Committee directs NNSA to wait until the JASON study group completes its review of scaled experiments before making a decision on whether to proceed with scaled experiments. If NNSA decides to conduct scaled experiments, the Committee expects NNSA to submit a plan explaining the scientific value of scaled experiments for stockpile stewardship and meeting the goals of the Nuclear Posture Review, the costs of developing the capabilities for and conducting scaled experiments, and the impact on other stockpile stewardship activities under constrained budgets if scaled experiments are pursued.

Engineering Campaign.—The Committee recommends $143,078,000 as requested.

Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High-Yield Campaign.—The Committee recommends $476,274,000 as requested. Within these funds, at least $62,500,000 and $48,000,000 shall be used for inertial confinement fusion activities at the University of Rochester's Omega facility and Sandia National Laboratory's Z facility, respectively. The Committee encourages NNSA to increase pulsed power capabilities at the Z facility by increasing available current and attainable pressures and radiation, especially for new radiographic capabilities. The Committee also recommends at least $5,000,000 as requested for the Naval Research Laboratory to continue operating laser facilities focused on laser plasma interactions, target hydrodynamics, and materials—issues which are important

for ignition. The Committee recognizes and supports the important work of medium scale laser facilities such as Trident at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Jupiter at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and Nike at the Naval Research Laboratory to provide independent peer review of experiments at larger scale facilities, such as the National Ignition Facility, and help resolve scientific barriers to achieving ignition.

The Committee recognizes the National Ignition Facility's important contribution to resolving a critical stockpile stewardship issue related to radiation transport. Scientists used the National Ignition Facility to conduct non-ignition experiments, which do not require using the full capability of the facility, to achieve temperatures and pressures that exceeded any other facility and address one of the largest sources of uncertainty in calculating weapon performance. These experiments validated physics-based models and increased NNSA's confidence in assessing the safety, security, and reliability of the stockpile. Despite this success, the Committee remains concerned about NNSA's ability to achieve ignition—the primary purpose of constructing the facility—by the end of fiscal year 2012 when the National Ignition Campaign ends and the facility should transition to regular ignition operations and pursues broad scientific applications. The Committee directs NNSA to establish an independent advisory board by January 1, 2012 that can evaluate experiments planned at the National Ignition Facility pre- and post-ignition, identify potential weaknesses with the experimental plan, and recommend, if necessary, alternative approaches to address scientific and technical challenges. The Committee also strongly supports the advisory committee's role in setting a strategic direction for inertial confinement fusion and high-energy density physics research and determining how best to use current facilities to advance this scientific field. If the National Ignition Facility does not achieve ignition by the end of fiscal year 2012 using a cryogenically layered deuterium and tritium target that produces a neutron yield with a gain greater than 1, the Committee directs NNSA to submit a report by November 30, 2012 that (1) explains the scientific and technical barriers to achieving ignition, (2) the steps NNSA will take to achieve ignition with a revised schedule, and (3) the impact on the stockpile stewardship program.

The Committee commends NNSA for taking the first steps in soliciting competitive bids for its full portfolio of target fabrication contracts. The Committee encourages NNSA to consider various criteria when awarding contracts, such as the extent to which the contract spurs innovation, lowers costs, reduces technical risk, and maintains a competitive multi-vendor market to avoid relying on one contractor for all future target fabrication needs. The Committee also encourages NNSA to take advantage of existing and presently underutilized fabrication capabilities to meet increased demands for targets rather than developing and building new infrastructure. The Committee also urges NNSA to develop a long-term plan that assesses the demand for targets for inertial confinement fusion facilities that support the stockpile stewardship program and identifies ways to meet that demand without significant cost increases.

Advanced Simulation and Computing.—The Committee recommends $625,000,000. High-performance computing underpins NNSA's ability to scientifically resolve outstanding weapons performance issues, address material aging and compatibility challenges, conduct future life extension program activities, and rapidly address results from Significant Findings Investigations. As the stockpile continues to age, NNSA will require a thousandfold improvement over today's modeling and simulation capability, commonly referred to as exascale. Therefore, of the funds provided, the Committee recommends $36,000,000 as requested for the exascale initiative.

Readiness Campaign.—The Committee recommends $125,000,000 for the Readiness Campaign. Within these funds, no more than $60,000,000 shall be used for tritium production efforts.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

The Committee recommends $2,170,546,000. The Committee is concerned about the escalating costs for two new nuclear facilities to handle plutonium and uranium. The new cost estimates for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement-Nuclear Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Uranium Processing Facility at Y–12 are two to three times more than previous estimates and constructions for these two facilities alone may exceed $12,000,000,000 over the next decade. An independent Corps of Engineers study that concluded that the cost range for the Uranium Processing Facility is between $6,500,000,000 and $7,500,000,000 only adds to the Committee's concerns. Since completing life extension programs to maintain the safety, security, and reliability of the stockpile is the highest priority and fiscal constraints will limit construction funding, the Committee directs NNSA to submit a contingency plan by February 1, 2012 that would identify the consequences to cost, scope, and schedule of delaying project implementation and the impact of sequencing construction of these two major facilities on stockpile requirements.

The Committee supports NNSA's decision to reach the 90 percent engineering design stage before establishing a project baseline and initiating construction of these two nuclear facilities. Initiating construction before designs are largely complete contributes to increased costs and schedule delays. The Committee also agrees with NNSA's decision not to forward fund these projects until a project baseline has been established and Congress has a more complete understanding of the costs.

The Committee encourages NNSA to develop a plan by the end of fiscal year 2012—consistent with NNSA's May 2011 strategic plan—to create an open, unclassified research and development space known as the Livermore Valley Open Campus that would increase interactions and partnerships between Lawrence Livermore and Sandia/California National Laboratories as well as the private sector and academia. This type of campus would help Livermore and Sandia maintain leadership in science, technology, and engineering in a wide variety of areas, including high-performance computing, energy and environmental security, and cybersecurity, and attract the workforce needed to fulfill the laboratories' NNSA mission.

Acquisition Strategy.—The Committee is concerned the Department took steps to implement a major new contracting strategy in the absence of complete information. Specifically, DOE was urged to await a Government Accountability Office review of the cost savings NNSA claimed it would achieve by combining the Management and Operations contracts at the Y–12 and Pantex production plants. GAO's preliminary findings did not validate that these savings were achievable and GAO has informed the Committee that efficiencies could be achieved through existing contracting mechanisms. However, NNSA has decided to proceed anyway. Many critical activities are at stake as NNSA begins to implement the requirements of the Nuclear Posture Review and the New START Treaty, while a contract overhaul likely will cause significant disruption and put these activities at risk. While the Committee strongly supports efforts to implement administrative efficiencies at all NNSA sites, efficiencies will come about in large part when NNSA improves its oversight of contracts.

Regardless of the outcome of the acquisition strategy, the Committee expects all efforts will be taken to ensure a minimum of disruption to work associated with the Uranium Processing Facility to keep this facility on time and on budget.

Operations and Maintanance.—The Committee recommends $1,555,278,000 for the Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities Operations and Maintenance account. Of these funds:

Operations of Facilities.—The Committee recommends $1,411,000,000.

Program Readiness.—The Committee recommends the requested amount of $69,170,000.

Material Recycle and Recovery.—The Committee recommends $80,000,000.

Containers.—The Committee recommends the requested amount of $28,979,000 as requested.

Storage.—The Committee recommends the requested amount of $30,289,000.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $551,108,000.

Project 12–D–301, TRU Waste Facilities, Los Alamos, New Mexico.—The Committee recommends $9,881,000 as requested to begin construction of a new transuranic waste facility to meet regulatory requirements of the State of New Mexico.

Project 11–D–801, TA–55 Reinvestment Project, Los Alamos, New Mexico.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000 to begin the second phase of this effort to mitigate safety risks to workers identified by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. NNSA has unobligated funds that can be used to fund additional upgrades to the facility.

Project 10–D–501, Nuclear Facility Risk Reduction, Y–12, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.—The Committee recommends $35,287,000 as requested to upgrade equipment and infrastructure in buildings 9212 and 9204–2E for continued safe uranium operations until the new Uranium Processing Facility is operational.

Project 09–D–404, Test Capabilities Revitalization Phase II, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico.—The committee recommends $25,168,000 as requested to refurbish nonnuclear capabilities, such as rocket sled tracks and mechanical

shock facilities, to test weapons components needed for the B61 and future life extension programs.

Project 08–D–802, High Explosive Pressing Facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas.—The Committee recommends $66,960,000 as requested to build a new facility to make high explosive hemispheres for nuclear weapons that is more reliable and can meet the projected workload for life extension programs.

Project 07–D–140, Project Engineering and Design [PED], Various Locations.—The Committee recommends $3,518,000 as requested to complete design work on the Transuranic Waste Facilities Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Project 06–D–141, PED, Uranium Process Facility, Y–12, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.—The Committee recommends $160,194,000 as requested.

Project 04–D–125 Chemistry and Metallurgy Facility Replacement Project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico.—The Committee recommends $240,000,000. Within these funds, $35,000,000 is to complete equipment installation at the Radiological Laboratory, $125,000,000 is for design activities to reach 90 percent design maturity by the end of the fiscal year, $40,000,000 is for long-lead procurements, and $40,000,000 is for site preparation.

SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Committee recommendation for the Secure Transportation Asset program is $251,272,000, the same as the budget request.

NUCLEAR COUNTERTERRORISM INCIDENT RESPONSE

The Committee recommends full funding of the nuclear counterterrorism incident response program. The Committee provides $222,147,000 as requested.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION

The Committee recommends $96,380,000 for Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization activities, consistent with the budget request. The Committee is concerned about an increasing backlog of deferred maintenance costs within NNSA's nuclear weapons laboratories and production facilities. Based on a March 2011 NNSA assessment, deferred maintenance costs are expected to increase by $70,000,000 a year. The Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program has only reduced some of the backlog in deferred maintenance and this program will end in fiscal year 2013. To increase transparency in NNSA's efforts to sustain existing physical infrastructure, the Committee directs NNSA to identify funds for maintenance and operations by site as separate line items under the Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities Account starting with the fiscal year 2014 budget submission. The sites include the three national security labs, the Y–12 National Security Complex, the Kansas City Plant, the Savannah River Site, and the Nevada National Security Site. The budget justification shall include an explanation of how NNSA plans to manage deferred maintenance costs, including ways NNSA will stabilize deferred maintenance for mission critical facilities and dispose of excess capacity. Further,

the budget shall include total deferred maintenance backlog and how much NNSA is spending at each site each year to reduce deferred maintenance. The Committee recommends using the Office of Science's Science Laboratories Infrastructure budget information on deferred maintenance as a model. Further, the Committee is concerned by a recent Government Accountability Office finding that NNSA does not have accurate, reliable, or complete data on the condition and replacement value of its almost 3,000 weapons activities facilities. The Committee directs NNSA to develop standardized practices for assessing the condition of its facilities and review the sites' methodologies for determining replacement value to ensure consistency, accuracy, and completeness through the complex.

SITE STEWARDSHIP

The Committee recommends $90,000,000. The Committee supports NNSA's efforts to consolidate and dispose of NNSA special nuclear material that is no longer required for the nuclear weapons mission.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation for the Safeguards and Security Program is $828,366,000.

Defense Nuclear Security Operations and Maintenance.—The Committee recommends $701,752,000. The Committee support NNSA's efforts to reduce costs related to securing national laboratories and production sites while still maintaining effective physical security measures at each site. The Committee encourages NNSA to continue eliminating unnecessary costs while still protecting facilities' assets and resources against theft, sabotage, and other criminal acts.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $11,752,000 as requested.

Project 08–D–701 Nuclear Materials Safeguards and Security Upgrades Project Phase II, Los Alamos, New Mexico.—The Committee recommends the requested level of $11,752,000 for this project.

Cybersecurity.—The Committee recommends the full request of $126,614,000.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND ENGINEERING CAPABILITY

The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for Science, Technology, and Engineering Capability activities. The Committee supports NNSA's efforts to leverage its science, engineering, and technological expertise to work with the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and intelligence agencies to improve the Nation's counterterrorism capabilities. The Committee also supports activities to build and sustain analytical capabilities at Los Alamos, Sandia, and Livermore to assess the nuclear and biological weapons capabilities of foreign adversaries to support the intelligence community. The Committee notes that $30,000,000 was provided in the 2009 Supplemental Appropriations Act to help build the technical capabilities for nuclear and biological weapons assessments. The Committee is concerned, however, that DOE's Office of Intelligence is

not fully utilizing these newly constituted capabilities and sustaining the human talent needed to address national security issues. The Committee encourages DOE's Office of Intelligence to further develop the analytical capabilities needed to fully utilize these improved scientific, technical, and engineering capabilities at the national security labs.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $2,318,653,000
Budget estimate, 2012	[2] 2,549,492,000
House allowance	[2] 2,056,770,000
Committee recommendation	[3] 2,404,300,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $45,000,000 under Public Law 112–10.
[2] Does not include proposed rescission of $30,000,000.
[3] Does not include proposed rescission of $21,000,000.

The Committee recommends $2,383,300,000 for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, which includes a rescission of $21,000,000 of prior-year unobligated funds. The Committee commends NNSA for making significant progress in meeting the goal of securing all vulnerable nuclear materials within 4 years. In 2009, the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States found that "the surest way to prevent nuclear terrorism is to deny terrorist acquisition of nuclear weapons or fissile materials . . . An accelerated campaign to close or secure the world's most vulnerable nuclear sites as quickly as possible should be a top national priority." To that end, since April 2009, when President Obama announced the 4-year goal, NNSA has removed over 960 kilograms of highly enriched uranium—enough material for 38 nuclear weapons. NNSA has also removed all highly enriched uranium from six countries. One of these countries was Libya. Given the recent unrest in Libya, the presence of this dangerous nuclear material in an unstable part of the world would have increased the risk of nuclear terrorism. Removing highly enriched uranium from six countries in 2 years is much faster than one country a year NNSA has averaged in the last 13 years. Further, NNSA has completed security upgrades at 32 additional buildings in Russia containing weapons usable materials. The Committee encourages NNSA to continue its accelerated efforts to secure vulnerable nuclear materials.

NONPROLIFERATION AND VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends $417,598,000 as requested to support investment in developing advanced nuclear detection technologies. Within available funds, $5,710,000 should be used for the Global Seismographic Network [GSN] Equipment Renewal project. The GSN, among other things, has 46 sites—the single largest contribution—that monitor compliance with the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and could detect foreign nuclear tests. However, GSN equipment, such as sensors, is more than 15 years old, obsolete, and increasingly difficult to effectively maintain. The committee supports this one-time investment to purchase new equipment to sustain and maintain GSN's critical monitoring activities.

The Committee supports research and development activities to develop new tools, technologies, techniques, and expertise to improve detection of nuclear weapons technology and special nuclear materials. However, the Committee is concerned that NNSA is not doing enough to transfer new technologies to its customers, including the Department of Homeland Security and intelligence agencies. The Committee encourages NNSA to develop better performance metrics that measure not only improvements in existing technologies but also the extent to which new technologies are adopted and used by its customers. NNSA should also be able to explain how the development of novel technologies reduced the threat to national security posed by nuclear weapon proliferation or detonation and the illicit trafficking of nuclear materials.

The Committee also supports NNSA's efforts to develop and build space based sensors to detect surface, atmospheric, or space nuclear detonations. However, the Committee is concerned that the requirements for these space based sensors have not changed since the Eisenhower administration and new capabilities may be required to detect illicit activities beyond just nuclear detonations. The Committee directs NNSA to work with U.S. Strategic Command, the Air Force, and other Department of Defense agencies to review the requirements for space based sensors, determine whether new requirements are needed to detect a broader and more diverse set of nuclear threats, the resource needs to implement new requirements, and the extent to which new space based sensors can increase capabilities at a lower cost than current technologies.

The Committee also encourages NNSA to accelerate efforts to find alternatives to helium-3 for radiation detection technologies, especially portal monitors that are deployed at ports and border crossings to detect radiation and prevent the smuggling of nuclear material into the United States. The Committee is concerned that critical shortages of this gas may limit deployments of this critical technology. NNSA's success in finding alternatives will benefit other Government agencies.

NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The Committee recommends $155,305,000. The Committee recommends $14,972,000, a reduction of $3,500,000, for the Global Initiative for Proliferation Prevention. The Committee believes that this program to assist weapons scientists in Russia and other countries needs to be reassessed. NNSA has not provided sufficient justification to the Committee on the continuing nonproliferation benefits of this program, especially the continuing threat posed by scientists in Russia and other countries who once worked on weapons of mass destruction programs, and whether improved economic conditions in these countries merit U.S. aid. The Committee directs NNSA to reassess this program and determine whether it is still needed based on the proliferation risk posed by weapons scientists in Russia and other countries. If the program is still needed, NNSA should develop a well-defined strategy to more effectively target the scientists of highest proliferation concern and have a clear exit strategy, including specific criteria to determine when specific countries are ready to graduate from the program.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS PROTECTION AND COOPERATION

The Committee recommends $571,639,000. The Committee is encouraged by NNSA's efforts in completing security upgrades at 213 out of 229 buildings that store weapons usable nuclear material and warheads in Russia and other former Soviet countries. These upgrades directly support the U.S. effort to secure all vulnerable nuclear materials around the world within 4 years by securing warheads and weapons-exploitable nuclear materials at their source. The Committee is also encouraged by NNSA's efforts in preventing and detecting the illicit transfer of nuclear materials by installing radiation detection equipment at 399 sites—365 borders, airports, and strategic ports and 34 megaports across the world.

The Committee understands that materials protection, control, and accounting work in Russia will continue past fiscal year 2013—the original deadline for this program. The Committee supports continued cooperation between the United States and Russia, but the United States must receive an assurance from Russia that it will assume full responsibility for sustaining U.S.-provided nuclear security systems over the long term. The Committee directs NNSA to work with the State Department to request future spending plans from the Russian Government to have a clearer sense of Russian intentions on funding nuclear security programs.

While NNSA has made considerable progress in securing Russian nuclear warheads and materials at numerous sites, the Committee believes more progress is needed in consolidating and reducing the number of locations in Russia with nuclear materials and phasing out the use of highly enriched uranium at Russian research reactors and related facilities. A recent Government Accountability Office report found that NNSA's plans involved removing highly enriched uranium from 5 sites and 50 buildings by 2010, but it has only removed material from 1 site and 25 buildings. In addition, of the 71 highly enriched uranium-fueled research reactors and related facilities in Russia, only 3 have been shut down. The Committee believes accelerating material consolidation will provide a higher level of security at lower potential cost and reactor shut downs and conversion will reduce quantities of weapons-usable materials potentially accessible in Russia.

The Committee understands that NNSA plans to establish Nuclear Security Centers of Excellence in China and India. The purpose of these centers is to help implement international efforts to lock down and remove vulnerable nuclear materials around the world and advance nuclear security best practices, research and development, and bilateral and regional initiatives. The U.S. role is limited to providing technical advice and equipment for nuclear safeguards and security. While China has taken concrete steps toward procuring land and developing a detailed design for building a center of excellence, the Committee is concerned about delays in establishing a center in India and how NNSA would use available funding to help develop and support the center. If by the end of third quarter of fiscal year 2012, NNSA, India, and other relevant international counterparts have not finalized an agreement that, among other things, specifies the overall cost estimate for the center, details how NNSA funding will be utilized to develop and sup-

port the center, and spells out Indian and other international cost-sharing arrangements in support of the center, the Committee directs NNSA to reprogram the $7,000,000 for the Indian center to the Global Threat Reduction Initiative's Nuclear and Radiological Material Removal program and notify the Committee as to how these funds have been reprogrammed.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The Committee recommends $751,489,000 to support the plutonium disposition program and construction projects.

U.S. Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition.—The Committee recommends $250,435,000 including $224,000,000 for the U.S. plutonium disposition and $26,435,000 as requested for the U.S. uranium disposition programs.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $500,054,000 to support construction of three facilities at Savannah River in South Carolina—the MO_X Fuel Fabrication Facility [MFFF], the Waste Solidification Building, and the Pit Disassembly and Conversion [PDC] project. These facilities will dispose of at least 34 metric tons of plutonium by fabricating it into mixed oxide fuel for domestic nuclear reactors. The Committee remains concerned with the overall management of the U.S. plutonium disposition program. The Committee notes a history of rising costs and schedule delays in the construction of these major disposition facilities, and believes that further costs increases or delays in program implementation may result from several pending NNSA decisions to reconfigure key program elements. In particular, the Committee is concerned by the prolonged delay by NNSA and DOE in achieving a CD–1 decision on the consolidation of the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility and the Plutonium Preparation Project into a new Pit Disassembly and Conversion capability, a possible redesign of the PDC program to produce plutonium feedstock at a lower rate than currently planned, and a proposed redesign of MFFF to allow production of MO_X fuel suitable for use in boiling water reactors and next generation light water reactors. The Committee further notes wavering interest and lack of firm commitments from U.S. utilities to irradiate MO_X fuel in their reactors. For these reasons, the Committee directs NNSA to provide a report no later than December 31, 2011 with:

—updated cost and schedule estimates for both PDC and MFFF;
—the anticipated startup date for both MFFF and PDC;
—the sources of and strategy for providing plutonium feedstock in the gap period between start up of MFFF operations and availability of feedstock from PDC;
—the status of agreements from U.S. utilities to irradiate MO_X fuel in their reactors, the deadline to obtain such agreements, and the status of contingency plans NNSA has developed should it fail to achieve such agreements with utilities; and
—the timeframe for completing disposition of 34 metric tons of U.S. surplus plutonium.

The Committee is aware that MFFF faced schedule delays and cost increased because of difficulties in identifying suppliers and subcontractors with the ability and experience to fabricate and install equipment that met strict quality assurance standards and re-

quirements for nuclear work. The lack of experienced nuclear equipment suppliers resulted in a lack of competition for work and higher than expected bids. NNSA also had to station dedicated MO_X facility quality assurance and engineering personnel at supplier and subcontractor stations to train personnel and ensure fabricated equipment and installations met requirements. Based on the lessons learned from this construction project and the large investment NNSA made to train nuclear equipment suppliers, the Committee directs NNSA to establish a working group that meets regularly composed of project managers and key management, acquisition, and procurement staff of MFFF and NNSA's three other major construction projects—UPF, CMRR–NF, and PDC—to share lessons learned and help new construction projects stay on time and on budget.

Project 99–D–143, Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, Savannah River, South Carolina.—The Committee recommends $435,172,000. This increase represents a transfer of $50,000,000 from Other Project Costs for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility to construction to keep construction on schedule and help install ventilation equipment, process piping, and electrical equipment and assemble and test gloveboxes.

Project 99–D–141–02, Waste Solidification Building, Savannah River, South Carolina.—The Committee recommends full funding of $17,582,000 for this project.

Project 99–D–141–01, Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility, Savannah River, South Carolina.—The Committee recommends $47,300,000 because NNSA has not completed a study of alternatives or a conceptual design report with a new cost and schedule range that is required under DOE guidance before construction can begin.

Russian Surplus Materials Disposition.—The Committee recommends $1,000,000, a reduction of $9,174,000. No funding shall be used to support research and development of the Gas Turbine-Modular Helium Reactor in Russia. The Committee understands that the United States committed $400,000,000, subject to future appropriations, to help Russia dispose of 34 metric tons of excess weapon-grade plutonium, but the Committee will not provide funding for this effort until NNSA can explain how the United States would spend the $400,000,000 and the milestones that Russia must meet before the United States releases any of those funds.

GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

The Committee recommends $508,269,000 as requested. The Committee recommends the full request of $148,269,000 for the reactor conversion program. The Committee supports NNSA's efforts to accelerate the shut down or conversion of research reactors that use highly enriched uranium [HEU] around the world. HEU-fueled research reactors have some of the world's weakest security measures and a determined terrorist could use HEU reactor fuel for a nuclear device. The Committee agrees that eliminating these HEU stockpiles should be a priority and directly supports efforts to secure vulnerable nuclear materials because once a reactor is converted or shut down, the HEU fuel can be shipped to the United States or Russia for permanent disposition and would no longer

pose a threat. Despite the slow progress in converting or shutting down HEU-fueled research reactors in Russia, the Committee commends NNSA for reaching agreements quickly with other countries, such as China and the Czech Republic, to convert or shut down their reactors. The Committee also supports related activities such as developing high density low enriched uranium fuel to convert high performance HEU-fueled reactors and developing a capability which does not currently exist in the United States to produce Moly-99—a medical isotope used in 16 million nuclear medicine procedures in the United States each year—with low enriched uranium. The Committee notes the significant achievement of South Africa's ability to convert their reactor from HEU to low enriched uranium fuel to produce Moly-99 and that the United States received the first shipment of Moly-99 produced with low enriched fuel in December 2010.

The Committee continues to support efforts to remove, dispose, and protect domestic nuclear and radiological materials. Nuclear and radiological materials are located at more than 2,500 facilities in the United States. Domestic stockpiles of nuclear and radioactive materials could be used by terrorist groups in an improvised nuclear device or a radiological dispersal device, or dirty bomb, in the United States. The Committee understands that the Department of Energy is responsible for disposing of many types of low-level radioactive materials because there are no commercial disposal options. The Committee commends the Department for reducing domestic public health and national security threats by recovering over 27,000 disused, unwanted and orphan sources in the United States and securing over 250 buildings.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $960,176,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,153,662,000
House allowance	1,030,600,000
Committee recommendation	1,100,000,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $1,000,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommends $1,100,000,000 for Naval Reactors. In fiscal year 2010, NNSA began work on three significant projects: design of a reactor plant for new OHIO-class ballistic missile submarines, refueling of a land-based reactor prototype, and construction of a new spent fuel facility. Based on current projections, funding for these three projects will grow from $200,000,000 in fiscal year 2011 to over $600,000,000 in fiscal year 2015. In the current budget environment, the Committee is concerned that there may not be sufficient funds to fund all three projects concurrently. The Committee directs the Office of Naval Reactors to submit a contingency plan by February 1, 2012 that would sequence these three major projects. The plan should identify the highest priority project, justify which project or projects could be delayed, and explain the consequences to cost, scope, and schedule of delaying project implementation.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $398,993,000
Budget estimate, 2012	450,060,000
House allowance	400,000,000
Committee recommendation	404,000,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $5,700,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommends $404,000,000 for the Office of the Administrator. The Committee strongly supports NNSA's efforts to improve Federal oversight of major nuclear construction projects, such as the Uranium Processing Facility and the Chemistry and Metallurgy Replacement Facility. The Committee believes NNSA must do more to build confidence it has the ability to execute large line item construction projects within budget and on schedule.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $4,991,638,000
Budget estimate, 2012	5,406,781,000
House allowance	4,937,619,000
Committee recommendation	5,002,308,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $11,900,000 or transfer of $33,633,000 to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommendation for Defense Environmental Cleanup is $5,002,308,000. Within the total provided, the Department is directed to fund the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program.

Reprogramming Control Levels.—In fiscal year 2012, the Environmental Management program may transfer funding between operating expense funded projects within the controls listed below using guidance contained in the Department's budget execution manual (DOE M 135.1–1A, chapter IV). All capital construction line item projects remain separate controls from the operating projects. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be formally notified in advance of all reprogrammings, except internal reprogrammings, and the Department is to take no financial action in anticipation of congressional response. The Committee recommends the following reprogramming control points for fiscal year 2012:

—Closure Sites;
—Hanford Site;
—Idaho National Laboratory;
—NNSA Sites;
—Oak Ridge Reservation;
—Office of River Protection;
—Savannah River Site;
—Waste Isolation Pilot Plant;
—Program Direction;
—Program Support;
—Technology Development and Deployment;
—Safeguards and Security; and
—All Capital Construction Line Items, regardless of site.

Internal Reprogramming Authority.—The new reprogramming control points above obviates, in most cases, the need for internal reprogramming authority. However, at the few sites to which the internal reprogramming statute still applies, Environmental Man-

agement site managers may transfer up to $5,000,000, one time, between accounts listed above to reduce health and safety risks, gain cost savings, or complete projects, as long as a program or project is not increased or decreased by more than $5,000,000 in total during the fiscal year.

The reprogramming authority—either formal or internal—may not be used to initiate new programs or to change funding levels for programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the act or report. The Committee on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be notified within 30 days after the use of the internal reprogramming authority.

Environmental Management Reorganization.—The Department announced on July 8, 2011, its intention to change the reporting structure of the Office of Environmental Management, the Office of Legacy Management, and the Office of the Chief of Nuclear Safety so that these offices would report directly to the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security. According to the Department, this reorganization is meant to capitalize on the expertise that exists throughout the Department on project management, nuclear materials and waste, and nuclear safety and security. While the Committee shares the Department's desire to improve EM project management and nuclear safety and security, confusion remains as to how the reorganization will impact day-to-day operations of EM and how specifically it will result in improved project management. The Department failed to provide sufficient advance notice of its plans and rationale for these plans, resulting in skepticism and frustration amongst DOE stakeholders. In addition, it is not clear how the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security—who is tasked with implementing an ambitious nuclear modernization effort—will be able to manage this additional, critical responsibility, without detracting from the NNSA mission. The Committee directs the Department to provide a detailed plan for implementation of the new EM management structure within 30 days of enactment of this act.

Closure Sites.—The Committee recommends $5,375,000 for Closure Sites activities.

Hanford Site.—The Committee recommends $953,252,000 for Richland Operations. The Committee is aware that the B Reactor has been identified as a National Historic Landmark and the Department of Energy has stated that the intent is preserving the reactor for public access. To ensure this intent is accomplished, the Committee believes that it is appropriate to use cleanup dollars for the maintenance and public safety efforts at the B Reactor. Funding for the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response [HAMMER] facilities are provided for within available funds.

Idaho National Laboratory.—The Committee recommends $384,499,000 for Idaho National Laboratory.

NNSA Sites.—The Committee recommends $253,767,000 for NNSA sites.

Oak Ridge Reservation.—The Committee recommends $202,509,000 for Oak Ridge Reservation. The amount provided includes $40,000,000 to downblend U–233 in Building 3019. It is expected this will be a 5-year effort with an annual requirement of $40,000,000. In view of the proximity of employees at Oak Ridge

National Laboratory to this highly contaminated facility, this work should be a high priority within the Environmental Management program.

Office of River Protection.—The Committee recommends $1,207,000,000 for the Office of River Protection.

Savannah River Site.—The Committee recommends $1,190,879,000 for the Savannah River site.

H-Canyon.—The request for Savannah River proposes to place H-Canyon into hot standby pending a determination by the Department to begin reprocessing spent fuel. The Committee is concerned by EM's plan to meet its statutory requirements to maintain the facility in a high state of readiness. H-Canyon is a unique national capability for performing large scale chemical processing operations that would take considerable time and funding to reconstitute if lost. The Department should demonstrate it can adequately maintain the condition of the chemical processing areas while it deliberates on the disposition of spent nuclear fuel. Additionally, as the Department continues to analyze ways to address the back end of the fuel cycle, the Committee notes the supportive role that H-Canyon could play in research and development.

The Committee also notes that with regards to its deliberations on spent nuclear fuel, H-Canyon appears to be the only available disposition path for nearly 14 metric tons of aluminum clad fuel currently residing at SRS and other sites around the complex. The decision not to process aluminum clad fuel may require the Department to spend millions of dollars to increase the storage space in L-basin to accommodate additional aluminum clad fuel. The indefinite storage of this material will be costly to the taxpayers and take budgetary focus away from other priorities at SRS and around the complex. The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board noted its opinion that there are unintended safety consequences of orphaning this material in a letter to Secretary Chu. The Committee directs that within 90 days, the Department provide a report to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, as well as the Senate and House Armed Service Committees on the disposition path for the 14 MT of aluminum clad fuel.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.—The Committee recommends $200,000,000 for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. The Committee notes the Department submitted a request for $28,771,000 in fiscal year 2012 to continue providing economic assistance to the State of New Mexico, even though the requirement to provide such payments under the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Land Withdrawal Act, as amended, was completed in fiscal year 2011. In light of the overall size of this grant relative to other State grants that EM makes, as well as other budget constraints, the Committee recommends no funding for making a voluntary payment under that act in fiscal year 2012.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $321,628,000 for program direction.

Program Support.—The Committee recommends $20,380,000 for program support.

Safeguards and Security.—The Committee recommends $252,019,000 for safeguards and security.

Technology Development and Deployment.—The Committee recommends $11,000,000 for technology development and deployment. The Department is encouraged to continue successful efforts with industry to transfer and demonstrate international technologies and approaches to the cleanup program. The Committee also encourages the Department to work with industry on initiatives which better support the transition of ideas and technology into practice.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2011	[1] $788,420,000
Budget estimate, 2012	859,952,000
House allowance	814,000,000
Committee recommendation	819,000,000

[1] Does not include rescission of $3,400,000 under Public Law 112–10.

The Committee recommendation is $819,000,000. The Committee provides no funding for acquisition workforce improvement because the Department did not provide sufficient justification to support this new program.

The Committee recommends that the Department consider changes to the structure of this account. Activities not related to defense are included in this account, such as hearings on whistleblower complaints, health and safety investigations, and safeguards and security at Idaho National Laboratory for the Office of Nuclear Energy. Many of these activities belong in other accounts, such as Departmental Administration or Nuclear Energy, or as separate accounts. The Committee encourages the Department to work with the Appropriations Committees to better structure this account and provide a new account structure to the Committees by February 1, 2012.

Health, Safety and Security.—The Committee recommends $437,436,000 for the Office of Health, Safety, and Security, including $72,058,000 for Health and Safety programs and $263,378,000 for Security programs. Within the Security programs funding, $186,699,000 is for Specialized Security Activities.

Office of Legacy Management.—The Committee recommends $169,740,000, as requested.

Idaho Sitewide Safeguards and Security.—The Committee recommends $93,350,000, a decrease of $5,150,000, for Idaho infrastructure for sitewide safeguards and security.

Defense-Related Administrative Support.—The Committee recommends $114,332,000, a reduction of $4,504,000.

Office of Hearings and Appeals.—The Committee provides $4,142,000 as requested.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

The Nation's power marketing administrations shall make every effort to use available funds and borrowing authority, where applicable, to facilitate and fully develop renewable energy resources and related transmission capacity in their region, and to work in a coordinated fashion with each other and regional transmission authorities, public and private utilities, and other entities to reduce barriers to greater movement of electricity between regions and

interconnections to promote reliability and the delivery of affordable, clean power.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Department of Energy's marketing agency for electric power in the Pacific Northwest. Bonneville provides electricity to a 300,000-square-mile service area in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets the power from Federal hydropower projects in the Northwest, as well as power from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also exchanges and markets surplus power with Canada and California. The Committee recommends no new borrowing authority for BPA during fiscal year 2011.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2011	.....
Budget estimate, 2012	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

For the Southeastern Power Administration, the Committee recommends no funding, the same as the budget request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2011	$13,050,000
Budget estimate, 2012	11,892,000
House allowance	11,892,000
Committee recommendation	11,892,000

For the Southwestern Power Administration, the Committee recommends $11,892,000, the same as the budget request.

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

Appropriations, 2011	$108,963,000
Budget estimate, 2012	95,968,000
House allowance	95,968,000
Committee recommendation	95,968,000

For the Western Area Power Administration, the Committee recommends $95,968,000, the same as the budget request.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriations, 2011	$220,000
Budget estimate, 2012	220,000
House allowance	220,000
Committee recommendation	220,000

For the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund, the Committee recommends $220,000 the same as the request.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2011	$298,000,000
Budget estimate, 2012	304,600,000
House allowance	304,600,000
Committee recommendation	304,600,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2011	−$298,000,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−304,600,000
House allowance	−304,600,000
Committee recommendation	−304,600,000

The proposed legislative language requires FERC to establish regulations which will assist States that choose to do so to develop technology-specific feed-in-tariff programs under the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978. Such regulations will clarify for general applicability to all qualifying facilities findings that FERC made in a series of recent orders on issues related to California's feed-in-tariff program for small (less than 20 MW), highly efficient combined heat and power facilities, at 132 FERC ¶ 61,047 (July 15, 2010) (FERC Declaratory Order), 133 FERC ¶ 61,059 (October 21, 2010) (FERC Clarification Order), and 134 FERC ¶ 61,044, (January 20, 2011) (FERC Rehearing Order).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY							
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy RDD&D:							
Hydrogen and fuel cell technologies	98,000	100,450	91,450	98,000	.....	−2,450	+6,550
Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D	182,695	340,500	150,000	180,000	−2,695	−160,500	+30,000
Solar energy	263,500	457,000	166,143	290,000	+26,500	−167,000	+123,857
Wind energy	80,000	126,859	76,000	80,000	.....	−46,859	+4,000
Geothermal technology	38,003	101,535	38,000	34,000	−4,003	−67,535	−4,000
Water Power	30,000	38,500	50,000	34,000	+4,000	−4,500	−16,000
Vehicle technologies	300,000	588,003	254,000	318,798	+18,798	−269,205	+64,798
Building technologies	210,500	470,700	150,000	210,500	.....	−260,200	+60,500
Industrial technologies	108,241	319,784	96,000	96,000	−12,241	−223,784	.....
Federal energy management program	30,402	33,072	30,000	30,000	−402	−3,072	.....
Facilities and infrastructure:							
National Renewable Energy Laboratory [NREL]	11,705	26,407	26,407	26,407	+14,702	.....	.....
Construction:							
08–EE–01 Energy systems integration facility National Renewal Energy Lab, Golden, Colorado	39,295	.....	.....	.....	−39,295	.....	.....
Subtotal, Facilities and infrastructure	51,000	26,407	26,407	26,407	−24,593	.....	.....
Program direction	170,000	176,605	110,000	165,000	−5,000	−11,605	+55,000
Program support	32,000	.....	.....	.....	−32,000	.....	.....
Strategic programs	.....	53,204	25,000	25,000	+25,000	−28,204	.....
Subtotal, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy RDD&D	1,594,341	2,832,619	1,263,000	1,587,705	−6,636	−1,244,914	+324,705
Weatherization and intragovernmental:							
Weatherization:							
Weatherization assistance	171,000	220,000	30,000	171,000	.....	−49,000	+141,000
Training and technical assistance	3,300	3,000	3,000	3,300	.....	+300	+300
Innovations in weatherization	.....	97,000	.....	.....	.....	−97,000	.....
Subtotal	174,300	320,000	33,000	174,300	.....	−145,700	+141,300

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Other:							
State energy program grants	50,000	63,798	25,000	50,000	.....	−13,798	+25,000
Tribal energy activities	7,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	+3,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	57,000	73,798	35,000	60,000	+3,000	−13,798	+25,000
Subtotal, Weatherization and intragovernmental	231,300	393,798	68,000	234,300	+3,000	−159,498	+166,300
Floor amendments	.....	.....	3,800	.....	.....	.....	−3,800
Use of prior year balances	.....	−26,364	−26,364	−26,364	−26,364	.....	.....
Rescission	−30,000	.....	.....	.....	+30,000	.....	.....
TOTAL, ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	1,795,641	3,200,053	1,308,436	1,795,641	.....	−1,404,412	+487,205
ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY							
Research and development:							
Clean energy transmission and reliability	26,000	60,817	20,000	27,000	+1,000	−33,817	+7,000
Smart grid research and development	29,000	45,000	33,813	24,000	−5,000	−21,000	−9,813
Energy storage	20,000	57,000	20,000	20,000	.....	−37,000	.....
Cyber security for energy delivery systems	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal	105,000	192,817	103,813	101,000	−4,000	−91,817	−2,813
Permitting, siting, and analysis	6,000	8,000	8,000	7,000	+1,000	−1,000	−1,000
Infrastructure security and energy restoration	6,100	6,187	6,187	6,000	−100	−187	−187
Program direction	27,610	31,217	22,000	27,010	−600	−4,207	+5,010
Use of prior year balances	.....	−504	−504	.....	.....	+504	+504
Rescission	−3,700	.....	.....	.....	+3,700	.....	.....
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY	141,010	237,717	139,496	141,010	.....	−96,707	+1,514

NUCLEAR ENERGY							
Research and development:							
Nuclear energy enabling technologies	51,383	97,364	95,014	68,880	+17,497	−28,484	−26,134
Integrated university program	.....	.....	5,000	.....	.....	.....	−5,000
LWR SMR licensing technical support	.....	67,000	67,000	.....	.....	−67,000	−67,000
Reactor concepts RD&D	168,535	125,000	136,986	31,870	−136,665	−93,130	−105,116
Fuel cycle research and development	187,615	155,010	132,000	187,917	+302	+32,907	+55,917
International nuclear energy cooperation	2,994	3,000	3,000	3,000	+6	.....	.....
Subtotal	410,527	447,374	439,000	291,667	−118,860	−155,707	−147,333
Infrastructure:							
Radiological facilities management:							
Space and defense infrastructure	46,906	49,902	44,014	64,902	+17,996	+15,000	+20,888
Research reactor infrastructure	4,808	4,986	4,986	4,986	+178	.....	.....
PU–238 production restart project	.....	10,000	.....	.....	.....	−10,000	.....
Subtotal	51,714	64,888	49,000	69,888	+18,174	+5,000	+20,888
INL facilities management:							
INL Operations and infrastructure	183,604	150,000	155,000	136,000	−47,604	−14,000	−19,000
Subtotal	183,604	150,000	155,000	136,000	−47,604	−14,000	−19,000
Subtotal, Infrastructure	235,318	214,888	204,000	205,888	−29,430	−9,000	+1,888
Program direction	86,279	93,133	92,000	86,279	.....	−6,854	−5,721
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy	732,124	755,395	735,000	583,834	−148,290	−171,561	−151,166
Use of prior year balances	.....	−1,367	−1,367	.....	.....	+1,367	+1,367
Rescission	−6,300	.....	.....	.....	+6,300	.....	.....
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	725,824	754,028	733,633	583,834	−141,990	−170,194	−149,799
FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT							
CCS and power systems:							
Carbon capture	.....	68,938	68,938	68,938	+68,938	.....	.....
Carbon storage	.....	115,477	115,477	115,477	+115,477	.....	.....
Advanced energy systems	.....	64,193	105,000	64,193	+64,193	.....	−40,807

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Cross-cutting research	.....	42,750	49,347	42,750	+42,750	.....	−6,597
Subtotal, CCS and power systems	.....	291,358	338,762	291,358	+291,358	.....	−47,404
Fuels and Power Systems:							
Innovations for existing plants	64,869	.....	.....	.....	−64,869	.....	.....
Advanced integrated gasification combined cycle	52,894	.....	.....	.....	−52,894	.....	.....
Advanced turbines	30,920	.....	.....	.....	−30,920	.....	.....
Carbon sequestration	142,057	.....	.....	.....	−142,057	.....	.....
Fuels	11,976	.....	.....	.....	−11,976	.....	.....
Fuel cells	49,835	.....	.....	.....	−49,835	.....	.....
Advanced research	47,614	.....	.....	.....	−47,614	.....	.....
Subtotal, Fuels and power systems	400,165	.....	.....	.....	−400,165	.....	.....
Natural Gas Technologies	1,996	.....	15,000	.....	−1,996	.....	−15,000
Program direction	151,729	159,233	120,847	151,729	.....	−7,504	+30,882
Plant and Capital Equipment	19,960	16,794	16,794	16,794	−3,166	.....	.....
Fossil energy environmental restoration	9,980	7,897	7,897	7,897	−2,083	.....	.....
Special recruitment programs	699	700	700	700	+1	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	.....	−23,007	−23,007	−23,007	−23,007	.....	.....
Rescission	−140,000	.....	.....	−187,000	−47,000	−187,000	−187,000
TOTAL, FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	444,529	452,975	476,993	258,471	−186,058	−194,504	−218,522
NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES							
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	22,954	14,909	14,909	14,909	−8,045	.....	.....
Rescission	−2,100	.....	.....	.....	+2,100	.....	.....
TOTAL, NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES	20,854	14,909	14,909	14,909	−5,945	.....	.....
STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE							
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	.....	192,704	192,704	192,704	+192,704	.....	.....

Storage facilities development	188,528	.....	.....	.....	−188,528	.....	.....
Management for SPR operations	20,913	.....	.....	.....	−20,913	.....	.....
Rescission	−86,300	−71,000	.....	.....	+86,300	+71,000	.....
TOTAL, STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE	123,141	121,704	192,704	192,704	+69,563	+71,000	.....
SPR PETROLEUM ACCOUNT	.....	−250,000	−500,000	−500,000	−500,000	−250,000	.....
CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY (RESCISSION)	−16,500	.....	.....	.....	+16,500	.....	.....
NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE							
Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve	10,978	10,119	10,119	10,119	−859	.....	.....
Rescission	.....	−100,000	−100,000	−100,000	−100,000	.....	.....
TOTAL, NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE	10,978	−89,881	−89,881	−89,881	−100,859	.....	.....
ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION							
Energy Information Administration	95,409	123,957	105,000	105,000	+9,591	−18,957	.....
Rescission	−400	.....	.....	.....	+400	.....	.....
TOTAL, ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION	95,009	123,957	105,000	105,000	+9,991	−18,957	.....
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP							
Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility (WA)	3,652	2,703	2,703	2,703	−949	.....	.....
Gaseous Diffusion Plants	99,302	100,588	97,588	100,588	+1,286	.....	+3,000
Small sites	63,730	57,430	55,930	57,430	−6,300	.....	+1,500
Subtotal, Small sites	63,730	57,430	55,930	57,430	−6,300	.....	+1,500
West Valley Demonstration Project	57,666	58,400	56,900	58,400	+734	.....	+1,500
Floor amendment	.....	.....	41,000	.....	.....	.....	−41,000
Rescission	−900	.....	.....	.....	+900	.....	.....
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	223,450	219,121	254,121	219,121	−4,329	.....	−35,000
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND							
Oak Ridge	.....	182,747	182,747	162,747	+162,747	−20,000	−20,000
Paducah	.....	77,780	77,780	77,780	+77,780	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Portsmouth	.....	243,642	188,473	188,473	+188,473	−55,169	.....
Undistributed funds	506,984	.....	.....	.....	−506,984	.....	.....
Rescission	−9,900	.....	.....	.....	+9,900	.....	.....
TOTAL, UED&D FUND/URANIUM INVENTORY CLEANUP	497,084	504,169	449,000	429,000	−68,084	−75,169	−20,000
SCIENCE							
Advanced scientific computing research	421,997	465,600	427,093	441,619	+19,622	−23,981	+14,526
Basic energy sciences:							
Research	1,526,898	1,833,600	1,547,343	1,542,460	+15,562	−291,140	−4,883
Construction:							
07–SC–06 Project engineering and design [PED] National Synchrotron light source II [NSLS–II]	151,297	151,400	140,802	151,400	+103	.....	+10,598
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	1,678,195	1,985,000	1,688,145	1,693,860	+15,665	−291,140	+5,715
Biological and environmental research:							
Biological systems science	316,744	376,262	.....	326,744	+10,000	−49,518	+326,744
Climate and environmental sciences	295,079	341,638	.....	295,079	.....	−46,559	+295,079
Research	.....	.....	547,075	.....	.....	.....	−547,075
Subtotal, Biological and environmental research	611,823	717,900	547,075	621,823	+10,000	−96,077	+74,748
Fusion energy sciences program	375,463	399,700	406,000	335,463	−40,000	−64,237	−70,537
High-energy physics:							
Research	795,420	756,200	759,070	756,200	−39,220	.....	−2,870
Construction:							
11–SC–40 Project engineering and design [PED] long baseline neutrino experiment, FNAL	.....	17,000	15,810	.....	.....	−17,000	−15,810
11–SC–41 Project engineering and design [PED] muon to electron conversion experiment, FNAL	.....	24,000	22,320	24,000	+24,000	.....	+1,680

Subtotal	.....	41,000	38,130	24,000	+24,000	−17,000	−14,130
Subtotal, High-energy physics	795,420	797,200	797,200	780,200	−15,220	−17,000	−17,000
Nuclear physics:							
Operations and maintenance	504,186	539,300	512,000	495,114	−9,072	−44,186	−16,886
Construction:							
06–SC–01 Project engineering and design [PED] 12 GeV continuous electron beam accelerator facility upgrade, Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator facility (was project 07–SC–001), Newport News, Virginia	35,928	66,000	40,000	55,000	+19,072	−11,000	+15,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	540,114	605,300	552,000	550,114	+10,000	−55,186	−1,886
Workforce development for teachers and scientists	22,600	35,600	17,849	20,000	−2,600	−15,600	+2,151
Science laboratories infrastructure:							
Infrastructure support:							
Payment in lieu of taxes	1,382	1,385	1,385	1,385	+3	.....	.....
Excess facility disposal	.....	.....	.....	25,000	+25,000	+25,000	+25,000
Oak Ridge landlord	5,249	5,493	5,493	5,493	+244	.....	.....
Subtotal	6,631	6,878	6,878	31,878	+25,247	+25,000	+25,000
Construction:							
11–SC–71 Utility infrastructure modernization at TJNAF	.....	.....	.....	12,086	+12,086	+12,086	+12,086
12–SC–70 Science and user support building, SLAC	.....	12,086	10,273	.....	.....	−12,086	−10,273
10–SC–70 Research support building and infrastructure modernization, SLAC	40,694	12,024	11,182	12,024	−28,670	.....	+842
10–SC–71 Energy sciences building, ANL	14,970	40,000	37,200	40,000	+25,030	.....	+2,800
10–SC–72 Renovate science laboratory, Phase II, BNL	14,970	15,500	14,415	15,500	+530	.....	+1,085
09–SC–72 Seismic life-safety, modernization and replacement of general purpose buildings Phase 2, PED/Construction, LBNL	20,063	12,975	12,066	12,975	−7,088	.....	+909
09–SC–74, Technology and engineering development facilities PED, TJNAF	28,419	12,337	11,473	12,337	−16,082	.....	+864
Subtotal	119,116	104,922	96,609	104,922	−14,194	.....	+8,313
Subtotal, Science laboratories infrastructure	125,747	111,800	103,487	136,800	+11,053	+25,000	+33,313
Safeguards and security	83,786	83,900	83,900	82,000	−1,786	−1,900	−1,900

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Science program direction:							
Science program direction	202,520	216,863		180,786	−21,734	−36,077	+180,786
Headquarters			78,028				−78,028
Office of Science and Technical Information			7,700				−7,700
Field offices			94,272				−94,272
Subtotal, Science program direction	202,520	216,863	180,000	180,786	−21,734	−36,077	+786
Subtotal, Science	4,857,665	5,418,863	4,802,749	4,842,665	−15,000	−576,198	+39,916
Rescission	−15,000				+15,000		
Use of prior year balances		−2,749	−2,749			+2,749	+2,749
TOTAL, SCIENCE	4,842,665	5,416,114	4,800,000	4,842,665		−573,449	+42,665
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL							
Repository program			20,000				−20,000
Program direction			5,000				−5,000
Rescission	−2,800				+2,800		
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	−2,800		25,000		+2,800		−25,000
ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY							
ARPA-E projects		521,943	80,000			−521,943	−80,000
Program direction		28,068	20,000			−28,068	−20,000
Undistributed funds	179,640			250,000	+70,360	+250,000	+250,000
Floor amendment			79,640				−79,640
TOTAL, ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY	179,640	550,011	179,640	250,000	+70,360	−300,011	+70,360

TITLE 17—INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY GUARANTEE PROGRAM							
Administrative operations	58,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	−20,000	.....	.....
Offsetting collection	−58,000	−38,000	−38,000	−38,000	+20,000	.....	.....
Loan volume rescission	−181,830	.....	.....	.....	+181,830	.....	.....
Additional loan volume	11,830	360,000	.....	.....	−11,830	−360,000	.....
Fed participation in title 17 loan guarantee projects	.....	500,000	.....	.....	.....	−500,000	.....
Additional subsidy cost	169,660	200,000	160,000	200,000	+30,340	.....	+40,000
TOTAL, TITLE 17—INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY GUARANTEE PROGRAM	−340	1,060,000	160,000	200,000	+200,340	−860,000	+40,000
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM							
Administrative expenses	9,978	6,000	6,000	6,000	−3,978	.....	.....
BETTER BUILDINGS PILOT LOAN GUARANTEE INITIATIVE							
Cost of loan guarantees	.....	100,000	.....	.....	.....	−100,000	.....
Administrative costs	.....	5,000	.....	.....	.....	−5,000	.....
TOTAL, BETTER BUILDINGS PILOT LOAN INITIATIVE	.....	105,000	.....	.....	.....	−105,000	.....
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION							
Administrative operations:							
Salaries and expenses:							
Office of the Secretary:							
Program direction	5,380	5,030	5,000	5,030	−350	.....	+30
Total, Office of the Secretary	5,380	5,030	5,000	5,030	−350	.....	+30
Chief Financial Officer	57,575	53,204	52,000	53,204	−4,371	.....	+1,204
Management	68,636	62,693	60,000	62,693	−5,943	.....	+2,693
Human capital management	25,294	23,089	22,000	23,089	−2,205	.....	+1,089
Chief Information Officer	34,238	36,615	35,000	36,615	+2,377	.....	+1,615
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs:							
Program direction	4,428	4,690	4,500	4,690	+262	.....	+190
Subtotal, Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,428	4,690	4,500	4,690	+262	.....	+190
Economic impact and diversity	4,279	5,660	5,660	5,660	+1,381	.....	.....
General Counsel	31,997	34,642	30,000	33,553	+1,556	−1,089	+3,553
Policy and international affairs	20,795	22,429	17,000	20,518	−277	−1,911	+3,518

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Public affairs	4,129	3,801	3,500	3,801	−328	.....	+301
Office of Indian energy policy and programs	1,476	1,500	2,000	1,500	+24	.....	−500
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	258,227	253,353	236,660	250,353	−7,874	−3,000	+13,693
Program support:							
Minority economic impact	2,000	1,813	1,813	1,813	−187	.....	.....
Policy analysis and system studies	671	441	441	441	−230	.....	.....
Environmental policy studies	791	520	250	520	−271	.....	+270
Climate change technology program (program support)	5,500	5,482	2,500	5,482	−18	.....	+2,982
Cybersecurity and secure communications	32,072	21,934	21,934	21,934	−10,138	.....	.....
Corporate management information program	8,333	.....	.....	.....	−8,333	.....	.....
Corporate IT program support [CIO]	.....	27,379	27,379	27,379	+27,379	.....	.....
Energy information technology services	18,310	.....	.....	.....	−18,310	.....	.....
Subtotal, Program support	67,677	57,569	54,317	57,569	−10,108	.....	+3,252
Subtotal, Administrative operations	325,904	310,922	290,977	307,922	−17,982	−3,000	+16,945
Cost of work for others	30,475	48,537	48,537	48,537	+18,062	.....	.....
Floor amendments	.....	.....	−158,140	.....	.....	.....	+158,140
Subtotal, Departmental administration	356,379	359,459	181,374	356,459	+80	−3,000	+175,085
Funding from other defense activities	−106,240	−118,836	−118,000	−118,836	−12,596	.....	−836
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	250,139	240,623	63,374	237,623	−12,516	−3,000	+174,249
Rescission	−81,900	.....	.....	.....	+81,900	.....	.....
Miscellaneous revenues	−119,501	−111,883	−111,883	−111,883	+7,618	.....	.....
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	48,738	128,740	−48,509	125,740	+77,002	−3,000	+174,249
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	42,764	41,774	41,774	41,774	−990	.....	.....

TOTAL, ENERGY PROGRAMS	9,181,665	12,596,391	8,248,316	8,615,988	−565,677	−3,980,403	+367,672
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES							
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION WEAPONS ACTIVITIES							
Directed stockpile work:							
Life extension program:							
B61 Life extension program	.....	223,562	278,562	180,000	+180,000	−43,562	−98,562
W76 Life extension program	248,249	257,035	255,000	257,039	+8,790	+4	+2,039
Subtotal	248,249	480,597	533,562	437,039	+188,790	−43,558	−96,523
Stockpile systems:							
B61 Stockpile systems	.....	72,396	72,396	72,396	+72,396	.....	.....
W76 Stockpile systems	.....	63,383	63,383	63,383	+63,383	.....	.....
W78 Stockpile systems	.....	109,518	99,518	84,000	+84,000	−25,518	−15,518
W80 Stockpile systems	.....	44,444	44,444	44,444	+44,444	.....	.....
B83 Stockpile systems	.....	48,215	48,215	48,215	+48,215	.....	.....
W87 Stockpile systems	.....	83,943	83,943	83,943	+83,943	.....	.....
W88 Stockpile systems	.....	75,728	75,728	75,728	+75,728	.....	.....
Undistributed balance	646,203	.....	.....	.....	−646,203	.....	.....
Subtotal	646,203	497,627	487,627	472,109	−174,094	−25,518	−15,518
Weapons dismantlement and disposition:							
Operations and maintenance	57,909	56,770	56,770	56,770	−1,139	.....	.....
Total, Weapons dismantlement and disposition	57,909	56,770	56,770	56,770	−1,139	.....	.....
Stockpile services:							
Production support	.....	354,502	300,441	310,000	+310,000	−44,502	+9,559
Research and development support	.....	30,264	30,264	30,264	+30,264	.....	.....
R and D certification and safety	.....	190,892	165,892	170,000	+170,000	−20,892	+4,108
Management, technology, and production	.....	198,700	193,000	188,700	+188,700	−10,000	−4,300
Undistributed balance	932,998	.....	.....	.....	−932,998	.....	.....
Plutonium sustainment	.....	154,231	142,231	140,000	+140,000	−14,231	−2,231
Subtotal	932,998	928,589	831,828	838,964	−94,034	−89,625	+7,136
Subtotal, Directed stockpile work	1,885,359	1,963,583	1,909,787	1,804,882	−80,477	−158,701	−104,905

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Campaigns:							
Science campaign:							
Advanced certification	76,495	94,929	19,400	40,000	−36,495	−54,929	+20,600
Primary assessment technologies	85,074	86,055	86,055	86,055	+981	.....	.....
Dynamic materials properties	96,237	111,836	96,984	110,000	+13,763	−1,836	+13,016
Advanced radiography	23,410	27,058	23,594	26,000	+2,590	−1,058	+2,406
Secondary assessment technologies	81,303	86,061	86,061	85,000	+3,697	−1,061	−1,061
Subtotal	362,519	405,939	312,094	347,055	−15,464	−58,884	+34,961
Engineering campaign:							
Enhanced surety	42,148	41,696	41,696	41,696	−452	.....	.....
Weapons system engineering assessment technology	13,443	15,663	15,663	15,663	+2,220	.....	.....
Nuclear survivability	19,665	19,545	19,545	19,545	−120	.....	.....
Enhanced surveillance	65,676	66,174	66,174	66,174	+498	.....	.....
Subtotal	140,932	143,078	143,078	143,078	+2,146	.....	.....
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high-yield campaign:							
Ignition	109,287	109,888	109,888	109,888	+601	.....	.....
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics, and experimental support	99,651	86,259	86,259	86,259	−13,392	.....	.....
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	4,970	4,997	4,997	4,997	+27	.....	.....
Joint program in high-energy density laboratory plasmas	3,992	9,100	4,000	9,100	+5,108	.....	+5,100
Facility operations and target production	259,701	266,030	266,030	266,030	+6,329	.....	.....
Subtotal	477,601	476,274	471,174	476,274	−1,327	.....	+5,100
Advanced simulation and computing	610,995	628,945	616,000	625,000	+14,005	−3,945	+9,000
Readiness campaign:							
Stockpile readiness	18,903	.....	.....	.....	−18,903	.....	.....
High explosives and weapon operations	2,994	.....	.....	.....	−2,994	.....	.....
Nonnuclear readiness	21,820	65,000	.....	65,000	+43,180	.....	+65,000
Tritium readiness	36,811	77,491	63,591	60,000	+23,189	−17,491	−3,591

Advanced design and production technologies	18,064	.....	.....	.....	−18,064	.....	.....
Subtotal	98,592	142,491	63,591	125,000	+26,408	−17,491	+61,409
Subtotal, Campaigns	1,690,639	1,796,727	1,605,937	1,716,407	+25,768	−80,320	+110,470
Readiness in technical base and facilities [RTBF]:							
Operations of facilities:							
Operations of facilities	.....	.....	.....	1,411,000	+1,411,000	+1,411,000	+1,411,000
Kansas City Plant	184,199	156,217	156,217	.....	−184,199	−156,217	−156,217
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	79,237	83,990	83,990	.....	−79,237	−83,990	−83,990
Los Alamos National Laboratory	315,652	318,526	318,526	.....	−315,652	−318,526	−318,526
Nevada Test Site	79,917	97,559	97,559	.....	−79,917	−97,559	−97,559
Pantex	121,011	164,848	164,848	.....	−121,011	−164,848	−164,848
Sandia National Laboratory	116,685	120,708	120,708	.....	−116,685	−120,708	−120,708
Savannah River Site	91,850	97,767	97,767	.....	−91,850	−97,767	−97,767
Y–12 Productions Plant	218,715	246,001	246,001	.....	−218,715	−246,001	−246,001
Institutional Site Support	40,888	199,638	10,000	.....	−40,888	−199,638	−10,000
Subtotal	1,248,154	1,485,254	1,295,616	1,411,000	+162,846	−74,254	+115,384
Program readiness	69,170	74,180	69,180	69,170	.....	−5,010	−10
Material recycle and recovery	69,910	85,939	75,639	80,000	+10,090	−5,939	+4,361
Containers	27,808	28,979	28,979	28,979	+1,171	.....	.....
Storage	24,028	31,272	31,272	30,289	+6,261	−983	−983
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,439,070	1,705,624	1,500,686	1,619,438	+180,368	−86,186	+118,752
Construction:							
12–D–301 TRU waste facility project, LANL	.....	9,881	.....	9,881	+9,881	.....	+9,881
11–D–801 TA–55 Reinvestment project II, LANL	19,960	19,402	19,402	10,000	−9,960	−9,402	−9,402
10–D–501 Nuclear facilities risk reduction Y–12 National security complex, Oakridge, Tennessee	.....	35,387	35,387	35,387	+35,387	.....	.....
09–D–404, Test capabilities revitalization II, Sandia National Laboratory, Albuquerque, New Mexico	.....	25,168	25,168	25,168	+25,168	.....	.....
08–D–802 High explosive pressing facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas	29,940	66,960	66,960	66,960	+37,020	.....	.....
07–D–140 Project engineering and design [PED], various locations	4,990	3,518	3,518	3,518	−1,472	.....	.....
06–D–140 Project engineering and design [PED], various locations	3,992	.....	.....	.....	−3,992	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
06–D–141 Project engineering and design [PED], Y–12 Uranium Processing Facility, Oak Ridge, Tennessee	114,786	160,194	160,194	160,194	+45,408	.....	.....
04–D–125 Chemistry and metallurgy replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico	224,550	300,000	200,000	240,000	+15,450	−60,000	+40,000
Subtotal	398,218	620,510	510,629	551,108	+152,890	−69,402	+40,479
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,837,288	2,326,134	2,011,315	2,170,546	+333,258	−155,588	+159,231
Secure transportation asset:							
Operations and equipment	152,620	149,274	145,274	149,274	−3,346	.....	+4,000
Program direction	94,929	101,998	98,002	101,998	+7,069	.....	+3,996
Subtotal	247,549	251,272	243,276	251,272	+3,723	.....	+7,996
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response	231,005	222,147	222,147	222,147	−8,858	.....	.....
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	93,296	96,380	96,380	96,380	+3,084	.....	.....
Site stewardship:							
Site stewardship	89,652	104,002	78,680	90,000	+348	−14,002	+11,320
Construction:							
11–D–601 Sanitary effluent reclamation facility LANL	14,970	.....	.....	.....	−14,970	.....	.....
Subtotal, Site stewardship	104,622	104,002	78,680	90,000	−14,622	−14,002	+11,320
Safeguards and security:							
Defense nuclear security	661,602	711,105	679,105	690,000	+28,398	−21,105	+10,895
Construction:							
08–D–701 Nuclear materials S&S upgrade project Los Alamos National Laboratory	51,896	11,752	11,752	11,752	−40,144	.....	.....
Subtotal, Defense nuclear security	713,498	722,857	690,857	701,752	−11,746	−21,105	+10,895
Cybersecurity	123,348	126,614	126,614	126,614	+3,266	.....	.....

Total, Safeguards and security	836,846	849,471	817,471	828,366	−8,480	−21,105	+10,895
Legacy contractor pensions	.....	.....	147,000	.....	.....	.....	−147,000
Science, technology and engineering capability	19,794	.....	.....	.....	−19,794	.....	.....
National security applications	.....	20,000	.....	10,000	+10,000	−10,000	+10,000
Rescission	−50,000	−40,332	−40,332	.....	+50,000	+40,332	+40,332
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	6,896,398	7,589,384	7,091,661	7,190,000	+293,602	−399,384	+98,339
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION							
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	360,986	417,598	346,150	417,598	+56,612	.....	+71,448
Subtotal, Nonproliferation & verification R&D	360,986	417,598	346,150	417,598	+56,612	.....	+71,448
Nonproliferation and international security	147,494	161,833	161,833	155,305	+7,811	−6,528	−6,528
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	571,994	571,639	496,465	571,639	−355	.....	+75,174
Fissile materials disposition:							
U.S. plutonium disposition	200,400	274,790	244,690	224,000	+23,600	−50,790	−20,690
U.S. uranium disposition	25,985	26,435	16,435	26,435	+450	.....	+10,000
Construction:							
MO_X fuel fabrication facilities:							
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, South Carolina	501,788	385,172	385,172	435,172	−66,616	+50,000	+50,000
99–D–141–01 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	17,000	176,000	20,000	47,300	+30,300	−128,700	+27,300
99–D–141–02 Waste solidification building, Savannah River, SC	57,000	17,582	17,582	17,582	−39,418	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	575,788	578,754	422,754	500,054	−75,734	−78,700	+77,300
Subtotal, U.S. fissle materials disposition	802,173	879,979	683,879	750,489	−51,684	−129,490	+66,610
Russian surplus materials disposition	25	10,174	10,174	1,000	+975	−9,174	−9,174
Total, Fissile materials disposition	802,198	890,153	694,053	751,489	−50,709	−138,664	+57,436
Global threat reduction initiative	435,981	508,269	388,269	508,269	+72,288	.....	+120,000
Floor amendment	.....	.....	35,000	.....	.....	.....	−35,000
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2,318,653	2,549,492	2,121,770	2,404,300	+85,647	−145,192	+282,530

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Rescission	−45,000	−30,000	−30,000	−21,000	+24,000	+9,000	+9,000
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2,273,653	2,519,492	2,091,770	2,383,300	+109,647	−136,192	+291,530
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	2,273,653	2,519,492	2,091,770	2,383,300	+109,647	−136,192	+291,530
NAVAL REACTORS							
Naval reactors development	887,721	1,069,262	498,700	1,015,600	+127,879	−53,662	+516,900
OHIO replacement reactor systems development	.....	.....	121,300	.....	.....	.....	−121,300
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	.....	.....	332,100	.....	.....	.....	−332,100
Construction:							
10–D–903, Security upgrades, KAPL	399	100	100	100	−299	.....	.....
10–D–904, NRF infrastructure upgrades, Idaho	499	12,000	12,000	12,000	+11,501	.....	.....
09–D–902, NRF Office Building #2 ECC upgrade, Idaho	3,992	.....	.....	.....	−3,992	.....	.....
08–D–190, Project engineering and design, Expended Core Facility M–290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID	24,950	27,800	27,800	27,800	+2,850	.....	.....
07–D–190, Materials research tech complex [MRTC]	2,695	.....	.....	.....	−2,695	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	32,535	39,900	39,900	39,900	+7,365	.....	.....
Program direction	39,920	44,500	38,600	44,500	+4,580	.....	+5,900
Rescission	−1,000	.....	.....	.....	+1,000	.....	.....
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	959,176	1,153,662	1,030,600	1,100,000	+140,824	−53,662	+69,400
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR							
Office of the Administrator	398,993	450,060	420,000	404,000	+5,007	−46,060	−16,000
Rescission	−5,700	.....	.....	.....	+5,700	.....	.....
Floor amendment	.....	.....	−20,000	.....	.....	.....	+20,000
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	393,293	450,060	400,000	404,000	+10,707	−46,060	+4,000

GENERAL PROVISION							
Section 309—Contractor Pay Freeze:							
Security	.....	.....	.....	−27,300	−27,300	−27,300	−27,300
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.	10,522,520	11,712,598	10,614,031	11,050,000	+527,480	−662,598	+435,969
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP							
Closure Sites:							
Closure sites administration	175	.....	.....	.....	−175	.....	.....
Closure sites	.....	5,375	5,375	5,375	+5,375	.....	.....
Total, Closure sites	175	5,375	5,375	5,375	+5,200	.....	.....
Hanford Site:							
Central plateau remediation:							
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition PFP	69,102	48,458	68,458	68,458	−644	+20,000	.....
Solid waste stabilization and disposition 2035	128,038	143,897	143,897	143,897	+15,859	.....	.....
Soil and water remediation—groundwater vadose zone 2035	164,628	222,285	222,285	222,285	+57,657	.....	.....
Nuclear facility D&D—remainder of Hanford 2035	139,640	56,288	56,288	56,288	−83,352	.....	.....
Subtotal, Central plateau remediation	501,408	470,928	490,928	490,928	−10,480	+20,000	.....
River corridor and other cleanup operations:							
Nuclear facility D&D river corridor closure project	351,027	330,534	330,534	330,534	−20,493	.....	.....
Richland community and regulatory support	19,540	.....	.....	19,540	.....	+19,540	+19,540
SNF stabilization and disposition	94,016	112,250	112,250	112,250	+18,234	.....	.....
Subtotal, River corridor and other cleanup operations	464,583	442,784	442,784	462,324	−2,259	+19,540	+19,540
Total, Hanford Site	965,991	913,712	933,712	953,252	−12,739	+39,540	+19,540
Idaho National Laboratory:							
SNF stabilization and disposition—2012	7,900	20,114	20,114	18,000	+10,100	−2,114	−2,114
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	169,760	165,035	165,035	165,035	−4,725	.....	.....
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	136,850	110,169	110,169	110,000	−26,850	−169	−169
06–D–401, Sodium bearing waste treatment project, ID	12,500	.....	.....	.....	−12,500	.....	.....
Soil and water remediation—2012	67,764	87,451	87,451	87,451	+19,687	.....	.....
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,892	.....	.....	4,013	+121	+4,013	+4,013
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	398,666	382,769	382,769	384,499	−14,167	+1,730	+1,730

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
NNSA:							
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory		873	873	873	+873		
NNSA Service Center/SPRU		1,500	1,500	1,500	+1,500		
Nevada		63,380	61,380	63,380	+63,380		+2,000
Los Alamos National Laboratory		357,939	185,000	185,000	+185,000	−172,939	
Sandia national Laboratory				3,014	+3,014	+3,014	+3,014
Undistributed funds	309,041				−309,041		
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	309,041	423,692	248,753	253,767	−55,274	−169,925	+5,014
Oak Ridge Reservation:							
Building 3019				40,000	+40,000	+40,000	+40,000
Nuclear facility D&D ORNL		44,000	39,000	39,000	+39,000	−5,000	
Nuclear facility D&D Y–12		30,000	30,000	30,000	+30,000		
Nuclear facility D&D, East Tennessee Technology Park		100	100	100	+100		
Soil and water remediation—offsites		3,000	3,000	3,000	+3,000		
OR reservation community and regulatory support				6,409	+6,409	+6,409	+6,409
Solid waste stabilization and disposition—2012		99,000	84,000	84,000	+84,000	−15,000	
Undistributed funds	152,135				−152,135		
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	152,135	176,100	156,100	202,509	+50,374	+26,409	+46,409
Office of River Protection:							
Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant:							
Waste treatment and immobilization plant 01–D–16 A–D	379,418	363,000	363,000	363,000	−16,418		
Waste treatment and immobilization plant 01–D–16 E	359,280	477,000	377,000	377,000	+17,720	−100,000	
Subtotal, Waste Treatment and Immobilation Plant	738,698	840,000	740,000	740,000	+1,302	−100,000	
Tank Farm activities:							
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	396,900	521,391	408,000	467,000	+70,100	−54,391	+59,000
Total, Office of River Protection	1,135,598	1,361,391	1,148,000	1,207,000	+71,402	−154,391	+59,000

Savannah River site:							
Cleanup and waste disposition:							
Savannah River community and regulatory support	17,230	.....	.....	15,000	−2,230	+15,000	+15,000
Site risk management operations:							
NM stabilization and disposition	261,302	235,000	235,000	235,000	−26,302	.....	.....
SNF stabilization and disposition	28,327	40,137	40,137	40,137	+11,810	.....	.....
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	.....	30,040	30,040	30,040	+30,040	.....	.....
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	631,122	710,487	667,081	658,722	+27,600	−51,765	−8,359
PE&D Glass Waste Storage Building #3	.....	.....	.....	3,500	+3,500	+3,500	+3,500
Construction:							
05–D–405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	234,403	170,071	170,071	170,071	−64,332	.....	.....
Subtotal, Radioactive liquid tank waste	865,525	880,558	837,152	832,293	−33,232	−48,265	−4,859
Soil and water remediation	.....	38,409	38,409	38,409	+38,409	.....	.....
Subtotal, Site risk management operations	1,155,154	1,224,144	1,180,738	1,175,879	+20,725	−48,265	−4,859
Total, Savannah River site	1,172,384	1,224,144	1,180,738	1,190,879	+18,495	−33,265	+10,141
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant:							
Operate WIPP	.....	228,926	220,000	147,000	+147,000	−81,926	−73,000
Central Characterization Project	.....	.....	.....	24,000	+24,000	+24,000	+24,000
Transportation	.....	.....	.....	29,000	+29,000	+29,000	+29,000
Undistributed funds	215,714	.....	.....	.....	−215,714	.....	.....
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	215,714	228,926	220,000	200,000	−15,714	−28,926	−20,000
Program direction	320,006	321,628	316,948	321,628	+1,622	.....	+4,680
Program support	21,101	.....	.....	20,380	−721	+20,380	+20,380
Community, regulatory and program support	.....	91,279	89,779	.....	.....	−91,279	−89,779
Safeguards and Security	247,781	248,826	248,826	252,019	+4,238	+3,193	+3,193
Safeguards and security	.....	248,826	248,826	.....	.....	−248,826	−248,826
Undistributed funds	247,781	.....	.....	.....	−247,781	.....	.....
Total, Safeguards and Security	495,562	497,652	497,652	252,019	−243,543	−245,633	−245,633
Technology development	19,413	32,320	10,000	11,000	−8,413	−21,320	+1,000
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	33,633	.....	.....	.....	−33,633	.....	.....
Subtotal, Defense Environmental Clean up	5,239,419	5,658,988	5,189,826	5,002,308	−237,111	−656,680	−187,518

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Use of prior year balances	.....	−3,381	−3,381	.....	.....	+3,381	+3,381
Rescission	−11,900	.....	.....	.....	+11,900	.....	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP	5,227,519	5,655,607	5,186,445	5,002,308	−225,211	−653,299	−184,137
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES							
Health, safety and security:							
Health, safety and security	.....	349,445	332,039	335,436	+335,436	−14,009	+3,397
Program direction	.....	107,037	99,369	102,000	+102,000	−5,037	+2,631
Undistributed funds	426,933	.....	.....	.....	−426,933	.....	.....
Total, Health, safety and security	426,933	456,482	431,408	437,436	+10,503	−19,046	+6,028
Office of Legacy Management:							
Legacy management	159,117	157,514	155,014	157,154	−1,963	−360	+2,140
Program direction	12,504	12,586	12,086	12,586	+82	.....	+500
Total, Office of Legacy Management	171,621	170,100	167,100	169,740	−1,881	−360	+2,640
Defense-related activities:							
Infrastructure:							
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	77,550	98,500	93,350	93,350	+15,800	−5,150	.....
Defense related administrative support	106,240	118,836	118,000	114,332	+8,092	−4,504	−3,668
Office of hearings and appeals	6,076	4,142	4,142	4,142	−1,934	.....	.....
Acquisition workforce improvement	.....	11,892	.....	.....	.....	−11,892	.....
Subtotal, Other Defense Activities	788,420	859,952	814,000	819,000	+30,580	−40,952	+5,000
Rescission	−3,400	.....	.....	.....	+3,400	.....	.....
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	785,020	859,952	814,000	819,000	+33,980	−40,952	+5,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	16,535,059	18,228,157	16,614,476	16,898,608	+363,549	−1,329,549	+284,132

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS [1]							
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION:							
Operation and maintenance:							
Purchase power and wheeling	85,264	114,870	114,870	114,870	+29,606		
Program direction	7,638	8,428	8,428	8,428	+790		
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	92,902	123,298	123,298	123,298	+30,396		
Less alternative financing (PPW)	−14,458	−14,708	−14,708	−14,708	−250		
Offsetting collections	−78,444	−108,590	−108,590	−108,590	−30,146		
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION							
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION:							
Operation and maintenance:							
Operating expenses	14,918	14,346	14,346	14,346	−572		
Purchase power and wheeling	48,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	+2,000		
Program direction	27,432	31,889	31,889	31,889	+4,457		
Construction	6,386	10,772	10,772	10,772	+4,386		
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	96,736	107,007	107,007	107,007	+10,271		
Less alternative financing	−13,818	−21,997	−21,997	−21,997	−8,179		
Offsetting collections	−69,868	−73,118	−73,118	−73,118	−3,250		
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	13,050	11,892	11,892	11,892	−1,158		
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION:							
Operation and maintenance:							
Construction and rehabilitation	109,887	110,449	110,449	110,449	+562		
Operation and maintenance	50,526	72,863	72,863	72,863	+22,337		
Purchase power and wheeling	542,510	471,535	471,535	471,535	−70,975		
Program direction	171,582	205,247	205,247	205,247	+33,665		
Utah mitigation and conservation	7,569	3,375	3,375	3,375	−4,194		
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	882,074	863,469	863,469	863,469	−18,605		
Less alternative financing	−271,895	−266,207	−266,207	−266,207	+5,688		
Offsetting collections (Public Law 108–477, Public Law 109–103)	−349,807	−306,541	−306,541	−306,541	+43,266		
Offsetting collections (Public Law 98–381)	−3,879	−4,821	−4,821	−4,821	−942		
Offsetting collections (for program direction)		−156,609	−156,609	−156,609	−156,609		

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—		
					Enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance
Offsetting collections (for O&M)	.....	−33,323	−33,323	−33,323	−33,323	.....	.....
Offsetting collections (for program direction, O&M)	−147,530	.....	.....	.....	+147,530	.....	.....
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	108,963	95,968	95,968	95,968	−12,995	.....	.....
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND:							
Operation and maintenance	3,715	4,169	4,169	4,169	+454	.....	.....
Offsetting collections	−3,495	−3,949	−3,949	−3,949	−454	.....	.....
TOTAL, FALCON AND AMISTAD O&M FUND	220	220	220	220	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	122,233	108,080	108,080	108,080	−14,153	.....	.....
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION							
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	298,000	304,600	304,600	304,600	+6,600	.....	.....
FERC revenues	−298,000	−304,600	−304,600	−304,600	−6,600	.....	.....
GENERAL PROVISION							
Section 309—Contractor Pay Freeze:							
Non-Security	.....	.....	.....	−46,400	−46,400	−46,400	−46,400
Total, General Provisions	.....	.....	.....	−46,400	−46,400	−46,400	−46,400
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	25,838,957	30,932,628	24,970,872	25,548,976	−289,981	−5,383,652	+578,104
(Total amount appropriated)	(26,533,587)	(31,173,960)	(25,141,204)	(25,930,676)	(−602,911)	(−5,243,284)	(+789,472)
(Rescissions)	(−694,630)	(−241,332)	(−170,332)	(−381,700)	(+312,930)	(−140,368)	(−211,368)

[1] Totals include alternative financing costs, reimbursable agreement funding, and power purchase and wheeling expenditures. Offsetting collection totals reflect funds collected for annual expenses, including power purchase and wheeling.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The following list of general provisions is recommended by the Committee. The recommendation includes several provisions which have been included in previous Energy and Water Appropriations Acts and new provisions as follows:

Section 301. Language is included on unexpended balances.

Section 302. Language is included on user facilities.

Section 303. Language is included specifically authorizing intelligence activities pending enactment of the fiscal year 2012 Intelligence Authorization Act.

Section 304. The Committee has included a provision related to 5-year budgeting.

Section 305. The Committee has included language related to loan guarantee co-pay.

Section 306. Language is included related to the minor construction threshold.

Section 307. The Committee has included language related to minor construction threshold.

Section 308. The Committee has included a provision on mandatory funding.

Section 309. Language is included related to contractor pay freeze.

Section 310. The Committee has included a provision on lighting standards.

Section 311. The Committee has included a provision on the barter of uranium.

Section 312. The Committee has included a provision on the use of metering stations.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2011	$68,263,000
Budget estimate, 2012	76,000,000
House allowance	68,400,000
Committee recommendation	58,024,000

Established in 1965, the Appalachian Regional Commission is an economic development agency composed of 13 Appalachian States and a Federal co-chair appointed by the President. For fiscal year 2012, the Committee recommends $58,024,000 for the ARC.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2011	$23,203,000
Budget estimate, 2012	29,130,000
House allowance	29,130,000
Committee recommendation	29,130,000

The Committee recommends $29,130,000, for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. The Committee carries a provision requiring the Board to enter into an agreement with an inspector general office from another agency for such services.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2011	$11,677,000
Budget estimate, 2012	13,000,000
House allowance	11,700,000
Committee recommendation	9,925,000

For the Delta Regional Authority, the Committee recommends $9,925,000. The Delta Regional Authority was established to assist the eight State Mississippi Delta Region in obtaining basic infrastructure, transportation, skills training, and opportunities for economic development.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2011	−$4,321,000
Budget estimate, 2012	11,965,000
House allowance	10,700,000
Committee recommendation	9,077,000

The Denali Commission is a Federal-State partnership responsible for promoting infrastructure development, job training, and other economic development services in rural areas throughout Alaska. For fiscal year 2012, the Committee recommends $9,077,000.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2011	$1,497,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,500,000
House allowance	1,350,000
Committee recommendation	1,275,000

The Committee recommends $1,275,000 for the Northern Border Regional Commission.

SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2011	$250,000
Budget estimate, 2012	.....
House allowance	250,000
Committee recommendation	212,500

The Committee recommends $212,500 for the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2011	$1,043,208,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,027,240,000
House allowance	1,037,240,000
Committee recommendation	1,027,240,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2011	−$906,220,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−899,726,000
House allowance	−890,713,000
Committee recommendation	−899,726,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2011	$136,988,000
Budget estimate, 2012	127,514,000
House allowance	146,527,000
Committee recommendation	127,514,000

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for fiscal year 2012 is $1,027,240,000. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of $899,726,000 resulting in a net appropriation of $127,514,000.

National Academy of Sciences Study.—At the recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future, the Committee directs the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to contract with the National Academy of Sciences [NAS] for a study of the lessons learned from the Fukushima nuclear disaster. The study should assess:

—the causes of the crisis at Fukushima;

—the lessons that can be learned;

—the lessons' implications for conclusions reached in earlier NAS studies on the safety and security of current storage arrangements for spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste in the United States, including an assessment of whether the amount of spent fuel currently stored in reactor pools should be reduced;

—the lessons' implications for commercial nuclear reactor safety and security regulations; and

—the potential to improve design basis threats assessment.

This study shall build upon the 2004 NAS study of storage issues and complement the other efforts to learn from Fukushima that have already been launched by the NRC and industry. The Committee directs the Commission to proceed with its own efforts to improve regulations as expeditiously as possible. From the funds made available to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Committee directs the Commission to transfer $2,000,000 to the National Academy of Sciences to undertake this study. The Committee expects the Commission to execute this transfer within 30 days of enactment of this act. The study should be conducted in coordination with the Department of Energy and, if possible, the Japanese Government. The Committee expects the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Department of Energy, and the Department of State to assist the National Academy of Sciences in obtaining the information it needs to complete this study in a timely manner.

Beyond Design-basis Events.—In light of recent earthquakes that exceeded the design basis of nuclear power plants in both Japan and the United States, the Committee encourages the Commission to evaluate whether it would be appropriate for the Commission to oversee, evaluate and test licensee beyond-design-basis event management guidelines and mitigation strategies in a more comprehensive manner, especially with regard to seismic and flooding events.

Mitigating the Impact of Earthquakes.—The Committee is concerned that risks to public health and safety exist due to a lack of understanding how critical nuclear energy infrastructure, particularly storage ponds and containers for spent nuclear fuel and waste, will respond to a catastrophic earthquake or kinetic impact event. The Committee directs the Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC] to develop protocols for the use of existing domestic seismic testing facilities, including the National Science Foundation's National Earthquake Engineering Simulation [NEES] program, to conduct tests on full-scale specimens of critical nuclear infrastructure, in order to validate related computer models and inform subsequent mitigation strategies. The NRC shall collaborate with NEES to submit a related plan and proposed budget to the Committee by January 23, 2012.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2011	$10,858,000
Budget estimate, 2012	10,860,000
House allowance	10,860,000
Committee recommendation	10,860,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2011	−$9,774,000
Budget estimate, 2012	−9,774,000
House allowance	−9,774,000
Committee recommendation	−9,774,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2011	$1,084,000
Budget estimate, 2012	1,086,000
House allowance	1,086,000
Committee recommendation	1,086,000

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $1,086,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2011	$3,883,000
Budget estimate, 2012	3,400,000
House allowance	3,400,000
Committee recommendation	3,400,000

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board was established to evaluate the scientific and technical validity of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board reports its findings no fewer than two times a year to Congress and to the Secretary of Energy. For fiscal year 2012, the Committee recommends $3,400,000.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Appropriation, 2011	$4,457,000
Budget estimate, 2012	4,032,000
House allowance	4,032,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000

The Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects was established as an independent agency in the executive branch on December 13, 2006. The Committee recommends $1,000,000. The Committee notes that only one joint venture is still pursuing the design and construction of a natural gas pipeline from Alaska to the Lower 48. This joint venture continues with extensive financial support from the State of Alaska. The Committee further notes that the Office of the Federal Coordinator is legally allowed to receive funding from the companies for its work. The Committee urges the agency to take greater advantage of this potential funding source as the work of the agency directly benefits the companies.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 401. The Committee carries a provision related to spent nuclear fuel.

Section 402. The Committee carries a provision related to design basis.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The following list of general provisions are recommended by the Committee.

Section 501. The provision prohibits the use of any funds provided in this bill from being used to influence congressional action.

Section 502. The provision addresses transfer authority under this act.

PROGRAM, PROJECT AND ACTIVITY

In fiscal year 2012, for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended, the following information provides the definition of the term "program, project of activity" for departments and agencies under the jurisdiction of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation bill. The term "program, project or activity" shall include the most specific level of budget items identified in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, 2012 and the report accompanying the bill.

If a sequestration order is necessary, in implementing the Presidential order, departments and agencies shall apply any percentage reduction required for fiscal year 2012 pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99–177 to all item specified in the report accompanying the bill by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in support of the fiscal year 2012 budget estimates as modified by congressional action.

TITLE VI

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR DISASTER RELIEF

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Natural disasters have impacted a large part of the Nation this year. The Committee recognizes that some of these disasters are on-going such as the flood on the Missouri River as well as the flooding and devastation caused by Hurricane Irene in late August and early September. The Corps of Engineers has dutifully attempted to provide the Committee with information concerning damaged Federal flood control, storm damage, navigation and other infrastructure associated with these Federal projects as waters recede and the damages can be assessed. The funding provided under this title represents the verifiable damages provided by the Corps. The Committee recognizes that as the waters recede and additional damage assessments are made, that funding needs will increase. Those needs as they become known and verifiable will be addressed by the Committee at a later date. These funds are not earmarked and the Corps should utilize them for the highest priority disaster needs.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

The Mississippi River and Tributaries Project has suffered a record flood event, in many cases surpassing the 1927 and 1937 floods. For only the second time ever and the first time since 1937, the Corps has had to operate the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway. Because of the rarity of the use of this floodway, there is no structure to open or close. The Corps had to literally blow up sections of the levee in order to keep from overtopping levees on the Mississippi River. This floodway was designed as one of four floodways to help pass the project design flood on the Mississippi River. Floodways at Morganza and Bonnet Carré in Louisiana were operated as well to ensure that levees were not overtopped in this reach of the river.

While these structures operated as planned, repairs will be necessary. The Birds Point-New Madrid levee has to be rebuilt as well as damages to the structures at Morganza and Bonnet Carré due to high flows and scouring. Numerous navigation structures that provide reliable navigation widths and depths on the Mississippi River were damaged by these unprecedented flows. Seepage under and through levees caused damages to the levees. Bank protection measures were impacted as well as tremendous amounts of silt de-

posited in navigable harbors. Recreation facilities were, in some cases, obliterated by the torrent of water that inexorably raged downstream.

All of these damages must be repaired if the Mississippi River and Tributaries project is to provide similar protection for future events. The Committee has included $890,177,300 to allow the Corps to address these repairs. Lessons learned from prior disasters should be put to use in making these repairs as expeditiously as possible. The Committee has also included language directing a report of the allocation and obligation of these funds within 60 days of enactment of this act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Projects that are part of the Mississippi River and Tributaries project were not the only items damaged by flood events. The flood on the Mississippi River moved tremendous amounts of sediment downstream clogging harbors and navigation channels. This sediment will have to be removed to restore the authorized widths and depths to these projects. Corps infrastructure has been damaged by high flows and scouring. Repairs to these facilities will have to be made if they are to provide similar functions in the future. The Committee has included $88,003,700 to allow the Corps to address these repairs. Lessons learned from prior disasters should be put to use in making these repairs as expeditiously as possible. The Committee has also included language directing a report of the allocation and obligation of these funds within 60 days of enactment of this act.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

The Corps participated in many flood fights alongside numerous local and State agencies. Most of these were successful. However, on the Missouri River, a few levees have failed that protect primarily agricultural lands. These levees will have to be rebuilt. Damages to levees and structures that are part of the Federal levee system that experienced damages due to seepage and erosion will have to be repaired if these levees are to reliably protect the areas from the next high water event. The Corps must take actions necessary to ensure that they are prepared for the inevitable natural disasters of the future. The Committee has included $66,387,000 for the Corps to address these repairs and for other activities related to responding and preparing for natural disasters. Lessons learned from prior disasters should be put to use in making these repairs as expeditiously as possible. The Committee has also included language directing a report of the allocation and obligation of these funds within 60 days of enactment of this act.

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 Committee recommends funding for the following programs or activities which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2012:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: General Investigations; Construction, General; Mississippi River and Tributaries; Operations and Maintenance; Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program;

Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation;

Water and Related Resources;

Department of Energy: Energy Conservation and Supply Activities:

Office of Fossil Energy: Fossil Energy R&D, Clean Coal, Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Research;

Health, Safety and Security;

Non-Defense Environmental Management;

Office of Science;

Department of Administration;

National Nuclear Security Administration: Weapons Activities; Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation; Naval Reactors; Office of the Administrator;

Defense Environmental Management, Defense Site Acceleration Completion;

Other Defense Activities;

Defense Nuclear Waste Fund;

Office of Security and Performance Assurance;

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;

Power Marketing Administrations: Southeastern, Southwestern, Western Area; and

Energy Information Administration.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(c), RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on September 7, 2011, the Committee ordered favorably reported en bloc the fiscal year 2012 budget allocation a proposed by the Chairman, and a bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; a bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water develop-

ment and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and a bill (H.R 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; provided, that each bill be subject to further amendment and that each bill be consistent with its spending allocations, by a recorded vote of 29–1, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Inouye	Mr. Johnson (WI)
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Johnson (SD)	
Ms. Landrieu	
Mr. Reed	
Mr. Lautenberg	
Mr. Nelson	
Mr. Pryor	
Mr. Tester	
Mr. Brown	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Shelby	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. Alexander	
Ms. Collins	
Ms. Murkowski	
Mr. Graham	
Mr. Kirk	
Mr. Coats	
Mr. Blunt	
Mr. Moran	
Mr. Hoeven	

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.

TITLE 16—CONSERVATION

CHAPTER 12H—PACIFIC NORTHWEST ELECTRIC POWER PLANNING AND CONSERVATION

§ 839b. Regional planning and participation

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(h) Fish and wildlife

(1)(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(10)(A) * * *

(B) The Administrator may make expenditures from such fund which shall be included in the annual or supplementary budgets submitted to the Congress pursuant to the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act [16 U.S.C. 838 et seq.]. Any amounts included in such budget for the construction of capital facilities with an estimated life of greater than 15 years and an estimated cost of at least **[**$1,000,000**]** *$5,000,000* shall be funded in the same manner and in accordance with the same procedures as major transmission facilities under the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act.

TITLE 42—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE

CHAPTER 149—NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY AND PROGRAMS

SUBCHAPTER XV—INCENTIVES FOR INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES

§ 16512. Terms and conditions

(a) In general

Except for division C of Public Law 108–324 [15 U.S.C. 720 et seq.], the Secretary shall make guarantees under this or any other Act for projects on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, only in accordance with this section.

[(b) Specific appropriation or contribution

[No guarantee shall be made unless—

[(1) an appropriation for the cost has been made; or

[(2) the Secretary has received from the borrower a payment in full for the cost of the obligation and deposited the payment into the Treasury.**]**

[(b) SPECIFIC APPROPRIATION OR CONTRIBUTION.—

[(1) IN GENERAL.—

[(A) an appropriation for the cost of the guarantee has been made;

[(B) the Secretary has received from the borrower a payment in full for the cost of the guarantee and deposited the payment into the Treasury; or

[(C) a combination of one or more appropriations under subparagraph (A) and one or more payments from the borrower under subparagraph (B) has been made that is sufficient to cover the cost of the guarantee.]

(b) SPECIFIC APPROPRIATION OR CONTRIBUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No guarantee shall be made unless.—

(A) an appropriation for the cost of the guarantee has been made;

(B) the Secretary has received from the borrower a payment in full for the cost of the guarantee and deposited the payment into the Treasury;

(C) a combination of one or more appropriations under subparagraph (A) and one or more payments from the borrower under subparagraph (B) has been made that is sufficient to cover the cost of the guarantee.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT, 1996, PUBLIC LAW 104–303

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 333. PASSAIC RIVER, NEW JERSEY.

Section 1148 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4254) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1148. PASSAIC RIVER BASIN.

"(a) ACQUISITION OF LANDS.—The Secretary may acquire from willing sellers lands on which residential structures are located and that are subject to frequent and recurring flood damage, as identified in the supplemental floodway report of the Corps of Engineers, Passaic River Buyout Study, September 1995, at an estimated total cost of $194,000,000.

"[(b) RETENTION OF LANDS FOR FLOOD PROTECTION.—Lands acquired by the Secretary under this section shall be retained by the Secretary for future use in conjunction with flood protection and flood management in the Passaic River Basin.]

(b) DISPOSITION OF ACQUIRED LAND.—The Secretary may transfer land acquired under this section to the non-Federal sponsor by quitclaim deed subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the public interest.

"(c) COST SHARING.—The non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out this section shall be 25 percent plus any amount that might result from application of subsection (d).

"(d) APPLICABILITY OF BENEFIT-COST RATIO WAIVER AUTHORITY.—In evaluating and implementing the project under this section, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section

903(c), to the extent that the Secretary's evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.".

(e) FUNDS FOR LAND ACQUISITION.—Funds for acquiring such lands as are necessary in carrying out the requirements of this section and requirements as further recommended by the Secretary shall include funds as provided in subsection (c) and (d) of this section herein and also funds as previously appropriated with any and all such funds to be held by the Secretary for use in acquiring the requisite lands in proportion to the project cost sharing percentages.

WATER DESALINATION ACT, 1996, PUBLIC LAW 104–298

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) SECTION 3.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 3 of this Act $5,000,000 per year for fiscal years 1997 through **[**2011**]** *2016*. Of these amounts, up to $1,000,000 in each fiscal year may be awarded to institutions of higher education, including United States-Mexico binational research foundations and interuniversity research programs established by the two countries, for research grants without any cost-sharing requirement.

(b) SECTION 4.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 4 of this Act **[**$25,000,000 for fiscal years 1997 through 2011**]** *$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016.*

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT, 2000, PUBLIC LAW 106–541

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 529. LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.— * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT.— * * *

(1) IN GENERAL.— * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated **[**$20,000,000**]** *$30,000,000* to carry out this section.

FARM SECURITY AND RURAL INVESTMENT ACT, 2002, PUBLIC LAW 107–171

TITLE II—CONSERVATION

Subtitle F—Other Conservation Programs

SEC. 2507. DESERT TERMINAL LAKES.

(a) TRANSFER.— * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) PERMITTED USES.—[In any case in which there are willing sellers] *For the benefit of at-risk natural desert terminal lakes and associated riparian and watershed resources, in any case in which there are willing sellers or willing participants*, the funds described in subsection (a) may be used—

(1) to lease water;

(2) to purchase land, water appurtenant to the land, and related interests [in the Walker River Basin in accordance with section 208(a)(1)(A) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–103; 119 Stat. 2268)]; and

(3) for efforts consistent with researching, supporting, andconserving fish, wildlife, plant, and habitat resources [in the Walker River Basin].

OMNIBUS PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT ACT, 2009, PUBLIC LAW 111–11

TITLE X—WATER SETTLEMENTS

Subtitle A—San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement

PART I—SAN JOAQUIN RIVER RESTORATION SETTLEMENT ACT

SEC. 10009. APPROPRIATIONS; SETTLEMENT FUND.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION COSTS.— * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.— * * *

* * * * * * *

(2) AVAILABILITY.—All funds deposited into the Fund pursuant to subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1) are authorized for appropriation to implement the Settlement and this part, in addition to the authorization provided in subsections (a) and (b) of section 10203, except that $88,000,000 of such funds are available for expenditure without further appropriation; provided that after [October 1, 2019, all funds in

the Fund shall be available for expenditure without further appropriation.] *October 1, 2014, all funds in the Fund shall be available for expenditure on an annual basis in an amount not to exceed $40,000,000 without further appropriation.*

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 2010, PUBLIC LAW 111–85

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 208. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b)(1) The amount made available under subsection (a)(1) shall be—

(A) * * *

(B) allocated as follows:

(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

(iv) $10,000,000 for associated conservation and stewardship activities, including water conservation and management, watershed planning, land stewardship, habitat restoration, and the establishment of a local, nonprofit entity to hold and [exercise water rights] *manage land, water appurtenat to the land, and related interests* acquired by, and to achieve the purposes of, the Walker Basin Restoration Program.

* * * * * * *

(2)(A) [The amount made available under subsection (a)(1) shall be provided to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation] *Any amount made available to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation under subsection (a) shall be provided—*

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	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the Budget Resolution for 2012: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....
Discretionary	31,625	32,670	45,071	[1] 45,838
Security	11,050	11,050	NA	NA
Nonsecurity	20,575	21,620	NA	NA
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2012	.....	.....	.....	[2] 19,500
2013	.....	.....	.....	9,315
2014	.....	.....	.....	3,038
2015	.....	.....	.....	580
2016 and future years	.....	.....	.....	181
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2012	NA	71	NA	15

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

Consistent with the funding recommended in the bill for disaster funding and in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(D) of the BBEDCA and section 106 of the Deficit Control Act of 2011, the Committee anticipates that the Budget Committee will file a revised section 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations reflecting an upward adjustment of $1,045,000,000 in budget authority plus associated outlays.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2011 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2012 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers—Civil							
Investigations	126,746	104,000	104,000	125,000	−1,746	+21,000	+21,000
Construction	1,789,822	1,480,000	1,615,191	1,610,000	−179,822	+130,000	−5,191
Rescission	−176,000	.....	−50,000	.....	+176,000	.....	+50,000
Subtotal	1,613,822	1,480,000	1,565,191	1,610,000	−3,822	+130,000	+44,809
Mississippi River and tributaries	263,906	210,000	210,000	250,000	−13,906	+40,000	+40,000
Rescission	−22,000	−23,000	.....	.....	+22,000	+23,000	.....
Rescission of emergency funding (Sec. 105)	.....	−35,000	.....	.....	.....	+35,000	.....
Subtotal	241,906	152,000	210,000	250,000	+8,094	+98,000	+40,000
Operations and maintenance	2,365,759	2,314,000	2,368,925	2,360,000	−5,759	+46,000	−8,925
Regulatory program	189,620	196,000	196,000	193,000	+3,380	−3,000	−3,000
FUSRAP	129,740	109,000	109,000	109,000	−20,740	.....	.....
Flood control and coastal emergencies	.....	27,000	27,000	27,000	+27,000	.....	.....
Expenses	184,630	185,000	177,640	185,000	+370	.....	+7,360
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	4,990	6,000	5,000	5,000	+10	−1,000	.....
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	4,857,213	4,573,000	4,762,756	4,864,000	+6,787	+291,000	+101,244
Appropriations	(5,055,213)	(4,631,000)	(4,812,756)	(4,864,000)	(−191,213)	(+233,000)	(+51,244)
Rescissions	(−198,000)	(−23,000)	(−50,000)	.....	(+198,000)	(+23,000)	(+50,000)
Rescissions of emergency funding	.....	(−35,000)	.....	.....	.....	(+35,000)	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2011 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2012 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Central Utah Project Completion Account							
Central Utah project construction	.....	29,441	25,154	25,441	+25,441	−4,000	+287
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	+2,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	.....	31,441	27,154	27,441	+27,441	−4,000	+287
Program oversight and administration	.....	1,550	1,550	1,550	+1,550	.....	.....
Undistributed funding level	31,940	.....	.....	.....	−31,940	.....	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	31,940	32,991	28,704	28,991	−2,949	−4,000	+287
Bureau of Reclamation							
Water and related resources	911,673	805,187	822,300	885,670	−26,003	+80,483	+63,370
Central Valley project restoration fund	49,914	53,068	53,068	53,068	+3,154	.....	.....
California Bay-Delta restoration	39,920	39,651	35,928	39,651	−269	.....	+3,723
Policy and administration	61,078	60,000	60,000	60,000	−1,078	.....	.....
Indian water rights settlements	.....	51,483	.....	.....	.....	−51,483	.....
San Joaquin restoration fund	.....	9,000	.....	.....	.....	−9,000	.....
Rescission	.....	.....	−66,000	.....	.....	.....	+66,000
Subtotal	.....	9,000	−66,000	.....	.....	−9,000	+66,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	1,062,585	1,018,389	905,296	1,038,389	−24,196	+20,000	+133,093
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	1,094,525	1,051,380	934,000	1,067,380	−27,145	+16,000	+133,380

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy Programs							
Energy efficiency and renewable energy	1,825,641	3,200,053	1,308,436	1,795,641	−30,000	−1,404,412	+487,205
Rescission	−30,000	.....	.....	.....	+30,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	1,795,641	3,200,053	1,308,436	1,795,641	.....	−1,404,412	+487,205
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	144,710	237,717	139,496	141,010	−3,700	−96,707	+1,514
Rescission	−3,700	.....	.....	.....	+3,700	.....	.....
Subtotal	141,010	237,717	139,496	141,010	.....	−96,707	+1,514
Nuclear energy	732,124	754,028	733,633	583,834	−148,290	−170,194	−149,799
Rescission	−6,300	.....	.....	.....	+6,300	.....	.....
Subtotal	725,824	754,028	733,633	583,834	−141,990	−170,194	−149,799
Fossil energy research and development	584,529	452,975	476,993	445,471	−139,058	−7,504	−31,522
Rescission	−140,000	.....	.....	−187,000	−47,000	−187,000	−187,000
Subtotal	444,529	452,975	476,993	258,471	−186,058	−194,504	−218,522
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	22,954	14,909	14,909	14,909	−8,045	.....	.....
Rescission	−2,100	.....	.....	.....	+2,100	.....	.....
Subtotal	20,854	14,909	14,909	14,909	−5,945	.....	.....
Strategic petroleum reserve	209,441	192,704	192,704	192,704	−16,737	.....	.....
Rescission	−86,300	−71,000	.....	.....	+86,300	+71,000	.....
Subtotal	123,141	121,704	192,704	192,704	+69,563	+71,000	.....
SPR petroleum account	.....	−250,000	−500,000	−500,000	−500,000	−250,000	.....
Clean coal technology (rescission)	−16,500	.....	.....	.....	+16,500	.....	.....
Northeast home heating oil reserve	10,978	10,119	10,119	10,119	−859	.....	.....
Rescission	.....	−100,000	−100,000	−100,000	−100,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	10,978	−89,881	−89,881	−89,881	−100,859	.....	.....
Energy Information Administration	95,409	123,957	105,000	105,000	+9,591	−18,957	.....
Rescission	−400	.....	.....	.....	+400	.....	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2011 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2012 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Subtotal	95,009	123,957	105,000	105,000	+9,991	−18,957	.....
Non-defense environmental clean up	224,350	219,121	254,121	219,121	−5,229	.....	−35,000
Rescission	−900	.....	.....	.....	+900	.....	.....
Subtotal	223,450	219,121	254,121	219,121	−4,329	.....	−35,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	506,984	504,169	449,000	429,000	−77,984	−75,169	−20,000
Rescission	−9,900	.....	.....	.....	+9,900	.....	.....
Subtotal	497,084	504,169	449,000	429,000	−68,084	−75,169	−20,000
Science	4,857,665	5,416,114	4,800,000	4,842,665	−15,000	−573,449	+42,665
Rescission	−15,000	.....	.....	.....	+15,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	4,842,665	5,416,114	4,800,000	4,842,665	.....	−573,449	+42,665
Nuclear Waste Disposal	.....	.....	25,000	.....	.....	.....	−25,000
Rescission	−2,800	.....	.....	.....	+2,800	.....	.....
Subtotal	−2,800	.....	25,000	.....	+2,800	.....	−25,000
Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy	179,640	550,011	179,640	250,000	+70,360	−300,011	+70,360
Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program	58,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	−20,000	.....	.....
Offsetting collection	−58,000	−38,000	−38,000	−38,000	+20,000	.....	.....
Loan volume rescission	−181,830	.....	.....	.....	+181,830	.....	.....
Additional loan volume	11,830	360,000	.....	.....	−11,830	−360,000	.....
Federal participation in Title 17 loan guarantee projects	.....	500,000	.....	.....	.....	−500,000	.....
Additional subsidy cost	169,660	200,000	160,000	200,000	+30,340	.....	+40,000
Subtotal	−340	1,060,000	160,000	200,000	+200,340	−860,000	+40,000

Advanced technology vehicles manufacturing loans program	9,978	6,000	6,000	6,000	−3,978	.....	.....
Better buildings pilot loan guarantee initiative:							
Loan guarantees	.....	100,000	.....	.....	.....	−100,000	.....
Administrative costs	.....	5,000	.....	.....	.....	−5,000	.....
Subtotal	.....	105,000	.....	.....	.....	−105,000	.....
Departmental administration	250,139	240,623	63,374	237,623	−12,516	−3,000	+174,249
Miscellaneous revenues	−119,501	−111,883	−111,883	−111,883	+7,618	.....	.....
Net appropriation	130,638	128,740	−48,509	125,740	−4,898	−3,000	+174,249
Rescission	−81,900	.....	.....	.....	+81,900	.....	.....
Subtotal	48,738	128,740	−48,509	125,740	+77,002	−3,000	+174,249
Office of the Inspector General	42,764	41,774	41,774	41,774	−990	.....	.....
Total, Energy programs	9,181,665	12,596,391	8,248,316	8,615,988	−565,677	−3,980,403	+367,672
Atomic Energy Defense Activities							
National Nuclear Security Administration							
Weapons activities	6,946,398	7,629,716	7,131,993	7,190,000	+243,602	−439,716	+58,007
Rescission	−50,000	−40,332	−40,332	.....	+50,000	+40,332	+40,332
Subtotal	6,896,398	7,589,384	7,091,661	7,190,000	+293,602	−399,384	+98,339
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	2,318,653	2,549,492	2,121,770	2,404,300	+85,647	−145,192	+282,530
Rescission	−45,000	−30,000	−30,000	−21,000	+24,000	+9,000	+9,000
Subtotal	2,273,653	2,519,492	2,091,770	2,383,300	+109,647	−136,192	+291,530
Naval reactors	960,176	1,153,662	1,030,600	1,100,000	+139,824	−53,662	+69,400
Rescission	−1,000	.....	.....	.....	+1,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	959,176	1,153,662	1,030,600	1,100,000	+140,824	−53,662	+69,400
Office of the Administrator	398,993	450,060	400,000	404,000	+5,007	−46,060	+4,000
Rescission	−5,700	.....	.....	.....	+5,700	.....	.....
Subtotal	393,293	450,060	400,000	404,000	+10,707	−46,060	+4,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2011 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2012 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
General Provision							
Section 309—Contractor pay freeze:							
Security (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	−27,300	−27,300	−27,300	−27,300
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	10,522,520	11,712,598	10,614,031	11,050,000	+527,480	−662,598	+435,969
Environmental and Other Defense Activities							
Defense environmental cleanup	4,991,638	5,406,781	4,937,619	5,002,308	+10,670	−404,473	+64,689
(Transfer to Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund)	(−33,633)	.....	.....	.....	(+33,633)	.....	.....
Rescission	−11,900	.....	.....	.....	+11,900	.....	.....
Subtotal	4,979,738	5,406,781	4,937,619	5,002,308	+22,570	−404,473	+64,689
Other defense activities	788,420	859,952	814,000	819,000	+30,580	−40,952	+5,000
Rescission	−3,400	.....	.....	.....	+3,400	.....	.....
Subtotal	785,020	859,952	814,000	819,000	+33,980	−40,952	+5,000
Total, Environmental and other defense activities	5,764,758	6,266,733	5,751,619	5,821,308	+56,550	−445,425	+69,689
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	16,287,278	17,979,331	16,365,650	16,871,308	+584,030	−1,108,023	+505,658
Power Marketing Administrations [1]							
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	78,444	8,428	8,428	8,428	−70,016	.....	.....
Offsetting collections	−78,444	−8,428	−8,428	−8,428	+70,016	.....	.....
Subtotal	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	82,918	45,010	45,010	45,010	−37,908	.....	.....

Offsetting collection	−69,868	−33,118	−33,118	−33,118	+36,750	.....	.....
Subtotal	13,050	11,892	11,892	11,892	−1,158	.....	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	610,179	285,900	285,900	285,900	−324,279	.....	.....
Offsetting collections	−497,337	−189,932	−189,932	−189,932	+307,405	.....	.....
Offsetting collection Colorado River Dam Fund	−3,879	.....	.....	.....	+3,879	.....	.....
Subtotal	108,963	95,968	95,968	95,968	−12,995	.....	.....
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,568	4,169	4,169	4,169	+1,601	.....	.....
Offsetting collections	−2,348	−3,949	−3,949	−3,949	−1,601	.....	.....
Subtotal	220	220	220	220	.....	.....	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	122,233	108,080	108,080	108,080	−14,153	.....	.....
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	298,000	304,600	304,600	304,600	+6,600	.....	.....
Revenues applied	−298,000	−304,600	−304,600	−304,600	−6,600	.....	.....
General Provision							
Section 309—Contractor pay freeze:							
Non security (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	−46,400	−46,400	−46,400	−46,400
Total, title III, Department of Energy	25,591,176	30,683,802	24,722,046	25,548,976	−42,200	−5,134,826	+826,930
Appropriations	(26,285,806)	(30,925,134)	(24,892,378)	(25,930,676)	(−355,130)	(−4,994,458)	(+1,038,298)
Rescissions	(−694,630)	(−241,332)	(−170,332)	(−381,700)	(+312,930)	(−140,368)	(−211,368)
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission	68,263	76,000	68,400	58,024	−10,239	−17,976	−10,376
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	23,203	29,130	29,130	29,130	+5,927	.....	.....
Delta Regional Authority	11,677	13,000	11,700	9,925	−1,752	−3,075	−1,775
Denali Commission	10,679	11,965	10,700	9,077	−1,602	−2,888	−1,623
Rescission	−15,000	.....	.....	.....	+15,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	−4,321	11,965	10,700	9,077	+13,398	−2,888	−1,623
Northern Border Regional Commission	1,497	1,500	1,350	1,275	−222	−225	−75
Southeast Crescent Regional Commission	250	.....	250	213	−37	+213	−37

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2011 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					2012 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	1,043,208	1,027,240	1,037,240	1,027,240	−15,968	.....	−10,000
Revenues	−906,220	−899,726	−890,713	−899,726	+6,494	.....	−9,013
Subtotal	136,988	127,514	146,527	127,514	−9,474	.....	−19,013
Office of Inspector General	10,858	10,860	10,860	10,860	+2	.....	.....
Revenues	−9,774	−9,774	−9,774	−9,774	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal	1,084	1,086	1,086	1,086	+2	.....	.....
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	138,072	128,600	147,613	128,600	−9,472	.....	−19,013
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,883	3,400	3,400	3,400	−483	.....	.....
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska natural gas transportation projects	4,457	4,032	4,032	1,000	−3,457	−3,032	−3,032
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	246,981	267,627	276,575	240,644	−6,337	−26,983	−35,931
Appropriations	(261,981)	(267,627)	(276,575)	(240,644)	(−21,337)	(−26,983)	(−35,931)
Rescissions	(−15,000)	.....	.....	.....	(+15,000)	.....	.....
TITLE V—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR DISASTER RELIEF							
Corps of Engineers—Civil:							
Construction, fiscal year 2011 (emergency)	.....	.....	376	.....	.....	.....	−376
Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 2011 (emergency)	.....	.....	589,505	.....	.....	.....	−589,505
Operation and maintenance, fiscal year 2011 (emergency)	.....	.....	204,927	.....	.....	.....	−204,927
Flood control and coastal emergencies, fiscal year 2011 (emergency)	.....	.....	233,876	.....	.....	.....	−233,876
Subtotal, Corp of Engineers—Civil	.....	.....	1,028,684	.....	.....	.....	−1,028,684

Transfer from title XII, Public Law 111–5 (emergency)	.....	.....	−1,028,684	.....	.....	.....	+1,028,684
Rescission of emergency appropriations (Public Law 111–5)	.....	.....	−471,316	.....	.....	.....	+471,316
Total, Title V, Emergency supplemental for disaster relief	.....	.....	−471,316	.....	.....	.....	+471,316
Emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Rescissions of emergency appropriations	.....	.....	(−471,316)	.....	.....	.....	(+471,316)
TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR DISASTER RELIEF							
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers—Civil							
Mississippi River and tributaries (disaster relief category)	.....	.....	.....	890,177	+890,177	+890,177	+890,177
Operations and maintenance (disaster relief category)	.....	.....	.....	88,004	+88,004	+88,004	+88,004
Flood control and coastal emergencies (disaster relief category)	.....	.....	.....	66,387	+66,387	+66,387	+66,387
Total, Title VI, Emergency supplemental for disaster relief	.....	.....	.....	1,044,568	+1,044,568	+1,044,568	+1,044,568
Grand total	31,789,895	36,575,809	30,224,061	32,765,568	+975,673	−3,810,241	+2,541,507
Appropriations	(32,697,525)	(36,875,141)	(30,981,709)	(32,102,700)	(−594,825)	(−4,772,441)	(+1,120,991)
Disaster relief category	.....	.....	.....	(1,044,568)	(+1,044,568)	(+1,044,568)	(+1,044,568)
Rescissions	(−907,630)	(−264,332)	(−286,332)	(−381,700)	(+525,930)	(−117,368)	(−95,368)
Rescissions of emergency appropriations	.....	(−35,000)	(−471,316)	.....	.....	(+35,000)	(+471,316)

[1] Totals adjusted to net out alternative financing costs, reimbursable agreement funding, and power purchase and wheeling expenditures. Offsetting collection totals only reflect funds collected for annual expenses, excluding power purchase wheeling.

○